

TO SUBSCRIBERS

AS we are now approaching the end of the year, it becomes our duty to request our friends who are in arrears to pay up their subscriptions at once. ALL ARREARS MUST BE PAID UP TO THE END OF 1885, AT THE RATE OF \$2 PER ANNUM. If \$1 additional is sent the paper will be paid for up to the end of 1886. At this period a number are past due, we trust they will now be paid promptly, as well as the next year in advance. In remitting it would be highly desirable if each subscriber would make sufficient effort to send on in addition to his own subscription, one or more from his friends or neighbors; so that we may be able to double our subscription list, and thus be placed in the same position as we hope all our subscribers will be, in having a MERRY CHRISTMAS, AND A HAPPY AND PROSPEROUS NEW YEAR.

CHURCH THOUGHTS BY A LAYMAN.

COMMUNION WINE.

A CORRESPONDENT in a letter you published on the 19th Nov., asks: "Will you kindly give your readers your opinion of the theory held by some that our Saviour at the institution of the Eucharist used the unfermented juice of the grape?" The writer adds: "The Jews now use the unfermented article, and they say their people have always been as careful to exclude fermented liquor as leavened bread from this celebration."

We have pleasure in answering both the above question and assertion. In the first place we admit the difficulty of completely dispelling the groundless opinion that unfermented grape juice was used at the Passover, without such a thorough discussion of the subject as would involve a scholarly enquiry into Hebrew, Syriac and Greek terms, such as could only be understood by those familiar with ancient languages. Those of our readers who desire to see this topic treated with masterly force and clearness, would do well to consult the July number of the *American Church Review*, to which we are mainly indebted for the following. The whole question turns upon this point: "What was the fruit of the vine which our Lord used in instituting the Sacrament?" Now, if it could be shown that two kinds of grape juice, fermented and unfermented, were in use among the Jews, then it might be argued that possibly the unfermented kind was used at the founding of the Eucharist. Or, if it could be proved that the Mosaic legislation included the fermented juice of fruits in the prohibition of things leavened, then the question might be regarded as settled. *But not a particle of evidence exists in Jewish literature, sacred or profane, that there was any such preparation of grape juice even known, as unfermented wine.* The evidence also is complete that the juice of the grape in any condition, formed no part of the Mosaic prohibition. Let our readers turn to every passage where "leaven" and "leavened" occur, and they will find that the reference is to bread and to nothing else. Those passages are: Ex. xii. 15, 39, xiii. 3, 7, xxiii. 18, xxxiv. 25; Levit. ii. 11, vi. 10, vii. 13, xxiii. 18; Deut. xvi. 3; Amos iv. 5. The meaning of "leaven"

is *sour*; but the Eastern wines are not sour, but sweet and pleasant; the sourness implied by "leaven," if used as regards wine, would involve its being twice fermented, first as wine, then as vinegar. The use of wine did not form a part of the Paschal feast instituted by Divine command, it was grafted on to that ceremony, on the general principle that it should be a time for rejoicing. The poorest were required to drink four cups of wine at the Passover. The wine was mixed with water, as otherwise its strength would have led to abuses of the feast. It is absurd to suppose that a sort of diluted treacle syrup would be used to promote convivial rejoicing at a great feast! It is childish to tell us that such stuff as that needed to be diluted with water! It is also pure nonsense to speak of an unfermented wine—mere grape juice—being used in the Spring, six months after the grapes were gathered. It was also required by the Talmud that the Passover wine should be "red wine," the very redness being a proof of fermentation. The argument that because the process of making wine involved a chemical process akin to leavening, therefore wine could not be used at the Passover, is also proved to be foolish by the fact that the use of *vinegar*, or wine twice fermented, formed part of the ritual of that ceremony. Dr. Moore, in the *Presbyterian Review* for January, 1882, gave abundant proofs that *Passover wine was always true wine*, that is fermented grape juice. The very notion of unfermented wine is an invention of the last few years. The word used for wine in the Bible invariably means wine—that is a fermented liquor. In every lexicon the word wine is explained to mean fermented grape juice. The whole dispute is treated by scholars as contemptible. No such controversy would have arisen but for the chance it gave owing to the market opened by the teetotal agitation, to a few charlatans who have made this chance a means of gain and notoriety. No such chance would have been given but for the practice on this continent of allowing unlearned men to wear the titles of D.D., by which they impose upon the ignorant.

