

some of the principle Scriptural arguments which may be adduced to show that the use of alcoholic wine at the Lord's Table is forbidden by the Almighty. In the three gospels of Mathew, Mark, and Luke, explicit instructions are to be found regarding the nature of the wine to be used as the Symbol of the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ at His Table. The chapters and verses are Mathew xxvi. 17, 30; Mark xiv. 1, 12, 26; Luke xxii. 1, 14, 20. These portions of Scripture afford the only direct arguments which I am to adduce as to the quality of the communion-wine authorized, and commanded by our Lord to be dispensed in remembrance of him at His Supper; but they embrace a body of evidence which, for point and strength, cannot be surpassed. The mass of indirect and corroborative evidence, part of which will be adduced, is also large and very powerful. Notice the language of Mark, xiv. 23, 24, 25—"and He took the cup, &c." and be pleased to turn your attention also to the first verse of the same chapter—"After two days was the feast of the Passover, and of unleavened bread." It is universally understood by Christians that by the term "cup" in the passage above quoted, is meant the "contents of the cup, or the wine in the cup, or still more correctly according to scriptural phraseology—"the fruit of the vine" in a liquid form, which the cup contained. That the wine, or fruit of the vine, was unleavened is shown clearly as follows: the first verse of the chapter, if you examine it in the authorized version, has the words, "the feast" in *italics*, indicating that they do not occur in the original. The original is the following:—*Ἡ δὲ τοῦ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας*, which may be thus literally translated, omitting the words in *italics* in the English version: "After two days was the Passover, and the unleavened things;" and in the 12th verse of the same chapter there is no reason for believing that there is any change in the meaning, and therefore the following words—*καὶ τῇ παύσῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἁζύμων* ought to be translated thus: "and the first day of unleavened things." If, then, this appropriate title of the feast—"the unleavened things"—be applied to the "cup," or rather "the fruit of the vine," in a liquid form, contained in it, the proper meaning will be clearly brought out; viz., "unfermented fruit of the vine," that being one of the unleavened things, commanded by the Lord to be used at His Supper according to verses 23, 25; and "unfermented bread," another unleavened thing, according to verse 22 of the same chapter. This translation corresponds exactly with the views of Dr. Lees, and Professor Moses Stuart, concerning the original institution of the Passover, the same things being used at the Lord's Supper, and at that feast. Thus Dr. Lees (article "Leaven Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature,") says—"All fermented substances were prohibited in the paschal feast of the Jews; and thus Professor Stuart affirms, "I cannot doubt that in its widest sense, i.e. any thing fermented was excluded from the Jewish Passover, when the Lord's Supper was first instituted: for I am not able to find evidence to make me doubt that the custom among the Jews of excluding fermented wine as well as bread is older than the Christian era." (Dr. Robinson's Bibliotheca Sacra, p. 508) That this is the natural and obvious translation there can be no doubt, and that the ordinary translation has been adopted, to meet a preconceived hypothesis, and to make room for the introduction of fermented, intoxicating wine, at the Lord's table seems highly probable. But it is not only the natural rendering of the passage referred to, and of the corresponding passages in the gospel of Mathew and Luke; but I

make bold to affirm that it is the only rendering which can be received so as not to bid defiance to the most common rule of grammar; that an adjective must agree with its substantive in gender, number and case, for *azyma* is the neuter gender plural number and nominative case of the adjective *azymes*, and if translated *bread*, (as it has been in the authorized version,) it will not agree with "*artos*" the plural number of the masculine noun "*artos*," which is the word used in the same chapter to signify bread, and in all the other gospels, while the word *lagana* (the one preposterously supposed to be understood,) is no where to be found in the New Testament, if we are to receive Dr. Robinson's Lexicon, edited by Dr. Bloomfield, two of the most eminent Lexicographers of modern times, as competent authorities upon the subject. On the other hand the translation proposed above, viz: "unfermented things" meets all the requirements of the case, and is perfectly in accordance with the established grammatical rule, in similar cases, as illustrated by the following examples, where an adjective in the neuter gender, plural number, is associated with things (*εργα* a neuter noun plural being understood)—"Thou in thy life time receivest thy good things, (*τὰ ἀγαθὰ σου*), and likewise Lazarus evil things; (*τὰ κακά*)."—Luke xvi. 25: "If I have told you earthly things (*τὰ ἐπ' γῆς*) and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things." (*ἐπουράνια*)—John iii. 12. But I draw an additional argument, and a very powerful one too, from the fact that the term "fruit of the vine" is exclusively applied by all the Evangelists who record the institution of the Lord's Supper, to signify the liquid made use of by our Divine Redeemer upon that occasion. I know that this is viewed as a trivial matter by some, who pertinaciously cleave to a trivial drink, through evil report, and good report, with zeal and affection, worthy of a nobler object. But to me it appears that there must have been cogent reasons influencing the mind of the Lord Jesus Christ, to set apart this periphrasis to denote exclusively the nature of the liquid which he consecrated, to be the sole symbol of His sin-atoning blood. Let it be remembered that it is no where else to be found in the New Testament; and that there has been, till within the last thirty years, a belief almost universal, that only one kind of wine existed, viz., *intoxicating*, (which belief is yet, alas, too general,) and that consequently fermented intoxicating wine was the only wine referred to in Scripture. Let it be moreover remembered, that by the researches and inquiries of eminent theologians, philologists, chemists, and physiologists, within the period above specified, it has been ascertained with certainty that two kinds of wine, were recognised in Scripture, and are to be met with in eastern countries, in the present day, and that an untold and appalling amount of misery, disease, crime, and destitution, has arisen from the inveterate prejudice existing in favor of alcoholic drinks amongst the masses—"Let all these things, I say, be taken into account, and along with them, the devil's evident intent to subdue all mankind to the tyranny of alcohol, and his unceasing insidious efforts to accomplish this malicious design; and there will be no difficulty in seeing why it was that Immanuel adopted "the fruit of the vine, (a phrase which, if fairly considered, can admit but of one precise meaning) to denote His pure and purifying blood. It was employed, I believe, that there might be no ambiguity—no misunderstanding, on the part of the honest inquirer, as to the nature of the liquid, which He used, and commanded to be used as the sole representative of His sin-atoning blood; and where could an expression have been found more admirably adapted to