

cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of Devils." "Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy, and we stronger than He?" "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy, under two or three witnesses:—Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified, an *unholy* thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace." Henceforth let every blood-bought soul consider—that, the institution of the Lord's Supper was intended by its Divine Author, to bring to remembrance the most momentous transaction that ever occupied the page of sacred history,—that it has reference to the death of Jesus for lost sinners,—that it involves reflections upon the mystery of godliness, which the angels desire to look into,—that it is fraught with the spiritual and eternal interests of the human race,—that it is forever identified with that precious blood which cleanses from all sin,—that it must have struck panic and consternation into the ranks of the devil and his angels,—that the sun was darkened, the veil of the temple rent in the midst, the earth did quake, the rocks rent, the graves were opened, and the dead arose, soon after the first celebration of this peace-speaking and soul-sanctifying meal, when the Son of God poured out his soul unto death for the sin of the world. And then let this question be put as in the presence of the heart-searching God, what did the Lord Jesus Christ mean when he spake these words, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood: *this* do as oft as ye drink *it* in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat *this* bread and drink *this* cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." Did he mean that his disciples should in future ages drink *not* the pure fruit of the vine? such as he blessed and gave to them upon that memorable night, to be partaken of in remembrance of him,—but instead of it the wine which St. Paul in his epistle to the Ephesians, so aptly describes as *that* wherein is excess or they very principle of intemperance, that which in the Apocalypse affords a striking figure of the great whore, the mother of harlots and abominations, or of her filthy and blasphemous mysteries and diabolical inventions, with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunken with the wine of her fornication;—the deadly enemy of Jesus and his cause, drunken with the blood of the saints? "Truth," as Barnes well expresses it, "is the representation of things as they are." There can be no harm then in applying the epithets which Scripture in other places applies to the wine used at the Lord's Supper, if as the mass of professing Christians assert it was intoxicating wine, which the Lord of Glory set apart to be the honored symbol of his precious blood, at that sacred meal: acting thus, will only (if they are right in their supposition) be an open declaration of the unvarnished truth as it is in Jesus, and it ought to be publicly proclaimed wherever the communion of Christ's body and blood is celebrated, just as any other important truth should be fully and deliberately made known, for there is nothing to be kept secret or to be ashamed of in Christianity, nothing that cannot be submitted to the brightest light, or endure the most sifting investigation. But he would be a man of more than ordinary nerve who would venture to carry out his principles, and put the following words into the mouth of the thrice-holy Immanuel, connexion with the cup of blessing, not of abominations. (The very idea is horrifying in the extreme; but if men will trifle with sacred things, and assume false doctrines, without the shadow of evidence, to them let the guilt attach—not to those who expose their errors.) But after all I must

not stain my paper with the blasphemy and pollution which would be involved in the declaration. Let it be enough to have hinted at the awfully heinous consequences which emanate from such false principles so recklessly received and propagated.

3 The fact of the admirable adaptation of this symbol, the pure blood of the grape to aid communicants in forming right views of Christ's atoning sacrifice and its blessed results.

There are, as far as I know, only three ways in which it is possible to conceive how alcoholic intoxicating wine could be used with impunity at the Lord's table, at least by those who have a liking to alcoholic beverages;—two of three suppositions involve miraculous interpositions on the part of the Almighty—the other demands an alteration in the terms of the institution of the ordinance. To begin with the lest, fermented alcoholic intoxicating wine might perhaps have been used at the institution of the Lord's supper, not to be *drank* but *tasted* by communicants—not as the symbol of Christ's precious sin-cleansing blood, to which it bears not the most remote analogy, but to denote what it is so often used in Scripture to represent, that formidable weapon in the hand of the devil by means of which he has waged such an incessant and destructive warfare against mankind, and especially against the visible Church of Christ. In this way I can conceive it possible that the curse of humanity might have been used by the Lord of Glory, to act as a beacon to deter Christians by the vile taste of it, and the harrowing details of misery, disease, and death, connected with it, from venturing a single step within the magic circle of its soul and body destroying influences. But against this hypothesis there are insurmountable objections apart from the startling fact that it is altogether contrary to the testimony of the word of God. For Solomon, inspired by God, forbid *even* looking upon the wine when it is red, when he giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright (when it is undergoing the process of fermentation), so dangerous and ensnaring an enemy is it to mankind. But if it ought not to be *even* looked upon how can it be tasted, and that frequently, without guilt and punishment?

The other two hypotheses which might be framed implying miraculous interpositions are the following. Something akin to the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation might be conjured up to make this dream feasible! Thus to enable the communicant to drink highly intoxicating wine at the Lord's table with impunity,—in the act of consecration it must be changed into the *unfermented* fruit of the vine, or in other words, all the alcohol, varying from 22 to 25 percent; and all the other poisons combined in it, must with electrical rapidity, be abstracted from it, and it must become the innocuous blood of the grape by a special miracle. Now that this prodigy could be swallowed by the Church of Rome, is easily intelligible; but methinks it will prove somewhat too hard of digestion, by most Protestants, however far advanced they may be in the science of redulity and superstition from their leanings Romeward! If this be discarded the other hypothesis is that a miracle must be wrought in the communicant who has still the dormant appetite for strong drink by which his stomach and nervous system must be rendered incapable of receiving those sensible impressions from alcohol, when used at the communion table, which are produced in them, by that poison, under all other similar circumstances. Facts, as has been seen, are in opposition to both these surd fancies, and were it not necessary to have recourse to desperate remedies to cure desperate diseases, and one so bound up with the very heart's blood of professors of the religion of the meek and