

# *Harper-Trail Discussion*

A Reprint from the file of  
"The Truth" 1933

Published by  
M. Lynnwood Smith Publications  
Route One, Box 151      Wesson, Miss. 39191

—INTRODUCTION—

This debate on the "Wine" question appeared in THE TRUTH, then published by brother H. C. Harper, in the year 1933. Brother Trail was born in DeKalb county, Tennessee, on February 23, 1860. At this time he was living in McMinnville, Tennessee. He graduated from the Medical Department of the University of Tennessee. He departed this life January 19, 1936.

Brother Harper was born at Schonnahon, Illinois, October 24, 1874. He graduated from Berta Mimms High School in Minnesota; attended Silver City, New Mexico, Normal; Norman School, Madison, Florida and the University of Florida. He taught school for twenty five years, including the University of Florida. His preaching carried him over much of the United States. He was a writer and publisher of outstanding worth. He passed away at his home in Sneads, Florida, December 1, 1936.

It is a great joy to give this debate back to the readers in booklet form. Though the years have come and gone this issue remains the same and, of course, the Truth has not changed. I send forth with hopes that it will do good and help clear up much of the error now taught on this subject.

M. Lynnwood Smith  
Route One, Box 151  
Wesson, Mississippi, 39191

# HARPER-TRAIL DISCUSSION

Proposition I: It is Scriptural to use **grape juice** as the drink element in the communion. H. C. Harper affirms; Dr. A. J. Trail denies.

Proposition II: It is Scriptural to use **fermented grape wine** as the drink element in the communion. Dr. A. J. Trail affirms; H. C. Harper denies.

## FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Terms of proposition: *Scriptural*, that which comports with the teaching of the Scriptures. *Grape juice*, the drink element produced by the grape vine. *The drink element*, the liquid to be drunk in the communion. *The communion*, the institution set forth in I Cor. 10:16, 17, I Cor. 11:23-34; Mt. 26:26-29; Mk. 14:22-25, and Lk. 22:17-20.

The original language setting forth this drink is: "*tou gennematos tes ampelou*," which the King James version renders, "the fruit of the vine."

*Tes*, the, before *ampelou*, vine, denotes a species of vine; and the species here indicated is the *grape* vine, designated in Scripture as "the vine," Gen. 49:11; Mal. 3:11; John 15:5, *et al.*

*Gennema* (*gennematos*, *gen.*), rendered "fruit" here, is a *drink*. It is defined: a. *the offspring, progeny, of men and animals.* b. *the fruits of the earth, products of agriculture, tes ampelou* (of the vine), Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.

This brings us face to face, as the lexicographer points out, with the very Scriptures of our proposition, setting forth and defining the drink element used in the communion, the thing produced by the vine, which was the thing they drank.

The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine was the drink element used in the communion, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.

Grape juice is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine. (by definition.)

Therefore, grape juice was the drink element used in the communion.

H. C. HARPER.

## FIRST NEGATIVE

In accepting Bro. Harper's propositions which he sent me for discussion I told him that I believed the

first proposition should read, It is Scriptural to use unfermented juice of the grape in the communion. But most people understand that grape juice means the unfermented product and grape wine means the fermented product. I also told him that if he would refer me to the Scripture that authorized the use of unfermented juice of the grape in the communion, I would be glad to acknowledge my appreciation and gratitude for what he had done for me.

I like Bro. Harper's first effort to prove his proposition. He seems to want to be pointed and to use as few words as possible to prove his point, but I cannot accept his article as the truth on the subject and will have to give my reasons for not accepting. I agree with Bro. Harper that *gennema* in the original is properly rendered product but I cannot agree with him when he said, "Therefore grape juice was the drink element used in the communion."

I saw a woman working up some grapes not long ago. She bruised the grapes, rubbed them through a colander and separated the seeds and the hulls from the pulp and the pulp was thin enough to drink for I drank some of it. She canned some of this for making pies. She then had three distinct products of the grape, the hulls, the seeds and the thin mixture of the pulp. Then she separated some of the pulp from the juice. She made marmalade of this pulp and canned the juice. She then put a small amount of juice in a jar to ferment and make wine. Now she has three more products of the grape, the marmalade, the canned juice and the wine, making six distinct products of the grape.

The Savior said, "This fruit (product) of the vine." Now Bro. Harper will you please refer me to the Scripture that tells which one of these products the Savior took out of the passover, in the night in which he was betrayed, and said, "This is my blood."

Bro. Harper, will you please tell me how I may know that the product that was in that cup that the Savior referred to when he said, "This is my blood of the covenant." was grape juice, unfermented?

Incidentally will you, if you have time, please tell me how I may know that the vine referred to by the Savior was the grape vine?

A. J. TRAIL.

## SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

If the Doctor will deny that *grape juice*, the fruit (*gennema*), offspring, product, of "the vine," is an *unfermented product*, I will submit an analysis by a competent physicist in proof that it is.

He says he agrees with me "that *gennema* in the original is properly rendered product," but can not agree with me when I say, "Therefore, grape juice was the drink element used in the communion."

But logically he admits this, my conclusion, when he admits my premises whether he says so or not. Here is my major premise:

"The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine was the drink element used in the communion, as set forth in the Scriptures." Will he deny this? He has not done so.

My minor premise is: "Grape juice is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine." Will he deny this? He has not done so. Hence his talk about not admitting my conclusion is simply jejune.

He asks how I know "the vine" was the grape vine. I said, "Yes, the, before *ampelou*, vine, denotes a species of vine; and the species here indicated is the *grape vine*, denoted in Scripture as 'the vine,' Gen. 49:11; Mal. 3:11; John 15:5, et al." Will he deny this? He has not done so.

Moreover, I pointed out the fact that "the fruit of the vine" here denotes a *drink*. Will he deny it? He has not done so. Hence it does not denote "pulp" nor "seeds" nor "hulls". And this is not all that it does not denote.

She "canned the juice."

Question: Was what she canned "the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine"?

