

real nourishment, and but little did he take. It was wonderful how erect he walked, but probably the swiftness of his motions aided him in balancing. A gentleman, and one of the civil authority, met him, and ordered him to leave town and take the shortest road to his parents; he dared not disobey, and his senses seemed to be in full vigor. At every town to which he came, he entered, and by dint of entirely obtained a drink. At one house, where a barn was in raising, the owner told me that Davidson drank nearly a pint of rum. At his lodging house, where naught but cider would be given, he drank, as was believed, not far from a half gallon, and could he have had his will, he might have died at the tap. On the following morning, he pursued his onward way to a house, where he begged for a horse to carry him home, as having a bilious fever, he was unable to walk; he was kindly furnished and mounted, when, as an additional favor, he would take a little gin to relieve his pain; this was brought to him in the form of sling nicely made. Having swallowed it, and being asked if it was agreeable, he replied it was very good, but clear gin would have relieved him sooner; a wine-glass of clear gin was then brought him, which followed the sling; then expressing his gratitude he rode on a distance of two or three miles, when a store seemed to offer him a resting place. How long he tarried is not known, but the horse slipping the bridle, made direct to his owner's barn. In the course of the day, a traveller upon the road discovered poor Davidson in a ditch: with much difficulty he was got into the waggon, and conveyed to the dwelling of his parents. For nearly two days he was as dead, save that he breathed. At the close of this period he revived, and was again himself. He vowed that he would never again take ardent spirits. He went to a neighboring place, where the past had not been known, and opened a school. This flourished, and he soon had a full complement of scholars; in another place he found a wife, whose father, however, was opposed to the connection, fearing the stability of his son-in-law. At the end of two years he became reconciled and gave his daughter her dower. This added to his own earnings induced him to suppose he might do better than by keeping school. He resolved to be a merchant, and as New York promised golden advantages, he proceeded thither, and opened a grocery store. How well he succeeded is not known, but in a year or two, he became ill, subject to a sort of fits, and to such a degree that relaxation from the cares of business was needful. He could now go to visit his parents and recruit. On board of the vessel, in which he had embarked, his sickness was so violent as to alarm the captain, who ordered a couple of his men to convey him in a boat to the nearest shore and to the first house, and to procure a physician. On landing, he was held up and led till within a little distance from the house, when, on inquiry, he cried, "I'm dying"—and sank from the grasp of the man to the ground, a corpse!—*Temp. Journal.*

Unintoxicating Wine in the Lord's Supper.

A BRIEF ILLUSTRATION OF THE EVIDENCE IN FAVOUR OF THE USE OF UNINTOXICATING WINE IN THE LORD'S SUPPER, WITH A REPLY TO SOME OBJECTIONS.—By Peter Mearns, Glasgow.

ARGUMENT.—The expression, "The Fruit of the Vine" is properly used of Unfermented Wine only.

6 10. That which the Sacramental cup contained is called "the fruit of the vine" by the inspired writers, and it receives from them no other name. The passages of the New Testament, which refer particularly to the institution of the Lord's Supper, are the following:—Matthew xxvi. 26—29; Mark xiv. 22—25; Luke xxii. 17, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23—26. There is not the slightest evidence in any of these passages that the wine was fermented, and we feel convinced that a plain man reading

these, and having nothing else to influence his judgment, would at once conclude that the pure juice of the grape was here intended. And a closer investigation of the subject will not invalidate, but strengthen our conviction of the correctness of this conclusion. It is remarkable that the term "wine" is not mentioned in any of those passages in our translation, neither does the Greek word, which corresponds to it in the New Testament, occur in any of these instances in the original. We deem it legitimate to infer from this circumstance that the use of *branded wines*, instead of the pure juice of the grape, in the ordinance of the Supper, is at least improper, if it does not amount to impiety, when the uncorrupted "fruit of the vine" can be easily obtained. And what shall we say of those vile compounds which are falsely called wine, and sold as such, and, of course, used at the Lord's Supper, but which are produced at home by a race of chemical operators, like those to whom Addison alludes, who "raised, under the streets of London, the choicest products of the hills and valleys of France," who could "squeeze Bourdeaux out of a sloe, and draw Champagne from an apple," and "turn a plantation of northern hedges into a vineyard." We are strongly of opinion that the expression, "the fruit of the vine," in the passages above quoted, refers to unfermented wine, in other words, to the unfermented juice of the grape, call it wine if you please.

1. The author of *Tivosh lo Yayin* (Div. xlvii. 8) has the following judicious remarks regarding the Sacramental cup and its contents:—"All that can be gathered concerning it is from the words addressed by Jesus to his disciples, on his presenting the *poterion*, in which he did not allude to its contents by any simple term which the Greek language possessed for wine. In fact, he did not address them in that tongue, nor was it likely that he did in Hebrew, which had long before ceased to be a spoken language, but most probably in the Chaldee, which was then the vernacular one of Palestine, with a great mixture of words originally Hebrew. Whether He used a single term, or, like the Greeks, a single phrase, cannot be ascertained; but the evangelists have all concurred in rendering the expression he did use by *γενεαμα τεας αμπελου*, 'the fruit of the vine.' Is it by any means impossible that it might have intended the juice of a bunch of grapes (grapes being literally the fruit of the vine) actually brought to the table, then and there squeezed for the occasion into a drinking vessel, or, perhaps, first into a crater, and mingled with water? This, of course, is merely a suggestion: it is much more difficult to pronounce what was intended than what was not."

2. Dr. Grindrod thus notices the expression, "the fruit of the vine."—"An expression which, undoubtedly, refers to the natural product of the grape, and not to any artificial product, the result either of man's ingenuity, or vegetable decomposition."

3. Dr. Adam Clarke (Disc. on the Nat. and Des. of the Eucharist, p. 59, ed. 1836) observes,—"It is of considerable consequence to ascertain what this cup contained. Wine is not specifically mentioned, but what is tantamount to it, namely, what our Lord terms 'the offspring or produce of the vine.' Though this was the true and proper wine, yet it was widely different from that medicated and sophisticated beverage which goes now under that name. The *yayin* of the Hebrews, the *oinos* of the Greeks, and the *vinum* of the ancient Romans, meant simply the 'expressed juice of the grape,' sometimes drunk immediately after it was expressed, while its natural sweetness remained, and then termed *mustum*; at other times, after fermentation, which process rendered it fit for keeping, without getting acid or unhealthful, then called *oinos* and *vinum*. By the ancient Hebrews, I believe, it was chiefly drunk in its first or simple state; hence, it was termed among them *peres haggaphen*, 'the fruit of the vine,' and by our Lord in the Synac, his vernacular language, 'the young, or son of the