

THE
REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN.

VOL. XIII.

JANUARY, 1850.

No. XI.

THE WESTMINSTER FORMULAS OF DOCTRINE, WORSHIP AND
GOVERNMENT:

THEIR VALIDITY AND OBLIGATION IN THE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

BY REV. JAS. CHRYSTIE.

Controversy is eminently diffusive and rarely terminates at the point at which it commences, or remains satisfied with its claims in the outset. It spreads, not always like oil imparting lustre and durability, but like fire, hurtful to the sight and destructive in its progress. The deacon question, very indefinite in its form from the beginning, and even yet scarcely capable of being accurately ascertained, has brought up some new issues which are calculated to disturb the very foundations of our ecclesiastical order and render it doubtful in what position we stand as it regards our subordinate standards. Among the matters which have become involved in disputation is one which is comprehended in the following words in our terms of ecclesiastical fellowship, Article 3: "An acknowledgment of the divine right of one unalterable form of church government and manner of worship—and that these are, for substance, justly exhibited in that Form of Church Government and the Directory for Worship agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, *as they were received by the Church of Scotland.*"

While there are other things in this article which have been brought into dispute, the particular matter contained in the words which are in italics, is one of equal interest at least, to any other. Whatever may be the character of the documents themselves—the form of Church Government and the Directory for Worship—the manner in which they were received by the Church of Scotland is very naturally and reasonably supposed to determine the degree and nature of their authority with us.

footsteps of the flock and our martyred fathers who bore testimony against all unholy and dangerous innovations both in church and state.

In conclusion, I would humbly ask every member of our church to reflect on what are the advantages our church has derived from this great, *so called*, reformation. What are these advantages? How much more brotherly love, piety and grace in exercise are found amongst us, than before its introduction? Has it increased our influence in maintaining and spreading our testimony? Or, is it every day more and more, making us and our church a proverb and a bye-word amongst those around us. For my part, I forbear to answer these questions. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

A LAYMAN.

(The Covenanter will please copy.)

SHOULD FERMENTED WINE BE USED IN THE LORD'S SUPPER.

We cheerfully give place to the following article, hoping that, coming from the quarter it does, it may tend to check the introduction of another element of discord into our church. We know that the view opposed by the respected author is held, and has been publicly advanced, by more than one of the esteemed brethren who have been active in introducing, and urgent in pressing some of the subjects, the agitation of which has so greatly marred the peace of our Zion, alienated the affections of brethren, and weakened the mutual confidence that formerly prevailed. We dread the addition of other topics of controversy to those already existing, believing that the fruits will be bitter.—ED.

A few years ago, Covenanters would have thought the above question ridiculous. But I lately heard one of our ministers endeavor to prove the negative; as I thought his reasoning fallacious, I propose to prove the affirmative.

1. The Hebrew word which we translate wine, when not qualified by some adjective, *always* in scripture means *fermented* wine. There is no exception. In Judges ix. 13, and Psalm civ. 15, wine is said to cheer the heart, but *must* has no such tendency.

2. The New Covenant blessings which are conveyed to believers in the Lord's Supper are represented by fermented wine, Prov. ix. 2, Is. xxv. 6. It is alleged that the phrase "*wines on the lees well refined*," no more proves that we should use fermented wine in the Supper, than the phrase "*fat things full of marrow*" proves that we should use marrow and fat. The reply is easy. Simply considered by itself, it proves nothing; but taken in connection

with Christ's example, it is conclusive; for, certainly, had Christ used marrow and fat in the sacrament, we should do the same. He used wine, but not marrow and fat, and therefore, so do we.

3. Christ used the *fruit of the vine—the juice of the grape*, for they could not drink the grapes themselves.

4. When the apostle reproveth the Corinthians for their abuse of the Lord's Supper, he says, one is hungry and another is *drunken*, 1 Cor. xi. 21. From this it is evident that the Corinthians used fermented wine. For the use of this the apostle does not reprove them; but for its abuse. We must certainly believe, that if they had used the wrong sort of wine, he would have told them so; but he does not so much as hint any such thing. My brother was so sensible of the force of this argument, that he alleged the word was not properly translated. He said, it was derived from the word that in Ps. xxxvi. 8, is translated *abundantly satisfied*. Now I do not think that the Greek word used by the apostle is derived from any Hebrew root; but it is the word by which the Septuagint renders the word in Ps. xxxvi. 8. It may be questioned, however, whether it be a happy translation, as it would be rather unusual to be drunk with fatness. The truth of the matter is this: of the two Greek verbs *methuo* and *methusko*, the first is neuter, and signifies, I am drunk; the second, active, I make drunk; they are so nearly allied that both are the same in the future tense active. Both are derived from *methu*, wine. I have examined all the passages in the New Testament, where drunk, drunken, drunkenness and drunkard occur, and find they are all derived from one or other of these verbs. I conclude, therefore, that our translation is correct, and that the Greek word in 1 Cor. xi. 21, (*methuei*,) means drunk with wine, and not surfeited with meat. The argument then remains in its full force, viz: The Corinthians used wine which caused drunkenness; the apostle does not reprove them for drinking such wine, but only for drinking to excess. From this we learn what sort of wine the apostolic churches used in the sacrament, viz: fermented.