Question: Was what she canned *fermented*?

You "drank some of it." Question: In so doing did you drink "the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine"?

She then put a small amount of the juice into a jar to ferment and make wine." And did she get this *fermented* wine as Aaron said he got his *calf*? (Ex. 32:24) Or did she do something else in making this *fermented* wine, as Aaron actually did in getting that *calf*? (Ex. 32:4) Give us the details. Tell us what is now in it that was not in it when it came as a *product* of the vine that makes it *fermented* wine now.

Yes, tell us what produced those things, seeing that they are not products of *the vine*. *The vine* produced what the lady canned. Dare you deny it?

We know what drink the Savior used in the communion just as we know how to baptize—by the meaning of the language used by the inspired penman to set forth these things. The Savior referred to the one he named, and the one he named is the drink produced by *the vine*. You admit that the *fermented* drink was not made by *the vine*, for she took what *the vine* made and

"set it away to ferment and make wine."

Please answer my questions, and refute my syllogism if you can. Since this argument sustains my proposition, it is useless to submit others.

H. C. HARPER.

## SECOND NEGATIVE

I do not want to deny that *grape juice* is an unfermented product of the vine. I said plainly that the woman had six distinct products of the vine and named *grape juice* as a product of the vine.

I still say I cannot agree with Bro. Harper when he says therefore *grape juice* was the drink element used in the communion.

It seems to me that there is lots of "jejune" in Bro. Harper's second affirmative. Let us do a little of Bro. Harper's reasoning and see how even Bro. Harper will take it.

When sap is rising in vegetation, in the spring, cut a *grape vine* and this sap will flow freely. A brother told me yesterday that he had caught as much as a half gallon from one vine in a day. Now this is the product of the vine. Nothing else could produce this same sap but the *grape vine*. This product is a liquid and can be drunk.

Now hear Bro. Harper's logic. This is a product of the vine. "The product of the vine was the drink element used in the communion as set forth in the Scriptures." Therefore this sap is the drink element used in the communion.

Now Bro. Harper, you say; that I admit that the fermented drink was not made by the vine. I deny this statement. I do not admit any such thing. You want to know what was done to that that was made wine. It was simply poured into a jar and let run its natural course and it made wine. Aaron's calf was made by heating it. This *grape juice* was preserved in this state by heating it and canning. There has to be something done by human beings to keep it from running its natural course and becoming wine. The Savior had some water poured into a jar and it came out the best of wine (*oinos*). This *grape juice* was poured into a jar and it came out wine. Now Bro. Harper, which process is more like the Savior and which is more like Aaron's calf? Bro. Harper, you started this! I did not.

An inspired man said, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto

all good works." If Bro. Harper will refer me to the Scripture that authorizes the use of grape juice in the communion, I will be glad to acknowledge my mistake. He talks like he has other arguments. If he has, he ought to come with them for such arguments as he has been using will never convince any thinking person that grape juice was the drink element used in the communion. So Bro. Harper give us the Scripture that authorizes the use of grape juice in the communion. I want the reader to notice how he answered the question, how may we know that the vine referred to by the Savior was the grape vine? I think I will have a use for it later. Get down to business and tell where to find the Scripture that authorizes the use of grape juice in the communion, and we will publish it so every one can read it.

The reader will realize that Bro. Harper's saying a thing is "jejune" does not make it so anymore than his saying grape juice was the drink element used in the communion makes it so.

A. J. TRAIL.

### THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

The Doctor will not deny that *grape juice* is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine, and is unfermented. Here it is—

1. The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine was the drink element used in the communion, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.

2. Grape juice is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine. (by definition.)

3. Therefore, grape juice was the drink element used in the communion.

Hence, if his saying that he does not admit my conclusion when he admits my premises, is not "jejune" (language that does not refute the argument) what is it? It amounts to nothing in the face of his admission.

This argument, unrefuted, proves my proposition. But I shall give him another chance. He still has left the smoke and the ashes of the vine.

His "sap" will not stand the test. The standard lexicon, in defining *gennema*, says: "b. the fruits of the earth, products of agriculture, *tes ampelou* (of the vine), Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18."

I have called his attention every time to the fact that the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine of these Scriptures denotes a *drink*. With his "sap" he is simply grabbing at straws. Now see—

1. The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine is a *drink*, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.

2. "This sap" is not a *drink*, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.

3. Therefore, "this sap" is not the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18. (Neither are: hulls, seeds, pulp.)

He said she "canned the juice." And he admitted the vine made this juice. Again he said, "She then put a small amount of the juice in a jar to ferment and make wine." Then this fermented wine was not made by the vine, else it would have been fermented wine when she "canned the juice." This he can not refute even if he does not admit it. He can not refute physical facts. He now says, "It was simply poured into a jar and let run its natural course and it made wine." Forsooth! Again he says, "This grape juice was poured into a jar and came out wine."

And Aaron said, "I cast it into the fire, and there came out this calf." (Ex. 32:24) And now the Doctor says, "It made wine." Yes, "fermented wine." Yes, "it" did. But what was "it"? Surely not "the vine," for the vine has no connection with the contents of the "jar" now. Yes, we want him to tell us what "it" is that made wine, "fermented wine." And we do not want him to fail to answer this.

As a matter of fact Aaron "fashioned it" (the calf). (Gen. 32:4) And as a matter of fact, "Right here is where man steps in and stops the process of nature." "Nature never prepares an alcoholic drink." (J. A. Culler, Ph.D., Professor of Physics.)

No; you "started this." You showed that it was not "fermented wine" when she "canned the juice" which the vine made. This was still to be made wine. And you say, "It made wine." Now tell us what "it" is. Is "it" a *hoecus-pocus* of an indefinite "it"? Or is this making of fermented wine done by a well-known process and a well-defined agency?

Yes; the Savior performed a miracle: turned water into wine. And "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage." (Bagster Bible, Christian Life Edition.)

