

mode in which many of the ancient wines were used merely to mix with water, and not as a drink by themselves." This certainly does not accord with Mr. Perkins' statement, neither does it in my humble judgment, correspond with the general customs of the ancients or moderns. For while I admit this "mode" might have been the practice to some extent, it formed the exception to the general rule, and we cannot gather from sacred or profane history that this was by any means the common custom. That the case of Persia is analogous to Palestine, and that the Jews had two distinct preparations of the juice of the grape there can be no doubt. If so, enquires Mr. Dougall, what were they called? That the fermented juice of the grape is called wine, both in ancient times, and at the present day admits of no question. And in regard to the term used to distinguish the latter, I must refer Mr. D. to the learned commentators. Says Dr. Gettess, "In my version" (Gen. xiii. 11) "I have rendered the Hebrew word *debesh*, palm honey after Bochart and Celecius. I am now convinced it is the inspissate juice of the grape, still called at Aleppo by the same name, *dihs*. It has much the appearance of coarse honey, but it is of finer consistence. It is much used by the inhabitants of Aleppo. It is brought to town in great goat skins, and retailed in small quantities at the Bazaars." Rosenmuller also speaks of a "resin honey, or syrups made from grapes."

We thus have "two distinct preparations" of the grape—one by fermentation, and in the other the process is arrested by reducing the juice by boiling to a thick syrup, used as honey or molasses with us.

Our Saviour, in speaking of the symbols of his blood, uses the term, "fruit of the vine." If we take this literally, we should understand the grape itself. But that it is a figurative expression, referring to wine, we may gather from the practice of all churches since the time of our Saviour, and moreover, that it was in general use at the time. Perhaps, however, the paraphrase of "Anti-Bacchus," (a text book for ultra teetotalers,) is appropriate: "Now we drink *passum* wine, made by pouring water upon dried grapes; then we shall drink virgin wine, the blood of the grapes of Paradise, the nectar of heaven"!!!

Allusion is made to the time of the substitution of the Lord's Supper being at the Passover, as evidence that there could have been no leaven in the wine.

Every one is aware that the juice of the grape, as well as the bread, was prepared expressly for the Passover, and because neither contained leaven, are we to suppose they were in common use? nor have we any right to suppose they were such as our Lord used, or that He would have retained anything pertaining to Jewish ceremonies in the institution of the Supper. If so, why do not the friends of this "new measure" display the same sensitiveness in regard to the bread?

Your correspondent desires one good argument from Scripture in favour of the present practice. For this I need only refer to the institution of the Supper by our Saviour himself, and here I suppose we shall differ in regard to the term "Fruit of the Vine." This, as I before stated, has been regarded by the church, since the time of our Saviour, as a figurative expression; of course we cannot suppose our Saviour to have used the adulterated wines of the present day. But if the same effort and care is exercised to procure a pure and wholesome wine, as is made to obtain syrup of grapes, there is no doubt all "difficulties," would be obviated. In conclusion, (and I fear I have trespassed upon your space and patience,) while I am not surprised that Mr. Dougall should prefer the syrup to the wine of grapes, and that he should be desirous for a change, I must say I was not prepared to see the "cup of the Lord," the symbol of his blood shed for sinners, that which Scripture pronounces as a "cup of blessings" around which such sacred associations cluster in the mind of every Christian, designated as an "intoxicating cup," and can only regard it as a "gratuitous and uncharitable charge brought," not only "against those whose desire is to exalt the authority of Scripture above that of tradition and custom," but against the institution itself. I cannot bring myself to believe that the cup of the Lord ever has or can be an "intoxicating cup," to any Christian who in sincerity partakes of it.

Yours respectfully,

A SUBSCRIBER.

June 6, 1844.

The following reply, which has been slightly modified, was declined by the Editor of the *Harbinger*, who stated that he had fully met the claims of Editorial equity and courtesy, and ad-

vised the transference of the correspondence to the *Temperance Advocate* :—

NO. 4.—TO THE EDITOR OF THE HARBINGER.

DEAR SIR,—I ventured to request one good argument from Scripture in support of the present practice of using fermented wine at the Lord's Supper, and your "Subscriber" refers me to the institution of that ordinance, and the words, "fruit of the vine," used on the occasion as the good argument required.

It is indeed apparently with some misgivings that he brings forward this admirable specimen of what has been called begging the question, for he supposes beforehand that we will differ as to the meaning of the term "fruit of the vine," a supposition which does credit to his penetration, wherefore he fortifies his view by adding that all churches from the time of our Saviour have understood the "fruit of the vine" to be a figurative expression for wine, i. e., according to Subscriber, fermented wine, for he maintains that nothing else was or ought to be called wine. Now I would admit this to be an exceedingly strong corroboration of Subscriber's opinion were it true, but where are the evidences? Subscriber ought to have them, for he makes the assertion without qualification, and I trust he will, for the credit of the side he espouses bring them forward.

The answer to my other question respecting the Scriptural designation of inspissated grape juice is not more satisfactory; only one instance being given, in which this article admitted to have been in common use is supposed to be named, and that in the book of Genesis, whilst the question at issue has reference chiefly to the New Testament.

I stated that very many ancient wines were used mixed with water, and not used as a drink by themselves, which Subscriber says does not in his judgment correspond with the customs of ancients or moderns. I will not quote Anti-Bacchus in opposition to Subscriber's judgement, as he seems disposed to underdate any thing from that quarter, although I think it might be well to examine nearer home before pulling the mote out of the eye of the learned author of that admirable work: but the following extracts from, I apprehend, unexceptionable authorities, appear to me rather to outweigh the evidence derivable from Subscriber's opinion. In Porter's Grecian Antiquities we find it thus written:—"The wine was generally mixed with water. There was no certain proportion observed in this mixture; some to one vessel of wine poured in two of water, some to two of wine mixed five of water; others, more or less, as they pleased." Vol. ii. p. 359, 360. In like manner in Adam's Roman Antiquities we find, "In order to make the wine keep, they used to boil the must down to one half, when it was called *Defrutum*. to one third, *Sapa*." "The wine was mixed with water in a large vase or bowl, called *crater*, whence it was poured into cups."—p. 441, 442.

It is here to be observed that the boiled preparation of the juice of the grape, which certain American writers of the *New York Observer* school (whose views Subscriber seems to have imbibed) delight to call syrup, and which they broadly assert was never called wine, is by the preceding highly respectable authorities called wine without hesitation, and that, be it remembered, before there were any temperance societies or controversy on the subject. Similar instances might be greatly multiplied. Now, I need not add that boiling is the way to prevent fermentation, or if fermentation had taken place, to drive off the alcohol; and that instead of boiling wines to preserve them, the custom of the present day is to add brandy, shewing a radical difference between most of the ancient wines and those now used.

Subscriber appears to admit that the Jews would not use fermented wine at the Passover, for he does not try to answer the argument on this head, but endeavours to escape its force in the following original manner:—"Nor are we to suppose," says he, "that they (the bread and cup used at the Passover) were such as our Lord used, or that he would have retained any thing peculiar to Jewish customs in the institution of the Supper." If we are not to suppose this, we must suppose that the Lord caused the unfermented bread and wine used at the Passover to be taken away, and those which were fermented to be brought in for the Supper, which would certainly in the absence of any evidence, be rather a stretch of imagination; besides, it is expressly said that after Supper he took the cup—not another cup. To ask why we do not equally object to leavened bread as to fermented wine, is quite foreign to the question. If there were as much intoxicating poison in the bread as in the wine, and if by taking it we gave as much sanction to deadly and desolating customs, and put a stumbling block in the way of brethren who had for-