







A N
A T T E M P T

To ascertain and illustrate

THE AUTHORITY, NATURE, AND DESIGN

· O F

THE INSTITUTION OF CHRIST

Commonly called

THE COMMUNION

A N D

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

By WILLIAM BELL, D.D.

Prebendary of St. PETER'S, Westminster.

Domestic Chaplain to HER ROYAL HIGHNESS
PRINCESS AMELIA.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. ROBSON, in New Bond-Street.

And sold by B. WHITE, Fleet-Street; T. CADELL,
in the Strand; and H. PAYNE, Pall Mall.

M. DCC. LXXX.

T. R.
B. 4352

T O .

HER ROYAL HIGHNESS

PRINCESS AMELIA.

MADAM,

SOME years ago I submitted to the Public an argument in proof of the divine original of the Gospel. I have now the honour of presenting to Your Royal Highness an attempt to rescue from mistake and uncertainty the most solemn of its Institutions: That Institution, which the

DEDICATION.

Romanists have corrupted with such extravagant absurdities as to render it the reproach of the Christian name ; and with respect to which it is likewise to be lamented, that the Protestant world is divided by a variety of opinions, differing very materially from each other.

Convinced upon enlightened principles, the fruits of reading and reflexion, as I well know Your Royal Highness to be, that the Gospel is a Revelation of the will of God ; I persuade myself, Madam, You will receive with indulgence an endeavour to place in the clearest and strongest light every point of importance relating

DEDICATION.

lating to a Rite, the celebration of which Your Royal Highness has ever attended with a religious regard, as a positive Christian Duty.

I embrace, with the sincerest pleasure, Madam, the opportunity now afforded me, of acknowledging to the world my particular obligations, for the honourable public marks of favour and approbation, with which Your Royal Highness has been pleased to distinguish my private discharge of the duties of my Profession in your own immediate service: and I am at the same time ambitious of making it in some measure appear, that Your Royal High-

DEDICATION.

ness's protection has been extended to one who has studied the Gospel with sincerity, and exerted his best endeavours to explain it with truth.

With the utmost deference I have the honour to be,

Madam,

Your Royal Highness's

most grateful,

most respectful, and

most dutiful Servant,

WILLIAM BELL.

TO THE
R E A D E R,

THE authority, nature, and effects of a Rite instituted by our Lord, as one of the two distinguishing Rites of his religion, must certainly be a subject of serious concern to all who embrace the Christian Faith: and the endeavour to acquire just and accurate ideas of the Lord's Supper has been rendered a matter of still greater necessity, by the no less important than contradictory opinions, which still continue to be entertained with respect to this particular Institution.

The following Treatise, which took its rise from the Author's endeavours several years ago to settle his own notions upon the subject, is

an attempt to reduce the points in question relating to this Rite, as near as may be, to demonstration; by examining into the only sources of information from which any true knowledge of it can be authentically deduced; the history of its institution given us by the Apostles, and whatever else is said of it in the New Testament itself.

On reviewing the argument with the closest attention he has not been able to detect any fallacy, either in the principles assumed, or the consequences drawn from them. But as it is very far from impossible that he may have been deceived by some involuntary prejudice in favour of his own conceptions, he now at length submits them to the Public; that from the unbiaſſed judgment of others he may either derive the satisfaction of being confirmed in the truth of his deductions, or the benefit of having his mistakes clearly pointed out, and such conclusions as may prove unexceptionable established. And with the direct view of more easily

easily obtaining one or other of these advantages, the enquiry has been pursued through a series of distinct, though connected propositions, drawn up in a close argumentative form; in order that every single principle upon which it proceeds may plainly and fully appear, and the truth or falsehood of every deduction be readily and clearly determined.

From the very important effects, which have not only been attributed to this Rite, but with the best intentions considered as points which it is scarce proper to call into question, there is perhaps reason to apprehend, that the conclusions here drawn relating to them may possibly give offence to Some, whose approbation the Author would be happy to obtain. Should this prove the case, he still flatters himself they will admit his apology, when he assures them, that the Treatise owes its existence, as well as its publication, to what he apprehends ought to be the leading motive of every such enquiry; a sincere desire of ascertaining the true intention
of

of Jesus in the Institution concerned, and spreading the knowledge of what it is certainly desirable that every one who professes the Faith in Christ should rightly understand.

If, in attempting to accomplish this, he has found himself under a necessity of reasoning in direct opposition to opinions of Men of the greatest name and most distinguished abilities, who have written professedly on the subject; the result of a conscientious pursuit of truth, in a point of such importance to the religion of the Gospel, will not, he trusts, be imputed to voluntary prejudice, or still more unbecoming presumption.

Attempts to rectify mistakes in points of considerable moment, and especially when advanced and espoused by Writers of the greatest authority, it will readily be agreed, are endeavours to serve the cause of Truth where it stands most in need of support. And such is the acknowledged eminence of those Writers
with

with whom we are in this question concerned ; that to shew Them to have fallen into any mistake, should that in the event be found the case, is little more than proving what would never be questioned, that even their superiour endowments did not exempt them from the common fallibility of man.

For the fundamental principles here enforced, with respect to the nature and effects of the Institution concerned, the world has long been indebted to the well known Mr. John Hales of Eaton ; and for a professed argument in their support to a very eminent Prelate several years since deceased. But how clearly soever they have been established by this distinguished Writer ; in consequence of objections which have been urged against some particulars of his reasoning in their defence, the subject itself still remains involved in obscurity ; and not only the public doctrines of each distinct Protestant Persuasion, but the private opinions of individuals of perhaps every Persuasion,

suasion, either vary considerably from each other, or at the least continue vague and indecisive. This obscurity and want of decision therefore it is the professed object of the following Treatise to remove; by such an application of the only principles upon which the points in question are capable of being determined, and so clear a deduction of the material consequences resulting from them, as may evince the true nature of the Rite by a complete direct proof; and, without expressly adverting to objections, in effect meet and supersede them.

Whether the argument here offered is equal to its design, such a scrupulous examination as the importance of the subject requires can alone determine. But should there be found in it any such mistakes as will affect the conclusion, still, it is hoped, the particular train of reasoning may have its use; by assisting others effectually to clear up what this attempt may have failed of determining. And should even this be
beyond

beyond its reach, it may yet be of some service, if it is only sufficient to excite a serious attention to the subject. For how little pleasing soever disquisitions of this argumentative nature may be, and how frequently soever they may have proved defective; on points which have occasioned much dispute, and contradictory opinions of great importance, they are still absolutely necessary; since it is certain, that nothing but attentive and close investigation can conduct us to the satisfactory detection of error, or the direct establishment of truth.

And that even the mere practical reader may not be deterred from the perusal of the following Treatise by its argumentative form, it is proper to apprise him, that though the form itself should not at first be familiar, this signal benefit will be found to be derived from it; that by means of it, the Authority, Nature, and Design of the Rite concerned, and every practical consideration relating to it, are here deduced in the plainest and most direct manner,

in

in the very short Treatise itself; while every point of difficulty, which would otherwise have embarrassed the question, is kept entirely apart, by being thrown into the Appendix, and the subsequent Notes: so that the argumentative method of treating the subject here adopted; while, by tracing every thing from the fountain head, it is far more instructive and satisfactory; will be found, it is presumed, as easy of comprehension, as even a mere popular treatise upon it could have been.

E R R A T U M.

Page 89, line 16. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{For}—\text{No. VI. of this Appendix—} \\ \textit{Read, No. V. of this Appendix.} \end{array} \right.$

A N

A T T E M P T, &c.

SECTION I.

I. **T**HE obligation we are under to celebrate any religious rite is founded on the authority of the person by whom it is instituted: and when the institutor is a person authorized to reveal the will of God, we are as much obliged to celebrate such rite, as we are to obey any other particular of the known will of God.

II. The true design of every religious rite must depend entirely upon the intention of the institutor himself with regard to it.

B

III. The

III. The intention of the institutor of any religious rite, and consequently the nature and design of the rite itself, must be learnt from the declarations of the institutor, considered jointly with all such circumstances as he must be supposed to have regarded at the time of the institution; and from the declarations of such other persons, if any such there are, as he has properly authorized to declare his intentions relating to it;---and from these authorities only.

SECTION II.

IV. If neither the words of the institution of any rite, nor the circumstances in which it was instituted, nor the declarations of those who alone are duly qualified to declare its design, contain or imply a promise of any peculiar rewards attending the performance of it; or a threatening of any peculiar punishments attending the omission of it;---the rewards, or punishments, attending the performance or omission of such rite, can be no other, than the good or evil arising from obedience or disobedience to any express command of the institutor; and the good or
evil

evil naturally resulting from the due performance or omission of the actions themselves, in which the rite consists.

SECTION III.

V. The christian rite commonly called the Lord's Supper^a was instituted by Jesus, and Jesus was divinely commissioned to reveal the will of God.

VI. The Apostles, including St. Paul, were duly authorized by Jesus, and the only persons so authorized, to preach his religion, and declare the design of such rites as he appointed.

VII. The design of the Lord's Supper must be learnt from the words of Jesus himself at the institution, considered jointly with the circumstances attending it; and the declarations of the Apostles relating to it; and from no other authorities whatever.

^a See note on p. 3. at the end of the Appendix.

SECTION IV.

VIII. The history of the institution of the Lord's Supper is delivered by the Apostles in the following passages, and in them only: viz. Matt. xxvi. 26, &c. Mark xiv. 22, &c. Luke xxii. 19, &c. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 23, &c. and what they have each related is as follows.

Matt. *And as they were eating Jesus took bread,*

Mark. *And as they did eat Jesus took bread,*

Luke. *And he took bread,*

Paul. *The Lord Jesus, the same night that he was betrayed, took bread,*

Matt. *And blessed it, and brake it, and gave to his disciples,*

Mark. *And blessed, and brake it, and gave to them,*

Luke. *And gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them,*

Paul. *And when he had given thanks, he brake it,*

Matt. *And said, Take, eat, this is my body,*

Mark. *And said, Take, eat, this is my body,*

Luke. *Saying, This is my body,*

Paul. *And said, Take, eat, this is my body,*

Luke.

Luke. *Which is given for you ; This do in remembrance of me ;*

Paul. *Which is broken for you ; This do in remembrance of me.*

Matt. *And he took the cup, and gave thanks,*

Mark. *And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks,*

Luke. *Likewise also the cup, after supper,*

Paul. *After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped,*

Matt. *And gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it ;*

Mark. *He gave it to them, and they all drank of it ;*

Matt. *For this is my blood of the New Testament ;^b*

^b It may not be improper to remind the reader here, once for all, of what has often been remarked, that in all passages where our translation adopts the term New Testament, it would have been more proper to have used the word Covenant, as that expresses the true sense of the word Διαθήκη in the original, which the word Testament does not. See Bp. Pearce's note on Matt. xxvi. 28. vol. i. p. 183.

6 THE AUTHORITY, NATURE, AND

Mark. *And he said unto them, This is my blood of the New Testament,*

Luke. *Saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood,*

Paul. *Saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood;*

Matt. *Which is shed for many,*

Mark. *Which is shed for many,*

Luke. *Which is shed for you,*

Matt. *For remission of sins.^c*

Paul. *This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.*

IX. These passages containing the whole history of the institution of the Lord's Supper, as the Apostles have transmitted it to us; all conclusions relating to the design of this rite, drawn from the institution itself, must be founded on a due consideration of the declarations of our Lord here related by the Apostles, and the peculiar circumstances in which they were made.

^c See the note on p. 6. at the end of the Appendix.

SECTION V.

X. Upon a joint view of these several relations it appears, that all our Saviour said and did, in instituting the rite under consideration, was as follows: .

That while he was at supper with the Twelve he broke a piece of bread, giving thanks to God, and gave it to them all, saying to them, *Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken, or given, for you; this do in remembrance of me.*

And that after supper he took a cup, and gave it to them, saying, *Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Covenant; or, this is the New Covenant in my blood; which is shed for you, or for many, for the remission of sins; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.*

XI. From these accounts given us by the Apostles of what Jesus said and did in instituting this rite, it evidently appears;

1st, That Jesus commanded the Apostles to observe a practice of breaking and eating bread, and drinking wine, together, in remembrance of him.

When he gave them the bread he said, *Take, eat; this is my body, which is given for you; do this in remembrance of me.* Here were two perfectly distinct, and positive commands. The first, to eat of the bread he then gave them, at that time; the second, to eat bread from that time forward, in remembrance of him. The words, *Take, eat,* accompanied with the action of giving them the bread, expressed the first; and the additional injunction, *Do this in remembrance of me,* the second; since it is evident, that in order to eat bread *in remembrance of him,* they must of necessity do it after he should be taken from them.

And this being clear with respect to the bread, there is not in reality any occasion for a distinct proof of the same points with regard to the cup; since it is manifest, that the participation of the one was intended to be accompanied with that of the other. But the words of Jesus will equally prove the certainty of the institution with regard to the cup likewise.

When he gave them the cup he said, *Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it,*

in remembrance of me. Here the words, *drink ye all of it*, accompanied with the action of giving them the cup, were a positive command to drink of that cup, at that time; and the additional injunction, *This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me*, immediately following the express injunction to drink at that time, as well as the positive command to *eat bread in remembrance of him*, was as positive a command to do this after he should be taken from them; clearly signifying by the new clause, *as oft as ye drink it*, that they were not to do this once only after he should have been put to death, but to repeat it as a standing ordinance; though at the same time leaving it to their discretion to determine how frequently they should do it.^d

2dly, It appears from the relations of the Apostles, that Jesus commanded them to do this, not as a mere general remembrance of himself; but that they should eat *the bread*, as a memorial of *his body, broken or given for them*; and the *wine* as a memorial of *his blood shed for them*; and consequently *both together*

^d See note on p. 9. at the end of the Appendix.

as memorials of *his death*; and further, of his suffering death for *many*, that is for all, *for remission of sins*.

And this likewise proves it to have been the intention of Jesus, that the rite should be observed after his death; since they were to regard the bread as a memorial of his body *given for them*, and the wine of his blood *shed for them*; which it was absolutely impossible for them to do till after he should have been actually put to death.

X 3dly, It appears, that the words and actions of our Lord in instituting this rite, considered in themselves, do neither express, nor imply, any thing more as contained in this rite, than what has now been explained.

X 4thly, More particularly it appears, that the words and actions of Jesus on this occasion, considered in themselves, do not contain or imply, either a promise of any special reward, that should attend the performance of this rite; or a threatening of any special punishment, that should attend the omission of it; or any thing more, than a plain description of the rite itself, and a positive command to celebrate it.

SECTION VI.

XII. The Lord's Supper was not instituted by Jesus for the observation of the Apostles alone, but was enjoined by him for a standing rite of his religion, to be perpetually celebrated by all who should ever profess themselves his disciples.

As the Apostles were the only persons present at the institution of the Lord's Supper, it may possibly be thought we cannot be certain, from Jesus's command to them to celebrate it, that he meant it to be observed by all who should ever believe in him to the end of the world. Yet this is, in the first place, only not absolutely certain, even from the very words of Jesus in the institution itself.

He expressly directed them *all* to do what he then prescribed; and not at that time only, but to repeat it, as a practice appointed by him, after he should be put to death;° without adding any intimation that they were ever to discontinue it; and the reason he assigned for enjoining it, that he suffered death *for many, for remission of sins*, was neither pe-

° See page 7-9.

cularly applicable to the Apostles, nor to any particular period of time. And since the reason he assigned for instituting the rite is no less applicable to all universally who shall ever believe in Christ, than it was originally to the Apostles; and he commanded *all* who were present to celebrate it, without any direction whatever, either to confine the celebration of it afterwards to themselves, or to discontinue it at any future period; it would, I apprehend, be contrary to every principle of reasonable interpretation to suppose, that he did not intend it for a perpetual and universal rite of his religion.

And this obvious conclusion, from Jesus's words alone, will derive no little additional strength from the particular circumstances in which they were delivered. At the time when Jesus gave the Apostles this injunction, he was celebrating with them the Paschal Supper, which was instituted by the law of Moses for a perpetual memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites out of Egypt, to be solemnly celebrated by every Jew.^f And

^f See Exod. xii. 14, 17, 25—27. xiii. 8—10. xxiii. 15. xxxiv. 18. Deut. xvi. 1, 3, 6.

since it is indisputable, that Jesus designed the christian rite he instituted at this time to be, in like manner, a memorial of the redemption of the world, through his death, for the remission of sins; we are absolutely bound to conclude from every circumstance accompanying the institution, that Jesus intended it to be a perpetual rite of his own religion, as the Passover was of the jewish; and to be universally celebrated by every Christian, as the Passover was enjoined to be, and actually was, by every Jew.^g

These considerations alone, founded upon the very words of the institution, and the particular circumstances attending it, appear to place the universal and perpetual obligation of this rite beyond all doubt: but if any can still remain, the conduct of St. Paul, after he was miraculously converted to the faith, and completely instructed in every particular of the will of Jesus, by immediate revelation from Jesus himself, and inspiration of the Holy Ghost;^h as well as that of all the other

^g See the note on p. 13. at the end of the Appendix.

^h Acts ix. 1—22. xxii. 14. xxvi. 15—18. Gal. i. 12. ii. 2, 6—9. Ephes. iii. 3, 4. 2 Cor. xi. 5. xii. 11.

Apostles, who likewise were divinely inspired to enable them to preach the gospel, and explain the intentions of Jesus, free from all mistake ;ⁱ must effectually remove it.

St. Paul, who was not even a believer in Christ till some little time after Jesus was put to death, was not one of those Apostles to whom Jesus said, when he instituted this rite, *This do in remembrance of me.* Had it therefore been the intention of Jesus, that none but the Apostles who were present at the time, and to whom he spoke, should observe the rite he then instituted, St. Paul himself could not have celebrated it, when afterwards he became miraculously converted, and professed the faith. Or, if it be allowable to suppose, that on account of his being converted in order to his becoming a chosen Apostle, it might be revealed to him that he was to celebrate it himself, though he had not been present at the institution ; still, if this rite was intended to be confined to the Apostles, it must at the same time have been revealed to him, that though he was to cele-

ⁱ Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. John, xiv. 16, 17, 26. xvi. 12, 13. Acts, i. 4, 5. ii. 1—4. Mark xvi. 20.

brate it himself, he was not to permit it to be celebrated by the converts he should make; and he must not only have made this the rule of his practice, but he would likewise have informed all the disciples whom he converted, of the revelation he had received, commanding him so to do, to account for this extraordinary particular of his conduct.

What then do we find to have been the fact? Does the New Testament shew us that he acted in this very particular manner? On the contrary, it is indisputably certain from his own writings, that he not only permitted, but authorised, and even required, all who professed the faith to eat bread and drink wine in remembrance of Jesus, as Jesus had commanded the Apostles to do, the night on which he was betrayed; and this in obedience to that original command to them, revealed by Jesus to him at his own conversion.

In his first epistle to the Corinthians, being desirous to illustrate a point of importance he was pressing strongly upon them, he appeals for this purpose to the nature and celebration of this very rite; and that in such a manner as to prove decisively, that it was at that time the established practice of all Christians to
celebrate

celebrate it; and that he himself approved of, and authorized the practice, as a standing institution of the religion of Christ.

I Cor. x. 16. *The cup of blessing, WHICH (saith St. Paul) WE BLESS, is it not the partaking of the blood of Christ? The bread WHICH WE BREAK, is it not the partaking of the body of Christ?*

17. *Because the bread is one, we, being many, are one body; FOR WE ARE ALL PARTAKERS OF THE ONE BREAD.*

This epistle was not written for the Corinthians alone, though for them more especially; but together with them was expressly addressed to all that in every place called upon the name of the Lord Jesus.^k This appeal therefore to the well known nature and celebration of this rite, as being universally practised and understood by the Apostles, and All, every where, who professed the faith, is an absolutely decisive proof, not only that St. Paul himself and all the Apostles celebrated it; but that it was the established practice of all Christians to break and eat bread, and drink wine, in religious remembrance of Jesus, as

^k I Cor. i. 2.

he had enjoined the Apostles to do, on the night on which he was betrayed. Nay, the similar conclusions to which St. Paul on this occasion appeals, as the obvious consequences of assisting at the celebration of this rite with Christians, and at the Jewish sacrifices with Jews; that the one implied the profession of Christianity, and the other of Judaism; is in fact a full proof, that the eating bread and drinking wine in religious remembrance of Jesus was as much a known and established rite of the religion of Christ, as the sacrifices offered up by the Jews were of the law of Moses.

And from the universal practice of the rite in question, completely established by this passage of St. Paul, it will necessarily follow, that it could not have been adopted without authority, either by the Corinthians, or any other Christian church; but that it must have been a duty enjoined by St. Paul, and all the Apostles, wherever they planted the gospel, as a perpetual institution of the religion of Christ. A practice of this, or indeed any other kind, had it been unauthorised by the Apostles, could not possibly have started up in every place at once, where they had estab-

C

blished

blished a christian congregation. And if any one church had attempted to introduce such a novelty into the religion they had been taught, it must have been utterly beyond their power, even long after this period, to have induced all other churches to adopt it. St. Paul and the other Apostles were at this very time preaching the gospel, and carefully superintending all the churches they had planted: and certainly, while this was the case, it was utterly impossible for any rite to be introduced, and become established, even in any one church, and much more so for any to have become the settled practice of all churches, unless it had been authorised and enjoined by the Apostles themselves. The converts to the faith in Christ must have taken the rites of their religion, as well as its doctrines, from the Apostles who converted them. They could not presume to introduce the celebration of any rite, as necessarily belonging to it, which the Apostles had not directed them to celebrate; nor could the Apostles have permitted them to continue the celebration of any such rite, if they had; and much less could they have sanctified any such rite, by even joining in the celebration of it themselves,

selves, and directing it to be universally practised; since for Them to have authorised the universal celebration of any rite, as an original institution of the religion of Christ, ordained by a command from him, which Jesus had neither instituted himself, nor by revelation directed them to enjoin, for universal celebration, would have been corrupting that religion which they were purposely selected to preach, and by inspiration enabled to preach free from all corruption or mistake; and therefore impossible.