I'll try to be with you when you get to those Scriptures that point out the *grape* vine as "the vine." to see that you keep the record straight. I have repeatedly cited you to the Scriptures that authorize grape juice as the drink element in the communion. And you have admitted the proof in admitting the premises. You now have more "business" than you can dispose of in this syllogism. This is not a case of "Harper's saying a thing"—it is an argument unrefuted. Let others do

their own judging. It seems you are not "convinced" neither can you refute the argument.

H. C. HARPER.

### THIRD NEGATIVE

No, I will not deny that grape juice is the product of the vine. I will not deny that the juice pressed out of the green leaves of the grape vine is the product of the vine, nor will I deny that the sap is the product of the vine. And I do not believe that Bro. Harper will deny it. Surely not.

I do not believe that it is necessary to say *gennema tes ampelou* every time we want to say product of the vine. I believe people will now know that we are talking about the product of the vine.

But Bro. Harper does not believe that sap of the vine is the drink set forth in the Scriptures Mat. 26:29 etc. I do not believe it either. I was only trying, in as mild a way as I could, to show Bro. Harper what a ridiculous argument he was making with his major and minor premises and his syllogism. But you believe that sap of the grape vine was the drink element used in the communion just as strongly as I believe that grape juice, unfermented, was the drink element used in the communion.

Listen again to some of Bro. Harper's reasoning: "The product of the vine is a drink as set forth in the Scriptures, Mat. 26:29, etc. 2. This sap is not a drink as set forth in the Scriptures, Mat. 26:29, etc. 3. Therefore this sap is not the product of the vine as set forth in the Scriptures, Mat. 26:29." Now let us put the words grape juice in place of sap and the conclusion will be the same. I do not believe that grape juice is the product of the vine as set forth in Mat. 26:29. The Greek word before product is *touto* (this), hence we have this product of the vine; showing that the Savior meant to specify a certain product of the vine, and in this little discussion, we are trying to find which product of the vine the Savior referred to when he said, "This product of the vine." I am denying that grape juice is the product of the vine as set forth in Mat. 26:2. Bro. Harper is affirming that grape juice is the drink element used in the communion as set forth in the Scriptures Mat. 26:29, but Bro. Harper has not referred us to a passage of Scripture that even touched on the subject. Bro. Harper has assumed the very thing that he is to prove. Who would have thought that Bro. Harper would have done a thing like that?

Bro. Harper is denying already that wine is the product of the vine and seems to want me to affirm that it is the product of the vine before my time to affirm.

It is my time to deny now and your time to affirm. When you get through with your affirmative you will have plenty of time to deny. So get busy now and point us to the Scripture that says Christ or the inspired apostles used or commanded to be used grape juice in the communion and I will never go into the affirmative but will spend my time in trying to correct my mistake.

A. J. TRAIL.

### FINAL AFFIRMATIVE

Proposition: It is Scriptural to use *grape juice* as the drink element in the communion.

Proof: Major premise—The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine was the drink element used in the communion, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.

Minor premise—Grape juice is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine. (by definition.)

Conclusion—Therefore, grape juice was the drink element used in the communion. And I do not assume the thing to be proved.

In trying to refute this argument, the Doctor makes reckless assertions, assertions he does not believe himself.

His sap (whether in the leaves or not), hulls, seeds, and pulp are no more the *gennema* of these Scriptures than are water and cornstocks. And when he substitutes *grape juice* for *sap* in his argument, it is his "ridiculous argument," not mine; for they are not equivalent terms. And the same is true of his sap, seeds, hulls, and pulp.

He says he is "denying that grape juice is the product of the vine as set forth in Mat. 26:29. Yes, but his *denial* does not meet the argument. Grape juice answers every requirement in the definition of *gennema* here, and the standard lexicon cites these very Scriptures in defining *gennema*. And he admits that grape juice is a "drink" and is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine. In fact "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage," as I have shown. Hence grape juice is the *gennema* of the vine as defined and these Scriptures cited by the lexicographer. And this is the drink pointed out—"toutou" (this) in the text here. And when the 20th Century version translates these Scriptures "this juice of the grape," they are backed by the highest scholarship in New Testament Greek. And the Doctor's denial in the face of the argument he can not refute, amounts to nothing. And if these Scriptures that set forth the drink element in the

communion "do not even touch the subject," then *baptizo* does not touch the form of baptism, and language means anything one pleases or fancies.

He can not overthrow my premises, and my conclusion logically follows—that "grape juice was the drink element used in the communion."

The Doctor admits that the vine made the "juice." And he said, "She put a small amount of the juice in a jar to ferment and make wine."

Then the vine never made this fermented element.

"The effect, therefore, of fermentation is to change entirely the character of the substance upon which it acts."—J. D. Steele, Ph.D. (Here is that famous "it" again. "it" that makes fermented wine.

"Grape juice is a product of nature, but wine is a product of decay."—J. A. Culler, Ph.D.

"... each (fermented wine and cider) containing, as one product of fermentation, more or less of the inebriating alcohol."—Steele.

"Alcohol is a poison."—Coller.

*Toxin* (poison) is from the Greek *toxikon*, hence "intoxication by drinking fermented wine."

Yes, the Doctor "started this," and it was my task to give it attention. And I hope he will now get to "it". What is "it"? "It made wine," yes, *fermented* wine. No new matter should be introduced in the final negative.

Lovingly,

H. C. HARPER.

#### FOURTH NEGATIVE

I notice that Bro. Harper is still contending that his major and minor premises and his syllogism proves positively that grape juice was the drink element used in the communion as set forth in the Scriptures Mat. 26:29 etc. Bro. Harper says; "In trying to refute this argument, the Doctor makes reckless assertions, assertions he does not believe himself." Well, I surely didn't know that. I thought I believed every assertion that I made, and I possibly never would have known any better, if Bro. Harper hadn't told me. But Bro. Harper does not believe that sap is any more the gennema (product) of these Scriptures (Mat. 26:29 etc.) than "water and cornstocks." I do not believe it either. But I do not believe that grape juice is any more the gennema of these Scriptures than I believe sap is.