We give a few of the authoritative testimonies published by the *Presbyterian Review*. Dr. Delitzsch of Leipsig, a Hebrew scholar of the highest rank says: "The wine of the Passover has at all times been fermented wine mixed with water." Professor Palotta, of Vienna, a Hebrew of high standing writes: "No strict Jew drinks any other than fermented wine at the Passover. Among thousands of bottles used at Vienna every year, for Passover use, there never has been one of unfermented juice." The Rev. D. Edward, of Breslau, a scholar and witness of much repute says: "In all my intercourse with Jews for nearly forty years, and in all my acquaintance with their literature, I never met with an allusion to unfermented wine at their feasts." The Rabbis of the Jewish Theological Seminary at Breslau write: "Unfermented wine is not wine, it would not suffice to fulfil the duty of drinking wine at the Passover." The Rev. I. H. Bruehl of the Jewish Institution, London, writes: "I do not know of any unfermented wine. Not vinous, but farinaceous

fermentation was prohibited." Dr. Wise, editor of the *American Israelite*, states: "At the Passover, wine—fermented wine and not mere grape juice, has been at all times and is still in use." Dr. Gottheil, Rabbi of the Emmanuel Temple, New York, says: "It is the rule to use fermented wine at the Passover." He adds: "Paschal wine is fermented grape juice." This distinguished Rabbi declares that having a large acquaintance with Hebrews in many lands, he never heard the question raised as to whether Passover wine was fermented or not, the rule is and ever has been, he affirms, that fermented wine is used at that feast.

The language of St. Paul shows that fermented wine was used by that Apostle in company with the early Church, for he rebukes some for taking wine at the Eucharist to excess. Every translation of the Bible gives the word used by St. Paul as meaning "drunken." The Review we have used so freely, quotes in proof of this a large number of versions in many languages.

Beyond all this we learn from the earliest records, that the primitive Church uniformly used wine and water at the Holy Supper, precisely as the Jews used to mix water with Passover wine to avoid occasion of abuse. There were some in early times who refused to drink wine at the Sacrament, but they also refused to eat flesh food and avoided marriage. Their imitators in one matter should be more faithful to their copy! But their abstention proves that in the second century fermented wine was used at the Eucharist, for these people would not have rejected a sort of treacle syrup and water which some novelty hunters fancy ought to be drunk at the Lord's supper.

The attempt to prove that the wine used by our Lord at the institution of the Eucharist was not wine, but the unfermented juice of grapes, is laughed at by scholars; or condemned, as it is by most, in the severest terms as a scandalously dishonest twisting, and perverting of Scripture and literature for the mere money making objects of professional advocates of modern theories. The author whose work we have used says truly: "All attempts to press the oracles of revealed truth into the support of theories utterly antagonistic to truth, can never receive God's blessing. A temporary triumph for some particular notion or hobby may be obtained, but the permanent result will be disaster." We regard those who are now endeavoring to force meanings into the Bible in favor of using mere syrup instead of wine at the Eucharist,—meanings which are opposed to scholarly interpretations and history—as far more dangerous enemies to revealed truth than open scoffers.

ON APPEALS FOR AID IN CHURCH WORK.

VERY frequently in our columns, as well as by printed circulars, have appeals for aid been made to us for some good Christian purpose or other in town or country. It is well to know that our brethren somewhere are engaged in ventures of faith in stirring up enter-