The universal established practice therefore of eating bread and drinking wine in religious commemoration of Jesus, in the time of the Apostles themselves; which, from St. Paul's appeal to it just considered, cannot be doubted; is a decisive proof, that this rite could not have been an unauthorised practice, improperly introduced, either by the Corinthians, or any other of the converts to christianity; but that it must have been every where enjoined from the first by all the Apostles, as well as St. Paul, as having been instituted by Jesus in his command to them on the night on which he was betrayed. And this is still further evident from the manner in which St. Paul

writes to the Corinthians in the same epistle, to correct some great improprieties which they had been guilty of, when met together to celebrate this rite.

To make them duly sensible of the great impropriety of their conduct in this particular, and of the serious behaviour which ought to accompany this rite, he relates to them the manner in which Jesus directed the Apostles to celebrate it, the night on which he was betrayed; ^l---informs them, that the history of its institution had been revealed immediately to himself from the Lord; ^m---reminds them, that he had imparted all the particulars of it to them, when he first converted them to the faith; ⁿ---explains to them, from himself, the religious purpose which the celebration of this rite was calculated to answer, that of *showing the Lord's death till he should come*; ^o---shews them the nature of their offence in attending at it without serious reflection upon its particular nature and design; ^p---assures them that sickness, and even death, had been inflicted on some of them, as

^l 1 Cor. xi. 23--25. ^m Ibid. ver. 23. ⁿ Ibid. ver. 23. ^o Ibid. ver. 26. ^p Ibid. ver. 27--29.

a temporal

a temporal punishment for their culpable behaviour in this instance; ⁹---and, after exhorting them to that serious disposition, which a commemoration of our Lord's death must necessarily require, he directs them to continue the practice.'

Was it then possible for St. Paul to write in this manner to those whom he had converted to the faith, in relation to any rite which had been improperly introduced by the converts themselves; or any but what he, and all the Apostles, had originally enjoined the practice of, as a standing institution of the religion of Jesus? Unless the original injunction of Jesus to the Apostles had been intended by him as a direction for the practice of all who should ever profess the christian faith, as well as for that of the Apostles themselves; with what truth or propriety could St. Paul here press this original command upon the Corinthians, and all other Christians, without alledging any other to explain or enforce it, as a proof of its being their duty, as Christians, to celebrate the rite which that injunction ordained?

⁹ 1 Cor. xi. ver. 30.

^r Ibid. ver. 33, 34.

If Jesus had intended to signify by that command, that this rite should be celebrated by the Apostles, but by the Apostles alone, it would have been counteracting his intentions, and therefore corrupting his religion, not only to enjoin, but even to allow the celebration of it to Christians at large. And if, for the sake of argument, we for a moment suppose it possible, for in no other light can the supposition be admitted, that Jesus might mean to enjoin the celebration of it, as a duty, for none but the Apostles; but at the same time to permit the practice of it to all Christians, as a voluntary act; even in this case the Apostles could not have recommended, or even permitted the celebration of it to their disciples, without at the same time explicitly informing them, that, as a duty, this practice was enjoined by Jesus for the Apostles alone; and that with respect to all others therefore they only recommended it as a voluntary practice; because, without this explanation, their apostolical authority would certainly have caused it to be regarded as a general duty, and thus have corrupted the religion they were appointed to preach.

Since therefore it is certain that the Apostles, who were by inspiration informed of the true
intention

intention of Jesus in all his commands, and especially in one of so remarkable a nature as that under consideration, and incapable of corrupting, or suffering any corruption of his religion, in any particular; since they not only celebrated this rite themselves, but enjoined all whom they converted to the faith to celebrate it likewise; and this not as a voluntary performance, but as an act of necessary obedience to the injunction of Jesus to themselves the night on which he was betrayed; it must be granted, that this rite was not instituted by Jesus for the observation of the Apostles alone, though they were the only persons present at the institution; but was enjoined by our Lord for a standing rite of his religion, to be celebrated by all who should ever profess themselves believers in him. ^s

This argument, if I am not deceived, is conclusive: but one particular of what St. Paul has said, not yet attended to, will supply us with another argument in proof of the same point. In explaining the use of this rite he says, *as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.* ^t The

^s See the note on page 23 at the end of the Appendix.

^t 1 Cor. xi. 26.

coming of the Lord in different passages denotes two different events; the destruction of Jerusalem, together with the jewish polity; ^u and the last judgment. ^x Had St. Paul therefore here meant, that this rite was to be celebrated for the purpose of commemorating the death of Jesus, till the first of these events, the destruction of Jerusalem, but no longer; he must of necessity have signified, that it was in this sense he here used the expression, since otherwise they would certainly have misunderstood him: for if the rite concerned continued to be celebrated, as an ordinance of the gospel, for thirty or forty years, without any signification of its being ever to be laid aside, nothing certainly could induce any one to believe that it was then to cease, and be no longer observed. Had this been the design therefore, St. Paul could not have wrote, that by celebrating this rite they shewed the Lord's death *till he should come*, without at the same time pointing out WHICH

^u As in Matt. xxiv. 30. Luke xviii. 8. xxi. 27. John xxi. 22, 23. Heb. x. 37.

^x As in John xiv. 3. Acts i. 11. I Cor. iv. 5. 2 Theff. i. 10. Rev. ii. 25. iii. 11. xxii. 7. 20. and, as will be proved, in the passage under consideration.

coming of the Lord he meant. Nay, had this been the design, either Jesus himself at the time of instituting the rite, or at least the Apostles when they came to preach the gospel and enjoin the celebration of it, must carefully have explained it; and we should have found each of the Evangelists who has recorded the manner of its institution, subjoining to it some intimation of the period for which it was intended to be observed, and at the end of which it was to be abolished. But the fact is, that neither Jesus, nor any one of the Evangelists, has given us the least hint of any such intended limitation; and the total silence of John in particular, with regard to this rite, supplies us with an absolute proof, that in fact it was instituted on purpose to be perpetual.

John the Evangelist not only lived, but wrote his gospel, many years after Jerusalem was actually destroyed. If therefore the rite in question had been instituted by Jesus in order to its being celebrated till the arrival of that event, but then to be abolished; no sooner could that event have taken place, than John must have declared, that this rite was then immediately to cease, and have issued out his apostolical injunctions to all christians to discontinue it. And
when

when afterwards he came to write his gospel, he must unavoidably have made mention, not only of the rite itself, but more especially of those revealed directions from the Lord, in obedience to which he had abolished it; and the original institution, together with the subsequent abolition of it, would have constituted one of the most extraordinary particulars in the whole history and dispensation of the gospel.

SECTION VII.

The Lord's Supper being established as a standing rite of the religion of the Gospel, the next point to be ascertained is, what effects arise from the performance or neglect of it.

XIII. All the benefits we are warranted in expecting from the due performance of any rite instituted by Jesus, to which no special benefits have been positively annexed, can be no other than these:

1st, That approbation of God, which an intentional compliance with his will must certainly procure.

2^{dly},

2dly, And, whatever additional strength our principles and habits of virtue may naturally acquire by the celebration of any religious rite, owing to the virtuous tendency of the rite itself.

XIV. All the evils we are warranted in apprehending from the omission of any rite instituted by Jesus, to the omission of which no special evils have been positively annexed, can be no other than these:

1st, That disapprobation of God, which an intentional disobedience to his will must certainly produce.

2dly, And the loss of whatever additional strength our principles and habits of virtue might naturally acquire by the celebration of any particular religious rite, owing to the virtuous tendency of the rite itself.

XV. Since neither the words, nor the actions of Jesus in instituting the Lord's Supper do in themselves contain, or imply, a promise of any special benefits to reward the celebration of this rite; or a threatening of any special evils to punish the omission of it; it must be granted, that there neither
are,

are, nor can be, any other benefits attending the performance, nor any other evils attending the omission of it, than those just described in Propositions XIII. and XIV. unless it shall be found, either that some circumstances yet unnoticed accompanied the institution of it, which will give some peculiar meaning to the words and actions of our Lord in the institution; or, that the Apostles in their writings have communicated to us some particulars of its nature and effects, which neither the words or actions of Jesus in the institution itself, nor the circumstances attending it, imply.

SECTION VIII.

XVI. This peculiar circumstance attended the institution of the christian rite in question, That the Supper at which it was instituted was not a mere common meal, but the Paschal Supper, a very remarkable rite of the Jewish Law.

XVII. It is likewise certain that Jesus was accustomed to allude, both in his words and his actions, to those peculiar circumstances and situations in which he was speaking or acting.

XVIII.

XVIII. If therefore we should find any manifest resemblance between the christian rite, which we call the Lord's Supper, and that Jewish rite which Jesus was celebrating with the Twelve at the time of its institution, we may reasonably infer, that it was the design of our Lord to make the one so far bear resemblance to the other. But,

XIX. Neither that resemblance which subsists between the Lord's Supper and the Jewish Paschal Supper, nor any possible allusion in the institution of the one to the other, can warrant us in supposing, that any other benefits or evils attend the celebration or omission of the Lord's Supper, than those already mentioned as necessarily arising from the institution itself, in Propositions XIII. and XIV.^y

XX. It cannot be supposed that Jesus intended to give the rite he himself instituted a resemblance to any other Jewish rite besides the Paschal Supper. For it was the Paschal Supper only, which he was celebrating with the Twelve when he instituted his own rite;

^y For the proof of this assertion see Appendix, No. I.

and there is no other Jewish memorial to which it bears any resemblance. This is so evident as to need no proof.

SECTION IX.

XXI. It would be manifestly unreasonable, and indeed utterly unwarrantable to suppose, that it could be the intention of Jesus, when instituting the christian rite in question, to give it any resemblance to, or make its nature and effects in any degree whatever correspondent with, those of any heathen rite. He who came to abolish all the religious systems of the heathens, could not mean to institute one of the distinguishing rites of his own religion in imitation of any of theirs.^z

But if it had been possible for him to have entertained this design, it is certain that in fact he did not.

^z The rite itself which Jesus instituted, which consisted of nothing more than tasting bread and wine in religious commemoration of some peculiar circumstances of his death, had not in reality the least resemblance to any feast, religious or not religious; though the common supper, which the first Christians for some time thought proper to eat together, when met to celebrate this rite, so far as it was a meal eaten at that time, necessarily had.

It is self-evident Jesus could not but be well aware, that when he was celebrating the Paschal Supper with the Twelve, in obedience to the law of Moses, their thoughts must have been totally withdrawn from the consideration of all heathen rites, which they held, and by their law were commanded to hold, in utter abomination. If therefore he had designed to make the nature and effects of his own institution correspond with those of any heathen rite, he must of necessity have explained this design to the Twelve, either at the time or afterwards; since without this explanation it would have been absolutely impossible for them to have conceived it; and they, for the same reasons, must in that case have expressly mentioned this design of Jesus, as he had imparted it to them, when they came to relate the history of the institution itself, in their gospels.

Since therefore they have not recorded any thing of this kind, it must be allowed, that Jesus neither had, nor could have any design of making the nature and effects of the Eucharist in any degree similar to the supposed nature and effects of any heathen rites; and consequently that the one cannot admit of any explanation

explanation from the other. In fact, the opposite supposition appears so manifestly inadmissible, that had it not been actually contended for, it need not have been mentioned.

SECTION X.

XXII. Since from the history of the institution of the Lord's Supper it is highly reasonable to believe, 1st, That in it Jesus did allude to the Paschal Supper, but not to any other Jewish rite; and 2dly, That he did not at all allude to any Pagan rite: And since no resemblance whatever to the Paschal Supper can make the Eucharist any thing different from what the words of the institution prove it to be;^a it must be allowed, that as far as the nature of this rite can be ascertained from the words of the institution, considered jointly with all the peculiar circumstances accompanying it, the Lord's Supper is specifically, A memorial of our Lord; but more especially of his death, and the general purpose for which he died; having no other benefits annexed to the celebration, nor any other

^a See Appendix, No. 1.

evils to the omission of it, than those necessarily attending the celebration or omission of any other positive rite under the Christian dispensation, explained already in propositions XIII. and XIV.

XXIII. But since it is certain that Jesus did by no means completely instruct his disciples in the nature of his religion, while he was with them; but left them to be further instructed in it by the Holy Spirit, after he should be taken from them; and since it is therefore possible that the Holy Spirit might afterwards inform them of something peculiar to this rite, of which Jesus himself had not apprized them; it is incumbent on us to enquire, whether the Apostles, in their writings, have communicated to us any information relating to the nature and design of the Lord's Supper, more than we have been able to derive from the history they have given us of the institution itself.

SECTION XI.

XXIV. The most remarkable passage in the New Testament relating to the Lord's Supper, besides those already considered which give

us the history of its institution, occurs in St. Paul's 1st Epist. to the Corinthians, and extends from chap. x. 14. to chap. xi. 1. But no further intelligence concerning the nature and design of the Lord's Supper is communicated to us in this passage by St. Paul, than has already been deduced from the history of its institution. ^b

XXV. The next passage of the New Testament in which mention is made of the Lord's Supper, is likewise in the 1st Epist. of St. Paul to the Corinthians, and occurs in ch. xi. from ver. 20 to ver. 34. But neither in this passage has the Apostle imparted to us any information relating to the nature and design of the Lord's Supper, in addition to what we are furnished with by the history of its institution. ^c

XXVI. There still remains another passage of St. Paul's 1st Epist. to the Corinthians, which, if left unconsidered, might possibly give occasion to some confused doubts, whether that account of the nature and design of the Lord's

^b For the proof of this, see Appendix, No. II.

^c For the proof of this see Appendix, No. III.

Supper, which we have been forced to admit from considering all the circumstances attending its institution, is a complete account of it, or not. But so far is this passage from communicating to us any new intelligence relating to the design of the rite in question, that in fact the Lord's Supper is not even so much as alluded to in it.^d

XXVII. There are not, as far as I know, any ~~X~~ passages in the writings of the Apostles, besides those which have now been considered, from which the nature and design of the Lord's Supper can be learnt.

XXVIII. From a due consideration therefore ~~X~~ of the history of the institution of the Lord's Supper, including the words and actions of our Lord in the institution itself, and the peculiar circumstances attending it; as well as from an examination of all the passages in the writings of the Apostles relating to it; it appears, that the Lord's Supper is specifically, A religious memorial of our Lord, but more especially of his death, and the general pur-

^d For the proof of this see Appendix, No. IV.

pose for which he died; which has not any other benefits annexed to the celebration, nor any other evils to the omission of it, than those necessarily attending the celebration or omission of any positive rite under the Christian dispensation, explained already in propositions XIII. and XIV.

SECTION XII.

XXIX. From the particulars of the institution of this rite, as well as St. Paul's account of its use,^e one principal design of Jesus in ordaining, that all who should ever profess themselves believers in him should eat bread and drink wine, as memorials of his body given, and his blood shed for them, for the remission of sins, appears to have been, To furnish all ages with an obvious circumstantial proof, in the appointment of such a rite by himself, that he did not suffer death, as it might have been supposed, by compulsion; but with his own foreknowledge and consent, on purpose to complete a dispensation which the wisdom of God thought fit to adopt for the redemption of mankind.

^e 1 Cor. xi. 26.

XXX. And as the celebration of this rite, with those serious reflections and thankful acknowledgments, which the voluntary sufferings and death of Jesus, for the redemption of man, commemorated in it, evidently require, has a direct and strong tendency to strengthen our religious principles, and improve our practice, and thus to promote all the great objects of the gospel; it seems highly reasonable to conclude, that in the institution of this rite our Saviour had likewise a design of contributing to promote by it this beneficial effect.

Besides the two purposes now explained, and perhaps that of instituting a rite of such a nature, that assisting at it would be a solemn public profession of the Christian faith, it does not appear that Jesus had any other end ~~X~~ in view in the institution of this rite.

SECTION XIII.

XXXI. The true nature of any religious rite being known, every thing necessary to the due celebration of it, and all the effects arising from it, must from thence be determined.

XXXII. The Lord's Supper being precisely, A memorial of our Lord, but more especially of his death, and the general purpose for which he died ;--whoever eats the bread and drinks the wine at the celebration of this rite, in designed remembrance of our Lord, but more especially of his death and the general purpose for which he died, does truly and properly fulfil the command of Jesus in this institution, so far as relates only to the immediate action of which the rite consists.

XXXIII. Since the act of eating bread and drinking wine in remembrance of Jesus, but more especially of his death, and the general purpose for which he died, should naturally lead us to the most serious reflection upon the goodness of God in appointing the plan for our redemption, and that of our Lord in fulfilling the part he sustained in it; together with the accumulated obligations we are thus laid under to fulfil the terms of our salvation, and the fatal consequence of disregarding them; we are bound to consider it as one part of the design of our Lord in ordaining this rite, that we should seriously apply the celebration of it to this excellent purpose. Whoever therefore assists at
this

this rite, without being careful to make this use of it; though he may actually eat the bread and drink the wine in remembrance of our Lord, and his death; does not make such a use of this commemoration of him, as the plain reason of the thing, and the moral doctrines of the gospel require.

XXXIV. The rite itself, as instituted by our Lord, consisting of nothing more than the actions of eating bread and drinking wine, with the intention prescribed; whatever prayers any Church may think fit to adopt, as well as whatever form of words they may appoint for the officiating person to make use of in distributing the bread and wine; in a word, whatever is said or done at the celebration of this rite, except the distribution and partaking of the bread and wine, with the professed design already mentioned; is no part of the rite itself, as ordained by our Lord, but must rest entirely upon human prudence and authority; and is proper, but only so far proper, as it may be wisely calculated to remind the participant of that particular design, which is essential to the due performance of the rite; and those dispositions of piety and virtue, to which the cele-

bration of this rite naturally leads, and with which it evidently ought to be accompanied. ^f

SECTION XIV.

X XXXV. The Lord's Supper having been instituted by Jesus, without his annexing any special benefits to the celebration of it, the benefits certainly arising from the due celebration of it can be no other than these :

1st, That approbation of the Almighty, which a voluntary obedience to his commands, upon the sincere principles of religion and piety, must certainly procure: and

^f This proposition is to be understood with one limitation. When Jesus took the bread and the cup, in order to give them to the Apostles, before he gave them he used a form of thanksgiving, customary at that time, over them: and from St. Paul we find (1 Cor. 10. 16. *The cup of blessing which we bless* :) that the Apostles observed the same practice. Though therefore it does not appear, that this thanksgiving was essential to the rite, as a commemoration of our Lord; nor can we be absolutely certain that Jesus designed it to be regarded as strictly a part of the rite; yet certainly, in imitation of his example, and the practice of the Apostles, some form of this kind may with peculiar propriety at least be introduced in the celebration of it.

2dly,

2dly, Whatever strengthening of our principles and habits of virtue will naturally arise from the serious and due performance of a rite, in which the death of our Lord, and the general purpose for which he died, are the very things commemorated.^s

XXXVI. The Lord's-Supper having been instituted by Jesus without his annexing any special evils to the omission of it, the evils unavoidably incurred by the omission of it can be no other than these: X

1st, That disapprobation of the Almighty, which designed disobedience to, or the careless neglect of his commands, must certainly occasion; and

2dly, The loss of all that improvement of our virtuous habits and dispositions, which would naturally arise from the serious and due performance of a rite, in which the death of our Lord, and the general purpose for which he died, are the very things commemorated.^h

XXXVII. The demerits of a thoughtless, light, unworthy manner of celebrating the

^s See Prop. XIII. and XXVIII.
XIV. and XXVIII.

^h See Prop.

Lord's Supper, must wholly depend upon the actual ill principles and intention; or at least the culpable want of good principles, and a good intention; in every particular instance, and in each particular person; of which God alone can judge.

XXXVIII. The Lord's Supper having been instituted without any special punishments annexed to a thoughtless, light, unworthy manner of celebrating it; ⁱ the punishment incurred by such a manner of receiving it must be regulated by the personal demerits of each individual in each particular instance.

XXXIX. Should any one be sincerely convinced, that the Lord's Supper was not instituted by Jesus for a standing rite of his religion, but merely for the observance of the Apostles themselves who were present at the institution; no punishment whatever will be incurred by

ⁱ That the temporal punishments which St. Paul informed the Corinthians had overtaken them, for their disorderly behaviour while assembled together for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, are no way inconsistent with what is here advanced, see what is said relating to them at the close of No. III. of the Appendix.

him for omitting to celebrate it under this persuasion; but he must be answerable for the honest, or dishonest use he made of his understanding, in consequence of which he embraced this opinion.

SECTION XV.

XL. It is in the power of God to produce whatever ideas he may please in the mind of man; and by that means to afford us such assistance as his wisdom may see fit, towards the practice of our moral and religious duties, by the unperceived operation of the Divine Spirit.

XLI. These gracious influences of the Spirit, which, whenever communicated, are so many instances of the divine goodness towards us, may be vouchsafed to us either at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, or in the performance of any other act of religious worship, or upon any other occasion whatever, though no way immediately connected with divine worship; as often as the wisdom and goodness of God shall see fit to vouchsafe them: but we have not any promise, or even any the slightest intimation, either from our Lord himself, or
any

any of the Apostles, of their being peculiarly conferred upon us, on account of our celebration of the Lord's Supper.

XLII. Whatever spiritual assistance the goodness of God may at any time vouchsafe to man, the reason of the thing forces us to believe, that it will not be vouchsafed us in the most ample degree, on account of the mere performance of any religious rites, or any acts of religious worship; but on those trying occasions, in the various difficulties of active life, when the circumstances we are placed in bring the strength of our virtuous and religious principles to the severest proof; and when, under such trials, we actually exert the greatest degree of virtue; and at the same time apply, with the properest disposition, for the divine assistance to strengthen our own weakness, and enable us to support the part which virtue and religion require.

XLIII. But comparing together our acts of religious worship, with respect to the natural tendency of the acts themselves; the Lord's Supper, in which the sufferings and death of Christ, and the general purpose for which he died,

died, are the very things commemorated, is of all mere acts of religious worship naturally in itself adapted to possess our minds most strongly with religious reflections; and to induce, as well as enable us to strengthen most effectually every virtuous resolution; and so far to render us deserving of, and thus enable us to obtain, the greatest share of assistance from above.

SECTION XVI.