I wondered why in Bro. Harper's first affirmative, that he said, in giving the definition of Scriptural, "That which comports with the teaching of the Scrip-

tures." I didn't say anything because I thought I might learn something. But I am suspicious now that he wanted to fix it so that he could make it appear that his reasoning was comports with the Scriptures.

I cannot accept Bro. Harper's reasoning as a foundation on which to risk my eternal salvation. I would not risk my own reasoning. Walking by reasoning is not walking by faith. Such a course is positively against the teaching of the Scriptures. If Bro. Harper will read the fifth verse of the third chapter of Second Corinthians, he will find this language. "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God." (A. V.) "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to account anything as from ourselves but our sufficiency if from God." (R. V.) "Not that we are qualified of ourselves to reason anything as from ourselves, but our qualification is from God." (Wilson's Emphatic Diaglot.)

I think I had a compliment but it was not intended for one. I thought I could see that sentiment was growing in favor of the use of individual cups in the communion. I therefore made a little talk on the subject. At the close of the services a lady came to me with an open Bible and her finger on a certain passage and said, "You won't believe anything unless you read it yourself." I pleaded guilty. She said, "Don't you see it says 'That Cup'". I said, "Yes, I thought that was what I said." She said, "Well, you have four cups here." I said "No, the four cups were here when I came here, if there were forty-eight members, there would be as many drink from one cup as in the night when the Supper was instituted. We have four rows of seats here and a cup for each row. I do not think the way we have it here destroys the communion. I do not think the object of using four cups is the correct a mistake the Savior made, but, if you want to do so, I will be delighted to just have one cup and then there can be no doubt as to its being Scriptural." That is what I have been trying to get Bro. Harper to do. When he refers me to the Scripture that says grape juice unfermented, was used in the communion I will believe it, and the lady said that I would not believe it unless I could read it for myself and I pleaded guilty.

Bro. Harper says that sap and grape juice are not equivalent terms. I knew that before Bro. Harper told me, but they are both produced by the vine and they are both liquids and Bro. Harper says grape juice is the drink element of the communion because it is a drink and a product of the vine. I wanted to know which one of these liquid products of the vine was used

in the communion, but Bro. Harper would not point me to the Scripture that told which one.

A. J. TRAIL.

#### FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Terms of proposition. *Scriptural*, that is contained in the Scriptures. (Webster) *Scriptures*, the books of the Old and New Testament or either, the Bible (Webster) *Communion*, the institution that was instituted by Jesus Christ "in the night in which he was betrayed," the Lord's Supper.

The thing to be proven in this proposition is that fermented grape wine was the drink element used when the Savior instituted the Lord's Supper. The proof to be of any value must be Scriptural and to be Scriptural it must be contained in the Scriptures.

In studying the Scriptures from first to last, we find the first account of this institution in the 26th chapter of Matthew. In this chapter we find this language, "Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover? And he said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master sayeth my time is at hand: I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples. And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them and they made ready the passover. (Mat. 26:17, 18, 19)

"And as they were eating (this passover that the disciples had made ready) Jesus took bread, and\_\_\_\_\_." And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins: But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom." (Mat. 26:27, 28, 29)

We learn from this Scripture that Jesus took this cup while they were eating this passover that the disciples made ready. Now if we can find what the disciples made ready when they made ready the passover, we will know for sure what the Savior used when he instituted His Supper. If you will read Numbers 15:5 you will learn there that the drink offering to be prepared for a one lamb feast whether a burnt offering, a sacrifice, or one of their set feasts, is the fourth part of an hin of wine (3 pints). The word used for wine here in Hebrew is *yayin*. *Yayin* in Hebrew means wine fully and completely fermented. There is a Hebrew word which means grape juice from the time it is expressed from the grapes until it is completely fermented and becomes *yayin*. This word is *tirosh*. See

Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, page 973. The Savior referred to this wine (*yayin*) as the fruit. (*gennema*) product of the vine. Bro. Harper flatly denies this. I now let the Savior and Bro. Harper fight this out while I stand on the side of the Savior always contending that the Savior did and said the right thing.

A. J. TRAIL.

#### FIRST NEGATIVE

1. There is no evidence that the Savior referred to the "drink offering" (the liquid to be poured on the sacrifice, not to be drunk) of Numbers 15:5. Would a command to *pour* kerosene on wood be a command to *drink* kerosene? No; and I still say, "The Savior referred to the one he named"—the *gennema* of the vine, the *drink produced by the vine*. (Matt. 26:29.) and "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage." (Bagster.) And *grape juice is a drink produced by the vine*. "Sap" of the vine is not a *drink*. Yes, you "can drink sap." So can you drink carbolic acid; but neither is "a drink." Why not go to the language in which the ordinance was given? As well go to the Old Testament for "sprinkling" when Jesus instituted baptism, using *baptizo*. Running from what the Savior "did and said" is standing on his "side" as the disciples did at his arrest. (Mt. 26:56.)

2. Again: "The use of wine at the paschal feast was not enjoined by the law." (Smith's Bible Dict. by Peloubert.) "There is no divine authority for use of wine at all, fermented or unfermented, at the Passover." (The Bible and Wine.) Here is a chasm you will never cross.

3. "Yayin is the extract from the grape, whether simple grape juice unfermented or intoxicating wine." (Fausset's Bible Cyclo., p. 722.) Hence even if you could find "a drink (*yayin*) in the passover in the Scriptures, it would still devolve on you to prove by the Scriptures that it was "fermented grape juice." And here is another chasm you could not cross.

I now introduce my syllogism in rebuttal: 1. The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine was the drink element used in the communion, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18. 2. *Grape juice* is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine, by definition. ("Grape juice, the drink element produced by the grape vine." (See my definition of terms.) 3. Therefore, *grape juice* was the drink element used in the communion.

The Doctor complained because I used "reason" with my Scriptures; but he misapplied the Sacred Text he used to condemn such a course. We find the apostles and others constantly "reasoning" in proof of propo-



sitions stated or implied.

