

glend at any pe
ndid lot of men
them. Single
ing the founda
ostolic devotion
dear unto them.
now commenced
r of railway men
Church, but this
work which will
sical effort. The
will soon be com
been subscribed.
reasingly impro
v himself to be
nd relinquishing
r of usefulness.

begs to acknow
battleaxe from
nd used in the

the writers in full
onsible for their

NCE SOCIETY
R TORONTO.

made as to the
diation, I will be
information re
san Society," as
that the execu
early meeting of
eties in the di
ber of branches
committee.
was quickly felt
hed in Toronto;
embers of those
at is now called
the committee
retaries and one
branches in the
and suburbs.
Association was
published by or
London. That
if various maga
n obtained from
tely to be useful
id several of the
h verbal correc
"Dollars" for
city branches, it
apers might also
til the diocesan
duty for those
or is about to
ie committee to
that supplies of
ost price when

to the clergy so
om London, and
must be added
al postage from
d: *Magazine*—
ekly; 2. Church
onthly; 3. Hand
standard Bearer,
ambers of Bands
ie clergy how to
rochial society;
2d.; 7. Success
k them; 8. How
ustain efficiency;
A word to the
; (All the above
For distribution
I several others.
to 25c. per 100.
s list be given to
contributing one
hen No. 3 to be
each contribut
Chronicle is for
portion. The
or will doubtless
se former home
lets Nos. 5 to 9
aged in forming

or working branches, and Nos. 10, 11, 12 are for dis-
tribution as may be necessary.

The leaflets, which will be numbered in order of
printing, and will, it is hoped, be added to, are for
distribution freely among all classes. Specimen
copies will be sent on receipt of 25 cents.

I would also beg leave to suggest that at the meet-
ing called to form a branch society, the resolution
should be in some such form as "That a branch of
the C. E. T. S. be formed in the parish of _____,"
and that delegates be elected either at the same time
or at the first meeting of the branch society, to repre-
sent the branch at any meeting called to elect the
executive committee of the diocesan society.

As yet the Central Association has no home; until
that is decided, letters addressed to me at Box 2,674,
Toronto, will have attention, and I will willingly
reply.

Yours truly,

G. MERSER,
Secretary Central Ass. for Toronto

GENERAL THANKSGIVING.

SIR,—Your correspondent, "R. S. Radcliffe," asks
some questions about the repetition by the whole con-
gregation of the General Thanksgiving. I am not
competent to answer the first or second question, but
I would like to express my own opinion regarding the
third, viz: Can it possibly be argued, "it is just as
rubrical to join in the General Thanksgiving as to join
in that prayer in Baptismal Office 'Almighty and
Everlasting God Heavenly Father.'"

To my mind both are equally un-rubrical and unad-
visable.

1. There is no rubric whatever directing the congre-
gation to repeat either form. There is such a rubric
for the General Confession, the Creed, the Lord's
Prayer, the Prayer in the Communion Office, etc.

2. The *Printing* in these two Prayers is unlike that
used where all the people are expected to join. In
the latter short clauses are used each beginning with
a capital letter—not grammatically necessary, but
evidently used like bars in music, to enable all to
"keep time."

3. The "Amen" shows, by its type, the same thing.
Of course the objection to this argument is the case
of the "Gloria in Excelsis"—Well, "exceptions
prove the rule."

4. The *style* of the two prayers in question is quite
unlike that of those intended for united voices. The
sentences are longer and more involved, and therefore
more suited to one voice. Besides, they are both
variable prayers. In the General Thanksgiving the
clause for special cases may or may not be used. In
the Form in the Baptismal Office the words, *this In-
fant—he—an heir—* are liable to change according to
circumstances: which things, though trifling, make it
somewhat awkward for all the people to join aloud.

5. The only reason I ever heard of for all the people
joining the Prayer in the Baptismal Office is that the
Priest says "Let us give thanks . . . and say."

By the same rule all should join aloud whenever he
says in the Litany or elsewhere "Let us pray" which
we know is not the case.

The difference of *style*—the difference of *Type*—the
absence of Rubrical Directions—are to me conclusive
against the practice of all speaking together in either
case.

Yours,

G. J. Low.

Carleton Place, 9th August, 1888.

UNFERMENTED WINE IN THE LORD'S SUPPER.

