

MR. CARRY'S LETTERS.

NO. IV.

To the Editor of The Mail.

SIR,—My last letter gave evidence clear and explicit that the Paschal wine, which our Lord employed for the Eucharistic rite, was intoxicating; to which I now add some further testimony of a different sort. The wine of the Passover was red. Red wine, *Yayin edom*, was distinctly prescribed in both the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds, as may be seen in "Lightfoot." This red wine is the blood of the grape; but no unfermented wine is red, not even that made from the juice of the purple grape. The reason is given in a quotation in the *Presbyterian Review* from "Miller's Organic Chemistry." The colouring matter is in the husks, and can be extracted only by alcohol and acid, or wine. "Red grapes may be made to yield a white wine if the husks of the grape be removed from the must before fermentation begins. * * * But if the skins be left in the fermenting mass, the alcohol, as it is formed, dissolves the colouring matter, producing the different shades of red wine." As I write, some "S. S." literature has been sent me, which tells us:—"When God's wine has been, by man's invention, subjected to a chemical process and becomes fermented, it is no longer the fruit of the vine, but another substance altogether; it is now a poisonous compound." But fermentation is not "man's invention;" it is a natural process which grape juice spontaneously undergoes on being expressed; and the attempt to arrest that fermentation is truly "man's invention," the real work of art. Prof. Tyndall, in a lecture at Glasgow a few years ago, made this plain to "the most excruciatingly mean understanding." The Jews later on thought it prudent to exchange this red wine for white, in order to remove all pretext for the charge that they drank Christians' blood at the Passover. But as it is asserted with endless iteration in the superficial literature of the temperance platform that the Jews did not, and do not, use fermented grape juice in the Passover rites, I copy from the *Presbyterian Review* the judgment of a scholar who has no rival in Jewish learning. Dr. Delitzsch says:—"The wine of the Passover has at all times been fermented wine, which, according to the prevalent custom, was mixed with water." The *Review* gives many other testimonies from the most unimpeachable authorities, and I may add one from Dr. Edersheim, well known for his Hebrew learning. In a long and learned letter to Dr. Bright, the Oxford professor of Ecclesiastical History, published in the *Guardian* 20th Sept., 1882, he says that fermented wine was, and is, undoubtedly used in the Passover. I have not that number by me to quote the *ipsissima verba*, but I represent them correctly. Of Acts ii. 13-15, where *gleukos*, "new wine," is clearly an intoxicant, Dr. Kerr says, with great candour, "Of all the explanations none is satisfactory to my mind," I suppose because they all recognize the fact that *gleukos* is an intoxicant, and the admission would spoil the symmetry of the doctor's theory. But there is yet another place in the N. T. of no small importance—I Cor., xi. 21. In the disorderly Agape celebrated at Corinth, St. Paul says "one is hungry, and another is drunken." To allow this would be to yield the whole point; and therefore *methuei* must not mean "drunken," but according to the temperance commentary, and Dr. Kerr, is "quite full." But the worse is, they shame two men, admirable for their learning and insight, by claiming their support for such a folly. One, St. Chrysostom, expressly denies this interpretation. He says: "They had passed into gluttony and drunkenness: wherefore he did not say, one is hungry and the other is full, *korennutai*, but *methuei*, drunken." And the modern Bengel says, "ebrius est." What sort of honesty or Christianity is it to claim these two as the patrons of such folly? In like manner Dr. Kerr represents St. Chrysostom as saying of the miracle at Cana, that it consisted in turning the water into wine in the grape. Whoever chooses to look into his Twenty-first Homily on St. John, will see the exact opposite. "Not simply wine, but the best wine."

From which he takes occasion to inveigh against excess, and goes on to observe what temperance men may well urge but don't, save as to drinks, "a poor and plain table is the mother of health." What respect can one have for men who thus show they don't care for truth? "Lightfoot" thinks the Corinthian Carouse is to be explained by the customary excesses in the Passover. As for the general prohibition of anything leavened or fermented during the Paschal Feast, it is enough to observe that it was confined to "whatever is made of any kind of grain," and was not extended to wine or any kind of fruit. In the famous Passover sauce, called "Kharoseth," used ever since the Babylonish captivity, vinegar was one of the prescribed ingredients. Buxtorf, in his Talmudical Lexicon, after enumerating them, says "*ea acetique perfundeant*"—vinegar was poured over all. Certainly if St. Paul were at one with the teetotallers he would have easily prevented the recurrence of the Corinthian disorder by forbidding wine in future. But he didn't. Yours, &c.

J. CARRY.

Port Perry, Nov. 30, 1882.

Correspondence.

AUTHOR WANTED.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian.

SIR,—Can you or any of the readers of the *GUARDIAN* tell me who is the author of the following version of the Doxology, probably the most beautiful in ecclesiastical literature:

"O Father, Son and Holy Ghost,
One, only God, Thee I adore;
I worship Thee who wast and art
And shalt be evermore. Amen."

S.

March 11th, 1883.

THE DUAL PLEDGE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.