How about that "it," Doctor, that "it" that *made* "fermented wine"? Now is a good time to get at "it," for "It made wine," you said. You are now in the affirmative, and we are expecting you to "refer us to the Scriptures that authorize" "fermented grape wine" in the communion. I do not see where you have used either reason or Scripture to support your proposition that "fermented grape wine" was used in the communion.

H. C. HARPER.

### SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

It seems strange to me that good, clever, religious people will resort to the means they do to prove their point, or rather to keep people blinded from seeing the truth on a subject that involves the plain teaching of the Scriptures.

Listen to what Bro. Harper says, "There is no evidence that the Savior referred to the "drink offering" (the liquid, to be poured on the sacrifice, not to be drunk). Num. 15:5.

If that is an argument the sectarian world have it on us. They say, "Baptism is non-essential" and prove it by saying, "There is no evidence to that effect in the Bible." Of course, Bro. Harper can say this if he wants to, but I surely would be afraid to make a statement like that about as plain passage of Scripture as Num. 15:5. Given by the mouth of Jehova himself. When I saw this statement, of Bro. Harper's, I actually got the Bible and turned to the passage to see if the word, poured, or the phrase, not to be drunk, was connected with that passage of scripture anywhere.

The idea of some man accusing Jehova of calling an element a drink offering and it "not to be drunk"! Can even Bro. Harper imagine Jehova calling a thing a drink offering and it "not to be drunk"? That's no "chasm to cross over"!

Bro. Harper goes to Fausset for authority to prove that yayin in this Scripture does not mean fermented wine but he cannot prove it by Fausset. Fausset said it meant completely fermented grape juice. There is a word in Hebrew that, if Jehova had used instead of yayin in giving this *law* and Bro. Harper had shown to me that he so did, I would have given up the discussion long ago and would have acknowledged my mistake. This word is tirosh and means grape juice not completely fermented. "Hence it may be said that tirosh applies not only to the 'must' in the wine fat but to 'new wine' before it has fully matured and be-

come yayin." (Hasting Bible Dictionary Page 973) If Fausset is right in saying that, "yayin is the extract from the grape, whether *simple grape juice unfermented* or intoxicating wine." How could it be that tirosh represents the freshly expressed grape juice until it went through the fermentation and became yayin? How could it become yayin, when it had been yayin all the time?

Bro. Harper seems to be anxious to find expressions in literature that would mussup this plainly given law by Jehova and make it appear that it doesn't mean what it says. If Bro. Harper should find 10,000 men who would say that there was no law given for the drink offering in their set feasts for one lamb, I would not believe it. For Jehova said plainly, "-----or in your solemn feasts-----and the fourth part of an bin of wine for a drink offering shalt thou prepare. Num. 15:3, 5. This looks very much like a law that they should follow when they took possession of the land of Canaan.

Bro. Harper keeps wanting to know about that "it". I didn't think that it was worth space to talk about that "it". The antecedent of that "it" is grape juice which anybody can see. Then grape juice made wine and became yayin the gennema (product) of the vine that the Savior took out of the passover and said "This is my blood." Now this is all there is to that "it."

M. C. Kerfees said that every word used in any of their set, or solemn, feasts was a word that indicated something that would take possession of the brain also in 1 Cor. 11:21 the word for drunken meant something that took possession of the brain.

I was once corresponding with a man who believed that grape juice unfermented should be used in the Lord's Supper. When I quoted 1 Cor. 11:21 he said that the reason they got drunk was because they had drunk so much grape juice that it fermented in the stomach, made wine and they became drunk. I did not even reply to this. It seems the poor fellow did not even know that the process of digestion was much shorter than the process of making wine.

A. J. TRAIL.

### SECOND NEGATIVE

"*Drink offering.* The pouring of a small quantity of wine on the daily morning and evening sacrificial lamb." (Bible Dictionary by Holman.) It is not the number of times you read, but the intelligence with which you read, that makes it profitable. If you had read the translation of the Bible—the whole Bible—by

that prince of Oriental scholars, Ferrer Fenton, you would not have blundered here, for you would have found it "a pouring," as the Hebrew denotes. The "drink offering" of the King James translation is no more confusing than their "meat offering" of the 9th verse is, in which no "meat" was used. But the "meal offering," as Fenton and the Revised have it, makes it clear.

You certainly know that the "paschal lamb" was not "the daily morning and evening sacrificial lamb," with which the "drink offering" (a pouring) went. And if it is not true that "The use of wine at the paschal feast was not enjoined by the law" (Bible Dictionary), and "There is no divine authority for the use of wine at all, fermented or unfermented, at the Passover" (The Bible and Wine), just find the Scripture that enjoins it. This chasm is still before you, Doctor.

Nobody denies that there was a law given for a "drink offering" (a pouring). But all your talk about *wine, yayin, or tirosh* is gratuitous since you find no *drink* enjoined in the Bible at the Passover. And when you are ready to deny that "Yayin is the extract from the grape, whether simple grape juice unfermented or intoxicating wine" (Bible Cyclo.), I am ready to meet you. And this chasm is still before you even if you could find "a drink" (*yayin*) enjoined at the Passover.

That "poor fellow" you mention makes me think of another poor fellow who advocated fermented wine. He said, "I hear that they have discovered a grape vine in California that produces *fermented* wine." I replied, "Show me."

"It made fermented wine." "The antecedent of 'it' is grape juice." I say again, "Show me!" I have grape juice in my house all the time, and it never made "fermented grape wine." Never!

I Corinthians: "drunken (King James), "filled" (Living Oracles), "gorged" (Ferrer Fenton); but even if "intoxicated," it was at "his own supper."

1. The *drink produced* by "the vine" was the *drink* used in the communion. 2. "Fermented grape wine" is not a *drink produced* by "the vine." 3. Therefore, "fermented grape wine" was not the *drink* used in the communion.