XLIV. Partaking of the Lord's Supper does so far contribute to our future salvation, as it is a designed compliance with an express command of our Lord, naturally productive of those benefits already explained in Propositions XXXV. and XLI. But the performance of this rite has no influence peculiar to itself in procuring for us the remission of our sins; nor can it at all contribute towards our obtaining their remission, by any other means, than the virtuous effects we take care to make it productive of, in our principles and our practice.—Refusing to partake of the Lord's Supper does so far endanger our salvation, as it is in any instance an act of voluntary disobedience^k to an acknowledged

^k See Proposition XXXIX.

command of our Lord, naturally productive of the evils described in Proposition XXXVI.— And performing the outward actions of eating and drinking at the Lord's Supper, without seriously reflecting upon the particular events commemorated in it, and the influence they ought to have upon our own conduct ; does so far endanger our salvation, as it contains in each distinct instance a certain degree of want of religious principle, and a culpable insensibility of the sufferings of our Lord, and the blessings of our redemption ; of the guilt of which, in every distinct instance, God alone is the proper judge.

X XLV. If ever the bread and wine are received, whether by the well, the sick, or the dying, as an appointed means of obtaining the remission of sins ; or in any other light, than merely as an act of due obedience to a positive command of our Lord, naturally expressive of faith in him ; and, when seriously performed, as naturally conducive to all such dispositions as that faith requires ; the participant is deceived, and the rite itself perverted.

XLVI. To live in the belief of the christian religion, and yet to refuse to partake of the Lord's Supper; except in the case of a conscientious persuasion that this rite was designed by our Lord for the observation of the Apostles alone; is living in this instance in a voluntary habit of sin, because in an habitual disobedience to a command acknowledged to be divine:¹ and in this particular sin are included these aggravating circumstances, that it is a voluntary contempt of an express command of our Lord, extremely easy to be complied with; given at the very time when he was going to suffer for our sakes; expressly intended to recal to our remembrance the sufferings he voluntarily underwent to promote our good; and on that account not only the most solemn rite of his religion, but that which gratitude ought to render us peculiarly willing to celebrate.

XLVII. Neither our Lord himself, nor the Apostles, having given us any precept to determine how often we ought to partake of the Lord's Supper, no precise limits can be assigned

¹ See the note on page 47. at the end of the Appendix.

to our duty in this particular. But since we are absolutely obliged to assist at this rite, by the express command of our Lord; ^m since the excellent moral and religious tendency of the rite itself is evident beyond question; and since we know the Apostles taught the first Christians to partake of it very often; it must certainly be incumbent on us to assist at it so frequently, according to the circumstances in which we may happen to be placed, as to shew plainly, that we regard it as one positive duty of the religion of Christ; and, for that reason, take pleasure in discharging it.

X XLVIII. Since the Lord's Supper is nothing more than a religious commemoration of him, ^X but more especially of his death, and the general purpose for which he died; and these particulars may be all commemorated with a truly pious and devout disposition, without our setting apart any precise period of time to prepare ourselves for it; such a practice is no more strictly necessary, however useful we may make it, for the worthy participation of the Lord's Supper, than for the worthy performance of

^m Except in the case mentioned in Prop. XXXIX.

any other act of religious worship : and habitual good intentions to regulate our conduct by the precepts of the gospel, joined to the serious employment of our thoughts, at the time, upon the business we are about ; will in every instance render our attendance upon the celebration of the Lord's Supper, as well as our performance of every other act of religious worship, an acceptable service.

XLIX. Since the partaking of bread and wine in remembrance of our Lord is an absolute christian duty, and the serious performance of it has a natural tendency to produce a beneficial effect upon our lives ; every attendance upon it really proceeding from a conviction of its being a duty, and accompanied with serious attention to the particulars commemorated in it, must be highly proper and praise-worthy, how defective soever the conduct of the participant may in other particulars have been.

L. But since the particulars to be peculiarly commemorated in this rite, are such as, above all others, ought to penetrate the heart with the warmest sense of gratitude, both to our Creator, and Redeemer ; and excite the most

unreserved acknowledgment of all our religious duties, and the sincerest sorrow for our sins ; as well as induce us to form and cultivate such virtuous resolutions as may produce that actual uprightness of conduct, which is the great object of the gospel dispensation ; it is more especially our duty in partaking of the Lord's Supper in particular, though it is likewise our duty when we perform any act of religious worship in general, to reflect so much, and so seriously, upon the particulars expressly commemorated in it, and the effect they ought to have upon us ; as to make our celebration of it actually conducive to that virtue, which the gospel terms of salvation require.

C O N C L U S I O N .

If the principles above laid down are true, and the consequences drawn from them just ; it follows,

That the Lord's Supper is a rite of the simplest and plainest nature, perfectly intelligible to every capacity.

That it is nothing more than what the words of the institution fully express, A religious commemoration of the sufferings and death

death of Christ, and the general purpose for which he died ;—which it is the absolute duty of every one who believes in him to celebrate, because he himself enjoined it ;—and which requires nothing more for its worthy celebration, than that intentional obedience, and serious disposition of mind, which deliberate reflection upon the particulars commemorated in it will naturally produce.

That as the performance of it is not attended with any other benefits, than those we ourselves take care to make it productive of, by its religious influence on our principles and practice ; so nothing but our own want of seriousness and good intention in performing it can possibly make it productive of any danger or evil.

That as its primary object is the commemoration of the sufferings of our Lord in accomplishing the adopted plan of our redemption, we ought always to be disposed to assist at it, with the same readiness, the same thankfulness, and the same ease and satisfaction of mind, with which we offer up our thanksgivings to God in our constant acts of worship.

And, in fine, that though it is left to our own discretion how often to celebrate it, nothing can so well manifest our proper ideas of, and attention to it, as an habitual performance of it, whenever an opportunity is purposely afforded us; while an habitual omission of it, when set before us, must unavoidably convict us, either of ignorance of its universal and perpetual obligation; some misconception of its nature and effects; or an intentional disobedience to a positive christian duty.—The injunction of our Lord is always a reason for performing it; and, if rightly understood, there cannot be any good reason for avoiding it; consistent with those principles which habitually influence the conduct of a man of virtue, and upon which whoever professes himself a Christian would be understood to act

A P P E N D I X.

N U M B E R I. ^a

TO determine whether the particular occasion on which the Lord's Supper was instituted will warrant us to conclude, that there are any other benefits or evils attending the performance or omission of it, than such as may be deduced from the words and actions of our Lord in the institution itself, we must consider in the first place, what resemblance our Lord himself intended to give it to the Jewish Paschal Supper; and then what consequences may be justly deduced from that designed resemblance.

I. The form of the institution, and general nature of the Lord's Supper, have a striking resemblance to those of the Passover.—As at the

^a See Proposition XIX. page 29.

institution of the Passover it was said, *It is the Lord's Passover*; ^b so our Lord, in instituting his own rite, said, *This is my body; this is my blood of the New Covenant*; or, *this is the New Covenant in my blood*.—As at the institution of the Passover it was said, *This day shall be unto you for a memorial*, ^c &c. so our Lord said, *This do in remembrance of*, or, *for a memorial of me*, &c.—As the Paschal Supper was to be a memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites out of Egypt, and the means by which it was accomplished; ^d so the Lord's Supper was to be a memorial of the redemption of mankind, and the means by which that was accomplished. ^e—So far the form of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and its general nature as a memorial, bears a striking resemblance to the form of the institution, and general nature of the Paschal Supper, as a memorial. ^f

II. The Paschal Supper being an institution of the law delivered by Moses, its true nature

^b Exod. xii. 11, 27. ^c Exod. xii. 14. ^d Exod. xii. 14, 17, 24, 27. ^e Matt. xxvi. 26, &c. I Cor. xi. 23, &c. ^f See the note on p. 54. at the end of the Appendix.

and effects, as a part of the jewish law, must be learnt from what is declared concerning it in the books of Moses.

In the history of the institution of the Paschal Supper, after reciting the directions for the particular manner in which the rite itself was to be celebrated,^g it is immediately added,^h—
 “ And this day shall be unto you for a memo-
 “ rial; and you shall keep it a feast to the
 “ Lord throughout your generations, and you
 “ shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for
 “ ever.”—And it is further said,—“ And ye
 “ shall observe the feast of unleavened bread;
 “ for in this self same day have I brought your
 “ armies out of Egypt; therefore shall ye ob-
 “ serve this day in your generations by an
 “ ordinance for ever.”ⁱ—Agreeably to which, when Moses had commanded the people to kill the Passover, and given them particular directions for the manner in which they were to kill it, at the first institution, he added,—“ And it
 “ shall come to pass, when ye be come to the
 “ land which the Lord will give you, accord-
 “ ing as he hath promised, that ye shall keep

^g Exod. xii. 3—13.
 ver. 17.

^h Ibid. ver. 14.

ⁱ Ibid.

“ this service. And it shall come to pass, when
 “ your children shall say unto you, What mean
 “ you by this service? that ye shall say, It is
 “ the sacrifice of the Lord’s Passover, who
 “ passed over the houses of the children of
 “ Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyp-
 “ tians, and delivered our houses.”^k—Again,
 “ Thou shalt keep the feast of unleavened
 “ bread; thou shalt eat unleavened bread seven
 “ days, as I commanded thee in the time ap-
 “ pointed of the month of Abib; for in it thou
 “ camest out from Egypt.”^l—And thus again
 in the book of Deuteronomy,^m—“ Observe the
 “ month Abib, and keep the Passover unto the
 “ Lord thy God; for in the month of Abib
 “ the Lord thy God brought thee forth out of
 “ Egypt by night.—Thou shalt eat no leavened
 “ bread with it: seven days shalt thou eat un-
 “ leavened bread therewith, even the bread of
 “ affliction; for thou camest forth out of the
 “ land of Egypt in haste; that thou mayest
 “ remember the day when thou camest forth
 “ out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy
 “ life.”—And again,ⁿ “ Thou shalt sacrifice

^k Exod. xii. 25—27. ^l Ibid. xxiii. 15. ^m Ch. xvi.
 3, 3. ⁿ Ibid. ver. 6.

“ the Passover at even, at the going down of
“ the sun, at the season that thou camest forth
“ out of Egypt.”—And thus we find Moses
ordaining a second time, very soon after the
institution of this rite,—“ And thou shalt shew
“ thy son in that day,” (when they should
celebrate the Passover in the promised land;)
“ saying, this is done because of that which
“ the Lord did unto me, when I came forth
“ out of Egypt. And it shall be for a sign
“ unto thee upon thine hand, and for a me-
“ morial between thine eyes, that the Lord’s
“ law may be in thy mouth; for with a strong
“ hand hath the Lord brought thee out of
“ Egypt. Thou shalt therefore keep this or-
“ dinance in his season from year to year.”°

III. From all these repeated accounts of the institution of the Passover, and the end for which it was instituted, delivered to the Jewish nation by Moses himself, the institutor of the rite, and the only person authorized to declare the nature and design of the institution; it indisputably appears,

° Exod. xiii. 8—10.

1st, That the Paschal Supper was expressly instituted for a standing memorial of the miraculous deliverance of the Israelites out of Egypt; purposely intended to make them the more mindful of that law of the Lord which Moses soon after delivered to them.

2dly, That this was the only design of the institution of which Moses made any mention, and consequently its only design as a part of the Jewish Law, and the only one of which the Jews themselves could have any conception.

3dly, That there were not any special promises annexed to the celebration of this rite, or any blessings to be expected from it, but those promised to obedience to all the positive injunctions in general of the law of Moses. And therefore,

4thly, That the Paschal Supper was precisely,—A religious memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites out of Egypt, and the miraculous manner in which it was accomplished;—and nothing more;—and had no other benefits attending the celebration of it, than those which attended the celebration of all the other positive rites in general of the Jewish Law; viz. the blessings there promised to all intentional obedience to God, and the natural good effects of the

the

the performance of the rite itself; which in this instance especially had a manifest tendency to excite and improve every sentiment of gratitude to God, and obedience to all his commands contained in the law of Moses.

IV. As the celebration of the Paschal Supper had no peculiar blessings annexed to it, so neither was there any punishment denounced for the omission of it, but what was equally threatened for the omission, or transgression, of any other of the great positive rites of the Jewish law. ^p

V. Since the Paschal Supper was to the Jews nothing more than a religious memorial, posi-

^p For the proof of this compare Exod. xii. 15, 19, with Exod. xxx. 33. xxxi. 14. Levit. vii. 20, 21, 25, 27. xvii. 4, 9. xxiii. 29. Numb. xv. 32—36. xix. 13. The general reason for denouncing one uniform punishment against all these direct transgressions of the plain and positive injunctions of the law, is given us in Numb. xv. 30, 31. “The soul that doth ought presumptuously, “whether he be born in the land or a stranger, the “same reproveth the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off “from among his people. Because he hath despised the “word of the Lord, and hath broken his command- “ment, that soul shall be utterly cut off; his iniquity “shall be upon him.”

tively enjoined by their law, without any peculiar benefits annexed to the celebration, or any peculiar punishment to the omission of it, and in reality not productive of either;—no resemblance which our Lord might design the rite he himself instituted should bear to the Paschal Supper, can possibly make the Lord's Supper any thing more than—A religious memorial positively enjoined in the law of Christ;—Or be the cause of annexing to the celebration of it any peculiar benefits whatever; or to the omission of it any peculiar evils whatever;—Or indeed any benefits, or evils, but those which are universally annexed to obedience, and denounced against disobedience, to the commands of our Lord, by the general principles and terms of the christian dispensation; which have been explained already in Propositions XIII. and XIV.

N U M B E R I I .^a

THE Christians at Corinth having allowed themselves in the practice of partaking of the religious feasts in the heathen temples, upon the flesh of those victims which had been offered in sacrifice to their idols; and having, as it should seem from 1 Cor. ch. viii. ver. 1. contended for the harmlessness of the practice, from their full conviction of the folly of all idol worship; St. Paul sets himself to convince them of its impropriety, and in the end absolutely forbids it, as unlawful in any one who embraced the faith in Christ.

In 1 Cor. ch. viii. he urges, that though in general they did this without any religious regard to the heathen idols; yet there were some among them not so free from all tendency to idolatry, who would be induced by their example to do the same with a real religious regard to the heathen idols; and thus be seduced into a degree of sinful idolatry.—In ch. ix. he further presses upon them the duty of abstaining from this practice, from a bene-

^a See Prop. XXIV. page 33, 34.

volent regard to the safety of their weaker brethren; by enumerating several particulars in which he himself had always abstained from what he had a full right to have done, merely with a view to promote the good of those who had embraced the christian faith.—In ch. x. he proceeds to dissuade them from this practice, as dangerous even with respect to themselves, notwithstanding they thought themselves secure from receiving any prejudice from it; by reminding them, from ver. 1 to 14, of several instances in which their forefathers the Israelites, notwithstanding the miracles which they were sensible had accompanied their deliverance from Egypt, drew upon themselves the displeasure of God, not only by various acts of disobedience, but even by acts of idolatry itself; and those of a similar nature to the idol feasts which the Corinthians had allowed themselves to frequent.—In conclusion, the Apostle finishes his arguments against the practice in question, from ver. 15 to 22, by shewing, from one obvious consequence of assisting, as well at the Jewish religious Feasts, as at the Christian Eucharist, that partaking of the Idol Feasts in the Heathen Temples, was an evident overt act of Idolatry; and

and therefore absolutely unlawful in all who embraced the christian faith.

The passage itself, in which he makes this mention of the christian Eucharist, and which is here necessary to be considered ; in order to know, whether it may afford us any insight into the nature of this rite, in addition to what has been deduced from the institution itself ; together with such directions as St. Paul thought fit to give the Corinthians, for regulating their conduct with respect to eating meat which had been offered in sacrifice to idols, even in the houses of the heathens, is as follows.

1st Epist. Cor. ch. x. ver. 14. to ch. xi.

ver. 1.

14. Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry.

15. I speak as to wise men ; judge ye what I say.

16. The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ ?

17. For we, being many, are one bread and one body ; for we are all partakers of that one bread.

18. Behold

18. Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?

19. What say I then? That the idol is any thing; or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing?

20. But *I say* that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils.

21. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of devils.

22. Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?

23. All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but all things edify not.

24. Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth.

25. Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat; asking no questions for conscience sake.

26. For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.

27. If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you eat; asking no question for conscience sake.

28. B it

28. But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice to idols, eat not; for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake: [For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.]

29. Conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other's: for why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience?

30. For if I by grace be a partaker; why am I evil spoken of, for that, for which I give thanks?

31. Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.

32. Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God.

33. Even as I please all men in all things; not seeking mine own profit, but the *profit* of many, that they may be saved.

Ch. xi. 1. Be ye followers of me, even as I also *am* of Christ.

We have here before us St. Paul's whole reasoning in this passage concerning the Lord's Supper. And to determine the true meaning of what he has here said relating to this rite, it is absolutely necessary, in the first place, to fix the sense of some words in the original, which are of importance to it, and whose

F

meaning

meaning has been made matter of doubt ; by enquiring into the sense in which the same words are used by St. Paul upon other occasions, as well as by the other Apostles throughout the New Testament.

Remark 1. In ver. 15, the clause translated---*I speak as to wise men* ;---is in the original----*ὡς φρονιμοῖς λέγω* ; and St. Paul always uses the word *φρονιμος* for a person of sense, judgment, or discretion : when he speaks of a person of scientific knowledge, he uses the word *σοφος*.

In this manner *φρονιμος* is used by St. Paul in 1 Cor. iv. 10. 2 Cor. xi. 19. Ephes. i. 8. And so by Matthew vii. 24. x. 16. xxv. 2, 4, 8, 9. And Luke ii. 42. xvi, 8.

St. Paul uses--*σοφος*--for a person of scientific knowledge, Rom. i. 14, 22. 1 Cor. i. 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27. ii. 1, 5, 6. iii. 10, 18, 19. 2 Cor. i. 12. And so Matt. xi. 25. xii. 42. And Luke x. 21. Acts vii. 22.

He once uses even--*σοφος*--in the sense of, prudent, sensible, discreet. Ephes. v. 15.

This clause therefore in ver. 15. ought to be translated,—*I address myself to you as to men of sense and discretion ; judge yourselves of what I say.*

Remark

Remark 2. The next words in the original whose meaning has been made matter of dispute, and upon the supposed meaning of which all the notions which have ever been embraced of something mysterious in the nature of the Lord's Supper have been chiefly, if not entirely founded; are--*Κοινωνία* in ver. 16; and *Κοινωνος* in ver. 18 and 20; and *μετεχειν* in ver. 17, 21, and 30.

Κοινωνία — *Κοινωνος* — *Κοινωνεω* —

1st, Signifies merely the connection, participation, partnership, agreement, &c. of one person or thing with, in, or of, another person or thing; without any reference whatever to the *joint* participation, &c. of more than one in the same thing.

As 2 Cor. vi. 14. viii. 23. Ephes. iii. 9. Philipp. ii. 1. iii. 10. 1 Tim. v. 22. Philem. 17. And 1 Pet. v. 1. 2 Joh. 11. And this is exactly the manner in which it is used in the very passage in question, 1 Cor. x. 16.

2dly, Where several persons or things are spoken of as partaking of any thing, this word itself does not express collectively the *joint* participation of all; but simply the *distinct* participation of each: That is, in other words,

it expresses the mere participation itself, and nothing more.

As Rom. xv. 27. 1 Cor. i. 9. 2 Cor. i. 7. xiii. 13. Gal. ii. 9. Heb. ii. 14. x. 33. 1 Pet. iv. 13. 2 Pet. i. 4. 1 John i. 3, 6, 7. Matt. xxiii. 30. Luke v. 10. And so it is used likewise in the passage before us, 1 Cor. x. 18, 20.

3dly, When St. Paul would express, in this word itself, the idea of the *joint* partaking, &c. of more than one in any person or thing, he distinguishes his meaning by prefixing to it the particle—συν.

As Rom. xi. 17. 1 Cor. ix. 23. Ephes. v. 11. Philipp. i. 7. iv. 14. And so John, Rev. xviii. 4.^r

ΜΕΤΕΧΕΙΝ—ΜΕΤΟΧΟΣ—ΜΕΤΟΧΗ—

1st, Signifies merely one person's or thing's partaking of, agreeing with, &c. another person or thing; without any reference whatever to the *joint* partaking, &c. of more than one in the same thing.

^r The word *κείρωμα* sometimes signifies benevolent assistance, or charitable contribution towards those who stand in need of it. As Rom. xii. 13. xv. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 4. ix. 1, 13. Gal. vi. 6. Philipp. i. 5. iv. 15. Heb. xiii. 16. And so Acts ii. 42. But with this application of it we have here no concern, and when used in this sense it is easily distinguished.

As 1 Cor. ix. 10. x. 30. 2 Cor. vi. 14.
Heb. ii. 14.

2dly, When several persons or things are spoken of, as partaking, &c. of any thing, this word itself does not express collectively the *joint* partaking of all, but simply the *distinct* partaking, agreement, &c. of each, with the thing spoken of: that is, it signifies the participation itself, and nothing more.

As 1 Cor. ix. 12. Heb. iii. 1, 14. vi. 4.
xii. 8. And in the passage before us, 1 Cor.
x. 17, 21.

3dly, When St. Paul would express, in this word itself, the idea of the *joint* partaking, *joint* agreeing, &c. of several together in any person or thing, he distinguishes his meaning by prefixing to it the particle--*συν*.

As Ephes. iii. 6. v. 7.

4thly, The words *μετεχειν* and *κοινωνειν*, *μετοχος* and *κοινωνος*, are used synonymously, as well in the internal or spiritual, as the external or material sense.

As 2 Cor. vi. 14. Heb. ii. 14. iii. 1, 14. vi. 4.
So particularly Luke v. 7. compared with
v. 10. And so likewise in the very passage
under consideration; as will appear by comparing
1 Cor. x. 16. with ver. 17. ^s

* See the note on p. 69. at the end of the Appendix.

