**church, than** this ſacrament ; and though all confeſs that one purpoſe of its inſtitution was to be a bond of love and union among Chriſtians, it has, by the perverſeneſs of man­kind, been too often converted into an occaſion of hatred. The outward and visible fign, and the inward and ſpiritual grace, have equally afforded matter of diſputation to angry controvertiſts. Many members of the church of Rome condemn the Greek church and the Proteſtants for using leavened bread in the Lord’s Supper, contrary to the ex­ample ſet them by our Saviour ; whilſt the Greek church **in** general, and ſome Proteſtant ſocieties in particular, unite with the church of Rome in cenſuring all churches which mix not the wine with water, as deviating improperly from primitive practice. See Eucharist.

That it was unleavened bread which our Lord blessed and brake and gave to bis diſciples as his body, cannot be queſtioned ; for at the time of the passover, when this or­dinance was inſtituted, there was no leavened bread to be found in Jeruſalem@@\*. For the mixed cup, the evidence is not ſo deciſive. It is indeed true, as we have obſerved un­der the article Eucharist, that the primitive Chriſtians uſed wine diluted with water ; and if we may believe Maimonides@@\*, it was the general cuſtom of the Jews, as well at the paſſover as at their ordinary meals, to add a little water to their wine on account of its great ſtrength ; but that this was *always* done, or that it was done by our *Sa­viour in particular,* there is no clear evidence. Origen in­deed affirms@@\*, that our Lord adminiſtered in wine unmixed ; and he was not a man to hazard ſuch an affirmation, had there been in his days any certain tradition, or ſo much as a general opinion, to the contrary. On this ac­count we have often heard with wonder the neceſſity of the mixed cup inſiſted on by thoſe who without hesitation make uſe of leavened bread ; for if it be essential to the ſacrament that the very ſame elements be employed by us that were employed by our Saviour, the neceſſity of un­leavened bread is certainly equal to that of wine diluted by water.

But the mixed cup is ſaid to be emblematical of the blood and water which flowed from the side of our Lord when pierced by the ſpear of the Roman ſoldier, while the abſence of leaven is emblematical of no particular circumstance in His paſſion. This argument for the mixture is as old as the era of St Cyprian, and has ſince been fre­quently urged with triumph by thoſe who ſurely perceived not its weakneſs. The flowing of the blood and water. from our Saviour’s side was the conſequence either of the ſpear’s having pierced the *pericardium,* or more probably of an *aſcites* or *hydrothorax,* occasioned by his cruel and ling­ering death (ſee Medicine, n⁰ 342, 343.) But whatever was the cauſe of it, how can the mixing of wine with wa­**ter in** the ſacrament be emblematical of the flowing of blood and water ſeparately ? Such a mixture ſurely bears a more linking reſemblance to the reunion of the *ſerum* and *crasſamentum,* after they had been ſeparated by whatever cauſe. See Blood.

We urge not theſe objections to the mixed cup from any diſlike that we have to the practice. It is unqueſtionably harmleſs and primitive ; and we wiſh that greater regard were paid to primitive practices than the generality of Chriſtians ſeem to think they can claim : but let the advocates for antiquity be consistent ; let them either reſtore, together with the mixed cup, the uſe of unleavened bread, or acknowledge that neither the one nor the other is essential to the ſacrament. This laſt acknowledgment muſt indeed be made, if they would not involve themſelves in difficulties from which they cannot be extricated. If either the mixed cup or unleavened bread be abſolutely necessary to the validity of the ſacrament, why not wine made from the grapes of Judæa ? why not that particular kind of wine which was uſed by our Saviour ? and where is that wine to be found?

But the controversies reſpecting the outward part or ſign of the Lord’s Supper are of little importance when compared with thoſe which have been agitated reſpecting the inward part or thing ſignified ; and of theſe we hasten to give as comprehenſive a view as the limits preſcribed to such articles will admit.

Our Blessed Lord, in the ſame night that he was be­trayed, “ took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the diſciples, and ſaid, Take, eat ; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave 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.” Such was the inſtitution of the Lord’s Supper as it is recorded in the goſpel by St Matthew ; and we have the ſame account of it, in almoſt the very ſame words, by three other inſpired writers, St Paul, St Mark, and St Luke. That it was the bread which Chriſt blessed and brake that is here called his body, and the wine over which he gave thanks that he ſtyles his blood of the new teſtament, will admit of no reaſonable doubt @@(a); but in what ſenſe they became ſo, has been the ſubject of many controversies.

The church of Rome, which holds·, that after conſecration, Jeſus Chriſt, God and man, is really, truly, and ſubſtantially, contained under the outward appearances of the bread and wine, informs us, that about the middle of the maſs, when the priest, taking into his hand, firſt the bread and then the wine, pronounces over each ſeparately the ſacred words of conſecration, the ſubſtance of theſe ele­ments is immediately changed by the almighty power of God into the body and blood of Chriſt ; but that all the outward appearances of the bread and wine, and all their

@@@[m]\* Exod. xii. 15, 19.

@@@[m]\* In Mishnam.

@@@[m]\* Hom. 12. in Hieremism.

@@@(a) Some over-zealous Proteſtants have indeed affirmed, that it was not the conſecrated bread and wine, but thoſe elements, *together with the whole action of* taking them into his hands, bleſſing them, breaking the bread, and diſtributing the bread and wine to the diſciples, that Chriſt calls his body and blood. This novel and singular opinion rests upon no better foundation than a very childiſh criticiſm. Our Saviour, after bleſſing and breaking the bread, gave it **to** the diſciples, saying, in the original, Λαϐειε, φαγειε TOVTO εσι το σωμα μον*.* Now, ſay our critics, τoυιο, in the neuter gender, can never agree with the antecedent αριος in the maſculine, but muſt refer to all the circumſtances of the action taken together, and conſidered as one complex neuter noun. But this noun, whether complex or simple, certainly de­notes what could be *eaten ;* and to ſuppoſe that our blessed Lord deſired his apostles to eat actions*,* is as repugnant to human reaſon as any doctrine of the church of Rome. The truth is, that the. word τoυιο, which is more properly a definite article than a demonſtrative pronoun (ſee Grammar, Chap. II. ), refers directly to the thing, whatever it was, which our Saviour held in his hand and gave to the diſciples ; and the clauſe, when completed, is τουίο ον εοιι το σωμα μου; this being,this subst*ance, is my body.* There was no neceſſity for characteriſing that ſubſtance by any analogy to sex, in order that it might be diſtinguiſhed from every other ſubſtance ; for the apoſtles could not but see it in the hand of their; Maſter.