5. We are commanded to go forth by the footsteps of the flock, Song i. 8, and to follow them who through faith and patience inherit the promises. Now it cannot be disputed that from the earliest times of Christianity, the Church has used fermented wine in the Lord's Supper.

Let us now consider some of the objections offered against our view of the subject.

1. It is alleged, that it is wrong to use alcohol, unless for a medicine. Ans. This is begging the question. *That* is the point to be proved. This would exclude the use of *must*, as well as wine; for it contains the alcoholic principle, and it needs only to come in contact with the atmosphere, to produce fermentation. This principle is recognised in Num. vi. 3, where the Nazarite is

forbidden even to eat grapes, green or dried, or to drink anything that cometh of the vine.

2. It is said that the Jews use *must* at the passover. Ans. With the practice of the modern Jews I have no concern.

3. It is alleged that the wine used in the passover by the ancient Israelites, must have been unfermented, because there was to be no leaven in their houses at that time. Ans. 1st. We have no evidence that the Israelites in early times used wine at the passover at all. There is no mention of it in the original institution, so that all reasoning from the passover is perfectly nugatory. 2nd. There is no command against using material leaven in the Lord's Supper. 3d. At the same time that leaven was prohibited in the offerings of God, wine was commanded. In the holy place shalt thou cause the *strong wine* to be poured unto the Lord for a drink-offering. Num. xxviii. 7. What sad work was this! that wine, containing leaven and alcohol, and what not, should have been offered to God!

4. It is alleged by some that when Christ is speaking of the *fruit of the vine*, he alludes to grapes lying on the table, out of which they pressed the wine into the cup. Fresh grapes in the beginning of April! I had thought the Jews put their grapes into a press to extract the juice. We read in Gen. xl. 11, of a man that saw this in a dream; but dreams are not always according to what takes place in real life. Perhaps, the thought was a wicked one, but I could not forbear thinking, that the man must be dreaming who could picture to himself the Redeemer and his disciples pressing the juice out of the grapes into the cup at the sacramental table.

But to settle this matter definitely, viz: whether it be lawful to use fermented wine, let us examine Luke v. 36. That the passage may be intelligible to common readers the following observations may be useful:

A gentleman, who had been recently in Judea, told me that the inhabitants cut out a certain extent of the rock for a wine press, and now, as formerly, tread the grapes with their feet. Their bottles are made thus:—having killed a goat, they strip off the skin; with the hair inward, they fill it with sand, to keep it from shrinking; when it is thoroughly dried, they fill it with the new wine, or *must*, and in these bottles carry it to Smyrna, where it is put into vats to be fermented. What they use at home is fermented in the skin bottles. It appears that anciently they hung the bottles in the smoke, to accelerate the fermentation. Ps. cxix. 83. So we see, that till this day, they put new wine into new bottles that can bear the fermentation.

It will be said by some, that Christ alludes to the Jews' custom of fermenting their wine, without either approving or condemning

the practice. Not so. He cites it as a vindication of his own conduct; and thus has given it his most decided approbation.

The speaker to whom I allude, gave it as his opinion, that *must* would be better suited to the design of the Lord's Supper than old wine. As I never tasted *must*, I do not pretend to be a connoisseur in this matter; but He who makes the wine, and who, when he was on earth used it, has said "the old is better." In short, I do not pretend to be wiser or holier than the Head of the church, or than the flock that has gone before us. "Remember them—who have spoken to you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation." Heb. xiii. 7. W. S.

OBITUARY OF THOMAS BLACK.

The subject of this notice was a native of Ireland. From his youth he was an esteemed and highly respected member of the Reformed Presbyterian congregation near Coleraine, now under the pastorate of the Rev. Samuel Carlyle. He was well known among his brethren at home; known to be honored and respected for his sincere, devoted but unaffected piety. He emigrated to this country in the year 1848, and on the 14th of September, 1849, a few weeks less than one year after his arrival, his death occurred.

On his arrival in Philadelphia, he was beguiled into another ecclesiastical connexion. Not being very accurately versed in the local history of the church in this land, he was induced by specious representations to connect himself with the New Light Covenanters. But a short time elapsed till his mistake was discovered. Though placed in the most delicate and trying circumstances, his resolution was invincible. He applied and was received into the membership of the 2nd Reformed Presbyterian congregation. During his last illness he recurred with satisfaction to the divine mercy and care in watching over and bringing him back from his wanderings. "What," said he, "could I have said, if my master had come and found me gleaning in another field."

It has seldom been the privilege of the writer to cultivate the acquaintance of a more mature christian than Thomas Black. His attainments in grace were much above the standard of ordinary christians. His mind was well balanced, and as might be expected, his piety was distinguished by the uniformity and evenness of its character. Humility, meekness and patience were its leading traits. The inoffensiveness of his spirit under injury was remarkable. On one occasion when the accuser of the brethren assailed him, through those of whom better things might have been expected, he meekly replied, "that it was all from God," and intimated that