Please define "fermented grape wine" of your proposition. "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage." (Bagster.) Will you deny this? Give us "the process of making wine." Is fermented wine "a manufactured product"? and is this product identical with what "the vine" makes?

H. C. HARPER.

### THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Bro. Harper says, "It is not the number of times you read, but the intelligence with which you read, that makes it profitable." Good, I believe you are surely right one time. May I add that what you read has something to do with it also? If Bro. Harper, in place of reading what "that prince of Oriental scholars" said had been reading what that Prince of men said about the man of God being completely furnished unto every good work by the Scriptures, with intelligence and had believed every word of it, he—maybe—would not have made such an awful blunder about the drink to be used in the communion. When he read, "And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them; and they made ready the passover." (Mat. 26:19) and had not known what they made ready when they made ready the passover, he could confidently have said that the Scriptures will tell me.

Then he could have turned to Rom. 15 and read verses 4, 5 and 6 and found this language, "For whatsoever things were written afore time were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope; Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like minded one toward another according to Christ Jesus; That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." He could have remembered that something had been written afore time about the passover for his learning. He could have found the law given for all of their set feasts that they should follow when they got possession of the land of Canaan. He could have found that the passover feast was a set feast set for the fourteenth day of the first month of the year. He could have found that it was a one lamb feast. He could have found a special law given for both meal and drink offerings of this feast. Then we could, by following this, be like minded according to Christ Jesus (marg. note After the example of) and with one mind and one mouth glorify God even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Well Bro. Harper, have I gone and "misapplied the sacred text" again? We never can be like minded according to your syllogism Bro. Harper, never.

But Bro. Harper likes what men say about it (some men) seemingly better than the plain teaching of the Scriptures. Let's see how he will like this. "When the Hebrew ate flesh, he ate bread with it and drank *wine* and when he offered flesh on the table of his God, it was natural that he should add to it the same concomitants that were necessary to make up a comfortable

and generous meal." (Hastings Bible Dictionary p. 812)

"The underlying idea of this, by far the commonest form of sacrifice, was that of sharing a common meal with the deity." (H. B. D. p. 812)

I once heard a Jew, who said he was reared by the orthodox Jew family. He said his mother had told him that their family ancestors had been true to the Jew's religion for nearly five thousand years. He showed how the food was arranged and the places occupied by the family respectively. He said there were three cups of wine on the table (I wondered if they were pint cups because the law said they were to prepare three pints) When he came to the disposal of the third cup, he said the father took it in his hand and addressed his youngest son. In this Jew's remarks he gave as a reason for them having wine was because wine had always been a sign of happiness. I think it would have been better if he had said, it was because Jehovah had commanded it. This Jew was giving a lecture on the passover.

Bro. Harper, I have tried so hard to make you see that this law was given the same for their set feasts and burnt offerings, etc. I do not know whether I will fail or not. You have acknowledged that it was a law for their burnt offerings and I cannot see why you cannot see that that law applies to their set feasts also when the set feasts is as plainly named and specified as their burnt offerings.

Bro. Harper, if Jehovah had wanted to make it plain that they were to prepare wine, fully and completely fermented, what terms could he have used that would have made it plainer than the terms he did use here? What word could he have used that would have expressed the idea better than the word "yayen"?

A. J. TRAIL.

### THIRD NEGATIVE

Is a command to *pour* carbohic acid on a sore a command to *drink* it, Doctor? "*Drink offering*. The pouring of a small quantity of wine on the daily morning and evening sacrificial lamb." (Bible Dict.) This is not wine to be drunk, no matter with what sacrifice it went. But you should know that the "daily morning and evening sacrificial lamb" was not the passover lamb. And when I read it "a pouring," I read the word of God; and I challenge you to refute it. Now bring on the Hebrew if you please.

Are you going to refuse to define "fermented grape wine" of your proposition and answer my questions, as the rules of honorable discussion demand? 1. Please

define "fermented grape wine." 2. What is "wine, fully and completely fermented," and how do you tell it is such wine? 3. By what authority do you make "fermented grape wine" mean "wine, fully and completely fermented"? You say "tirosh" may denote fermented grape wine. 4. Why, then, do you reject *tirosh* in the communion? (When you tell me what you mean by "wine, fully and completely fermented," and how you know it is such wine, I may be able to tell you the word to denote it.)

When you "apply" any Scripture to show that wine to be drunk was enjoined at the passover, you "misapply" it, Doctor. Your task is worse than one to "look for a needle in a haystack," for in your case there is no needle in the stack. You seem to realize this now, for you have gone to Jewish tradition after telling us "The proof to be of any value must be Scriptural and to be Scriptural it must be contained in the Scriptures." 4. Why do you think it "better" if that Jew had falsified by saying, "because Jehovah had commanded it," instead of what he did say, when neither you nor the Jew can find the command? And Hastings plainly indicates by what he says that it was not commanded, too. If you're going to take tradition, change your proposition; and I'll meet you on it, too.

Israel entered Canaan without wine (Ex. 29:6) on the tenth day of the first month (Josh. 4:19), and just four days later ate the passover (Josh. 5:10). 5. Did they have a "drink offering" with this lamb?

I find many things "afore time" for our "learning," Doctor; and one thing is, that wine to be drunk at the passover was not enjoined by divine authority. And I can "confidently" rely in the Scriptures for this. And I can "confidently" go to the Scriptures (Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18) for the drink used in the communion, "as Jesus had appointed them," where I find *gennema* (offspring, product) of "the vine" was used. And I know that "fermented grape wine," an alcoholic product, is not produced by "the vine." It is physically impossible. And you admit that *grape juice* is a *drink produced by* "the vine." Hence *grape juice* was the *drink* used in the communion, as set forth in these Scriptures. And if you will stay with the Scriptures, we can agree.

6. Does "the vine" produce a poison? 7. Can "fermented grape wine" be produced without yeast? 8. Is yeast a leaven? 9. Is "fermented grape wine" a "manufactured product manipulated by yeast fermentation?"