From these indisputable proofs of the sense in which St. Paul uses these words it is abundantly plain, that they must be interpreted in the same sense respectively in those verses where they occur in 1 Cor. ch. x. And more especially, as what is of the utmost importance to the true interpretation of ver. 16, it appears from these proofs, that St. Paul having here made use of the simple word *κοινωνια*, not the compound *συγκοινωνια*, its true and whole meaning in this verse must be---*each* person's *partaking*, or *participation*, of the body and blood there mentioned, and nothing more. †

And the true sense of *κοινωνια* in this passage being thus ascertained from St. Paul's undoubted use of it in other places; it is of great moment, I apprehend, to observe further, what, as far as I know, has never yet been properly attended to, that though St. Paul has actually inserted this word only in the latter part of each of the questions he here asks, the obvious sense of the questions themselves absolutely requires it to be understood in the first part of each question likewise. The cup or wine itself, in this rite, is the blood of Christ; but it must be the *partaking* of the cup, that is the *partaking* of the

† See the note on page 70, at the end of the Appendix.

blood of Christ: in like manner the bread itself is the body of Christ; but it must be the *partaking* of the bread, that is the *partaking* of the body of Christ. This is self-evident. And from this observation joined to the foregoing, in which the meaning of *κοινωνια* was ascertained, it necessarily follows, that in order to comprehend St. Paul's true meaning, we must here understand by *the cup*, and *the bread*, the *κοινωνια*, or *partaking of* the cup and the bread, in the first part of these questions; to answer to the *κοινωνια*, or *partaking of* the body and blood in the last part of them. ^u

There is still another particular, of the utmost importance to the meaning of St. Paul in this verse, and the nature of the rite concerned, which it is absolutely necessary to clear up, because it has been made matter of much doubt; and that is, the true sense in which *the bread and wine* are here styled *the body and blood of Christ*. And this will appear extremely plain, merely from considering the acknowledged meaning of the same form of expression in the appointment of the Jewish Paschal Supper; from which Jesus evidently borrowed it, when he applied it to the rite he himself ordained.

^u See the note on page 71, at the end of the Appendix.

As in the institution of the Paschal Supper it is said of the lamb killed and eaten in the manner prescribed, *It is the Lord's Passover*;* so in the institution of the rite before us Jesus said, of the bread and wine taken as he directed, *This is my body*; *This is my blood of the New Testament*;--or--*This is the New Testament in my blood*.

And as the Paschal Lamb, killed, dressed, and eaten as enjoined, was not the action itself of the Lord's passing over the houses of the Israelites in Egypt; but precisely a religious memorial of that transaction, called by its name; and expressly declared to be so at the very time of the institution;^y---So the bread and wine taken as Jesus commanded, are not *the body of Christ*, and *the blood of Christ in the New Testament*, themselves; but precisely religious memorials of them, called by their names; and expressly declared to be so, by Jesus himself, in the words of the institution.^z In this sense therefore, and in no other, must St. Paul have meant to ask, whether the par-

* Exod. xii. 11. ^y See Exod. xii. 14. and more at large in No. I. of this Appendix. ^z See Luke xxii. 19. and 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

taking of them was not the partaking of *the body and blood of Jesus*, in the passage under consideration.

From these several remarks that have now been made it appears, that in order fully to express the true sense of St. Paul, and nothing but his sense, in ver. 16, it must be translated in the following manner.

Ver. 16. The partaking of *the cup of blessing*, ~~X~~ *which we bless, is it not, to each of us, the partaking of the memorial of the blood of Christ?* The partaking of *the bread which we break, is it not, to each of us, the partaking of the memorial of the body of Christ?*

Remark 3. We translate ver. 17 thus;---
For we, being many, are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.

Now though a meaning may be collected from it even thus translated, certainly the figure by which we are called *one bread* is extremely forced and unusual. It is at the same time observable, that through the whole argument St. Paul has not made even the least use of it; but argued entirely from that plain and familiar figure of styling all *one body*. If therefore the original will admit of being properly translated,

so as to free the passage from this forced and unusual figure, which is not only useless, but even embarrasses the sense, it ought to be so interpreted; and it has long been observed, that it may with the strictest propriety be translated thus:---*Because the bread is one, we who are many (or, we all) are one body; for we all partake of the one bread.*

This renders St. Paul's meaning just, forcible, and clear. He first styles the bread---*one* bread; evidently because it is partaken of by all as the representative of one and the same thing; and then he argues,—Because the bread so partaken of is *one*, all who thus partake of it are *one body*; that is, One collective body of Christians, distinguished from all other collective bodies, by the celebration of this peculiar christian rite. A consequence so clear, that he might well leave it to the Corinthians themselves to judge of its evidence and truth. This therefore I apprehend must be admitted as the true interpretation of this verse. ^a

Remark 4. To remove all obscurity from St. Paul's meaning in this whole passage it is

^a See the note on page 74, at the end of the Appendix.

necessary to observe, that *δαίμονις* and *δαίμονων*, in ver. 21, 22, which we translate, devils, ought to be rendered, Dæmons; that is, false idol Lords, worshipped by the heathens as mediators between their superiour gods, *θεοί*, and men.

Where the word *δαίμονις* is used in the New Testament to express the object of heathen worship, as in this passage, it must always, I apprehend, be translated dæmon,^b signifying the intermediate object of their worship. And that it ought to be so translated here is further manifest from hence, that the whole force of the argument which St. Paul here urges to deter the Corinthians from all approaches to idolatry, by frequenting the feasts upon those sacrifices which were offered by the heathens to their *δαίμονα*, does not in any degree depend upon their being evil beings, or devils; but merely upon their being Idols, or false objects of worship; so that no one could with propriety, or even innocence, offer worship to the one only true God, and to these Dæmons, or vain Idols, likewise.

^b As Acts xvii. 18, 22. 1 Tim. iv. 1.

These points settled, the whole passage before us, containing the argument St. Paul here insists on, and some consequences he draws from it for the direction of the Corinthian disciples in the point to which it relates, may now be clearly and satisfactorily explained. Through the whole of it the Apostle has expressed himself, as he usually does, with great conciseness; and left something to be supplied, though nothing but what is obvious, in order fully to express his meaning.—Thus it is evident that ver. 17 wants something to connect it with ver. 16; and to prove the point intended by it, and connect it with ver. 18. And, of the other verses, part require, and all will admit some insertions, to make them express their whole meaning and design; as it is apprehended will now be clearly seen, by the following full, but exact and close illustration.

I Cor. chap. 10.

Ver. 14. *Wherefore, my beloved brethren, flee from idolatry.*

15. *I address myself to you as to men of sense and discretion; pass sentence yourselves upon the force and propriety of what I advance.*

16. The

16. The partaking of *the cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not to each of us the partaking of the memorial of the blood of Christ shed for us?* The partaking of *the bread which we break, is it not to each of us the partaking of the memorial of the body of Christ, given or broken for us?*—And is not our partaking of these memorials of the body and blood of Christ, in the manner in which he commanded his disciples to partake of them, a public virtual declaration that we are his disciples? This must certainly be allowed; for—

17. *Because the bread, thus taken by us all, is One; i. e. is the memorial of one and the same thing, the body of Christ; we, being many, are one body; i. e. we become one body, viz. of Christ's professed disciples; for we are all partakers of the one bread; viz. that bread, which so partaken of, is to each of us the memorial of one and the same thing,---Christ's body broken for us.*

It is plain then, that our partaking of the bread which we break in this manner, and of the cup which we bless in this manner, is a virtual public declaration, that we are each of us disciples of Christ.—Nor is this apparent, virtual declaration peculiar to the performance
of

of this christian rite alone; the case is exactly the same in the jewish worship.

18. *Behold Israel after the flesh*: consider how the case stands with respect to the Jews:-- *Are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?* Is not every one who eats of the jewish sacrifices understood to profess himself, by eating of them, a disciple of Moses, and a worshipper of the God of the Jews, to whom the sacrifice he eats of is offered up, and the altar professedly consecrated?

19. *What say I then?* What then need I assert to make good the point of which I would convince you; viz. That it is improper for you, as Christians, to frequent the idol feasts of the Gentiles? Need I assert---*That an idol is any thing?* any real superiour being?—*Or, that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing?* any thing of such a nature in itself, after having been offered to idols, that eating it can pollute you; and that you ought not to frequent the idol feasts on that account?

Certainly I have no occasion to assert this to prove my point, nor do I assert it: and therefore, your denying this, and being free from all mistaken prejudices of this sort, cannot possibly

be

be any answer to my objections to your frequenting the idol feasts.

20. *But, what I assert is, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Dæmons, and not to God:—to false, imaginary, intermediate Lords, not to the one true God:—And I would not that ye should have connection with Dæmons:—*And what I contend for is, that you, who profess yourselves worshippers of the one true God, ought not to have any connection whatever with false imaginary Gods;— which you must necessarily appear to some to have, so long as you frequent those idol feasts, which are considered as acts of religious worship to the idols, or imaginary dæmons, in honour of whom they are held.

The reason why I oppose your allowing yourselves to appear thus connected with idols, or false imaginary Gods, is nothing more than the plain self-evident impropriety of the thing.

21. *Ye cannot drink the Lord's cup, and the cup of dæmons:—*If ye drink the cup professedly consecrated to the Lord in the rite instituted by Jesus, and by so doing profess yourselves disciples of Christ, and worshippers of the one true God; evident it is, that you cannot either consistently, or innocently drink a cup consecrated

crated to false Gods, at the feasts held in their temples; by drinking which you appear to profess yourselves worshippers of those idols or false Gods:---*Ye cannot partake of the Lord's table, and the table of dæmons*:---If ye partake of the table consecrated to the Lord, in the rite instituted by Jesus, and by so doing profess yourselves disciples of Christ, and worshippers of the one true God; evident it is, that you cannot either consistently, or innocently, partake of a table consecrated to false, imaginary Gods, in the Temples of those Gods; by doing which you appear to profess yourselves worshippers of those idols, or false Gods.

You cannot indulge yourselves in this practice without provoking the jealous anger of the Lord, by this apparent act of idolatry: for by idolatry more especially, you very well know, the jealous anger of the Lord will certainly be excited.^c Let me then ask you—

22. *Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy?*---
Do you really chuse to stir up the jealous anger^d
of

^c Vide the second Commandment.

^d Bishop Pearce observes upon the place (see his Commentary, vol. 2. p. 257.) that the word in the original does not necessarily signify jealousy: but when we consider

of the Lord against you, by being guilty of this act of apparent idolatry?—*Are we stronger than he?*—Are you able to secure yourselves from the effects of that wrath of God, which your continuance in this act of apparent idolatry will certainly draw upon you?

As I have already said,^e to you, *who have knowledge*; who know that *an idol is nothing*, no real God; ^f and that *what is offered to idols is nothing*, nothing in itself capable of polluting you by eating it; ^g to you, as far as concerns yourselves only, there cannot be any harm in the mere action of partaking of things offered to idols. I grant therefore, that if the matter was to be considered with respect to yourselves only, it would be allowable for you to do it. But will you therefore contend, that there cannot be any good reasons against it?

23. *All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient*:—Because an action is such, that considered with respect to myself

sider the second Commandment, we may, I should suppose, with peculiar propriety translate it, jealous anger, in this particular passage; where the giving countenance to idolatry is the very offence against which the Apostle is cautioning the Corinthians.

^e 1 Cor. viii. 1.

^f Ch. viii. 4.

^g Ch. x. 19.

only, it would not be criminal in me; it does not follow, that therefore it must be profitable, or expedient.—*All things are lawful for me, but all things edify not:*—Because an action is such, that considered with respect to myself only it would not be criminal in me; it does not follow, that therefore my doing it will contribute to the edification and good of others.

Certain it is, that though your partaking of idol feasts cannot be prejudicial to you, *who have knowledge* to prevent it;^h yet may your example in this instance, as I have already told you,ⁱ be of great prejudice to such of your fellow Christians, as have not an equal degree of knowledge in these particulars with yourselves. The immediate consequence of which can be no other than this; that you must regulate your conduct in this particular, as in all others, by the extensive principles of that sincere benevolence enjoined in the law of Christ.

24. *Let no man seek his own, but every man another's good.*—Let no man, in any instance, for a satisfaction to himself, do what he knows will be attended with real mischief to others; but forego any such pleasure to himself, for the

^h 1 Cor. viii. 1, 4.

ⁱ Ch. viii. 7, 9—13.

sake of promoting the good of others. Let no man therefore frequent idol feasts in the heathen temples, for his own gratification; but absolutely abstain from them, that he may not set an example, which will prove in the end prejudicial to others.

The extensive principles of sincere christian benevolence, if properly attended to, will clearly teach you what course you have to pursue, with regard to this matter, upon all occasions. As first,

25. *Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no questions for conscience sake.*—

Whatever meat you find publicly exposed to sale, in the customary manner, make no scruple of eating, without making any enquiry into the particular occasion on which it was killed.--- For though it should have been part of a sacrifice offered to idols, as this is not known, nor supposed to be known to you, your eating it cannot possibly mislead, or give offence to any one.

26. *For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.*---For, as every good thing with which the earth abounds is created by the one true God; certainly we may partake of them

all, where no particular circumstance interferes, as given us by him.—Again,

27. *If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go, whatsoever is set before you, eat; asking no questions for conscience sake.*—By this means, as before, your eating what is set before you cannot mislead, or give offence to any one.

28. *But if any one say unto you, This has been offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not; for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake.*—For, by eating in this case, you may set a prejudicial example to him who informed you it had been offered to idols; which by the laws of christian charity just mentioned you ought conscientiously to avoid.—[*For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.*—For, since every good thing with which the earth abounds is created by the one true God, you ought not to partake of any of them under such circumstances, as may give room to others to conclude, that you attribute them to idols, or false imaginary gods.]^k

^k Such appears to be the natural meaning of this clause in this place, if the repetition of it here be genuine; which however there seems reason to believe it is not, as it is a manifest interruption to the reasoning of the passage.

29. *Conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other's.*—But, mistake me not; I do not mean, that in this case you should abstain for any scruples you ought to entertain in your own minds; but purely as a duty of christian benevolence, that you may not give offence to him who told you, or be the means of leading him into error.—*For, why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience?*—For certainly there cannot be any good reason, why I should abridge myself of a liberty which is innocent in me, but this; That I ought to avoid shocking the prejudices of another, and leading him into evil.—That there is no reason respecting myself only, why I ought to abstain from eating, in this case, is plain:—

30. *For if I by grace¹ be a partaker; why am I evil spoken of, for that, for which I give thanks?*—For if I partake of any thing with proper thankfulness to God, from whom it originally comes; there cannot be any reason whatever, relating to myself alone, why I should be evil spoken of, for partaking of that, for which I am properly thankful to the Creator of all things.

¹ It ought to be translated—*with thanksgiving*:—See Bp. Pearce on the place. Commentary, vol. II. p. 259.

It is evident there cannot be any; and therefore, the rule by which you must conduct yourselves in this whole affair, is the great law of christian charity just mentioned.

31. *Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.*—With regard therefore to the point under consideration, as well as to every other, be careful to act in such a manner, upon every occasion, as plainly to shew yourselves sincere worshippers of the one true God, in opposition to every the least appearance of idolatry.

32. *Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God.*—Be careful not to place any stumbling-block in the way of the unbelieving Jews and Greeks, which may prevent their conversion to the faith in the one true God, in the gospel; and neither to give offence to your weaker christian brethren; nor to be the means of leading them into any practice, which they themselves esteem sinful.

33. *Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but that of the many, that they may be saved.*—In acting thus you will do no more than I myself do; for it is my rule, on all occasions, to prefer the good and salvation of others to my own immediate ease and satisfaction.

Ch. xi. 1. *Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.*—As in this I have set Christ before myself for my example, so ought you to take me for your's.

From this illustration of the whole passage before us, which, if I mistake not, renders St. Paul's method of arguing in it clear, pertinent, and conclusive; and which is founded on the true meaning of his words, as they are used by St. Paul himself, and the other sacred writers, throughout the New Testament; it is obvious, that through this whole passage, the Apostle has not either expressly asserted, or said what implies, any thing concerning the nature of the Lord's Supper, more than this;—That the celebration of this rite was necessarily to be considered, and always actually was considered, as a public profession, by every person who assisted at it, that he himself was a believer in Christ, and a worshipper of the one true God.

The whole strength of St. Paul's argument in this passage, as far as it relates to the Lord's Supper, is founded on this consideration, and this only; the inference he draws requires no other principle to be allowed, to make it valid

and complete; nor will the use to which he has here applied it, admit of any other consideration to be added to it. No other conclusion therefore; relative to the specific nature of the Lord's Supper, can possibly be drawn from any thing the Apostle has here said relating to it, than this;—That celebrating the Lord's Supper must certainly be considered as a virtual declaration, on the part of each communicant, that he is a believer in Jesus, and a worshipper of the one true God, in opposition to every species of idolatry.—And this certainly was a truth so evident, that St. Paul might well appeal to it, in the manner he has; and leave it to the sense and discretion of the Corinthians themselves, to pass sentence upon the manifest truth and propriety of the conclusion he drew from it, for the future regulation of their own conduct.

After the full enquiry we have now made into the true meaning of St. Paul in his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. x. 14, &c. no suspicion, it is hoped, can still remain, that any particular information relative to the specific nature and design of the Lord's Supper can possibly be drawn from what St. Paul has there

there said concerning it. But since a remarkable argument has been founded upon this particular passage, which appeared to its very eminent author, Dr. Cudworth, and has appeared to others of the greatest name since^m him, as an absolute demonstration, that the Lord's Supper is a rite of a very different nature from what we have yet found it to be ; it will add to our satisfaction upon this point, though it is by no means necessary, if by taking a view of what Dr. Cudworth has advanced in favour of that opinion, which he was the first proposer of, and imagined he had demonstrated, we can shew it to be founded in mistake. This therefore will be particularly considered in No. VI. of this Appendix.

^m See in particular a treatise entitled, A Rational Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, by Bishop Warburton.

N U M B E R III. *

THE Christians at Corinth having been guilty of very great improprieties in their behaviour, when assembled together to celebrate the Lord's Supper, St. Paul reproves them on this account, in 1st Ep. Cor. xi. 20—32.

Of this passage ver. 23, 24, 25, contain St. Paul's history of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and have been already considered; ° and ver. 26, the Apostle's own explanation of its use and design; and the only verses which can induce us to doubt, whether that explanation of its specific nature, to which we have hitherto been forced to assent, is a true and complete account of it, or not, are the following, from 27 to 32.

27. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

ⁿ See Proposition XXV. page 34.

^o See Sections

IV. and V. of the Treatise itself.

28. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup.

29. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.

30. For this cause many *are* weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.

31. For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged.

32. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world.

To understand this passage, it is necessary to observe,

First,—That by eating and drinking *unworthily*; or, as it may be translated, *unworthily of the Lord*, ver. 27; is precisely meant, eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper, without seriously considering, and by that means without behaving as becomes those who do seriously consider, that this rite is always to be celebrated, as—A religious commemoration of our Lord, but more especially of his death, and the general purpose for which he died;—intended to *shew his death till he come*.

Secondly,

Secondly,—That the *examination* of themselves before they partook of the Lord's Supper, enjoined in ver. 28, cannot signify any thing more, than such a degree of serious reflection upon the action they were about to perform, as would secure their partaking of it with a proper attention to its religious design.

Thirdly,—It is an agreed point, that the word *damnation*, which our translation has adopted in ver. 29, is here improperly made use of, instead of the more general term *judgment*, or *condemnation*; and that it here refers expressly to nothing more than the temporal punishments made mention of in ver. 30; and which St. Paul informs them were inflicted on them as merciful chastisements, in ver. 32. And it is further certain, that by *not discerning the Lord's body*, as we translate the words in the same verse; St. Paul meant, not attending to that distinction between the common use of bread and wine, and partaking of them as the religious memorials of the body and blood of Jesus, which the nature of such a commemoration required.

The only particular therefore, which can lead us to doubt, whether the Lord's Supper has not something more in its nature, than we
have

have yet been able to discover, must be this; that it is here declared, Whoever shall eat and drink *unworthily*, or without suitable serious reflection and behaviour, *shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.*

This expression, it must be confessed, is so obscure, as to render it extremely difficult to assign its true meaning.

The only natural meaning of the words themselves is, *being guilty of wounding his body, and shedding his blood*; or, in other words, *guilty of putting him to death.*

But certain it is, that they among the Corinthians, who, when met together to partake of the Lord's Supper, had behaved in that irreverent and indecent manner, which St. Paul in this letter to them has informed us they did, had neither been guilty of putting our Lord to death, nor of any sin equal to that; but only, of shewing themselves in that instance in a very high degree culpably destitute of all serious reflection on the goodness of our Lord, so signally displayed in his sufferings and death; which want of serious reflection, though extremely blameable, and worthy of punishment, was by no means to be compared to the crime of actually putting Jesus to death. So that the
first

first and obvious meaning of our translation of this passage cannot possibly be the true meaning of St. Paul.

To convince the Corinthians of the impropriety of that indecent behaviour they had been guilty of at their meetings to celebrate the Lord's Supper, St. Paul having first repeated ^p the history of its institution, which closes with this command, *Do this in remembrance of me*; in order to make them properly sensible of the solemn nature of this rite, he immediately adds, from himself,—*for as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew (proclaim) the Lord's death, till he come.*^q—Having thus reminded them, that it was the death of Christ in particular, for the commemoration of which this rite was more especially enjoined, he directly draws this consequence from that consideration;—*Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily (i. e. in an inconsiderate, and indecent manner, as they had done;) shall be, as we translate it, guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.*

^p Ver. 23—25.

^q Ver. 26.

St. Paul says, *wherefore*, whosoever shall eat, &c. If we ask, why? it is evident he means, because this rite was designed, more especially, *to shew the Lord's death*;—to be a religious commemoration of his sufferings and death in particular. So that whoever behaved at the celebration of this rite in such a manner as to shew a thoughtless disregard, and want of serious attention to it, did by that particular misbehaviour unavoidably shew a disregard and want of serious attention to the sufferings and death of our Lord; in some small degree similar to, though by no means to be compared with, that of those who actually caused him to be put to death: and consequently, so far as the want of a proper attention to his sufferings and death in this instance bore a resemblance to that of those who actually caused him to be put to death; so far they became *guilty*, as we translate the word, *of the body and blood of the Lord*.

