

in the Lord's Supper is a stumbling-block, let the following statement from the pastor, elicited in a recent controversy, testify. In describing the case of one of his flock he writes:—"He dare not taste the wine for fear of his appetite for liquor breaking beyond all bounds; and that on one occasion when he was present as a non-communicant the faint smell of the wine coming to him across the church almost drove him frantic. He has since absented himself from church on communion occasions, and declares that no one knows the daily battle he fights with his passion for liquor, that after six years refuses to die. He has stood firm all that time, is a regular church-goer, a good citizen, and his word I have no reason to doubt. I may add that *we use non-fermented wine.*"

It is manifest that if the practice of the Church is to be modified to meet such cases as this the reformers must go much farther than they have yet proposed. Their remedy is futile to meet the very cases for which it is designed. Nothing short of withholding the cup from the laity with the Roman Catholics, or totally abolishing the ordinance with the Quakers, will supply them with the radical remedy that they are groping after.—The REV. W. MITCHELL, M.A., in *Knox College Monthly*.

THE SACRAMENTAL WINE OF SCRIPTURE.

IF the intoxicating wine used in celebrating the Lord's Supper was a violation of the Apostle's practice and the original institution, is it conceivable that He would have passed over the fact in silence? If the scandal alluded to in Cor. xi. 20, 21, was caused by the use of fermented wine instead of unfermented how did it remain uncorrected? The remedy was very simple. Why was it not applied?

The fact is an "unfermented wine" is unknown to the New Testament. Possibly Must is referred to in two or three passages, but no traces of "unfermented wine" can be discovered. A champion of this innovation has had the temerity, recently, to assert that "*glukus* is sweet unfermented wine" in the face of Acts i. 13, 15, "These men are full of new wine;" "These are not drunken as ye suppose." And again, "we shall find that all the way down through the ages before and since the time of Christ, we can trace the words translated 'wine' used in senses which utterly preclude the thought of fermented liquors." The word wine occurs about forty times in the New Testament. It is with its usage that we are concerned in this matter. Will this gentleman point out one case among these in which the thought of a fermented liquor is "utterly precluded?" What are the facts of the case? Two terms *glukus* and *oinos* are used in it to designate wine. The single passage in which the former occurs has already been quoted. *Oinos* occurs thirty-eight times, five of these in composition. Once (Rev. xix. 15) it is used in a phrase to designate the wine press. Twice (Rev. vi. 6; xviii. 13) it is joined with corn in passages from which nothing can be certainly

inferred regarding the matter at issue. In the great majority of the thirty-three that remain the fact that it was fermented lies on the surface, and in every one of them may be legitimately inferred. In the face of a usage so clear and unequivocal it is useless to attempt to bury the issue under a mass of irrelevant quotations from travellers and others regarding *dibs*—equally so to glean exceptional and doubtful passages from the wide field of classic literature bearing on the meaning of *oinos* and *vinum*. Such a course may serve to perplex the ignorant, but it contributes nothing to the settlement of a question which is essentially Scriptural.

"The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine" then, which our Lord chose as the symbol of His blood shed for us was undoubtedly (*oinos*) wine, and overwhelming evidence shuts us up to the acceptance of the fact that it was wine in the sense ordinarily understood.

The second Scriptural objection which is urged is based on the assertion that wine, the product of fermentation, cannot have been employed at the institution of the ordinance, as it is precluded by the law of the Passover. "Here," says Dr. Gordon, "we found our strongest appeal."

The argument briefly summed up is to this effect. The Lord's Supper was instituted at the close of a Passover meal. The bread and wine then used formed part of the ordinary provision for such an occasion. Nothing leavened was permitted at the Passover or for seven days after in the houses of the Jews. The wine of commerce is "leavened," and, therefore, cannot have been used. The wine employed at the Passover, and consequently at the first observance of the Lord's Supper, must have been the unfermented juice of the grape.

No historical proof has been offered, that as a matter of fact, the wine used by the Jews at the Passover in the days of our Lord was unfermented, or even that they were acquainted with any process by which the juice of the grape could be preserved from September till April in an unfermented state. No sooner is juice pressed from the grape than fermentation begins to work. The advocates of the use of "unfermented wine" depend, not on historically ascertained facts, but upon their own reasonings and deductions from what we shall endeavour to show is a mistaken identification.

It is true that leaven was forbidden at the Passover. It was the divinely appointed symbol of moral corruption and, as such, was regarded as defiling, and excluded from the offerings laid on the Lord's altar. This symbolical significance of leaven renders its prohibition at the Passover and during the feast of Unleavened Bread simple and intelligible. So far we are agreed. But here the advocates of the use of "unfermented wine" quietly assume the identity of leaven and ferment, and the processes of leavening in bread and fermentation in wine. In order to establish this identity it is necessary that proof should be adduced that the cause, process and result are the same in each case—that the same efficient agent is present, that the same elements are acted on,

and that the same products result. Will anyone who knows anything of the chemical processes in the leavening of bread and the fermentation of wine assert that this is the fact? Will anyone assert identity in even one of these particulars? Supposing that the active agent were the same the difference in the matrices would modify the processes and results to such an extent as to vitiate all a priori conclusions as to identification. We venture the assertion that this identification cannot be established and that its assumption is a radical mistake. The process of leavening is simply one of putrefaction, and it derives its whole force as a symbol from that fact. The leaven formerly used in baking was dough in an incipient stage of putrescence. Let the favorable conditions of heat and moisture be present and it will go forward till the whole mass becomes putrid. The result is complete destruction from the viewpoint of human food. The product is a rotten mass loathsome to our senses.

Now turn to the process of fermentation in grape juice. Introduce the ferment, and let all the favorable conditions for its operation in the must be present. What is the result? It runs its course, transforms a certain proportion of the grape sugar into carbonic acid and alcohol, and then ceases. The result is a stable product agreeable to the human palate. The must has undergone a transformation that in the estimation of ages has vastly increased its value. The grape juice which could not be preserved with the rude appliances of early days has become wine that may be kept without trouble for years, and that often increases in value with age.

The processes are different, and are not confounded in Scripture. They receive entirely different treatment at the hands of God. The one is ever the symbol of evil, the other is never so employed. The accuracy of modern chemical terminology is not to be looked for in the popular language of the Bible. But it does discriminate between matters so different in their process and result as putrescence and fermentation. It has been reserved for modern reformers to be guilty of such solecisms as those embodied in their phrases "leavened wine" and "unfermented wine." The Hebrew *chomets* and *seor* are commonly used in Scripture of dough and bread. The products of grain may be leavened but of the vine not. We have been unable to find a single passage of Scripture in which leaven or leavening is connected with must or wine, or one that by any fair interpretation would warrant the application of such phraseology. Certainly if there be a leavened product of the vine it is vinegar (*chomets*) and not wine. Its sour taste due to the acetic acid gives it one characteristic in common with the leavened dough in which lactic and acetic acids are found.

As the processes of leavening and fermentation are not confounded in Scripture their products are regarded and treated with discrimination. Among the offerings presented to God according to the Mosaic ritual, were many meat or meal offerings. Directions are given