PLEDGE I.

Non-Abstaining Declaration—"I recognize my duty as a Christian to exert myself for the suppression of Intemperance, and having hereby become a member of this Society will do my utmost, both by example and effort, to promote its objects."

PLEDGE II.

Abstaining Declaration—"I hereby agree to abstain from the use of alcoholic liquors except for religious purposes or under medical order."

As there seems to be some misapprehension in the public mind about the above pledges, even among those belonging to the Church, I have given them both, putting the moderation one first, because I think that those who take it will in nine cases out of ten have need of the other (of course I do not mean those advanced in years or whose habits are well formed.) I know that I am going into antagonism against many who hold the cause of temperance at heart just as dearly as I do and who have thought deeply on the subject, but nevertheless I feel justified in giving my ideas publicly. I am told, is it not something when you get a man to pledge himself not to go into a bar room for a drink? What a fallacy! Is there any difference, as far as the drink is concerned, whether it is taken there or at home—I mean so far as its effects apply to the individual? Or, granting that it is better, how long will it be, in the majority of cases, that he will continue that course? Experience has shown that alcoholism is so insidious in its approaches that imperceptibly it grows on one, and so stealthy are its footsteps that not even the unhappy victim suspects the danger until he is already a helpless captive in its iron grasp; then, and not till then, does he realize its power. How often has a community been startled by seeing one whom all thought a model young man reeling about the streets? Did he become at once a drunkard? No; he was, perhaps, but following in the footsteps of some loved father, who was always a moderate drinker, but for some physiological cause he craved a stronger stimulant or larger quantities to quench his ever-growing thirst; and hence the result.

Again it is urged that is desirable to gain over to the cause of temperance, for the sake of their influence in the community or their wealth, those who would not take a total abstinence pledge, but who would take the other one. The good their money would do in giving total abstainers the wherewithal to carry on their good work, I grant, but their influence otherwise I cannot see. I cannot see how good fruit can come from a diseased tree, nor pure water from a foul spring; besides, will not the work have to be done over twice, if the patriarchs who were at the Institute the other evening had at the beginning used two pledges; think you they could have taken a retrospective glance and seen the same satisfactory results as they told us of? The fact is when they got a man to sign a pledge they were sure of him (that is if he kept it); they were sure, I say, of him, for it was touch not, taste not, handle not; no drunkards could be made with those conditions; but now, if a man will not take the total abstinence pledge they have got to be content with his taking the moderation one, and they are not sure of him, nor is any man sure of himself who does take that pledge. I care not how bright his station, nor by what checks and guards he is surrounded, and I speak from a bitter experience, and know of what I speak, and if that one does fall, it is doubly harder to bring him back than at first. If small-pox or any other infectious disease breaks out, are not the physicians summoned, not only to effect a cure but to seek out the cause so that it be stamped out and prevent its recurrence? But how worse a disease is intemperance, for it not only destroys and mars the body but it destroys the soul. We know the remedy—total abstinence. The cause has not far to be looked for—it is moderate drinking. Why, then, seek to perpetuate a disease, a sin, when we know the cause and its cure?

A very large proportion of those who uphold the moderate use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage for the sake of gaining over, are total abstainers themselves or those who never drank to excess, either from choice or other causes, those who in fact never had to sign a pledge or felt the need of one;—but, Mr. Editor, did you ever in your large experience both as a temperance worker or as a clergyman hear a drunkard or a reformed drunkard advocate such a course? is it not the reverse, when for the very depths of the soul and in the bitterness of anguish the cry has rung out, "if I had not touched the accursed cup I would not now be in this position." After many a night's debauch, the body ill, the nerves shaking, the spirits depressed, the signs of misery at home, in answer to the pleading wife, the frightened children, has the poor inebriate sworn to give up the fatal cup, and meant it, but to no purpose,—the seeds of moderate drinking have been slowly but surely maturing, and what promised in youth and manhood to be a flourishing old age, has brought forth instead as its deadly fruit a drunkard. Let us not then seek by any tampering with this fearful vice to perpetuate the disease and incur the curse, "No drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of heaven"—his doom is the same now and as certain as when pronounced thousands of years ago. But it may be said, why should those who have been accustomed to their glass of wine be compelled to give it up. I shall, Mr. Editor, if you give me space reply to that and other questions at a future date, as I fear I have already exhausted both your space and patience,

And for the present remain, yours,

Halifax, March 2nd, 1883.

F.

Dr. W. P. Mackay, preaching one day to some British soldiers, put the question: "If Queen Victoria were to issue a proclamation, and, placing it in the hands of her army and navy, should say, 'Go into all the world and proclaim it to every creature,' how long do you think it would take to do it?" One of the men, accustomed to obeying orders without questioning or delay and at the peril of their lives, replied (he was a grave and intelligent officer), "I think we could manage it in about eighteen months." And who can doubt it? Or what shall hinder the Church, in this day of almost miraculous facilities, from taking its King's proclamation to every creature in very nearly, if not quite, the same time?