Thus interpreted, what St. Paul here says is easy and intelligible, as well as strictly just and true; but in no other sense can it possibly be either intelligible, just, or true.^r And the

^r See the note on page 95, at the end of the Appendix.

fact is, that this is the true meaning of the Apostle's own words, and that the obscurity of the passage arises wholly from an impropriety in the translation.

The original is, *ενοχος εσαι τῷ σωματι*, &c. and the word *ενοχος* is of such extensive use and application, that on different occasions the obvious sense of the passages will force us to translate it in very different manners.

In Matt. ch. xxvi. 66.---*ενοχος θανατου εστι*; and Mark, ch. xiv. 64.---*ειναι ενοχου θανατου*; it may with propriety be translated, *guilty of*; because, *guilty of death*, is an elliptical expression which use has rendered familiar; and the meaning of which answers exactly to the meaning of the word in these two passages.

But in Matt. ch. v. 21, 22.--*ενοχος εσι τῇ κρισει—τῷ συνεδριῳ—εις τὴν γενναν*;—and Mark iii. 29.—*ενοχος εστιν αιωνιου κρισεως*;---and Heb. ii. 15.—*ενοχοι ησαν δουλειας*;---in all these passages it must of necessity be translated---*subject to, exposed to, liable to, obnoxious to*, &c. and cannot possibly be rendered--*guilty of*.

And in 1 Cor. xi. 27. the passage under consideration, *ενοχος εσαι του σωματος*; as well as in James ii. 10.---*γεγονε παντων ενοχος*, which is exactly similar to it; to give it its true and proper

proper meaning, it must be rendered in a different manner still; such as,—*offends against—affronts—shews a disrespect to, &c.*—Or, still more fully, *is guilty of offending against—guilty of affronting—guilty of shewing a disrespect to, &c.*—Not absolutely, *guilty of the body and blood of Christ*, in the one instance; or, *guilty of all the commandments*, in the other.

The necessity there is for translating the word in this manner, in these two perfectly similar passages, is not only evident from the reason of the thing, but likewise from St. James's explanation of his own meaning.

St. James says,^s Whosoever shall offend against one commandment of the law—*ΥΕΥΘΥΕ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΕΥΧΟΣ*;—which we translate,—*is guilty of all.*—But here the evident reason of the thing must convince us that this translation is improper; because it makes St. James affirm what is manifestly false; and what indeed he himself has informed us, he did not mean. Whoever breaks *one* commandment of the law only, is far less guilty than he who actually breaks them *all*. The utmost that with truth can be said of him who breaks *one only*, is, that he *offends against, or affronts, or shews a disrespect*

^s Ch. ii. 10.

to, all; by *offending against*, in one instance, that authority, which equally enjoins *all*: and this the Apostle himself has informed us was exactly what he meant.^t Here therefore it is manifest, that ενοχος γεγωνα should not have been rendered, absolutely, *is guilty of*; but ought to have been translated, *becomes an affronter of*, or, *becomes guilty of affronting*, or, *of shewing a disrespect to*, all the rest.

And for the self same reasons, in the passage before us, ενοχος γεγωνα του σωματος ought not to have been translated, absolutely, *is guilty of the body*, &c. but should have been rendered by some such expression as, *offends against*, *affronts*, *shews a disrespect to*; Or, more fully, *is guilty of offending against*, *affronting*, or *shewing a disrespect to*, the body and blood, that is, the memorials of the body and blood, and consequently the sufferings and death of Christ.^u

^t James ii. 11.

^u The reader may have the satisfaction of finding this interpretation confirmed by the authority of Bp. Pearce, in his Commentary, and note upon the passage, vol. II. p. 270. Though there in the note, by filling up the words of St. James thus,—*is guilty of the breach of all*;—he undesignedly goes further than either his own interpretation of the original word, or the reason of the thing, will warrant. See likewise his note on Matt. ch. v. 21. vol. I. p. 30.

From the parallel passage of St. James therefore, as well as from the nature of the thing itself, it is evident, that this obscure expression, *is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*, is improperly adopted by our translation in 1 Cor. ch. xi. 27; and that the real meaning of St. Paul himself, in this passage, cannot possibly afford us any foundation whatever for attributing to the specific nature and design of the Lord's Supper, any thing more than, or different from, what we have found it to be, by considering the history of its institution, and all the peculiar circumstances attending it.

Should it nevertheless be imagined, that even those temporal punishments, which St. Paul here tells the Corinthians had actually overtaken them, on account of their *unworthy*, indecent behaviour, when met together to celebrate the Lord's Supper, seem to shew, that this rite must contain something more in its nature than has yet appeared from all the particulars of its institution; the answer is easy and obvious.

From the history of the institution it is indisputably certain, that our Saviour himself neither annexed any special benefits to the due performance of this rite; nor any special evils to the omission, or unworthy performance of it.

And since it is likewise certain, that none of the Apostles have given us even the least intimation of any such appointment; it necessarily follows, that as far as depends upon the nature of the rite itself, no other blessings or evils can arise from the due celebration, or faulty neglect of it, than those already enumerated in Propositions XIII. and XIV.

But St. Paul has here informed us, that the Corinthians were punished in a special manner, for their unworthy behaviour at the Lord's Supper, with weakness, sickness, and death; and this with a special design to chastise the persons so offending, in this world, in order to prevent them from being condemned in the next.

It follows therefore, that these judgments, which were inflicted on the Corinthians, were not any established punishments, annexed to the unworthy celebration of the Lord's Supper, and always accompanying it, on account of any thing peculiar in the nature and effects of this rite itself; but extraordinary punishments, inflicted on them by the special providence of God, at that particular time; in order the more effectually to further the propagation, and secure the establishment of the gospel, in those early days of its infant state, by these extraordinary means.

NUMBER IV.*

THE passage here referred to is 1st Epist. Corinth. chap. v. ver. 7, 8; and is as follows.

“ Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us ;
 “ therefore let us keep the feast, not with old
 “ leaven, neither with the leaven of malice
 “ and wickedness, but with the unleavened
 “ bread of sincerity and truth.”

As this passage is wholly figurative, styles Christ our passover, makes mention of his being sacrificed for us, and exhorts us to keep the feast in a particular manner; it may possibly at first view, and while considered merely by itself, excite a confused suspicion that it relates to the Lord's Supper; and that it is founded on something in the nature of that rite, which we have not yet discovered. But if we consider it, as it stands connected with what goes before it, which is absolutely necessary to ascertain its true meaning, we shall be satisfactorily convinced, that the Lord's Supper is not so much as alluded

* See Proposition XXVI. page 34.

to in it ; and that it is not even capable of being applied to that rite.

St. Paul is here addressing the Corinthian disciples upon a very particular occasion.

Ch. v. ver. 1. It is reported commonly, (says the Apostle) that there is fornication among you ; and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles ; that one should have his father's wife.

2. And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned ; that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you.

3. For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed :—

4. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of the Lord Jesus Christ ;

5. To deliver such an one to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh ; that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

6. Your glorying is not good : know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump ?

7. Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump ; as ye are unleavened.

For

For even Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed for us :

8. Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of evil^y and wickedness ; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

Such is the whole connected passage : and if for a moment we suppose St. Paul to have alluded to the Lord's Supper in the last clause of it, his reasoning must then unavoidably stand thus :

“ I condemn you Corinthians for suffering so extraordinary a species of fornication, as I hear of, to be practised among you without reproof ; and I command you, by my apostolical authority, to put away from among you the person who has been guilty of it. And this I enjoin you purposely that more persons may not become guilty of as flagrant enormities, by the influence of his example. You know that a little leaven leaveneth the whole mass in which it is suffered to remain ; and you ought therefore to be solicitous to separate from you every one who is guilty of such enormities,

^y So the word *κακία* should be translated, instead of *malice*, which is foreign to the meaning of the passage.

as tend naturally to destroy in others that purity of manners required of you by the gospel. For as Christ, who may be called our Passover, is sacrificed for us; we ought (to do what?) *to celebrate the Lord's Supper*, not with old leaven, our old accustomed vices; nor with the leaven of evil and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincere goodness and truth; i. e. with a virtuous and pure conversation."

Such must St. Paul's reasoning here be, if by *keeping the feast* he meant—*celebrating the Lord's Supper*, in the passage in question. To convince the Corinthians, that they ought to expel from their society the fornicator he mentions; and that for this particular reason, which he expressly assigns, lest his unpunished wickedness should embolden others to an indulgence in equal vices; he must here have meant to remind them of the obligations they were under as Christians, (not, to regulate their lives by the pure and virtuous precepts of the gospel; but truly,) to celebrate the Lord's Supper with a proper disposition. But this interpretation of the Apostle's meaning is surely so manifestly improper, and even absurd, that there is no possibility of admitting it as true.

Evident

Evident it is, that St. Paul does not here object to the person whom he orders them to put away from them, that he had been guilty of profaning the Lord's Supper; but that he was guilty of such an immoral conduct, as was utterly inconsistent with the purity required of a disciple of Christ. In all that St. Paul says, both of the person and the offence,^z his thoughts are wholly taken up with the vicious and immoral nature of the offence itself; without even the least glance at any remote effect of it, in profaning either his celebration of the Lord's Supper, or any other act of religious worship, which it equally profaned. And since it is certain, that there is not even the remotest hint at the Lord's Supper, in the five first verses, in which he insists upon the enormity of the offence, and directs them to separate from them the person who was guilty of it; it would be, strictly speaking, absurd to imagine, that in the three next he should mean to tell them, and this without any thing to introduce it, that they must separate from them the person in question, for this strange reason above all others,—lest they should come, like him, to profane the Lord's Supper.

^z From ver. 1. to 5.

By the figurative expression of *keeping the feast*, and the manner in which they should keep it, it is plain St. Paul meant the due regulation of their lives as disciples of Christ, without any reference whatever to the Lord's Supper. This is not only clear from the five first verses of the passage, but even still more so from the three last themselves; which consist of such figures as St. Paul could not have made use of in speaking of the Lord's Supper.

He here directs the Corinthians to purge out *the old leaven*; because, as Christians, they were *unleavened*; and bound to *keep the feast*, not with old *leaven*, nor with the *leaven* of evil and wickedness; but with the *unleavened* bread of sincerity and truth. But how could St. Paul chuse out this figure, above all others, when speaking of the Lord's Supper; or how can it be applied to that rite? As far as relates to the Lord's Supper, most certain it is, that Christians are not, what St. Paul here says they are, *unleavened*; since the gospel contains no direction to make use of *unleavened bread* in celebrating the Lord's Supper; and it is therefore impossible that St. Paul could have the Lord's Supper in his thoughts, when he reminded

minded the Corinthian disciples, that they were *unleavened*.

In fact the truth is simply this. To make the Corinthians sensible of the necessity there was for publicly stigmatizing the person who had been guilty of that enormity, which the Apostle here reprehends; he reminds them of the mischievous influence which such an example, if suffered to go unpunished, would have among them; by putting to them a question, than which none could be more familiar,----*Know ye not, that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?* Having put this question, he immediately, and very naturally, styles those sins in which they had been accustomed to allow themselves before their conversion to the faith in Christ, *the old leaven*; and directs them to *purge it out*, or to keep themselves pure from all such corruptions for the future; in order that they might *be a new lump; as they were unleavened*; that is, in plain terms, that they might now be really purified from all those vices in which they had before indulged; as their profession of the faith in Christ plainly required, and supposed them to be.

This

This illustration of the point he had to inculcate from the nature of leaven, and the mention of unleavened bread, having led St. Paul's thoughts to the jewish Paschal Supper, in which the bread was indispensably required to be unleavened; and there being a striking resemblance between the deliverance of the Israelites, of which that Supper was the appointed memorial, and the redemption of mankind through Christ; he goes on to strengthen what he had already said, by reminding them, that *Christ, their Passover, had been sacrificed for them; and that therefore they ought to keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of evil and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth*:—As if he had said, in direct and plain terms,----That Christ, who might very aptly be styled the Passover of Christians, had been slain for them; and therefore, as the Jews, in celebrating their deliverance by the Paschal Supper, abstained from all leavened bread, in obedience to the injunction of the law of Moses; so they, who professed themselves Christians, should as it were celebrate their redemption through Christ by abstaining from all sin and wickedness, and practising

practising sincere holiness and virtue, agreeably to the precepts of the law of Christ.

This appears so manifestly the truth, and the whole meaning of St. Paul in this passage, that we may venture to affirm, in exhorting the Corinthians *to keep the feast with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth*, it was their moral conduct in their whole life and conversation, not their manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper, that he had his thoughts upon; and consequently, that no intelligence concerning the nature and design of the Lord's Supper can possibly be derived from this passage; since in reality that rite is not even so much as alluded to in it.^a

^a The reader may see other arguments to prove the same point with respect to this passage, in the treatise entitled, *A Plain Account of the Lord's Supper*, by Bishop Hoadly.

NUMBER V. ^a

TO preclude the possibility of misrepresenting Dr. Cudworth's argument concerning the nature of the Lord's Supper, founded on what St. Paul has said relating to it, in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. x. 14, &c. and that we may have it completely before us, it will be proper to insert it at length.

A Discourse concerning the true Notion of the Lord's Supper, Chapter iv.

“ But lest we should seem to set up fancies of our own, and then sport with them, we come now to demonstrate and evince, that the Lord's Supper, in the proper notion of it, is *Epulum ex Oblatis*, or, A Feast upon Sacrifice; in the same manner with the Feasts upon the Jewish Sacrifices under the Law, and the Feasts upon *ειδωλοθυσια*, things offered to idols, among the Heathens. And that from a place of Scripture where all these shall be compared together, and made *exactly* parallels to one another.”

^a See page 89.

1st Ep. Cor. ch. x.

Ver. 14. Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry.

15. I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say.

16. The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? ^b

18. Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?

20. Now I say, the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with Devils.

21. Ye cannot drink of the cup of the Lord, and the cup of Devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of Devils.

“ Where the Apostle's scope being to convince the Corinthians of the unlawfulness of eating things sacrificed to Idols, he doth it in this manner;—Shewing, that though an Idol

^b It is remarkable that Cudworth leaves out ver. 17 and 19; as if they embarrassed the argument St. Paul is here upon.

were truly nothing, and things sacrificed to Idols physically nothing, as different from other meats; as it seems they argued, and St. Paul confesses, ver. 19; yet morally and circumstantially to eat of things sacrificed to Idols, in the Idol's Temple, was to consent with the Sacrifices, and be guilty of them."

" Which he doth illustrate, First, from a parallel rite in the christian religion; where the eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, offered up to God upon the cross for us, in the Lord's Supper, is a real communication in his death and sacrifice:----Ver. 16.—*The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread, which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?*"

" Secondly, from another parallel of the same rite among the Jews; where always, they that ate of the sacrifices were accounted partakers of the altar; that is, of the sacrifices offered up upon the altar: Ver. 18.—*Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?*—In veteri Lege quicunque admittebantur ad edendum de hostiis oblatis, censebantur ipsius sacrificii, tanquam pro ipsis oblatis, fieri participes, et per
illud

illud sanctificari ;---as a late commentator fully expresses it."

" Therefore, As to eat the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, is, to be made partaker of his Sacrifice offered up to God for us ;—As to eat of the Jewish Sacrifices under the Law, was to partake in the Legal Sacrifices themselves ;—So, to eat of things offered up in sacrifice to Idols, was to be made partakers of the Idol Sacrifices, and therefore was unlawful."

" For, *the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils* ; but Christ's body and blood were offered up in sacrifice unto God ; and therefore they could not partake of both together ; the sacrifice of the true God, and the sacrifice of Devils :—*Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of Devils ; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of Devils.*----St. Paul's argument here must needs suppose a *perfect* analogy between these three, and that they are all parallels to one another, or else it hath no strength. Wherefore I conclude from hence, —That the Lord's Supper is the same among Christians, in respect of the Christian Sacrifice, that among the Jews the Feasts upon the Legal Sacrifices were, and among the Gentiles the Feasts upon the Idol

I

Sacrifices ;

Sacrifices; and therefore, *Epulum Sacrificiale*, or, *Epulum ex Oblatis*.—*Οπερ εδει δεξασ.*”

Thus reasons Dr. Cudworth. To enable ourselves to determine satisfactorily, whether his reasoning is really conclusive, the best method will be, to consider first, his explanation of St. Paul's argument; and then the conclusion which he himself draws from that explanation of it.

In the first place, he lays it down, that the point St. Paul here intends to prove is, That going to the Pagan Feasts upon Sacrifice was “morally and circumstantially to consent with the sacrifices, and be guilty of them.”

And then, That in order to prove this point, St. Paul alledges these two considerations: viz.

That, among Christians, partaking of the Lord's Supper is, “A real communication in his death and sacrifice:” by which Cudworth means, in the effects, or benefits, of his death and sacrifice: And,

That among the Jews, all who ate of the sacrifices were accounted partakers of the effects, or benefits, of their sacrifices.

He says first, St. Paul's design here is, to prove, that eating at the Pagan Idol Feasts was “morally and circumstantially to consent with

“ the

“ the sacrifices, and be guilty of them :” That is, for I know not what other meaning to give the words, That as being seen at the Idol Feasts was a circumstance, from which every one was morally sure it would be concluded by some who saw him there, that he was an idolater ; so every one, who, notwithstanding this, frequented Idol Feasts, must be supposed unconcerned at its being thought he was an Idolater ; and consequently must be considered as virtually guilty of an act of Idolatry, before those who saw him there.

This then is the point, according to Cudworth himself, which St. Paul here intended to prove ; and in this we are perfectly agreed : let us now consider the two reasons, which, according to his representation of them, St. Paul alledges to prove it.

The first is, That among Christians, partaking of the Lord’s Supper “ is a real communion in his death and sacrifice :” and that is, as Cudworth means, in the effects or benefits of his death and sacrifice.

But how could this particular consideration answer St. Paul’s purpose in this argument, as it has just been explained ?

To prove, that partaking of Idol Feasts was being virtually guilty of an act of idolatry, and consequently a virtual profession of idolatry; how could St. Paul possibly alledge, that partaking of the Lord's Supper among Christians was (not, virtually joining in an act of christian worship, and consequently a virtual profession of christianity;—but) “a real communication in Christ's death and sacrifice;” i. e. in the effects or benefits of it? For St. Paul to have alledged this consideration, to prove the point just mentioned, would have been urging what was quite foreign to his purpose, and manifestly useless and improper.

To prove the point which it is agreed he meant to prove, the only argument he could draw from what obtained among the Christians must have been this:—That as among Christians partaking of bread and wine at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, was apparently partaking of them in compliance with the institution of Christ, and assenting to the christian rites, and therefore a virtual profession of Christianity;----so partaking of the Idol Feasts with Idolaters, must be apparently consenting to, and being guilty of, the idol sacrifices; and consequently a virtual profession of Idolatry.

Thus

Thus interpreted, St. Paul's argument, drawn from what obtained among the Christians, is natural, obvious, and indisputably conclusive; nor could he possibly alledge any thing more plain, or more directly to the purpose, to prove the point he certainly had in view. Whereas, if we interpret it as Cudworth does, it necessarily becomes improper, and utterly inconclusive.

The second argument which St. Paul urges is drawn from what obtained among the Jews:--*Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?---* And according to Cudworth his meaning in this question is,—Among the Jews, are not all who eat of the Legal Sacrifices accounted partakers of the effects, or benefits, of those Sacrifices?

But here it is evidently just as foreign to the point St. Paul wanted to prove; (that frequenting Idol Feasts was being virtually guilty of an open profession of idolatry;) to alledge, that eating of the jewish sacrifices was accounted a real participation in the effects, or benefits, of those sacrifices; as it was to alledge, in the former instance, That partaking of the

Lord's Supper was a real communication in the effects of Christ's death.

On the other hand, it is evidently as pertinent to St. Paul's design, to urge, That among the Jews, frequenting the Jewish Feasts upon Sacrifice was virtually assenting to those sacrifices, and consequently a virtual profession of Judaism; As, to urge from the Christians, That partaking of the Lord's Supper was virtually assenting to the christian rites; and consequently, a virtual profession of Christianity.

For the same reasons therefore which oblige us to reject Cudworth's interpretation of the argument drawn by St. Paul from the Christians, we must likewise reject his similar interpretation of the similar argument drawn from the Jews. And the meaning of this question put by the Apostle, *Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?* can be no other than this; Is not eating of the jewish legal sacrifices with the Jews, virtually giving assent to those sacrifices; and consequently, a virtual profession of Judaism?

Thus, it is presumed, we see clearly, that Cudworth's interpretation of St. Paul's two premises

premises is founded on a mistake : we must now examine his representation of the manner in which St. Paul argues from them ; which, according to him, is as follows.

“ Therefore,—As to eat the body and blood of Christ in the Lord’s Supper, is, to be made partaker of his sacrifice offered up to God for us ;—As to eat of the Jewish Sacrifices under the Law, was, to partake in the Legal Sacrifices themselves ;—So, to eat of things offered up in sacrifice to Idols, was, to be made partakers of the idol sacrifices ; and therefore was unlawful.”

Here first it is absolutely necessary to observe, that this stating of St. Paul’s argument requires to have the meaning of each of its propositions precisely ascertained, to enable us to determine whether the argument it contains is conclusive or not : for unless the identical terms in which it is drawn up, (“ being made partakers of “ Christ’s sacrifice,” and “ partaking in the “ legal sacrifices,” and “ being made partakers “ of the idol sacrifices,”) are used to express exactly the same meaning in each of the premises and the conclusion ; the argument must necessarily prove inconclusive ; or, in reality, no argument at all ; though by means of hav-

ing its premises and conclusion expressed in the same terms, it wears at first sight the appearance of complete demonstration.

To discover therefore with certainty whether St. Paul's argument, as it is here stated by Cudworth, is really as well as apparently conclusive, we must strike out the identical terms themselves, in which the premises and conclusion are expressed; and substitute in their stead that precise meaning, which Cudworth here designed to express by them. And when we have done this, his state of St. Paul's argument, as appears from what he says in his three preceding paragraphs, will stand thus:—

“ Therefore,

“ As to eat the body and blood of Christ
“ in the Lord's Supper, is, a real communi-
“ cation in his death and sacrifice;” that is, in
the effects or benefits of it;—

“ As to eat of the jewish sacrifices under the
Law, is, to share in the effects or benefits of
those sacrifices;” *per illa sanctificari*;—

“ So, to eat of things offered up in sacrifice
to idols, is,” (what? not, “ to share in the
effects of those idol sacrifices;” the only con-
clusion that can possibly be drawn from these
premises; but) “ to consent with those sacri-
fices,

fices, and be guilty of them :” that is, nothing more than to be virtually guilty of an act of idolatry, and therefore, to be virtually a professed idolater.

