

accomplish this purpose? If the term "*oinos*" had been employed instead of "*gennema ampelou*," "the fruit of the vine," there might have been some color of reason for keeping the mind in suspense, as to the nature of the liquid set apart by the Redeemer, to be the emblem of His blood, and the out and out sticklers for alcoholic wine, and alcoholic wine only, under all circumstances of good and evil, might have congratulated themselves on the use of a term by the Lord Jesus Christ, to which a meaning consonant with their views might be attached. But it is difficult—very difficult to conceive how these men can by any sophistry have cozened themselves into the belief that this perfectly unambiguous circumlocution can be applied to intoxicating wine, or any liquid, except that which retains the qualities of the grape uncorrupted. The only way of accounting for this strange misconception and perversion, is to trace it to stubborn prejudice, deeply rooted upon man's unbounded lust after alcoholic beverages. That every safe guard was erected by the love and wisdom of Jesus, to prevent this moral delinquency, in His institution of the Sacred Supper is abundantly evident. As has already been shown "unfermented things" alone, are to be used at its celebration, and to make security doubly secure, against the intrusion of alcoholic wine, a new assemblage of words was introduced, expressive of the precise nature of the liquid to be dispensed, in possession of its natural salutary qualities, and which, without manifest outrage, could not be applied to a liquor which had acquired noxious properties by the process of fermentation, or vegetable putrefaction.

The question now occurs to my mind, what can be the reason why men should have no objection to the interdict of "leavened," or 'fermented bread,' at the Lord's Table, and should shrink from the discussion of the question of the rightful use of fermented wine at that ordinance? No voice is ever raised against the one prohibition, but the other is everywhere spoken against, and all but universally discredited. The reason of this difference probably is, that there is a latent apprehension lurking in the minds of Christians—that the Bible, if it were thoroughly and candidly searched, and rightly interpreted, on the subject of wines, might be found to testify strongly against the use of the intoxicating liquor dispensed at "the Communion Table," which many of them seem to love as "a right eye," and to prove that the use of it *there*, which has hitherto been viewed as a duty and a virtue, is indeed a violation of law and a vice, so that their consciences hitherto in favour of it might be obliged to pronounce sentence against it, and their love to it be turned into hate; while no such dread exists in regard to fermented bread, the poison "alcohol" having been expelled from it, by heat, in the process of baking, so that the cause of the Divine interdict of intoxicating drinks being removed, the moral law necessarily ceases in regard to it, and the primitive or ceremonial law only continues binding upon the Christian in that particular ordinance. And if alcoholic wine should be proved to have usurped the rightful place of "unfermented fruit of the vine," in the sanctuary, it would follow that it must be driven from it, and that "unfermented fruit of the vine" must be elevated to its *just* ascendancy in the department of evangelical temperance. This is precisely the triumph which it will be shown in the future pages of this letter will be achieved upon the general adoption of the Scriptural doctrine that "unfermented fruit of the vine," was appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ, to be the sole symbol of His blood, to be employed at His Table, till his second coming, the declaration of the Lord in support of it

at the institution of His Supper, being as it were the *experimentum crucis* establishing for ever the noble principle of that pure liquid and its hallowed associations, with all the blessings purchased by His blood, being the heaven born antidote of alcoholic intemperance! To illustrate this view, let it be supposed that unfermented bread occupied the place of unfermented wine, and that fermented bread occupied the place of fermented wine, at the Sacrament, and that the latter possessed intoxicating qualities the same as are inherent in alcoholic wine, and in all respects sustained the same character, accompanied by the same intense affection, while the former was a bland nutritious substance hardly ever thought of; then, there would be equal sensitiveness and aversion to explore its noxious qualities, as in the case of wine, lest conscience should be obliged to give sentence against it: but let it be supposed that there was no love to this intoxicating bread, and therefore no fear of losing it, then the mind being without bias to either side, would judge fairly of the contending claims, and correctly weigh the evidence for and against each, so that if it preponderated on the side of unfermented bread, the mind would consent to its use at the ordinance of the Supper. Now the fact is that the evidence does preponderate in favor of unfermented bread, as is allowed by moderate drinkers, according to the authorised version; and fermented bread, according to the canon of Scriptural interpretation that "positives include negatives" is therefore admitted to be forbidden. But if fermented bread be forbidden in the one case, laying aside prejudice and partiality, it cannot be consistently denied that fermented wine, is also forbidden in the other, according to the translation which has been given above, and which I believe cannot be controverted, for according to it, there is precisely the same amount of evidence for the use of unfermented wine, as for the use of unfermented bread, and against the use of fermented wine that there is against the use of fermented bread, the expression the feast of "unfermented things" being equally applicable to both, the only thing making an apparent difference, and influencing the will, (the wish being father to the thought) against the one, and for the other, and neutralizing the evidence, being immoral attachment to an unlawful object; a similar reason to which might be made to justify any act however base and criminal. The design of Satan throughout has been to conceal or distort the truth, and to carry out this design he has, by means of his dupes, involved in a dense cloud, and thereby reduced to the smallest possible dimensions, all in the Bible, that seems to countenance the use of unfermented wine; and surrounded with an *ignis fatuus* deceitful glare, so as to magnify to the greatest extent all that seems in any way propitious to the use of fermented intoxicating wine, at the Lord's Table; and, alas, hitherto he has been too successful in carrying out his evil purpose.

But hereafter the heavenly motive alluded to above, and which will be more fully developed by and by, will be seen to operate by drawing away unlawful affection from intoxicating wine, and fixing lawful affection upon its supplanter, "the unfermented fruit of the vine," the rightful possessor of the high dignity assigned to it from everlasting in the counsels of Jehovah.

It is human nature to shrink from the exposure of any physical defect, or moral taint, and envelop it in darkness. It is also human nature to rejoice at any thing in an illustrious individual, which tends in any degree to extenuate or justify any equivocal but darling feature of personal character, and to dread its being found otherwise than has been uni-