SIR,—In your issue of the 26th July, Mr. Tocque, in
his letter on this subject, says, "Scholarly writers, as
well as ordinary readers of the Bible, differ on the
wine question." Now this "wine question" is but
one of a very large number of other Bible questions
upon which they very much differ, simply because a
considerable number of these same "scholarly (?)
writers" and others, in dealing with these questions,
take little or no pains at all to distinguish between
demonstration and declamation; between fact and
fiction; between truth and twaddle. If Mr. T., to-
gether with those scholarly (?) writers who view the
matter as he does, have succeeded in making it quite
clear that the "fruit of the vine" mentioned in the
Gospels does not mean anything more than simply
unfermented grape juice, then why call such grape
juice wine at all, seeing that it so happens to have
the term "fruit of the vine" instead of wine applied
to it in the Gospels; and since it is claimed that in
them it is "not once called wine." Assuming then
for a moment that it was simply unfermented grape
juice that was used at the institution of the Lord's
Supper, and in the earliest administrations of it in the
Primitive Christian Church, it clearly follows that the

use of the fermented article at any time afterwards is
at the least a very grave innovation indeed, and can-
not be regarded in any other light in the present day.
In this view of the matter, and to make certain this
very uncertain innovation, would it not be well for
those scholarly (?) writers who view the matter as
Mr. T. does, to apply themselves to the discovery of
the time when it crept in, if it crept in at all; whe-
ther in the days of the Holy Apostles, or what time
afterwards; and whether there is in Church history,
or in any reliable ecclesiastical writing any record or
mention made of the name of at least one individual
in the "Holy Church throughout all the world," who
thought it worth his while to raise any question or
make any protest then or within any reasonable time
afterwards. I may be utterly wrong, but I at present
very strongly suspect that "scholarly writers" or
any other writers will find this task just about as
difficult as the yet unperformed and very similar
task which has in all fairness been laid upon "schol-
arly" Baptist writers as to the supposed innovation
of infant baptism.

Let it be once clearly established that to "use
grape or raisin juice" without any fermentation what-
ever, and perfectly free from any spirit in the slight-
est degree intoxicating, is the quite correct and indis-
pensable article to be used in the true and proper
administration of the Holy Communion; and that
immersion is the quite correct and (as the Baptists
maintain) indispensable practice in the true and pro-
per administration of Holy Baptism, and it shall then
have come to pass that Christianity is not for all
climes as well as for all times, so far at least as its
two great Sacraments are concerned, inasmuch as it
will greatly puzzle any scholarly (?) Baptist writer or
anybody else to show by what means any adult candi-
date for Holy Baptism may in the arctic regions be
immersed in water except for the purpose of sending
him immediately to another world. And I venture to
think that any clergyman in those regions attempting
to use this "grape or raisin juice" in the Holy Com-
munion would find it no more easy to solemnly and
reverently say to his communicants, "Drink this,"
than it would be for them to comply however willing
and anxious they might be to do so. If either the
one or the other can, will some "scholarly (?) writers"
on Mr. Tocque's side of the question kindly explain
how such clergyman might manage the matter in that
region without such "grape or raisin juice" becoming
very quickly a solid article in the cup or other sacred
vessel on the holy table. It would be well also if he
would at the same time give some Scriptural proof of
the truth of the allegation that the "use of all ferment
in . . . drink during the Passover season was prohi-
bited by the Mosaic law." I confess that after a
careful search I have been unable to find any proof in
support of this allegation.

As long as this proof is wanting it is perfectly idle
to argue that what our Blessed Lord described as the
"fruit of the vine," and used when he instituted the
Holy Communion, was wholly free from ferment sim-
ply because He did not on that occasion call it wine
but the "fruit of the vine." The conversation which
Mr. Tocque described as having taken place between
Mr. Gough and a gentleman about the "two kinds of
wine recognized in the Bible," would no doubt, by
some "scholarly (?) writers," be regarded not only as
very pretty but very clever so far as Mr. Gough's
part of it is concerned. I venture to think, however,
that there are a good many people in the world who
consider both the prettiness and the cleverness very
much marred by the very great difficulty that there
is in applying respectively the fermentation and the
non-fermentation to the "wine of the wrath of God,"
and "that which we shall drink new in our Father's
kingdom," arising chiefly if not altogether from the
absolute certainty in the one instance and the very
strong probability in the other of the complete non-
existence of both those wines except as a mere figure
of speech. But then I do not overlook the fact that
there are also a good many people, and among them
no doubt some "scholarly writers" and total abstin-
ence lecturers to whom the figure and the fact are
about one and the same thing.

Mr. Tocque tells us "This kind of distinction runs
all through the Scriptures; the one kind of wine is a
symbol of divine love, the other is an emblem of the
wrath of God and of the Lamb." But it probably
never occurred to Mr. Tocque that "This kind of dis-
tinction runs all through" the imagination of some
very good people very much more than "all through
the Scriptures" and that it does not by any means
follow that because the "love" and the "wrath" are
different that therefore the "wine" must also be dif-
ferent to the extent of "unfermented" and "ferment-
ed," for if on the contrary it does follow, then should
it not also be held to follow that when the Scriptures
speak of the "fire" of Divine love, and the "fire" of
Divine wrath, there must be a difference in the kind
of "fire"—see Acts ii. 3, Psalms xviii. 8. Will Mr.
T. or some "scholarly (?) writer" or total abstinence
lecturer like Mr. Gough kindly explain how it is about
the "fire."

