

drinking fermented wine, why does the Saviour mention the *new* as the *better*? for surely the idea of better is implied. This would be contrary to the declaration noticed above, and subversive of His main design. On the other hand, if they were drinking *must*, which was (as it must have been,) some six months old, then to mention the *new* fruit of the vine, that they would drink in the kingdom of God, would make the sense altogether opposite. *New* and *fresh must* must always be better than the old."

2. A similar use is made of the Saviour's language by President Green.—(Enq. p. 28.)

3. Mr. Delavan gives a slightly different explanation of the force of the term *new*. He observes that "the blood or juice of the grape, so far as Sacramental purposes are concerned, (the Saviour being judge,) is when '*new*' in its best state. I am strongly inclined to the use of the wine in the *new* state rather than in the *old*; and I have greatly erred if the words of the Saviour, who spoke of drinking the same—not *old* but '*new*' in the kingdom of His Father, does not bear me out in this."—(Enq. p. 74.)

§ 13. Mr. Medhurst is not satisfied with such an explanation of our Saviour's statement as that we have now given. He seems to adopt the opinion "that because our Saviour designates that wine as *new* which should be drunk in heaven, that, therefore, what he then partook of was not *new*, but *old*, or fermented wine." There is an obvious error here, in speaking of *old wine* as synonymous with *fermented wine*. In speaking on this point, however, Mr. Medhurst does not deny that the wine might be *old* and not fermented. Besides, as Professor Stuart remarks above, "when fermented wine is compared with itself the *old* is better than the *new*." It could not be fermented wine, then, they were drinking, else the Saviour would not have spoken of the *new* as better, and the symbol of the higher happiness of heaven. Mr. Medhurst endeavours to set aside Dr. Stuart's observations on this passage, but with ill success. He does not tell us where he has found them, but he seems to refer to those we have quoted in the preceding section. If so, his words, in giving a brief statement of Dr. Stuart's observations, are not well chosen. And how does he endeavour to set them aside? He deems a single sentence sufficient for this. "To us, however," he says, "the expression *kainon* (*new*) does not refer so much to the quality of the wine as to the constant supply—ever *new*, and still increasing, without any possibility of its cloying or palling the appetite." This is properly no answer to Dr. Stuart's argument, and does not, by any means, set it aside. Had he said that the word *new* cannot refer to the quality of the wine, but must refer solely to its constant supply, and had he succeeded in proving this, he would then have furnished an answer. As the matter stands, the argument retains all its force. It is obvious that he could not produce sufficient evidence in favour of such a use of the word as would at all serve his purpose. So far as we know, his explanation of *kainon* is altogether unique. He produces no evidence in its favour, and who will for a moment suppose that his unsupported assertion on such a point will have the weight of a feather against so distinguished a scholar and critic as Dr. Stuart? Dr. Robinson, of America, the author of the best Lexicon of the Greek New Testament that we have, explains the expression in the passage under discussion, "to drink *new* wine, in its best state according to the Hebrew taste."

ARGUMENT.—As a Symbol of the Blood of Christ, Unfermented is more Appropriate than Fermented Wine.

§ 14. Our next argument is drawn from the appropriateness of the symbol. (Matthew xxvi. 27, 28.) We feel so conscious that we have decidedly the better of our opponents here that we find it difficult to give them credit for sincerity when they differ from us on this point. No one, however, denies that unfermented wine is appropriate

as a symbol of the Saviour's blood. All that is contended in opposition to us is that fermented wine is also appropriate. By the *blood of Christ*, as a figurative expression often occurring in scripture, we are to understand *His sufferings and death*; and when we are said to *drink His blood*, it is meant that we receive by faith the truth revealed in the gospel regarding *His sufferings and death*. "A symbol, for religious instruction, is that natural object which is selected to represent a moral reality."

1. *Nourishment* and *purification* are the main ideas intended to be suggested by the symbol now under consideration.—John vi. 53—56; Heb. ix. 14; 1 John i. 7. Alcohol wine stimulates, but does not nourish. In reference to our intoxicating wines Dr. E. Johnson, (Life, Health, and Disease, p. 268) says, "If wine be productive of good, what is the nature and kind of that good? Does it nourish the body? It does not, for the life of no animal can be supported by it." Dr. Grindrod (Bacchus, pp. 184, 185, 2d ed.), who will be acknowledged no mean authority in such matters, says,—"The popular notion that stimulants are capable of adding to the strength of the human frame, has already been shown to be completely fallacious. A principal cause of this belief may be found in the erroneous ideas entertained relative to the terms *stimulation* and *strength*." After explaining the nature of animal stimulation, this distinguished writer adds,—"It simply urges and forces the animal powers to increased velocity, exactly as the application of the whip or the spur increases the speed of the horse. As the laws of the physical system are definite and fixed, a corresponding diminution of capacity is the necessary consequence of this extraordinary outlay of power, which is, in fact, a real waste of animal strength." Dr. Grindrod quotes similar sentiments from Mr. Abernethy, Dr. Andrew Combe, and Sir Astley Cooper. On the other hand, unfermented wine is excellently adapted for the nourishment of the body, as is well stated in the language of Dr. Duff, formerly cited.—(See section 4.)

2. Again—alcoholic wine is ill adapted to suggest the idea of *purification*. Does it not suggest the very opposite? Think of individuals who have indulged freely in the use of intoxicating drink, and you have almost necessarily the associated idea of debased moral feeling.

"O, it hardens a' withal,
And perverts the feeling!"

We here introduce, slightly abridged, the judicious language of the Rev. Dr. Chapin.—(Enq. p. 17.) He says,—"An alcoholic, and, therefore, intoxicating liquor, named wine, is received in the solemnities of our religion, as a symbol of that cleansing blood. It adds life and strength to sin, instead of slaying the detestable evil. It is exciting, and palatable, and gratifying to an appetite which, wherever it exists, should be forthwith destroyed. It is deceptive as it affects spiritual experience. Here, then, a solemn question arises. Between the blood of Christ, in its qualities, design, and application, and a liquor so vile in its construction, and so defiling in its effects, can there be so much as a shade of resemblance? Ought a liquid so corrupting to be religiously employed? Allow that it has been sealed and treated as sacred by the traditional custom of eighteen centuries, can any person rationally believe that even a tradition so inveterate has power to make the poisonous fluid an appropriate symbol of cleansing from sin?" The blood of Christ is said to 'purge the conscience,' but intoxicating drink stimulates to vigorous action all the baser passions of the soul. On the other hand, the unfermented juice of the grape is eminently adapted to promote the health and the happiness of man; and, in accordance with the design of Providence, is largely used as a nutritive beverage in countries where the vine abounds. How fit an emblem of the blood of Christ, the health, and the joy of our souls!

§ 15. We know of no one who has objected to the view.