By thus substituting in the room of the identical terms themselves in each proposition, that meaning in which Cudworth uses them in the two premises, and that very different meaning in which he uses them in the conclusion ; we see at once, that the conclusion by no means follows from the premises, as he understood them ; and in fact has no dependance upon them ; and consequently, that his interpretation of St. Paul’s method of arguing, from what obtained among the Christians and the Jews, must be false ; because it renders the Apostle’s conclusion not pertinent, and his method of reasoning improper.

In reality, St. Paul’s own argument, unobscured by any thing foisted into it, is as simple and plain as possible, and is nothing more than this :—

As, to eat bread and drink wine with Christians, when they professedly eat the one, and drink the other, as the appointed Memorials of the body and blood of Christ, is, virtually eating and drinking with the same apparent design
that

that they professedly eat and drink with; and consequently, is a virtual, apparent profession of Christianity; And,

As, to eat of the jewish sacrifices with the Jews, is, for the same reasons, a virtual, apparent profession of Judaism;

So, to eat of idol sacrifices with professed Idolaters, is, for the same reasons likewise, a virtual, apparent profession of Idolatry. Wherefore,

Since, as I said at first,^c it is your duty as Christians to *flee from idolatry*; and of course from all apparent professions of idolatry; it must of necessity be improper in you as Christians to frequent Idol Feasts. Q. E. D.

We may now, I imagine, clearly see the falsehood of that fundamental principle from which Cudworth draws his own conclusion, that the Lord's Supper is *Epulum Sacrificiale*, or *Epulum ex Oblatis*.

He says,^d "St. Paul's argument here must
 " needs suppose a *perfect* analogy between
 " these three actions, and that they are all
 " parallels, ^e *exact* parallels, to one another;
 " or else it hath no strength."

^c 1 Cor. x. 14.

^d See the passage in page 113.

^e See his first paragraph in page 110.

Answer.

Answer.

1st, St. Paul's argument must needs suppose such an analogy between the three actions concerned, and that they are parallel to each other so far, as is necessary to make his argument drawn from comparing them together really conclusive and just; but it does not suppose the analogy between them to extend further, or that they are parallels to each other in any greater degree, than this may require.

2dly, St. Paul's argument is made really conclusive and just, merely by granting, what cannot be denied, that the three actions mentioned in it agree in this one particular only, That Each is a virtual, apparent profession of that religion, to which it respectively belongs; without taking it at all into consideration, whether the Lord's Supper is exactly the same sort of rite in the christian religion, that the jewish and idol feasts upon sacrifice were in the jewish and pagan religions; that is, without considering at all, whether the Lord's Supper is specifically *Epulum Sacrificiale*, or *Epulum ex Oblatis*, or not. Therefore,

3dly, St. Paul's argument does not suppose a *perfect* analogy between the specific natures of the three actions in question: It does not
suppose

suppose them to be *exact* parallels; or parallels to each other so far, as to afford any ground whatever for concluding, “ that the Lord’s
 “ Supper is the same among Christians, in
 “ respect of the christian sacrifice, that among
 “ the Jews the feasts upon the legal sacrifices
 “ were, and among the Gentiles the feasts
 “ upon the idol sacrifices;” That is, in other words, St. Paul’s argument does not afford any ground whatever for concluding, that the Lord’s Supper is specifically *Epulum Sacrificiale*, or *Epulum ex Oblatis*. Q.E.D.^f

^f If so great a man as Cudworth shall be found to have been mistaken in a point on which he flattered himself with having arrived at demonstration, it certainly behoves any one who attempts to point out his mistakes, to remember well his own liableness to error. But whether we have succeeded in detecting the particular fallacies of Cudworth’s argument, or not, it must not be forgotten, that if the train of reasoning which has been pursued in the preceding Treatise itself be just, certain it is, that Dr. Cudworth’s argument must be fallacious, and his notion of the Lord’s Supper untrue.

If the reader is desirous of seeing such arguments as may be drawn from the nature of the distinct sorts of the Jewish Sacrifices, to prove that the Lord’s Supper cannot be a Feast upon Sacrifice; he may consult “ A Discourse
 “ on the Nature and End of the Lord’s Supper, wherein
 “ is shewn that it neither is, nor can be, a Feast on the
 “ Sacrifice.” Published by J. Payne, Pater Noster Row, 1758.

From

From what has now been urged, it must, it is hoped, be clearly seen, that the sense in which Cudworth has interpreted the principles upon which St. Paul argues, in the passage on which he has founded his own notion of the Lord's Supper, is by no means the true sense of St. Paul; and consequently, that the peculiar opinion of the nature of the Lord's Supper, which he has founded wholly upon this mistaken interpretation of the Apostle, is absolutely destitute of all foundation. But lest any confused suspicion should still remain, that his notion of the nature of the Lord's Supper may yet be true, notwithstanding he has been mistaken in founding it on this passage of St. Paul; it will not perhaps be without its use, to prove, a priori, if we are able to do it, that Dr. Cudworth's notion of the nature of the Lord's Supper must of necessity be false; or, in other words, that on account of the obvious fundamental principles of the christian religion, it is absolutely impossible, that the Lord's Supper can be "the same among Christians in respect to the christian sacrifice, that among the Jews the feasts upon the legal sacrifices were, and among the Gentiles the feasts upon the idol sacrifices." And this shall be the object of the remaining article of this Appendix.

NUMBER VI.

IN every religion, the true nature and design of every instituted rite must necessarily be conformable to, and perfectly consistent with, the great fundamental principles of the religion itself.

In religions, therefore, whose fundamental principles are in any respect different, all rites, dependant in any degree upon those principles, must be proportionably different from each other in their true nature and design.

If then the certain, acknowledged nature and design of the jewish and pagan feasts upon sacrifice was, in any degree, inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the religion instituted by Christ; it will unavoidably follow, that the true nature and design of the Lord's Supper must be different from, and cannot be the same with, the acknowledged nature and design of the jewish and pagan feasts upon sacrifice; ^s that
is,

^s To prevent misapprehension, it may be proper to observe, that what is here said with respect to the jewish feasts upon sacrifice, is not in any degree applicable to the
the

is, the Lord's Supper cannot be specifically a Feast upon Sacrifice.

To determine the point therefore nothing more is necessary, than to compare the acknowledged nature and design of the Jewish and pagan feasts upon sacrifice, with the fundamental principles of the religion instituted by Jesus.

In the Jewish Dispensation many particular sacrifices were appointed to be offered up, on account of particular legal offences; and all these sacrifices were declared, and understood, to be expiations of those particular offences; or, in other words, the appointed legal means of obtaining forgiveness, and remission of the punishment incurred on their account.

In the Pagan Religions likewise, particular sacrifices were offered up on account of particular offences; and were designed for, and

the Passover or Paschal Supper. For, not to enquire whether the Passover was in any sense a sacrifice, most evident it is, that it was not an expiatory sacrifice. Instead of being appointed for an expiation of any offences, it was expressly and solely appointed for a commemoration of a blessing; (as see No. I. of this Appendix) and was so far a rite of exactly the same nature in the Jewish religion, that the Eucharist is in the Christian.

regarded

regarded as expiations of those particular offences, and the immediate means of obtaining forgiveness from the Gods.

Hence in the Jewish Dispensation, the sacrificers, in all these cases, did really expiate their offences against the Law, by offering up the sacrifices appointed in the Law for them; and in the Pagan Religions were understood to do the same. And as those who partook of the sacrificial feasts were understood, in Both, to partake of all the benefits of the sacrifices themselves; hence partaking of these feasts was considered, in each religion respectively, as an expiation of those offences for which the sacrifices were offered up, and the formal cause of their being forgiven.^h

Such was the acknowledged nature and end of the Jewish and Pagan feasts upon sacrifice. And from hence it immediately follows, that if the Lord's Supper is specifically a feast upon sacrifice; if "the Lord's Supper is the same among Christians in respect of the Christian sacrifice, that among the Jews the feasts upon

^h Thus is the nature of the Jewish sacrificial feasts described, by the commentator whom Cudworth quotes for the propriety of the description. See the passage quoted in pages 112, 113, of this Appendix.

the legal sacrifices were; and among the Gentiles the feasts upon the idol sacrifices;”---Then our partaking of the Lord’s Supper, our joining in this feast upon his sacrifice, this very action itself, must be an immediate atonement for our sins; and the appointed christian means, or formal cause, of their being forgiven, under the law of Christ; since Jesus himself expressly declared, at the very time of instituting this rite, that his blood would be shed for the remission of sins.

But this consequence, which must unavoidably be admitted if the Lord’s Supper is specifically a Feast upon Sacrifice, is, in the first place, absolutely unauthorised by the form and circumstances of the institution; and, in the next, utterly inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the religion of Christ.

It is absolutely unauthorised, because, as we have already seen, from an accurate examination of all the circumstances of the institution, and every passage relating to it; it is no where declared, or even so much as hinted, throughout the New Testament, that the celebration of the Lord’s Supper was appointed by Jesus, to be itself an atonement for, or formal cause of the forgiveness of, sin; as the jewish expia-

tory sacrifices were declared to be under the Law, and the heathen sacrifices were understood to be among the Pagans.

And it is utterly inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the religion of Christ; because it is not only certain, that there is not any action whatever appointed by the gospel, for us to perform, under the notion of an expiation of, or atonement for, or formal cause of the forgiveness of, sin; but equally certain, that in the gospel all forgiveness of sin is expressly attributed, and wholly confined to the merits and mediation of Christ, through the gratuitous appointment of God.

And with respect to the Lord's Supper in particular, forgiveness of sin, as we have fully seen, is no more signified in the gospel to be the appointed consequence of our celebrating this rite; which it must have been if the Lord's Supper was a feast upon sacrifice; than of our offering up our prayers, or our performance of any other religious act. Celebrating the Lord's Supper is itself one act of our christian duty, in consequence of its having been expressly enjoined by our Lord; but neither that, nor any other religious act, is enjoined in the gospel, as in any degree whatever an atonement for sin.

The

The goodness of God has declared in the gospel, that through the mediation of Christ, our sins, if properly repented of, shall be forgiven; and our sincere though imperfect obedience to his laws be rewarded with eternal life. In consequence of this great fundamental principle of our redemption, as it is revealed in the gospel, nothing but repentance, productive of sincere though imperfect obedience, can obtain for us the forgiveness of our sins, through the mediation of Christ; and this repentance and obedience must necessarily include, and be estimated by, our whole conduct through life. Celebrating the Lord's Supper therefore cannot possibly be the means of applying the efficacy of the mediation of Christ to ourselves, so as to atone for our sins; since it is nothing more than complying with one single command, out of very many more which the gospel no less enjoins, and to all of which without exception our obedience is required.

Since therefore the Jewish feasts upon sacrifice actually were, and the Pagan were understood to be, to all who partook of them, actual atonements, or appointed means of atonement, for those sins respectively on account of which the sacrifices themselves were offered up; And

since in the Christian Dispensation there is not any rite, or action, enjoined; the celebration or performance of which is there appointed, or considered, as an atonement for any sins; so as that the remission of any sins is the proper, or even the *possible* effect, of the performance of such action, or the celebration of such rite; it follows unavoidably, that no Rite of the Christian religion can possibly be of the same nature, and have the same effects, with the Jewish and Pagan feasts upon sacrifice; and consequently, that the Lord's Supper cannot be "the same among Christians, in respect to the Christian Sacrifice, that among the Jews the feasts upon the Legal Sacrifices were, and among the Gentiles the feasts upon the Idol Sacrifices;" that is, cannot be specifically a Feast upon Sacrifice. Q. E. D. ⁱ

ⁱ See the subsequent note on page 132.

N O T E S.

Page 3. **I**T seems requisite to apprize the reader, that this name is generally made use of throughout this Treatise, only because it has been so generally adopted, not because it is in reality a proper denomination of the rite concerned. The rite itself, when instituted by Jesus, though borrowed from a ceremonial of his Supper, was totally distinct from it; nor does it appear that at the first establishment of Christianity it was ever called by this name. In the time of the Apostles, when the disciples met together to celebrate this rite, they adopted a practice of eating together a common supper; as a memorial most probably of that Supper, at, and immediately after, which Jesus instituted this rite: and, as appears at least extremely probable from what St. Paul says relating to it, 1 Cor. xi. 20, 21; it was this common supper of their own adopting, not the rite by which the death of Jesus was commemorated, which was then called by this name. The religious rite itself, which has since been so generally, but as I apprehend improperly, called the

Lord's Supper, there seems great reason for believing, from Acts ii. 42, 46; compared with Acts xx. 7; was then denominated *the breaking of bread*.

Page 6.] *Which is shed for many for the remission of sins.*—Bishop Pearce in his Commentary proposes to translate this passage, and the corresponding ones in St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, in a different manner: and though perhaps no consequence of any moment would follow from the alteration, yet as these are the words in which the institution of the rite is recorded, it may be requisite, in an express enquiry into its true nature and design, to examine an alteration proposed in the manner of translating them, by so very respectable an authority.

The words in question, as related by St. Matthew, are,—*πιετε εξ αυτη παντες; τουτο γαρ εστι το αιμα μου, το της καινης διαθηκης, το περι πολλων εκχυομενου, εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων.*—The exact literal translation of these words, is:—*Drink ye all out of it; for this is my blood, That of the New Covenant, That shed for many, for remission of sins.*—And this their literal sense, in the very order in which they stand, is so clear, express, and pointed; that as no other translation of them can be wanted to give them a meaning; so I apprehend, none which would require them to be materially

terially transposed, and when so transposed would either alter their sense, or render their meaning less clear and pointed, ought to be admitted.

Bishop Pearce however is inclined to be of opinion, that the word *εκχυνομενον* is not to be referred to *αιμα*, though that is expressed; but to *ποτηριον*, though only understood; so as to make the sentence signify,—“ This wine, which was
“ just now poured out of a larger vessel for you
“ to drink it out of this cup, represents my
“ blood.”—Commentary, vol. I. p. 184, note P.

But if the wine in the cup given by Jesus to the Apostles had in fact been poured out of a larger vessel into that cup, this circumstance was surely so utterly insignificant, and so foreign to the business which Jesus was then upon, the institution of his new rite; that it seems absolutely impossible he could at that time have had his own thoughts upon it, or take any notice to them of it.

And even if the insignificancy of the sense here proposed did not render it incapable of being admitted, still, it is apprehended, the construction of the sentence would not permit it to be received. For it appears evident on inspection, that the clause *ΤΟ ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΛΛΩΝ ΕΚΧΥΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ*, must refer to the same thing, whatever that may be, with the immediately preceding clause, *ΤΟ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΙΝΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΣ*; and That, to its own immediately preceding clause,

ΤΟ αιμα μου; and consequently, ΤΟ περι πολλων εκχυνομενου, το αιμα likewise.

Had St. Matthew meant to express, by το εκχυνομενου, the wine in the cup, and not the blood of Jesus; instead of writing as he has, τουτο γαρ εσι το αιμα μου, το της καινης διαθηκης, το περι πολλων εκχυνομενου, &c. he would surely have so placed the clause in question as to make it express that meaning; and have written, τουτο γαρ, το περι πολλων εκχυνομενου, εσι το αιμα μου, το της καινης διαθηκης, &c. That is, instead of writing as he has done, *For this is my blood, THAT of the New Covenant, THAT poured out for many, &c.* he would surely have written, *For this, which is poured out for many, is my blood, That of the New Covenant, &c.* And since he has not placed his words in this obvious manner, we have all the evidence that the words themselves can give, that he did not intend them to be understood in this sense.

Besides, if by εκχυνομενου Jesus had meant the wine, and not his blood; after saying to them πιετε εξ αυτου παντες, he surely could not have said, that it was—περι πολλων εκχυνομενου; but must have said, περι υμων, or περι παυτων υμων εκχυνομενου: That is, after saying to them, *Drink YE ALL of it*, he could not have added, that it was *poured out for MANY*; but must have written, *poured out for you*; or, *for you all*; since though
his

his blood was to be shed for *many*, the wine in the cup was poured out for *them only*.

The same observations are applicable to the words of St. Mark, which are as close and pointed as those of St. Matthew; and if translated agreeably to the Bishop's proposed interpretation, will stand as follows;—*And he said unto them, this is my blood of the New Covenant, That, the wine, poured out into this cup for many*: but this, it is submitted, is such a sense and position, as needs but to be stated in order to be rejected.

The words of St. Luke are different:—*ΤΟΥΤΟ ΤΟ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ ἢ ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΑΙΜΑΤΙ ΜΟΥ, Τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ΕΧΧΥΟΜΕΝΟΝ*. Here *εχχυομενου* certainly agrees with *ποτηριου*; and according to the syntax therefore the clause must be translated, *This cup is the New Covenant in my blood, the cup, the wine, poured out for you*;—Or, *This cup, the New Covenant in my blood, is the cup, the wine, poured out for you*. But as neither of these senses appears capable of being admitted, the strict syntax must here, as in some similar passages, which have been remarked,^a be given up; and St. Luke be interpreted in a sense agreeable to the clear and pointed sense of St. Matthew and St. Mark.

^a See Bowyer's note, and the passages it refers to, from Bengelius, on the place; as well as Ephes. iii. 17, 18. Coloss. iii. 16. Apoc. i. 4, 5; which have likewise been referred to on the same account.

The words of St. Paul relating to the bread, are, *τοῦτο μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλωμενον*: *This is my body, that broken for you*:—But if by *broken* was meant *the bread*, and not *his body*; surely he would have placed the words so as naturally to express that meaning, thus:—*τοῦτο, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλωμενον, ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου*;—*This, which is broken for you, is my body*: and since he has not placed them in this manner, which was just as easy and as obvious as the other, we are bound to believe, that he did not intend to express this sense.

Notwithstanding the authority of Bishop Pearce therefore, and what happened to appear probable to him, at the time when he wrote his notes on these particular passages; the received translation, it is presumed, will approve itself, upon close enquiry, as their true meaning.

Page 9.] That this is the obvious and true meaning of this injunction, including the clause—*as oft as ye drink it*, is, I imagine, so clear as to require no proof. It has however been contended, by those who do not allow that Jesus designed on this occasion to institute any rite,^b that the words—*as often*—import no command; and in effect therefore prevent this injunction, as delivered by

^b See Barclay's Apology, page 477.

St. Paul, from having the force of a command. But scarce any thing, I think, can be more clear, than that in order to have this effect, the words in question must have been—*if ever*; instead of—*as often as*. Had Jesus said—“this do ye, *if ever* ye drink it, in remembrance of me;” the objection would have been well founded. But the injunction, “this do ye, *as oft as* ye drink it, in remembrance of me;” especially when delivered, as this was, after a positive command to drink of the cup at that time, and to eat bread both at that time, and in remembrance of him; could not signify any thing less than a similar absolute command to drink wine, as well as to eat bread in remembrance of him; with this additional signification, by the insertion of the words in question, that it was left to themselves to determine how often to do it.

Page 13.] These conclusions naturally arise from considering the particulars contained in the four accounts given us of this transaction in one joint view. But a distinct argument in favour of the perpetuity and universality of the rite in question has been deduced from St. Luke’s account of it considered by itself. ^c

^c See Dr. S. Patrick’s Christian Sacrifice, pages 1, 2. And Mr. Kettlewell, P. 2. ch. 1.

The words of this Apostle are,—*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. Likewise, &c.* ch. xxii. 19, 20.

In this relation, the direction of Jesus to the Apostles to *eat* the bread, when he gave it to them, is clearly understood, but not expressed; and his command to them, *This do, in remembrance of me*, naturally refers to, and comprehends, the whole of what he had then done before them. Thus related therefore, it includes a command to the Apostles, not only to eat bread themselves in remembrance of him; but to take bread, and give thanks, and break it, and give it to others; adding, that it was his body given for them;—in the same manner that he had just given it to themselves. So that this injunction, as it is related by St. Luke, was in fact a command to the Apostles to observe this practice as a standing rite of his religion; and consequently was a virtual command to all who profess themselves his disciples, to assist at this rite, and partake of the bread and wine when so administered.—And though we cannot be certain that St. Luke, or either of the Apostles, have exactly related the words of Jesus; yet thus much is clear, merely from this manner of relating them, that the Apostles understood them as a command to observe the celebration of this rite.

Page 23.] Though the universal and perpetual obligation of the institution in question is now, it is hoped, abundantly established, it may perhaps be attended with use to take notice here of the argument principally relied on by those Christians, who deny it to have been the intention of Jesus to institute such a standing rite, and who therefore pay no regard to it.

It has been alleged, that there are other practices and injunctions of our Saviour and the Apostles recorded in the New Testament, which have at least as good a claim as those relating to the bread and wine, to be regarded as standing institutions of the religion of the gospel; in consequence of which however we do not celebrate any rite; and therefore that the ceremony of partaking of bread and wine ought not to be retained.

But surely it needs very little consideration to perceive, that this objection, even granting that there are any other injunctions in the New Testament so circumstanced as is here supposed, will by no means warrant the conclusion drawn from it. On this supposition, it would indeed convict us of inconsistency in our conduct, and error in some part of it; but this alone could never prove in which part of our inconsistent conduct we had acted erroneously; whether in retaining the rite we have retained, or in rejecting whatever practices we have rejected. We are utterly destitute of all principles

principles of judging before-hand what rites our Saviour might think proper to institute. Whether therefore we ought to admit, or reject, any particular practice recorded in the New Testament, as having been intended, or not intended for a standing rite of the religion of Christ, is a point that must be determined solely by the conduct or directions of Jesus or his Apostles, with respect to such particular practices independently of all others. And how clearly their conduct and directions prove, that the partaking of bread and wine in religious commemoration of the death of Jesus, was designed by him to be a standing rite of the religion of the gospel, has now, it is imagined, been fully seen.