The Hebrew word that does not include unfermented wine is *yainthareleh*. (The Bible and Wine, p. 6) "*Yayin* is the extract from the grape, whether simple grape juice unfermented or intoxicating wine." (Bible Cyclo. by Fausset, p. 722.) "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage." (Bagster, Teacher's Bible.)

1. The *drink produced by the vine* was the drink used in the Communion. 2. "Fermented grape wine" is not a drink *produced by the vine*. 3. Therefore, "fermented grape wine" was not the *drink* used in the communion. You can not refute this, yet you will not agree with it. Why? If it is not the truth, expose it if you can. Evidently you can not or you would do so.

H. C. HARPER.

#### FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Bro. Harper told of a "poor fellow" that told him that he had heard that they had discovered a grape vine in California that produced fermented wine, and you wanted to be shown. You do not have to go to California to see that sight. Just come to McMinnville, Tenn. and I will show you the vine and the wine (*yayin*). I have more than a dozen grape vines that produce that very kind of wine. If you want to get some of these vines, I will give you the names of them. One variety is the Lutie, another Concord, another Moore's early, another Martha Washington and another the Campbell. These all produce wine. I will explain and in so doing I will answer all your questions that you seem to be so anxious about. I gathered some grapes from these vines. I then squeezed the juice out with my hands and strained "it," (that wonderful "it") into a crock and let "it" set four days (Bro. Harper please keep up with that "it"). The Hebrew let it set from 4 to 7 days. I then strained "it" into a common half gallon jar, filling the jar from one-half to two-thirds full and then put a top on with a good rubber under it. There has not been a thing put in this jar except what the vine produced.

"It is ordained in the Mishna that new wine cannot be presented at the sanctuary for a drink offering until it has stood for at least forty days in the fermenting jars." (Hastings B. D. p. 974. I watched the process of this "it" that was in that fermenting jar, and just about the time and sometimes a few days before the forty days were up "it" quit fermenting. Not a bubble was seen to come up after this. At this point "it" ceased to be "tirosh" and became "yayin". This is wine fully and completely fermented.

I remembered at this point that David Lipscomb

said, "Good clever people spend time and much research and ingenuity in striving to fix up a theory that will banish fermented wine from the Lord's table. A few will take the position under stress of the evil of intemperance, but the consensus of the learned and the common sense of those who study the Bible hold to the idea that it was fermented wine is free from leaven. The fermentation works out the leaven."

Webster's Unabridged Dictionary says that leaven is anything that ferments or is destined to ferment.

I know that grape juice ferments. I know that Bro. Harper knows that grape juice ferments. I know that Bro. Harper knows that no leaven should be found in their houses during the seven days of the feast of the passover according to the law of Jehovah.

"Honey was excluded along with milk from the altar on the ground that both were liable to fermentation (see also leaven)" H. B. D. p. 813.

Now Bro. Harper, will you please tell us what you do to that "it" (grape juice) to keep it from fermenting and give us the Scripture for the procedure? Also please tell us where the Savior got that grape juice in the night in which he was betrayed and said of it that it was his blood of the covenant?

It is too plain for people to miss seeing it, that grape juice unfermented was not the drink element used in the communion as set forth in the Scriptures, Mat. 26: 27, etc.

To have used grape juice in the set feasts would have been to do something positively forbidden by the Scriptures. Hence I will not take grape juice under any circumstance in the communion. I would be afraid to do so.

"Bagster said grape juice was used as a beverage." What in the world has that to do with the communion?

"Wine is a poison." Paul wanted Timothy to poison himself. Did he? I have just looked up the word in Greek and it is *oinos* (wine) not *gleukous* (grape juice).

It seems that Bro. Harper cannot see that the Hebrew was eating his meal while he was offering to his God the same that he was eating. "The Hebrew offered to God the things with which his own table was furnished." H. B. D. p. 817.

"When the Hebrew ate flesh, he ate bread with it and drank wine." H. B. D. p. 812. When the Hebrew was eating the paschal lamb he was eating flesh.

Bro. Harper says that there was **no** law given for a drink in the passover either fermented or unfermented. That does not prove anything for his grape juice theory.

The Savior was living under the Mosaic Law and I do not believe he would have presumed to have added anything to that law before it was fulfilled and nailed to the cross. He said that He came to fulfill it. Then we know that the Savior kept the law when he was eating the last passover. Where can we find a passage that looks more like a law to that effect than Num. 15:5?

Paul, in giving instructions to the Corinthians concerning this institution that the Savior established "in the night in which he was betrayed," said, "For I received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you ----." Now while these Corinthians were eating this bread and drinking this cup that Paul says the Savior told him about and he told the Corinthians about, they got drunk, and the Savior said of this very drink that it was the fruit, gennema, product of the vine. Bro. Harper, I believe the Savior knows better than you as to whether this is the product of the vine or not. I am still standing on the side of the Savior contending that he knows best. But Bro. Harper wants to get out of this by saying that some translations use the word "filled" or "gorged" in place of drunken. Of course, they were filled or gorged on intoxicants. I believe that Bro. Harper knows this. If he will read Eph. 5:18. "And be not drunken with wine wherein is riot but be filled with the Spirit," he can plainly see that the Greek for drunken here is the same as the Greek for drunken in 1 Cor. 11:21 and the word translated filled in this verse is a different word.

In correcting this conduct of the Corinthians Paul did not say now brethren, I told you the Savior used grape juice and, if you had done as I told you, you would not have become intoxicated. He didn't even hint at such a thing.

Bro. Harper does not believe that the use of the word "yayin" by Jehovah in Num. 15:1,5 proves that completely fermented wine was meant by this command. It seems that Jehovah understood that somebody would reason as Bro. Harper has and in repeating the law for preparing a meal and drink offering for a one lamb feast, Num. 28:7, he used the word "shekar" which means strong drink, but if Jehovah had not used the word "yayin," we could not have known what the wine was made from, but when Jehovah specified that this strong drink was yayin, we know that yayin is strong drink made from the juice of grape and grapes grow on grape vines.

