

or working branches, and Nos. 10, 11, 12 are for distribution 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 meeting 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 represent 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 congregation 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 unadvisable.

1. There is no rubric whatever directing the congregation 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 Infant—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., together 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 cannot 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; whether 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 "scholarly" 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 whatever, and perfectly free from any spirit in the slightest degree intoxicating, is the quite correct and indispensable 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 proper administration of Holy Baptism, and it shall then have come to pass that Christianity is not for all *dimes* 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 candidate 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 Communion 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 prohibited 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 simply 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 abstinence 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 distinction 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 different to the extent of "unfermented" and "fermented," 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, synonymous 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 intoxicating." 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 than 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 intoxicating. 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 ferment, and fermenting it will become possessed of intoxicating 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 device 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 certain 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 fermentation 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 distinction" 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 straightway 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 anything 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 fermentation 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. McCLEARY

glend at any pe
ndid lot of men
them. Single
ing the founda
ostolic devotion
dear unto them.
row commenced
r of railway men
Church, but this
work which will
social 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

ANCE SOCIETY
R TORONTO.

made as to the
sation, 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. Magazines—
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