But as there is one transaction in particular, which has been insisted on with a degree of plausibility, as having at least as strong a claim as his direction to eat bread and drink wine in remembrance of him, to be regarded as a designed institution of a standing rite of his religion, it will perhaps be satisfactory to consider what has been urged in support of this opinion.

The transaction alluded to is the very remarkable behaviour of Jesus, when he washed the feet of his Apostles, as it is recorded by St. John.^d It has been alleged, that his command to the Apostles

^d John xiii. 2—17.

cles on this occasion *to wash one another's feet*, was given on the very same night with that "to eat bread, and drink wine, in remembrance of him;" the night on which he was betrayed.—That the several circumstances preceding it, "Jesus's rising from supper, laying by his garments, girding himself with a towel, pouring water into a vessel, washing all their feet, and wiping them with the towel," were in themselves far more remarkable, than his "taking bread" when at the paschal supper, and "blessing," and "breaking it," and "giving it to them, saying, take, eat, this is my body;" and after supper "taking the cup, and giving thanks, and giving it to them, saying, drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."—That the command, "Do this in remembrance of me;" was not so striking, as his putting the question to them, when he had sat down again after washing their feet, "Know ye what I have done unto you?" and then adding, to explain his design, "If I, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet;" and even enforcing this conclusion by adding still further, "I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you."—That on the one occasion he said to Peter, "If I wash thee not thou hast no part in me;" but that on the other,

other, he made no mention of any ill consequence that would have arisen to them, if they had refused to eat of the bread, or drink of the wine, as he commanded them.—And upon the whole, that if we consider the time when this transaction took place, the several particulars included in it, or the injunctions which followed it, it has as much to recommend it as the appointment of a standing ordinance of the gospel, as Jesus's giving the bread and wine to the Apostles, directing them to eat of the one and drink of the other, and enjoining them to “do this in remembrance of him;” or any other injunction recorded in the New Testament. ^c

Such are the particulars which have been insisted on with regard to this very striking particular in the behaviour of Jesus. But that these considerations, notwithstanding the plausibility of their appearance, will not warrant the conclusion drawn from them; a due consideration of what Jesus said upon the occasion, joined with the subsequent conduct of the Apostles, will unanswerably prove.

When Jesus instituted the Eucharist, soon after having washed the feet of the Apostles, he clearly and expressly directed the Apostles to perform that action which he meant to have practised: “Take
“eat,”—“Drink ye all of this;”—“This do in

^c See Barclay's Apology, p. 467—469.

“remembrance

“ remembrance of me.” And had he designed to institute a ceremony of their washing each other’s feet, he would no doubt have commanded them to do that in a similar direct and explicit manner.

But in this instance, instead of giving them any such authoritative *command*, he only appealed to what they *ought* to do in consequence of his *example*. “ Know ye, said Jesus, what I have done to you? Ye call me Lord and Master, and ye say well, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye *ought* also to wash one another’s feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the servant is not greater than his Lord, neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him.”

If Jesus meant, by the action he had now performed, to press upon the Apostles the practice of the moral duties of brotherly love and humility, no action could be better adapted, nor could any stronger reason be alleged, to explain and enforce his design; since the *example* of him, whom they acknowledged for their Lord and Master, in so singular an exercise of humility, was certainly one of the strongest proofs, that they ought to put in practice even a less degree of the same virtue. But if his design was to institute a ceremonial rite, what he now said was neither so well calculated to signify that intent, as a simple and direct com-

mand to observe such a practice would have been ; nor such an explanation of his design as he would most naturally have given ; because his *example* in the action of washing their feet, was no proof that they ought to adopt a ceremony of washing each other's feet ; for this plain reason, that nothing but an express command from him could inform them of its being his intention that they should do so. Since therefore instead of giving them such a direct and absolute *command*, in the manner he presently after did with respect to the bread and wine ; he only pressed upon them the proper influence of his *example* ; it appears highly reasonable to conclude from this circumstance, that his real design was only to inculcate the practice of those virtues, which the action he had performed, emblematically understood, was so strikingly calculated to enforce ; not to enjoin a repetition of the action itself, as a rite of his religion. And when it is likewise considered, that he closed his admonition, founded on his example, with this reflection, “ If ye know these things, happy are ye if “ ye do them ;” we shall scarcely require any further proof, that *the things* he had then in his thoughts must have been the obligations they were under, and especially from his example in this instance, to practise the virtues of brotherly love and humility ; not the adopting a ceremony of washing each other's feet, as a rite of his religion.

And

And that this was the sense in which the Apostles actually did understand the conduct and admonitions of Jesus on this occasion, as well as That sense in which He designed it to be understood by them, some circumstances considered jointly with their subsequent conduct will unanswerably prove.

When Jesus came to Peter, after having already washed the feet of some, and Peter, out of respect, refused to let him wash his; Jesus, to overcome his well meant refusal, said to him, "What I do," i. e. my design in this action, "thou knowest" "not now, but thou shalt know as soon as I have" "done."^f Accordingly "after he had washed their" "feet, and had taken his garments, and was set" "down again, he said unto them, Know ye what" "I have done unto you?" and immediately explained to them his design in this action in the manner we have seen.

It is certain therefore, that Jesus meant to make them understand his design in this action at the very time: and as they were the persons whom he had chosen to preach his gospel, and by whom

^f We translate this, "Thou shalt know *hereafter*;" which, in the general acceptance of that word, rather signifies, that Jesus would inform him at some distant time: but the words in the original, *μετα ταυτα*, "after these things," plainly signify here, "as soon as I have finished what I am now doing."

alone he intended it should be established in the world; whatever his meaning was in the action he had just performed, and the explanation he now gave them of it, he could not possibly leave them, in the end, under any ignorance or mistake relating to it. If therefore it had been his intention to inform the Apostles by this transaction, joined with his own explanation of it, that they were to establish a ceremony of washing each other's feet, as an ordinance of his religion; he would certainly have taken care, either at this very time, or at the latest when they were furnished with the necessary knowledge for entering upon their office of preaching the gospel, to make them fully acquainted with this design: in consequence of this, they must actually have observed such a ceremony themselves, and directed the observation of it by all their disciples; and it would have been found, that this rite, like that of eating bread and drinking wine in remembrance of Jesus, was from the beginning an established practice of the christian world.

Is this then the fact? On the contrary, there is not even the least shadow of reason for supposing, nor has any one ever supposed, that the action which Jesus on this occasion performed was ever so much as imitated by the Apostles themselves; and much less that they ever required the imitation of it, as an ordinance of the Gospel, from those
whom

whom they converted to the faith. Nay, so far were the Apostles from having any conception, that Jesus intended by what he did and said on this occasion, to direct them to observe such a practice, and require the observation of it by their disciples; that neither Matthew, Mark, nor Luke, who succeeded each other in writing their gospels,⁵ have made the least mention of this whole transaction; while they have each recorded the institution of the Lord's Supper; and had not John, who wrote his gospel many years after them, made it his peculiar design to preserve a variety of the private discourses of Jesus with the Apostles, which related more especially to them alone, and which Matthew, Mark, and Luke had omitted; we should never have been made acquainted with any particular of his conduct in this instance. And since it is unquestionable, that while the Apostles zealously inculcated the virtues recommended by this action, none of them, not even John the very Evangelist who has recorded it, ever imitated the action itself; it must be admitted, that the allegorical sense of it alone was that in which they understood it, as well as that in which Jesus certainly designed it to be understood by them.

⁵ See Mr. Townson's late valuable Discourses on the Four Gospels.

It appears therefore from the very different manner in which Jesus expressed his designs, in the two distinct instances under consideration; but more especially from the opposite conduct of the Apostles with respect to the two transactions; that it certainly was the intention of Jesus, that all who might ever come to profess the faith in him should partake of bread and wine in religious commemoration of him; but not his intention that they should observe a ceremony of washing each other's feet, in consequence of what he said to the Apostles to explain his design in washing their feet.

Nor can the performance of this singular action by Jesus with such an allegorical intent, or their understanding it in the figurative sense he designed they should, give us any just cause for surprise. Brotherly love and humility were the distinguishing characteristics of Jesus himself, and the religion he came to establish; and a very uncommon portion of these virtues in particular was peculiarly necessary in those who were to preach it to the world. The Apostles, on the contrary, were so far from possessing these virtues in the requisite degree for the task they were intended to perform, that they had more than once betrayed such a spirit of ambitious contention, as Jesus had been obliged to reprehend them for in the most forcible terms.^h After this, even if no new cause for it

^h See Matth. xviii. 4. xx. 25—29. xxiii. 11. Mark ix. 33—35. x. 42—45. Luke ix. 46—48. xxii. 24—27.

had arisen, it could not surely have been matter of wonder, that on the very evening when Jesus knew he must be taken from them, he should perform some striking action to press upon them in the strongest manner those particular virtues they would have so much occasion for, and in which they were so deficient; or that they should interpret any action he performed with this view, and accompanied with an explanation of his design, in that sense in which he intended it to be understood.

But besides, from the relation of one Evangelist we learn, that on that very evening “there was a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest;” and that Jesus rebuked them for it, at the time when it happened, in a similar manner to that he had made use of on other occasions. And certainly after so recent an instance as this, we can neither wonder, that Jesus should afterwards endeavour to make the strongest impression upon their minds, by so striking an action, just before he was to leave them; or that they should rightly understand his design in it, as we have seen they did, when he explained it to them in the manner St. John has related.¹

L 4

This

¹ It is St. Luke who has informed us, ch. xxii. 24—28, that there was such a strife among the Apostles on the very

This point cannot stand in need of any further proof. But there is still one particular of the objection remaining unnoticed, which, on account of the use that has been made of it, it will be satisfactory to explain.

It has been alleged, that when Jesus gave the Apostles the bread and wine, he did not signify to any of them, that if they did not eat of the one,

very evening on which Jesus was betrayed. He makes mention of it almost immediately after having related the institution of the Eucharist; but he introduces it in such a manner as to leave the point of time when it happened entirely undetermined. St. John has given us a very minute account of Jesus's rising from table, and washing the feet of the Apostles, and then explaining to them his design in what he had done. And as it is utterly inconceivable, that the Apostles could be guilty of breaking out into any contention about *who should be the greatest*, after so very striking a lesson of humility, as this action, joined with the exhortation Jesus gave them in explaining his intention in it; we are under a necessity of concluding, that this contention between them had arisen some little time before, and was in fact the true cause of Jesus's performing this very singular action.—For this judicious remark, how obvious soever it may appear, I with great pleasure acknowledge myself wholly indebted to the learned Bishop Newcome, in the elaborate Harmony with which he has very lately obliged all those, who are desirous of making themselves masters of the history contained in the gospels.

or drink of the other, they would draw on themselves any evil by refusing it; but that when he washed their feet he said to Peter, *If I wash thee not thou hast no part in me*: and that, “this being
“spoken upon Peter’s refusing to let him wash his
“feet, should seem to import not only the continu-
“ance, but even the necessity of this ceremony.”^k

But in fact, what can be more evident, than that the words in question relate only to the action which Jesus himself was performing at that very time, without reference to any repetition of it by them? Jesus’s words were—*If I wash thee not; i. e. if you refuse to let me wash you, now, at this time, as I was going to have done;—Not, if you do not hereafter observe a ceremony of washing one another; as he must have said, to warrant the inference here drawn: and accordingly, in return, St. Peter immediately expressed his eager desire to be washed by Jesus, at that time; but without the least conception of any future washing to take place among themselves.—And what was the evil which Jesus informed Peter he would sustain, if he continued to refuse? If I wash thee not, thou hast no part in me.* The meaning of which was extremely simple and obvious, and nothing more than this; “If you refuse to comply with my intention, you cannot really regard me as your

^k See Barclay’s Apology, p. 468.

Lord and Master, nor can I consider you as my disciple; and you cannot therefore have any share in that Dispensation which it is my business to establish."

As none of the Apostles refused to partake of the bread and wine, when he directed them to do it, no cause was given for his saying any thing of this kind upon that occasion. But had Peter, or any of the rest, refused in like manner to comply with his direction, when he said, *Take, eat, &c. and drink ye all of this, &c.* his answer to them in that instance would, for the same reasons, have been exactly similar to what it was in this; *If thou eatest, or drinkest, not, thou hast no part in me*; and this, even if he had only ordered them to eat and drink at that time; without adding the further command, *Do this in remembrance of me*; and without intending to institute any standing ceremony of that kind. For the mere eating or not eating, as well as the being washed or not washed, were circumstances in themselves alone not productive either of good or harm; but their not complying with any injunction of Jesus, must necessarily convict them of not taking him for their Lord, and not being his sincere disciples; and must therefore unavoidably prevent them from being permitted to have any concern in the establishment of his gospel.

Page 47.] To the general rule here laid down one exception must be admitted. If any individual is sincerely persuaded, that the method of administering the bread and wine adopted in any particular Church is so erroneous and superstitious, as to render it sinful for him to give countenance, by his example, to such error and superstition; his partaking of them in that manner would then be sinful, and it becomes his duty to abstain from partaking of them in that Church. But in order to secure him from all fault in this instance, it behoves him to be particularly careful, to make an honest and virtuous use of his abilities, in forming the judgment upon which he acts.

Page 54.] Notwithstanding these particulars in which Jesus gave his own manner of instituting the rite he now ordained a resemblance to the manner in which the Passover, that he was celebrating at the time, had been instituted; to prevent misapprehensions it may be useful to observe, that the form of the rite instituted by Jesus was not borrowed from any part of the Paschal Supper itself, as instituted by Moses; to which it had not even the smallest resemblance; but wholly from a custom established by the Jews without any command, of blessing and distributing bread and wine, at all the public festivals of their religion, as well as the Passover. And to comprehend how Jesus
came

came to adopt this particular method of commemorating his own death, nothing more is necessary, than to know what that practice of the Jews was.

“ Among the Jews,” says Bishop Pearce, “ in
 “ all their public festivals it was a custom for the
 “ master of the house, when his guests were set
 “ down, to bless bread and then break it, and
 “ give a piece of it to every one at table; and
 “ so after supper to take a cup of wine, and hav-
 “ ing blessed it, and drank of it himself, to give
 “ it round for the guests to drink likewise: hence
 “ came the phrase of *κλασις τῆς αἰσῆς*, and hence that
 “ of *ποτηριον ευλογιας*, the cup of blessing; the
 “ same with the grace cup, and which was their
 “ closing cup. This ceremony among the Jews
 “ was ritual only; it was properly acknowledging
 “ God in his creatures, thanking and praising him
 “ for his goodness in vouchsafing to them the use
 “ of them. Now to this ceremony our Lord
 “ annexed the commemoration of his death;
 “ requiring his disciples when they broke that
 “ bread, to join with their thanksgiving to God
 “ for the bread, a commemoration of his body
 “ broken on the cross; and when they drank that
 “ cup, to join with their thanksgiving for the
 “ wine, a commemoration of his blood shed, or
 “ poured out for them.”¹

¹ Bishop Pearce's Second Letter to Dr. Waterland. Commentary, vol. ii. p. 443. See likewise p. 423, 424; and Commentary on 1 Cor. x. 16. p. 253; and on 1 Cor. xi. 24. p. 268.

The professed writers on Jewish Antiquities inform us more minutely,—That as soon as the guests were placed at the table to eat the Passover, the master of the family began with taking a cup of wine, over which he said a certain appointed thanksgiving, and then gave it to be drank of by all:—That when they had eat a little of one fixed thing, they had a second cup, over which certain appointed psalms were rehearsed:—That after this the master of the feast took bread, over which he said an appointed thanksgiving, and then broke it, ate a bit of it himself, and distributed it in the same manner to all present:—That when they had eat of the paschal lamb itself, which was always the last thing they did eat of, they had a third cup of wine; which from the particular thanksgivings said over it, was emphatically called *the cup of blessing*;—And that after the rehearsal of other appointed psalms and prayers, a fourth cup concluded the feast.^m

From these particulars, compared with the relations of the Evangelists, we see in what manner Jesus acted on this occasion, and how naturally he founded the institution of his own rite upon this ceremonial. Upon delivering the usual cup, in the accustomed manner, at the beginning as it should seem, he added from himself, *Take this,*

^m See Lightfoot, vol. I. p. 967.

and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. Afterwards upon distributing the bread in the usual manner, *as they were eating*, he added, in order to institute his own intended rite, *Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me.* And upon giving the customary cup, called emphatically *the cup of blessing*, when they had done eating, he added in like manner, *Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, or, the New Testament in my blood; which is shed for you, or, for many, for the remission of sins; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.*

Thus was the form of eating bread and drinking wine in the Eucharist borrowed entirely from this established practice of the Jews. But as this ceremonial was not a part of the Paschal Supper itself, as it was instituted by Moses; which consisted of nothing more than eating the Paschal Lamb in a certain prescribed manner;ⁿ it is evident that the christian rite of eating bread and drinking wine, in memory of the death of Christ, is not borrowed from the Passover itself, but merely from a ceremonial which the Jews had thought fit to introduce without any injunction of their Law; and which was common to all their

ⁿ See Exod. xii. 3—11.

other religious festivals, as well as the Passover, though confined to their religious festivals alone.

Page 69.] Had Bishop Warburton happened to have observed the perfectly corresponding meaning of these words in the several passages here referred to, he could not, it is presumed, have inclined to the opinion, as he does, ° in opposition to bishop Hoadly, P that *κοινωνια* was used to signify the inward or spiritual part in the Lord's Supper, and *μετεχειν* the external part only. In fact, it appears from the passages referred to, that there is not any ground for such a distinction; and *κοινωνια* here signifies nothing else than the participation of the bread and wine, considered as the appointed representatives, or memorials, of the body and blood.

Page 70.] Bishop Pearce in his Commentary, and note Q, on ver. 16; as well as in his Commentary, and note S, on ver. 18; and his Commentary, and note W, on ver. 20; is very particularly careful in repeatedly interpreting the word *κοινωνια*, as signifying the *common*, or *joint* participation of several together in the same thing; and Bishop Hoadly likewise has interpreted it in the same

° Rational Account, &c. p. 35—37.
Account, p. 45, 46.

P Plain
manner.

manner.⁹ But if they had happened to observe, what is so fully proved by the passages referred to in pages 67—70, that St. Paul uses *κοινωνια* itself to express merely the participation, &c. of one only, of whatever it may be; and that when he designs to express the *common*, or *joint* participation of several together in any thing, he makes use of the compound word *συγκοινωνια*;—they could not, it is presumed, have interpreted *κοινωνια* in these verses in the sense they have.—Bishop Warburton rightly contends, that *κοινωνια* itself does not include the idea of *joint* participation; ^r though he had not observed the use St. Paul makes of the compound *συγκοινωνια*, when he would express that meaning.

Page 71.] The observation that the word *κοινωνια* must necessarily be understood in the first part of each of these questions, though St. Paul has actually inserted it only in the last part of them, appears so obvious the moment it is suggested, as to seem scarce requisite to be made: and yet the want of attending to this particular, obvious as it is, appears to have been one radical cause of all the variety of opinions which have been entertained of the meaning of the word itself in these

⁹ See Plain Account, &c. p. 33, 34, 39, 43.—3d Edit.

^r Rational Account, &c. p. 33—35. Edit. 12^{mo}. 1741.

questions;

questions; and of its having been supposed, that St. Paul meant to express by it some mysterious spiritual effects arising from, or accompanying, the partaking of the bread and wine in this rite.— Had it been observed, that *the cup* or wine itself can only *be*, or answer to, the *blood*; and the *bread* itself only to the *body*; and consequently, that the *κοινωνία* of the cup and the bread must here be supplied, or understood, to answer to the *κοινωνία* of the blood and the body; had this been attended to, it could not but have been seen likewise, that *κοινωνία* must of necessity have the self same meaning as applied to each; and therefore that it could not signify any thing more than the external partaking of the representatives or memorials of the body and blood; since it is evidently impossible for it to signify any thing more than the external partaking of the bread and wine. And thus the meaning of St. Paul in these questions; which he thought so obvious, that the Corinthians themselves could neither mistake nor doubt about it; and the simple nature of the rite to which they relate, would have been clearly understood, and effectually ascertained. But partly from not attending to this particular, and partly from not previously establishing the true sense of *κοινωνία*, by observing in what manner the Apostle uses it on other occasions; it has here been translated by the improper term *communion*, instead of the proper

term *participation*. St. Paul, as it has been shewn, here means by *κοινωνια* the *participation*, or act of partaking of the bread and wine: whereas the word *communion* does not signify the *participation* itself, but the *connexion* or *fellowship* arising between the several partakers, in consequence of their joining in the same religious act: so that by translating *κοινωνια* by the word *communion*, instead of the word *participation*, the sense of St. Paul is misrepresented, and rendered extremely doubtful and obscure.—This improper translation of *κοινωνια*; and the not distinguishing between the sense in which St. Paul uses the simple term *κοινωνια*, and the compound *συγκοινωνια*, pointed out in pages 67—70, seem to have been the immediate causes of all the apparent difficulty of ascertaining the meaning of St. Paul in these questions, which he himself thought so obvious as not to be mistaken; and of all the obscurity with which the nature and design of the Eucharist have been so much embarrassed in consequence of it.

Page 74.] Bishop Pearce, in his Commentary and note on ver. 17, supposes St. Paul to speak of the bread partaken of by each person in the Lord's Supper as part of one and the same *loaf*; and to argue, that the partakers are all *one body* because the bread they all partake of is *one loaf*: and
 Bishop

Bishop Hoadly^s and Dr. Waterland^t interpret the Apostle's reasoning in the same manner. But this, it is apprehended, is neither true in fact, nor the meaning of St. Paul. The Apostle is not here speaking of any one congregation of Christians only; or of separate congregations as united in themselves, though distinct from each other; but of all Christians universally. He expressly addresses himself in this Epistle not only *to the church of God which was at Corinth*, but at the same time *to all that in every place called upon the name of Jesus Christ.*^u And he affirms, that because the bread partaken of by all universally is *one*, all are one body, since they all partake of the *one bread*. But it is by no means true, that the bread partaken of by all universally is *one loaf*; since in different places it always is, and even in the same place sometimes may be, taken from different loaves; and in different countries the loaves may often consist of very different kinds of bread; and yet the rite is properly celebrated, and all Christians become one body in the sense of St. Paul, by celebrating it, notwithstanding these differences: and this consequence would be just as true, if it should be celebrated with something else instead of bread in any place where no bread was to be had.