Mr. Tocque says "There are passages (in the Bible)
which speak of wine as a blessing. There are other
passages which represent it as the direct curse." I
deny both allegations in the most positive terms. The
first can only be proved by supposing that "Every
good and perfect gift" of God is "a blessing." This
I do not admit simply because I deny that the word
"gift" is as some scholarly (?) writers imagine, syn-
onymous with the word "blessing." As for the second
allegation, I deny that it can be proved at all, and it
would certainly lead to some very awkward logical
conclusions if it could be proved.

Mr. Tocque says "We agree with those scholars
who teach that there are two kinds of wine recognized
in the Bible; the one the natural product of the vine
unfermented and unintoxicating the other intoxicat-
ing." I admit this in a certain manner, but
only in the sense in which I admit that there are
two kinds of cheese viz. new and old and as old cheese
was once new and is now stronger then when it was
new. So old wine was once very new and therefore
unfermented and unintoxicating but afterwards became
strong simply because it became fermented and intox-
icating. Now this view of the matter may not suit
certain "scholars" and "scholarly" writers and
total abstinence lecturers, but nevertheless facts are
stubborn things, and these gentlemen if they are really
fair and honest in this matter, will do wisely and well
to submit to them.

In making wine in the days of our Blessed Lord,
what was the practical operation; and in the very
nature of things as they were then, what were the
probable results which I venture to think must have
happened in a very natural way indeed?

Given a certain quantity of the pure juice of the
grape, unmixed and unadulterated with any foreign
article whatever. Will any scholarly writer deny
that when exposed to the air it will in due time fer-
ment, and fermenting it will become possessed of in-
toxicating power? And will any sane man say that
it is not as much "the natural product of the vine"
after fermentation as before? Nay, is it not a fact
that if the fermentation be wholly and absolutely
prevented for all time, it is done by some means or de-
vice other than that which is "natural," in the very
true and strict sense of that word, and therefore
unnatural. It is one of the favourite devices of cer-
tain scholarly (?) writers and total abstinence lecturers
to represent fermentation as the work of the devil, or
at any rate, the work of man by his aid; when in
very truth the non-fermentation of the pure juice of
the grape, and the pure juice of other kinds of fruit
besides, is wholly the result of man's art; and fer-
mentation being nature's "natural" work, is in very
fact the work of God. The truth is that the "two
kinds of wine recognized in the Bible" are simply one
kind in two different stages—in both stages alike "the
natural fruit of the vine; in the first stage unfermented
and unintoxicating, in the second stage fermented and
intoxicating. Let me here use Mr. Tocque's own
words, and says, "With this clear distinction before
us we can understand the Bible, but otherwise we are
involved in confusion," and permit me to add, "in
the veriest childish folly." "With this clear distinc-
tion" we can understand the force and meaning of
the words of our Blessed Lord, "No man putteth
new wine (very new wine) into old bottles, else the
new wine will burst the bottles (because the swelling
and expanding nature of the fermenting new wine is
too great a strain upon these old bottles, made of
skins). No man also having drunk old wine straight-
way desireth new: for he saith the old is better."—
S. Luke v. 37-39. But if no fermentation takes place
at any time in one of the two kinds of wine we are
told about by the scholarly (?) writers, what is the
trouble between the "old bottles" and this unmoving
and placid "symbol of divine love" that it "will burst
the bottles?" "With the clear distinction" referred
to, and only under such conditions can we understand
how there might by any reasonable possibility be any-
thing objectionable or disreputable in being really
and truly a "winebibber," and how men might be
"drunken with new wine,"—S. Matt. xi. 19; Acts ii.
13-15.

Whatever may be done in these days to prevent fer-
mentation of the "pure juice of the grape" by sealing
it air tight in modern bottles; no such thing was or
probably could be done with bottles made of skins.
In the above view of the matter I venture to think
there is very little ground indeed for Mr. Tocque to
say "There is neither authority nor probability in
favour of the idea that the 'fruit of the vine' was
fermented." Would it not be well for all concerned
in this question to give all "scholarly writers" a
little "rest" except only in so far as their scholarly
attainments may in some way or other afford more or
less aid in demonstrating the truth of the particular
position or thing sought to be established; and except
of course where they themselves wish to use their
scholarly attainments in the same very desirable
manner instead of giving us, as they too often do, their
simple opinion, which after all may be either right or
wrong.

W. J. McCLARY