

law of the Jews ("He came not to destroy but to fulfil," Matt. v. 17.) were used at the immediately preceding Passover Supper.

But here two questions naturally arise, viz., 1st. How can it be explained that such an egregious blunder should ever have been committed by the Church as the substitution of alcoholic intoxicating (poisoning) wine for unfermented nutritious wine, or "fruit of the vine" at the Lord's Supper? and, 2nd. How is it that such an one should have been propagated by the Church in heathen lands, and perpetuated in Christendom till now? Without attempting an answer to the first question, but in order to throw some light upon the second, we would observe that the word *unleavened*, or unfermented, occurs only nine times in the New Testament, eight of these in the plural number, neuter gender, without any substantive expressed, requiring one to be understood, which must, according to analogy, be *things*, viz., *unleavened or unfermented things* (as above noticed); but in all of these instances the translators of the authorized version of the New Testament have supplied the word *bread* without printing it in *italics* (except in 1 Cor. v. 8), as is usual when a word is introduced not having a corresponding word in the original; thus no index is given which might have induced the learned reader of these portions of Scripture to refer to that original, and thus to make the discovery that the translation should have been *things* instead of *bread*, wherever the word "*azuma*" is used in relation to the Passover-feast and Lord's Supper. This may partly account for the perpetuation of the error in Christian lands, and for its propagation among heathen converts to Christianity.

But another question we can conceive might here be started by some one—even this: Why such a piece of work about a matter of no very great moment? Now we cannot allow that it is a matter of no very great moment. On the other hand, we hold it to be a matter of the greatest moment, inasmuch as it involves the glory of Immanuel, the only-begotten Son of God, and the good of his rational, accountable, and immortal creature man, whom He died upon the cross to redeem and save.

It has been well remarked by Count de Gasparin, in his excellent work, *The Claims of the Truth*, "that nothing could be more revolting or more incompatible with the feelings with which God should be regarded by us, than to suppose that He would reveal to men truths in themselves indifferent, the reception or rejection of

which would be attended with nearly the same results. The theory of harmless errors is as fatal as it is reprehensible. If it be derogatory to the wisdom of God, as implying that He has revealed truths to us that are of no importance, it is also fatal to the souls of men, smothering them under a heap of lies, and in the end hiding from them the fundamental doctrine which it pretends to maintain exclusively."

The rejection of the truth that Jesus commanded "unfermented bread and fruit of the vine" to be used by the disciples at His Supper, in remembrance of Him, till His second coming, and the adoption of the falsehood that He commanded fermented bread and fermented intoxicating wine to be the symbols of His body and blood, we confidently affirm are most derogatory to the wisdom and holiness of Immanuel.

In answer to the question in the Larger Catechism of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, "What are the sins forbidden in the second commandment," we find the following: "Corrupting the worship of God, adding to it, or taking from it, whether invented, or taken up of ourselves, or received by tradition from others, though under the title of antiquity, custom, devotion, good-intent, or any other pretence whatsoever . . . sacrilege, all neglect, contempt, hindering and opposing the worship and ordinances which God hath appointed." And among the proof quotations at the bottom of the page, Malachi i. 7, 8, 14 is referred to, viz., "Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar; and ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of the Lord is contemptible. And if ye offer the blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? and if ye offer the lame and sick, is it not evil? offer it now unto thy governor; will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person? saith the Lord of hosts. But cursed be the deceiver, which hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing: for I am a great King, saith the Lord of hosts, and my name is dreadful among the heathen."

We submit to all who seek the glory of God, and love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, the simple question whether, if it was wrong in the Jews to offer up such polluted sacrifices as those above-mentioned, to Jehovah, contrary to His commandment, it can be right in Christians at the present time, with surpassing privileges, and far more accurate and extensive knowledge of the benevolent character of their God and Saviour, to offer to Him, in de-

spite of His solemn and pathetic injunction addressed to His apostles the night in which He was betrayed—instead of the pure symbol of His sin-atoning blood—"an odour of a sweet smell"—that vile, perilous, polluted portion described in the Old Testament as "the poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps," and in the New as "wine wherein is excess" (Ephes. v. 18), "*asotia*," destruction—that which Solomon the wisest of mere men so pictorially exhibits to our view, when "it is red, when it giveth his colour in the cup, when it moveth itself aright"—not that we should be lurel to our ruin by these deceitful appearances, as our first mother Eve was to hers and that of the whole human family, at the instigation of Satan, by the pleasant look of the forbidden fruit; but that we might be put on our guard against its blandishments, by wisdom's warning voice crying out, "Look not thou upon it;" "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging; and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise;" "At the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder." For our own part, we must declare our solemn conviction, that if we were habitually to use such divinely-prohibited intoxicating wine, instead of "the unfermented fruit of the vine," the only divinely-appointed symbol of Christ's blood, at His Supper (as almost all the churches of Christendom do),* we should be conscious that we were thus habitually breaking the positive command of our blessed Redeemer, while professing allegiance to His kingly authority and submission to His law, and thus be guilty of impeaching the omnipotent power, matchless wisdom, adorable goodness, immaculate holiness, and all the other glorious attributes of Immanuel, and thus be doing what by our single puny arm we could to wrest from Him His mediatorial crown, and the sceptre of universal dominion. For if true, as thus professed and implied, that the Lord Jesus Christ gave such deleterious soul and body-destroying alcoholic wine to His apostles the night of His betrayal, and commanded it to be used thereafter by His disciples till His second coming, it is evident that He would have transgressed His own holy commandment given to His apostles and disciples, "to drink of unfermented fruit of the vine in remembrance of Him;" and that other commandment so impressively pronounced by Solomon under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, "Look not thou upon the

* We dare not do it in a single instance, and have not for many years, since ever our eyes were opened to see the evil of it.