^s Plain Account, &c. p. 34. 3d edit. ^t Review
of the Doctrine, &c. p. 465. ^u 1 Cor. i. 2.

When St. Paul therefore said, that the bread partaken of by all, in all countries, was *one*, and that all were on that account one body; he did not, because he could not mean, that the bread itself partaken of by all every where was *one loaf*; and the partakers one body, because partakers of *one loaf*; or even because the food partaken of by all in this rite was of one and the same general nature, *bread*; but that the bread was partaken of by all every where as the representative or memorial of one and the same thing, the body of Jesus; * which he had particularly reminded them it was, by his questions in the immediately preceding verse; and therefore, that all universally who partook of bread in this rite, on this one religious account, shewed themselves by the celebration of this rite to be one body, viz. of professed Christians, or believers in Christ.

Page 95.] The fault which the Corinthians had been guilty of, as plainly appears from what St. Paul has said upon it, was that of eating and

* Notwithstanding the reason above-mentioned is given by Bishop Hoadly, as that on account of which the bread is called *one*, in the Plain Account, &c. p. 34; he afterwards takes notice, in his Appendix, p. 187, that St. Paul might call it *one*, for the very reason here assigned. We have seen, it is presumed, that there was not any other reason for which he could call it *one*.

drinking

drinking their common supper, not only without a becoming seriousness and decorum, but even with much indecency and disorder, at those very times when they were assembled purposely to eat bread and drink wine in remembrance of Jesus; and either had just assisted at the celebration of that rite, or were just about to do it. This no doubt was extremely blameworthy; but blameworthy as it was, nothing surely can warrant us in supposing, that this offence was equal to the sin of those who actually put Jesus to death, or that St. Paul could mean to assert that it was. But the great Grotius, in his short note upon the passage, has interpreted the Apostle as if he did; and the very eminent Author of the Rational Account, &c. citing St. Paul's words, that those who partook of the Lord's Supper *unworthily, were guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*; explains their meaning by saying expressly—"i. e. his murderers."^y In another passage likewise he explains St. Paul as in this place—"ranking these criminals with the murderers of the Lord of life."^z—And to account for this supposed "severity" of the Apostle; of which he acknowledges "we can hardly see the justice,"^a "if the Lord's Supper was instituted only to commemorate a dead benefactor;"^b and

^y See A Rational Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, small 12^{mo}.—1761--page 42. ^z Ibid. page 13. ^a Page 14. ^b Page 13.

at the same time to support that notion of the Lord's Supper for which he contends, his Lordship says, "But let us only suppose, that St. Paul considered the last Supper as *a Feast upon a Sacrifice*; that is, as a Rite in which the benefits of Christ's death and passion were conveyed, and at the same time slighted; and all becomes easy and natural. The profanation of such a rite, by rendering his death ineffectual, was indeed aiding the purpose of his murderers; and therefore might be fitly compared, and *justly equalled to* the prodigious enormity of that crime."^c

With all due respect for so very eminent an Author, when the point in question is of such importance, as the nature of the most distinguishing institution of our Lord, it may I hope be permitted to observe, that if indeed this consequence would follow from the notion of the Lord's Supper here contended for, this consideration alone would be a decisive proof, either that the Lord's Supper is not a Feast upon Sacrifice, as is here contended; or, that the Christian Religion, of which it is an institution, is not from above. For this doctrine, that the guilt of the Corinthians in the instance under consideration, was equal to the guilt of those who actually put Jesus to death, appears so plainly repugnant to truth, that it cannot be received as

^c See A Rational Account, &c. page 14.

coming from God; and St. Paul, as we apprehend it has been fully proved, is entirely innocent of any such assertion.

Page 132.] Bishop Warburton having introduced in his Rational Account, &c. an argument urged by the Bishop of Meaux in favour of the real Presence; and having acknowledged the objection on which it is grounded to be a great difficulty;^d and even himself asserted, that this difficulty “has long embarrassed all the several opposers “of the doctrine of TRANSUBSTANTIATION;”^e and having likewise employed several pages in endeavouring to shew, that this objection is entirely removed by the discovery that the Lord’s Supper is a Feast upon Sacrifice;^f And it having now been proved, if we have reasoned right, that the Lord’s Supper cannot be a Feast upon Sacrifice; it will afford us satisfaction, though it is not necessary, to shew, upon this occasion, that Mr. Bossuet’s argument is really destitute of all foundation in truth; and the supposed difficulty upon which it proceeds purely imaginary; as well as, that if it was real, the notion of the Lord’s Supper’s being a Feast upon Sacrifice would not even in the least degree enable us to remove it.

^d Rational Account, &c. Edit. 12^{mo}—1761—page 59.

^e Ibid. page 61. ^f From page 53, to page 65.

The Bishop of Meaux's argument against interpreting the words of the institution as signifying nothing more than that the bread and wine were to be taken as representatives and memorials of the body and blood, is as follows, in Bishop Warburton's own translation of the passage.

“ When Jesus Christ said, *This is my body, This is my blood*, he was neither propounding a parable, nor explaining an allegory.—The words, which are detached and separate from all other discourse, carry their whole meaning in themselves.—The business in hand was the institution of a *New Rite*, which required the use of SIMPLE TERMS: and that place in Scripture is yet to be discovered, where the sign hath the name of the thing signified given to it at the moment of the institution of the rite, and WITHOUT ANY LEADING PREPARATION.”^g

Whether any such instance has yet been observed in Scripture or not, certain it is, that Scripture will supply us with one. The Passover is an instance of exactly the same nature with that here required; and the unquestionably figurative form of its institution answers exactly to that of the Lord's Supper figuratively understood. At the very first institution of it, the Lord, having instructed Moses in what manner to direct the people

^g Rational Account, &c. as before, page 55.

to chuse out, kill, dress, and eat, a lamb; ^h immediately declared, without any leading preparation, *It is the Lord's Passover*; and then added the reason, on account of which the rite was instituted, and distinguished by this name. ⁱ

This is certainly a case in point. When the Lord said, on this occasion, *It is the Lord's Passover*, he was neither propounding a parable, nor explaining an allegory.—The words, *It is the Lord's Passover*, in the institution of this rite, were as much detached and separate from all other discourse, and did as much carry their whole meaning in themselves, as the words, *This is my body, This is my blood*, did in the institution of the Lord's Supper.—The business in hand was here likewise the institution of a *New Rite*; and if that circumstance would have required the use of SIMPLE TERMS, as opposed to figurative, in the institution of the Lord's Supper; it must equally have required the use of simple terms, as opposed to figurative, in this prior institution of the Passover.—And evident it is, that in this instance the sign, the Lamb killed and dressed, &c. as commanded, had the name of the thing signified, the action of the Lord's passing over the houses of the Israelites, given to it at the moment of the institution of the

^h Exod. xii. 3—11.
the passage.

ⁱ Ibid. ver. 11—14. See

rite ; and as much without any leading preparation, as the bread and wine had the name of the body and blood of Jesus given to them, in the institution of the Eucharist.

Here therefore we have a direct and complete refutation of the argument before us, which will admit of no reply. Not even the Bishop of Meaux himself would allow, much less contend, that the words of the institution of the Jewish Passover ought to be understood literally ; though he contends for disgracing the religion of Christ with all the absurdities of a real Presence and Transubstantiation in the Lord's Supper. And yet the instituting forms of words in both these rites are so exactly similar, in the point concerned, that the same mode of interpretation must of necessity be applied to both. If the declaratory words of the institution of the Passover must be figuratively understood, so must those of the Lord's Supper ; and *vice versa*, if the declaratory words of the institution of the Lord's Supper must be literally understood, so must those of the Passover likewise. The necessary consequence of which would be, that what the Jews ate at the Paschal Supper, and that as often as they celebrated it, was not really the lamb itself, that they had killed and dressed in the manner they were commanded ; but was actually the Lord himself ; and not only so, but it was the Lord, employed at the very time in the act of
passing

passing over the houses of the Israelites, and that in Egypt; and smiting the first born both of man and beast in those of the Egyptians.

These are such extravagant absurdities as even They who contend for a real presence and transubstantiation in the Lord's Supper, will by no means admit the possibility of in the Passover; and yet the principles of the argument in question would force them to receive the one, as well as the other: for if the Lord's Supper must be understood literally, because a New Rite cannot be instituted in figurative terms; the Passover must likewise be understood literally for the self same reason. And if the sign could not have the name of the thing signified given to it at the moment of the institution, without any leading preparation, in the Lord's Supper, neither could it in the Passover. ^k

It appears then, that the figurative form of the institution of the Passover supplies us with a direct and full refutation of this argument of the Bishop

^k It is a fact well worthy of remark, and such as deserves the most serious reflexion of all whom it concerns, that while a very great proportion of the Christian world have been required to believe, and actually have believed, a real Presence and Transubstantiation in the Lord's Supper; no Jew was ever yet wild enough to conceive the thought, or dishonest enough to inculcate the belief, of a real Presence or Transubstantiation in the Passover.

of Meaux against the figurative interpretation of the declaratory words in the institution of the Lord's Supper.

But to remove all obscurity from this subject, which has been so unhappily obscured; to establish the Protestant Doctrine relating to it upon its true principles, and vindicate the figurative interpretation of the Lord's Supper from all objections whatever; it will be useful to shew, that the very principles upon which this argument of Mr. Bossuet proceeds, and which Bishop Warburton has admitted, are destitute of all foundation in truth, and the reason of the thing; so that if no other rite of a figurative kind had ever before been instituted, the figurative institution of the Lord's Supper would have been just as unexceptionable and proper as it now is; and That, without any recourse had to the supposition of the Lord's Supper's being a Feast upon Sacrifice.

“ We see,” says Bishop Warburton, “ that Bossuet rests his objection upon the force of the words; which, in his opinion, can admit of no *figurative* sense, without doing extreme violence to human language and expression.” And he directly adds from himself—“ Indeed as far as regards *the hardness* of the figure, I believe most protestant Doctors have been ready enough to join with him.”¹

¹ Rational Account, &c. page 59.

Whether most protestant Doctors have in fact been ready to join with the popish Bishop in this particular, or not; a point of which I confess myself ignorant; to determine the merits of the question, it must be our business to enquire into the reality of this supposed "*hardness* of the "figure;" and this "extreme violence here supposed to be done to human language and "expression;" by understanding our Saviour's words, *This is my body, &c. This is my blood, &c.* as meant to signify,—I appoint this for a representative or memorial of my body, &c.—and this for a representative or memorial of my blood, &c.

The proper use of language is to convey our thoughts. When therefore language is so used, as to shew whether it is intended to be understood in a literal, or a figurative sense; it is used as properly, and is as perfectly free from having any violence done to it, when made use of figuratively, as when used in the most literal sense.

But in making use of language, our thoughts may be conveyed not only by the words we deliver, but likewise in some measure by the particular situation and circumstances in which they are delivered.

When therefore an expression is made use of in a figurative sense, but in such circumstances as clearly shew, that the speaker does not intend it to be understood literally; whatever the words themselves

themselves may be, and whatever the occasion on which they are delivered, the words are used properly; nor is any violence done to human language and expression, by their being used in a figurative, instead of their literal sense.

These positions, I presume, must be granted; and from them it will immediately follow, that if the words made use of by Jesus, in instituting the Rite in question, were spoken by him in such circumstances as sufficiently shewed to those to whom he addressed them at the time, that he did not intend them to be understood in their literal sense, but figuratively; then the words under consideration must be understood figuratively; and Jesus's making use of them in such a figurative sense, upon this particular occasion, could not be doing any violence whatever to human language and expression.

After all therefore the only particular to be considered, in order to determine the point in question, is, whether the words of this institution were spoken by Jesus in such circumstances, as must have plainly shewn at the time, that they were not intended to be understood in their literal sense, but figuratively. And evident it is, that the circumstances in which they were spoken were so very particular, as far as relates to them, that it was absolutely impossible for those to whom they were addressed to imagine they were designed to be
be

be literally understood. The bread he gave the Apostles to eat, and the wine he gave them to drink, were part of the very same with those they had just been partaking of in the Paschal Supper itself; and had nothing in them peculiar or uncommon: and *this* bread, he told them, *was his body given for them*; and *this* wine *his blood of the New Testament shed for them*; when they saw him, at the very time, yet whole and unhurt before them; and knew intuitively, that his body was not given, nor his blood shed. So that unless they had been real ideots, or absolute madmen, it was utterly impossible for them to consider the words in question as spoken to them in any other than a figurative sense.

Instead therefore of being obliged to have recourse to the notion of a Feast upon Sacrifice, or any other particular idea of the Lord's Supper, to rescue the figurative interpretation of the words of the institution from the charge brought against it by the Bishop of Meaux, and readily joined in by the Author of the Rational Account; it appears, merely from considering the words themselves, and the circumstances in which they were spoken, that the figurative interpretation of them must be their true interpretation; and that to understand them in the literal sense, when delivered in such circumstances, would indeed be doing
such

such extreme violence to human language and expression, as could not possibly be admitted.

After what has now been seen, it is scarce possible to avoid enquiring, what “the *hardness* of the figure,” so much complained of by the Author of the Rational Account, as if contained in the words in question, may mean, and in what it can consist?—The figure is nothing more, than the appointment of one thing for the representative or memorial of another, by affirming it *to be* that other; at such a time, and in such circumstances, as indisputably shewed that the name of the thing signified was given to the sign, not in the literal, but in a figurative sense.—What *hardness* is there in this figure, or in what can it possibly consist? If there is any *hardness* or difficulty at all in it, it must arise from one of these two circumstances; Either that bread and wine are things exceedingly unlike a man’s body and blood; or, that the bread and wine are here said *to be* the body and blood; instead of being said explicitly, and at length, to be *representatives* or *memorials* of the body and blood. But from neither of these circumstances can the least hardness or difficulty arise in this particular instance.

With respect to the first, if one thing be appointed to represent, or be a memorial of another, it is not of any moment how unlike that other it may in itself be; provided only it be clearly signified,

signified, that it is appointed to represent, or be a memorial of it. Nothing could in itself be more unlike the action of the Lord's passing over the houses of the Israelites in Egypt, when he smote the first born, both of man and beast, in those of the Egyptians, than a lamb killed, dressed, and eaten, in any manner whatever. Yet the Paschal Supper, when once positively appointed for a memorial of that transaction, was as clear and indisputable a memorial of it, and did as effectually preserve the memory of it, as any supposed representation of the transaction itself could have done. And in the same manner, though bread and wine had not in themselves any natural resemblance to the body and blood of Jesus, yet in consequence of being expressly appointed by him to be taken as memorials of them, they are in fact as clear and certain memorials of his sufferings, as any representation of his sufferings could be. No *hardness* of figure therefore can be justly complained of in the institution of the Lord's Supper, on account of the want of a natural resemblance between the bread and wine and the body and blood of Jesus, which they are appointed to represent in it.

Neither can any arise from the particular manner in which the appointment of these memorials was expressed. When one thing is intended to be made the representative, or memorial of another,

N

if

if instead of saying explicitly — “ This is a representative of That,”—it should be said concisely— “ This is That;”——and if, at the same time, the particular circumstances, in which this form of expression is made use of, shew infallibly, that the One thing concerned can in no other sense *be* the Other, than as a representative or memorial of it; then the form of expression made use of—“ This is That,”—must be known to signify—“ This is a representative or memorial of That;”——and no *hardness* of figure can be justly objected to it; nor can any violence whatever be done to human language and expression by it; as we have seen already, from considering the nature and end of language, in this note. And this it is obvious was the very case in the institution of the rite under consideration.

The notion therefore of any “ *hardness* of the figure;” or of any “ violence done to human language and expression,” by interpreting the declaratory words of the institution of the Lord’s Supper in the figurative sense, instead of the literal; is utterly destitute of all foundation in truth, and the plain reason of the thing. And when it is considered, that Jesus, and they to whom he addressed himself on this occasion, had just been celebrating the Jewish Passover, the most signal memorial in that religion, at the very time when he instituted this rite, for a memorial of himself
in

in his own; it must surely be confessed nothing could be more natural, than that he should institute This in a form of expression similar to the form which had been made use of in the institution of That, and which every Jew without exception understood in an exactly similar figurative sense.

The Bishop of Meaux indeed has asserted, and even without any attempt at a proof, as if it was a point not to be questioned, that “the institution of a *new Rite* required the use of *simple* terms;”^m but the assertion is destitute of all foundation in truth. In instituting a New Rite, as well as upon every other occasion, it is requisite we should use our words in such a manner, that the sense in which we mean them to be understood, whether literal or figurative, should appear: but this is all that is required; and when this point is properly taken care of, figurative expressions are just as proper in instituting a New Rite, as the most literal.

When in the first institution of the Passover it was said of the lamb killed and dressed, &c. as enjoined,—“It is the Lord’s Passover;”—the Rite itself was as properly instituted in this figurative form of expression; and its nature as well understood to be figurative, as they could have been, if

^m See the passage quoted from him, page 168.

it had been said, simply and at length,—“It is a memorial of the Lord’s Passover;”—and for this obvious reason, because it was self evident, that the lamb so eaten could not *be* the action of the Lord’s passing over the houses of the Israelites in Egypt, in any other sense than as a memorial or commemoration of it.

And the same figurative form of expression was, for the self same reason, just as allowable and proper, in the institution of the Lord’s Supper. When Jesus broke the bread and gave it to the Apostles, saying at the same time—*Take, eat; this is my body; this do in remembrance of me;*—and when he gave them the cup, and said—*Drink ye all of it; this is my blood of the New Testament;*—or, *This cup is the New Testament in my blood;*—*this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me;*—the words he made use of were as properly used, and the sense in which he designed them to be understood was as effectually shewn, as they would have been, if he had said explicitly of the bread,—*This is the memorial of my body;*—and of the cup,—*This is the memorial of my blood, &c.*—because it was self evident at the time, that they could not be, literally, either the one or the other.ⁿ

It

ⁿ But let it not be imagined it is here meant to be inferred, that the Apostles comprehended at the time the
further

It appears then, merely from considering the use and intent of language, that all the difficulty supposed to attend the figurative interpretation of the words of Jesus in instituting the rite in question, is purely imaginary; and that a figurative form of expression, when used in such circumstances as clearly shew it is intended to be figuratively understood, is just as proper in instituting a New Rite, as in propounding a parable, or framing an allegory, or on any other occasion whatever.

But to close this subject, which has carried us so far, it is highly necessary to take notice, that if the difficulty complained of had any real existence, it would unavoidably remain an insuperable ob-

further design of Jesus in what he said and did on this occasion. It is only contended, that the circumstances in which Jesus called the bread his body, and the wine his blood, were such as fully authorised him to call them so, in a figurative sense; without being guilty of even the smallest impropriety in the use of language; because those circumstances must certainly have convinced the Apostles at the time, that it was a figurative sense only in which he so denominated them.—As to the further design with which Jesus spoke and acted as he did in this instance, That it was impossible for them to comprehend, till by inspiration they were fully instructed in the purpose for which he appeared upon earth, and in that religion they had been selected to preach in his name.

stacle to the figurative interpretation of this rite, in any sense whatever; would absolutely prevent its being a feast upon sacrifice, or even a simple commemoration; and oblige us to interpret the words of the institution in their strict literal sense only.

Bishop Warburton contends, ° that “the difficulty, great as it is, is entirely removed;” and that the words of the institution “suffer no violent conversion” from being understood figuratively; if the Lord’s Supper is specifically a Feast upon Sacrifice; because, if Jesus meant this rite to be a Feast upon Sacrifice, the words of the institution must of necessity have been made use of by him in a figurative sense; and the bread and wine naturally would, nay and even necessarily must, stand for, or be the symbols of, his body and blood.

Now if there was any real difficulty in the case, and if these considerations would remove it, supposing the rite in question was intended by Jesus to be a Feast upon Sacrifice; they will equally remove it, supposing Jesus to have designed it for a Commemoration only. For in this case, as well as the other, the words of the institution must of necessity have been made use of by him in a figurative sense; and the bread and wine naturally would, nay and even necessarily must have stood

° Rational Account, &c. page 59—61.

for, or have been the symbols of, his body and blood. So that if these considerations prevent the words of the institution from "suffering any violent conversion" by being used figuratively in the one case, they likewise prevent it in the other; and no peculiar advantage whatever can be derived from the supposition of the Lord's Supper's being specifically a Feast upon Sacrifice.

But the truth is, that if there really was any such difficulty attending the figurative use of the words of the institution, these considerations would be so far from removing it, as Bishop Warburton contends, that they would in reality strengthen and confirm it. For if, in the first place, it is granted, as Bishop Warburton grants, that the words of the institution, if here used in a figurative sense, really do extreme violence to human language and expression;—And if, in the next, it cannot be supposed, that Jesus in instituting a rite could use words in such a manner as to do extreme violence to human language and expression; which is here the fundamental principle all along understood, and argued upon;—Then must it unavoidably follow, That Jesus could not mean to make the rite he instituted, in this form of expression, either a Feast upon Sacrifice, or even a Commemoration; because in either case his words must of necessity be understood figuratively; but that, on the contrary, he must have designed the words to be understood

understood in, and the nature of the rite to be determined by, their strict literal sense alone. And thus the admission of the reality of this difficulty; which the Bishop of Meaux has taken for granted, and Bishop Warburton readily allowed, but which, I apprehend, we have seen has no real existence; would effectually preclude all defence of any figurative interpretation whatever of the Rite in question, and drive us unavoidably into all the absurdities of a real Presence and absolute Transubstantiation.

F I N I S.

Published by the same Author,

I. An Enquiry into the Divine Missions of *John the Baptist* and *Jesus Christ*; so far as they can be proved from the Circumstances of their *Births*, and their *Connexion* with Each Other. 8vo. Price 5s.

II. A Defence of *Revelation* in General, and the *Gospel* in Particular; in Answer to the Objections advanced in a late Book, entitled, *The Morality of the New Testament digested under various Heads, &c.* and subscribed, *A Rational Christian.* 8vo, Price 4s.



