being a sacrifice of any kind, is nothing more than bread and wine reverently eaten and drunk, in remembrance that Chriſt’s body was broken and his blood ſhed in proof of his Father’s and his own love to mankind ; that nothing is essential to the ſacrament but this remembrance, and a ſerious deſire to honour and obey our Saviour as our head; that the ſacrament might be celebrated without uttering one prayer or thankſgiving, merely by a ſociety of Chriſtians, whether ſmall or great, jointly eating bread and drinking wine with a ſerious remembrance of Chriſt’s death ; that St Paul enjoins a man to examine himself be­fore he eat of that bread and drink of that cup, not to diſcover what have been the sins of his paſt life in order to repent of them, but only that he may be ſure of his remembering Chriſt’s body broken and his blood ſhed ; that, however, it is his duty in that as in every other in­ſtance of religious worſhip to reſolve to obey from the heart every precept of the goſpel, whether moral or poſitive ; and that to partake worthily of the Lord’s Supper is acceptable to God, becauſe it is paying obedience to one of theſe precepts ; but that no particular benefits or privileges are annexed to it more than to any other in­ſtance of duty. Biſhop Hoadley acknowledges, that when St Paul says @@\*, “ 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 ?” he has been ſuppoſed by many learned men to affirm, that all the benefits of Chriſt’s paſſion are in the Lord’s Supper conveyed to the worthy communicant ; but this (says he) is an idea which the apoſtle could not have in his thoughts as at all proper for his argument. The Greek word ϰοινωνια and the Engliſh *communion* signi­fy only a partaking of ſomething in common with others of the ſame ſociety ; and the apoſtle’s meaning (he ſays) can be nothing more, than that in the Lord’s Supper we do not eat bread and drink wine as at an ordinary meal, but as memorials of the body and blood of Chriſt, in ho­nour to *him* as the *head* of that body of which we are all *members.* That the word ϰοινωνια is not meant to denote any inward or ſpiritual part of the Lord’s Supper, he thinks evident, becauſe the ſame word is uſed with regard to the cup and the table of idols, where no ſpiritual part could be thought of, and in an argument which ſuppoſes an idol to be nothing @@\*.

To this view of the nature and end of the Lord’s Sup­per, it muſt appear no ſmall objection, that “ he who eateth and drinketh unworthily is ſaid to be *guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, and to eat and drink a judge­ment to himſelf, not diſcerning the Lord's body.”* No doubt it would be ſinful to eat and drink a mere memorial of Chriſt’s death without ſerious diſpoſitions ; but we cannot conceive how a little wandering of the thoughts, which is all the unworthineſs which the author thinks there can be on ſuch an occaſion, ſhould be a sin of ſo deep a dye as to be properly compared with the guilt of thoſe who mur­dered the Lord of life. Other divines therefore, feeling the force of this and ſimilar objections, ſteer a middle courſe between the mere memorialiſt and the advocate for a real sacrifice in the holy Euchariſt, and insiſt that this rite, though no sacrifice itſelf, is yet a ſeaſt upon the one ſacrifice offered by Chriſt and ſlain upon the croſs. The moſt eminent patrons of this opinion have been Dr Cudworth, biſhop Warburton, and the preſent biſhop of Cheſter ; and they ſupport it by ſuch arguments as the following : “ In thoſe ages of the world when victims made so great a part of the religion both of Jews and Gentiles, the sacrifice was always followed by a religious feaſting on the thing offered ; which was called the feast upon, *or after the sacrifice,* and was ſuppoſed to convey to the partakers of it the benefits of the sacrifice. Now Jeſus (ſay they), about to offer himſelf a sacrifice on the croſs for our re­demption, did, in conſormity to general practice, inſtitute the *last ſupper,* under the idea of *a feast after the ſacrifice ;* and the circumſtances attending its inſtitution were ſuch, they think, that the apoſtles could not poſſibly miſtake his meaning. It was just before his paſſion, and while he was eating the paſchal ſupper, which was a Jewiſh f*east upon the sacrifice,* that our blessed Lord inſtituted this rite ; and as it was his general cuſtom to allude, in his actions and expreſſions, to what paſſed before his eyes, or preſented it­ſelf to his obſervation, who can doubt, when, in the very form of celebration, we see all the marks of a *ſacrificial ſupper,* but that the divine inſtitutor intended it ſhould bear the ſame relation to his *ſacrifice on the croſs* which the *paſchal ſupper* then celebrating bore to the oblation of the *paſchal lamb ?* If this was not his purpoſe, and if nothing more was intended than a general memorial of a dead be­nefactor, why was this inſtant of time preferred for the inſtitution to all others throughout the courſe of his miniſtry, any one of which would have been equally commodi­ous ? Indeed any other time would have been more com­modious for the inſtitution of a mere memorial ; for the paſchal lamb and unleavened bread were certainly a ſacrifice ; and the words uſed by our Saviour, when he gave the bread and wine to the apoſtles, were ſuch as muſt neceſſarily have led them to conſider that bread and wine as bearing the same relation to his sacrifice that the paſchal ſupper bore to the paſchal sacrifice. At that Jewiſh ſeaſt, it was the cuſtom of every father of a family to break the un­leavened bread, and to give to every gueſt a portion, saying∙, “ This is the bread of affliction, which our fathers did eat in the land of Egypt :” a cuſtom which, we may be ſure, that Chriſt, as father of his family, would religiouſly ob­ſerve. The apoſtles knew well that they were not eat­ing the identical bread which their fathers did eat in Egypt, but the feaſt upon the sacrifice then offered in commemoration of their redemption from Egyptian bon­dage ; and therefore when they saw their Master after ſup­per break the bread again and give it to each of them, with theſe remarkable words, “ This is my body which is given for you, do this in remembrance of me,” they muſt have concluded, that his meaning was to inſtitute a rite which ſhould to the end of the world bear the ſame rela­tion to his sacrifice that the paſchal ſupper bore to the sacrifice oſ the paſſover.

This inference, from the circumſtances attending the inſtitution, biſhop Warburton thinks confirmed by St Paul’s mode of arguing with the Corinthians, on their impiety and abſurdity in partaking both of the Lord’s table and the table of devils ; for “ what (ſays he) had the eaters of the ſacrifices to do with the partakers of the bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper, if the Lord’s Supper was not a feaſt of the ſame kind with their feaſts ? If the three feaſts, Jewiſh, Pagan, and Chriſtian, bad not one common nature, how could the apoſtle have inferred that this in­tercommunity was inconſiſtent ? Y*e* cannot (says he) *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.* For though there might be *impiety* in the promiſcuous uſe of Pagan and Chriſtian rites oſ any kind, yet the *inconſistency* ariſes from their having a common nature, and consequently, as they had oppoſite originals, from their deſtroying one another’s effects in the very celebration. Sacrifices, and feaſts upon ſacrifices, were univerſally conſidered as fe*deral* rites ; and therefore the Lord’s table and the table of devils being both *federal* rites, the ſame man could no more

@@@[m]\* 1. Cor. 1. 16.

@@@[m]\* A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper.