

and his remaining companions reached Malta, after a sick and tedious passage of 'thirty-eight days. Being joined by the, "Supply" on the 12th Sept. they sailed for New York, where they arrived early in December, having been absent a little more than a year.

-----

After the principal part of this article was written, the North British Review came to hand, containing a review of Lieut. Lynch's work, in connection with another compiled from the notes of a member of the expedition. The critique, it cannot be denied, is decidedly John Bull-ian, strongly impregnated with the bitter waters of jealousy, little less pungent perhaps to the writer's own palate than the acrid-brine of Asphaltites itself, acidulated with the cider of the dhom apple. But whatever may be the views and feelings of our transatlantic brethren towards us, by their own constrained admission, the ablest work on Palestine ever written, and indeed the only one that, even approximates perfection, is the product of American genius. And it is a no less notorious and gratifying truth, that the same infant Navy of the far distant American Republic, which, first dared to dash defiance at the unjust extortions and cruelties of Tripolitan piracy, while that splendid power that claimed to sit as ocean queen, and see no sorrow, recoiled from the undertaking, has been now permitted to glory in the honour of, making the first successful exploration of the Jordan and the Dead Sea.

-----

ARTICLE III.

*Critical Remarks on the Institution of the Lord's Supper. By the Rev. W. M. SMYTHE, A. M. Dallas Co. Alabama.*

Jesus took bread and blessed it (evXoynaas) and brake it. And he took the cup and gave thanks (evxapwar,as) and gave it to them.

Matt. xxvi. 26, 27,

And as they did eat; Jesus took bread and blessed (εὐλογησας) and brake it. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks (ευχαριστησας) he gave it to them.—Mark xiv. 22, 23.

And he took bread and gave thanks (ευχαριστησας) and brake, and gave unto them,—Luke xxii. 19.

And when he had given thanks (ευχαριστησας) he brake it and said, take, eat.  
I. Cor. xi. 24.

The Bible is its own best interpreter. Man may err, and often does, but the word of inspiration is infallible and abideth forever. It is like its great author, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. It gives no uncertain response; it teaches no false doctrine.

In ascertaining the meaning, of Scripture, questions often arise that baffle the skill and the judgment of the most learned and intellectual.

The great desideratum, then, in the interpretation of the Holy Writings, is to find out, if possible, the sense which the Spirit of Truth intended, and the writers themselves attached to their own language. Having obtained this, and comparing spiritual things with spiritual, we may rest assured that we will be guided into the knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Our foundation will be laid deep and broad in the everlasting rock, in place of the shifting sands; and the winds of public opinion may expend their feeble force upon the indestructible fortress of divine faith.

We have often been pained at the ignorance of some who minister in holy things, who, attempting to be wise and learned, handle the word of God deceitfully, and lead his people into damnable error. Such men are a curse to the Church. They are blind leaders of the blind.

But it is not our object in this paper to sit in judgment upon others; we aim at a higher and holier undertaking. We wish to investigate, as far as we are able, and have opportunity, the verses placed at the head of this article, and to discover, if possible, the exact import of some expressions contained in them.

Before and since we came into the ministry, we have often heard, with sorrow we confess, great and good men, at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, use such language as the following in their introductory prayer, "Grant O Lord, that so much of this bread and wine, as shall be used on the present occasion, may be set apart from a com-

mon to a holy use." This they call *consecrating* the elements, and when asked for their authority, they refer us to the Saviour's example, when he instituted the ordinance. We are well aware that the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, was at a very early period introduced into the Church and performed with great formality, and with a set of words and prayer, which were a source of frequent and bitter discussion in different Churches.

It would not add much to our knowledge to enumerate all the various controversies that have prevailed on this subject. They were more curious than profitable. In general, the Church has agreed that the elements should be set apart to a sacramental use by prayer. The words in the original institution, were uniformly included in the consecrating prayer. Some even went so far as to maintain that a personal invocation of the Holy Ghost was essential to a due consecration of the elements.

The Scripture is exceedingly plain on the subject; it gives not the least intimation of any mystery or difficulty connected with the institution. Every thing about it is simple, and easily understood, even by the most unlettered.

The question now comes up. Did our Saviour bless the bread and wine? We hold to the opposite opinion, for reasons which we will state. The word "*it*," which has been improperly supplied in the English version,—it is neither in the Greek nor Latin—has led many into the opinion we are opposing. In the passages where the institution is recorded, whether the word *blessed* or gave thanks is used, we believe it refers not to the bread and wine, but to God, the giver of every good and perfect gift.

No blessing, therefore, of the elements was intended; they were already blessed, in being sent as a gift of kindness from the Lord of Creation. *Blessing* and *touching* the bread are Popish ceremonies, not sanctioned either by the word of God, or the practice of the Church in the days of her purity, and should have no countenance from Protestants. He who will say, that this is a matter of small importance, ought to reflect, that from this very practice arose the *elevatio hostiae*, elevation of the host, in the Church of Rome. We solemnly believe that it is

fraught with dangerous error to the whole ordinance of Heaven.

The Greek gives no countenance to the view we are combating. Both the Evangelists, Matthew and Mark, use the word <sup>εὐλογησας</sup>, *blessed* in reference to the *bread*, while they use <sup>ευχαριστησας</sup>, *gave thanks* in reference to the *wine*. Luke and Paul use <sup>ευχαριστησας</sup>, in reference to both elements. But instead of <sup>εὐλογησας</sup>, in Matthew, <sup>ευχαριστησας</sup>, is the reading of ten MSS, in uncial characters, of the Dublin *codex rescriptus*, published by Dr. Barrett, and of more than one hundred others of the greatest respectability. This also is the reading of the *Syriac* and *Arabic*, and is confirmed by several of the primitive fathers. Oriental use would incline us to believe that the meaning is, *gave thanks to God*. The Jews have in their rituals a prayer used at their meals, which they call *Bracha*, that is, the "blessing" or "benediction." On "taking the bread" they say: "Blessed be thou our God, King of the universe, who bringest forth bread out of the earth." Likewise on taking the cup, they say: "Blessed be our God, King of the universe, the Creator of the fruit of the vine." The Mahomedans follow the example of the Jews, constantly saying, before and after meat, "In the name of God, the most merciful, the most compassionate." From this we see that no more is meant than the *giving of thanks*, and from this custom we have derived the practice of saying grace (thanks) before and after our meals.

<sup>εὐλογησας</sup>, is compounded of <sup>ευ</sup> and <sup>λογος</sup>, to speak well of any one, hence to praise, to celebrate. In this sense it is used in Luke I, 64: He spake, and praised <sup>(εὐλογων)</sup> God; II. 53: Praising and blessing <sup>(εὐλογουντες)</sup> God; James III, 9: Therefore bless <sup>(εὐλογοουμεν)</sup> we God. We might quote numberless other passages which go to prove our position, that the Saviour did not bless the bread, but that he gave thanks to his Heavenly Father.

The *change* of the word, when he took the cup, strengthens our view. If he blessed the bread, we are assured that he did not *bless* the *wine*; for he does not use <sup>εὐλογησας</sup> but <sup>ευχαριστησας</sup>, in reference to the cup; which, as far as we know, never means to *bless*, but to *give thanks*. The advocates, therefore, of consecrating the elements, cannot, by the utmost ingenuity, and distortion

of Scripture, which they may employ, obtain more than one consecrated element, namely, the *bread*.

But Luke and Paul cut off every hope of our opponents. They use <sup>εὐχαριστήσας</sup>, *gave thanks*, in reference to the bread. This destroys every vestige of an argument in favour of those who differ from us, and we think completely establishes our position, that our Lord Jesus Christ, in the institution of the Supper, did not bless the bread and wine.

There is one passage which seems strongly to militate against our view; it is found in I Cor. 10, 16, "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?" Formidable as this appears, we believe it favours our opinion, rather than our opponents. Literally translated it means, "*for which we speak good, words of praise and thanks.*"—Macknight renders it "The cup of blessing *for which we bless.*" Ambrose says, "The Apostle calls it the cup of blessing, because when we have it in our hand we praise and bless with admiration of his ineffable gift, Him who shed his blood for us. The Paschal cup was called by the Jews, "the cup of blessing," because they gave thanks for it. Calvin translates it "calix benedictionis, *cui benedicimus.*" The cup of blessing *for which we bless.*—Whitby uses the same language, "The cup of blessing which we bless—or receive with thanksgiving to God for it." Neander, in his "Life of Christ," says: The *giving of thanks*, before the distribution of the bread and wine, corresponds to a similar act on the part of the head of the family, in the Jewish Passover feast, in which *thanksgiving* was offered for the gifts of nature. We may infer, therefore, that Christ's thanksgiving had reference partly to the creation of all material things for man, (bread and wine symbolizing all God's gifts in nature.)" In his Church History, vol. i. p. 324, he uses similar language: "The Jewish passover was a festival of thanks for the favour which the Almighty Creator of nature showed the people whom he honoured with his especial guidance. The father of the family, who kept the passover with his household, and distributed bread and wine among the guests, *praised God* who had bestowed these fruits of the

earth on man. Hence the cup of wine over which this *giving of thanks* was pronounced, was called *the cup of praise or thanksgiving* ποτηριον ευλογιας that is ευχαριστιας." Justin Martyr says. "The bread and a cup of wine is brought to the president of the brethren, and he taking them, offers praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and maketh a very long thanksgiving, because he hath thought us worthy of these gifts; and when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgiving, all the people present approve it with acclamation, saying Amen."

From these, opinions of good and learned men in every age of the Church, we are forced to the conclusion, that this passage does not support the doctrine that the sacramental elements were blessed by the Saviour, or subsequently by the Apostle Paul.

Therefore we have no warrant from Scripture for the practice which many adopt of *consecrating* the bread and wine.

We might continue this discussion to an indefinite length, but we have said enough to convince any impartial inquirer after truth, what is the Bible view of the subject.

I hope, that for the future, our dear brethren in the bonds of the Gospel will avoid every expression at the Lord's table, that might be tortured into the idea that the elements are any thing more than simply *common* bread and wine.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### THE MARK OF CAIN AND CURSE OF HAM.

It has been our object in former pages of this Review, to defend the teachings of the Scriptures, as to the unity of the human race, and to point out those causes which may have operated, in the special Providence of God, to produce the varieties found existing in the family of man.