This is why I wanted the reader to notice how Bro. Harper answered the question, How may we know what

kind of vine was referred to by the Savior when he said "fruit of the vine?"

Bro. Harper "has grape juice in his house all the time." He has to do something unknown in the Mishna (the law of God to the Jews) "It may be stated at this point that no trace can be found among the hundreds of references to the preparation and use of wine in the unfermented state." Hastings B. D. p. 974.

Bro. Harper has one more chance to repeat his syllogism. But it will not compare with the plain teachings of the Scriptures.

A. J. TRAIL.

#### FINAL NEGATIVE

I showed that "The use of wine at the paschal feast was not enjoined by the law," not to "prove anything for grape juice," but to expose your futile effort in going to the O. T. for a drink element in the passover. You stumbled over "drink offering," contending it was "wine to drink," but when you came to "*Drink offering*." The pouring of a small quantity of wine on the daily morning and evening sacrificial lamb," you fell flat. This does not "look like wine to drink" any more than carbolic acid to pour on a sore "looks like" carbolic acid to drink. When I wanted "anything for grape juice," I went to the Scriptures giving the ordinance "as Jesus had appointed them," and found it *gennema* (offspring, product, fruit) of the vine, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18, *a drink produced by the vine*, and I stood with the Savior.

You bring up "drink offering" in the *Mishna* of Jewish traditions; but this does you no good. We are not debating the *drink offering*, and no matter what its character was. And of the thing we are debating "The proof to be of any value must be Scriptural and to be Scriptural it must be contained in the Scriptures," as you said. I will say, however, that the *Mishna* was not "the law of God" to anybody. Nor is the rehash of these traditions by Hastings a guide for any man who wants the word of God for his faith and practice. These traditions are as full of absurdities as "a dog is of fleas." They also "ordain" that it is the duty of a man to get drunk at the feast of Purim. (Talmud. Fol. 7.) Christ's most scathing rebuke of the Jews was for following their tradition. The Jew had no more right to violate God's law by taking at the passover "things with which his own table was furnished" than we have to do the same thing at "the Lord's table." And I will further say that if honey and milk were excluded from the altar "on the ground that both were liable to

fermentation," so would all flesh be, for it, too, is "liable" to fermentation. (See World Book; Life of Pasteur and Hygienic Physiology by Steele. "The legs of the lame are unequal.")

Webster speaks of *leaven*, not things that may be leavened. His "leaven" is active as "anything that ferments;" inactive as "destined to ferment." Grape juice is not leaven. You should read more carefully.

Fermentation *does not* "work out the leaven," yeast. (Brittanica, Vol. 28, p. 719; Col. Cyclo, p. 32; Life of Pasteur, p. 85; The Bible and Wine, p. 16.) You are now face to face with physical, demonstrated facts, Doctor. Hence, to use such an element on the altar or at the passover would violate the law of God. (Ex. 12:8; Lev. 2:11.) "Fermented bread" (Smith's B. D., p. 179) and "fermented wine" are both produced by *yeast*, a leaven. "All fermented liquors are artificially produced (see p. 132); these (ferments, yeast) also cause the 'rising' of bread." (Steele, p. 301).

Yes, your vines "all produce wine." But it is "unfermented wine, simple grape juice," even *yayin*, for "*Yayin* is the extract from the grape, whether simple grape juice unfermented or intoxicating wine." (Bible Cyclo. by Fausset, p. 722.) *Fermented wine, alcoholic wine, intoxicating wine* are terms that mean the same thing; and your vines do not "produce that very kind of wine." And if "There has not been a thing put in this jar except what the vine produced," there would be no "fermented wine," for no *yeast*, no "fermented wine."

"Yeast is the ferment which causes alcoholic fermentation." "It consists of microscopic plants." (Steele, p. 133.) "These germs, parasitic vegetations, called yeast, are the cause of fermentation." (Life of Pasteur, p. 85.) "Alcohol is produced by a process called fermentation, which is caused by very minute round plants called yeast." (Lippincott, Book II, p. 33.) You did not see "it" (*yeast*, not grape juice, Doctor), but it "got there just the same." Had you kept it out, you would still have had "what the vine produced," but not "fermented wine." You "put a top on with a good rubber under it." "Right here is where man steps in and stops the process of nature." "Nature never prepares an alcoholic drink." (Lippincott, Book II, p. 33.) "This minute being (yeast) produces the transformation which constitutes fermentation by breathing the oxygen of the substance to be fermented, or by appropriating for an instant the whole substance, then destroying it by what may be termed the secretion of the fermented products. *The effect, therefore, of fermenta-*

*tion is to change entirely the character of the substance upon which it acts.*" (Steele, p. 132.)

No sane man will deny that "the vine" produces "simple grape juice," "unfermented wine." Hence, it can not produce such a product as "fermented wine," a product *entirely different in character*. As well might you expect "grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles," or a fountain to "send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter." (Mt. 7:16; Jas. 2:11.) And "Wine was preserved in its unfermented state." (Inter. Ency., Art. wine.) "In our Lord's time there was an ample supply of unfermented wine, 'the fruit of the vine'." (The Bible and Wine, p. 18.) "Unfermented wine, the juice of grapes, was valued in Palestine as a beverage." (Smith's B. D., p. 320.) "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage." (Bagster Bible, p. 117). See also Pliny, Book XIV, ch. 19; Inter. Ency. Vol. 28, p. 3087; Steele, p. 133; Life of Pasteur, pp. 85, 113, 285. (The *Misha* is not "the only pebble on the beach," Doctor.) There was plenty of this "fruit of the vine" for the Savior in the communion when all leaven was put away; and there was plenty for Timothy without his taking "intoxicating wine," with its *toxin*, poison in which is "riot." (Eph. 5:18.)

I Cor. 11:21. I showed that this condition (whether gorged or intoxicated) was effected at "his own supper." It reads, "Every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken." Paul corrected some things and said, "The rest will I set in order when I come." (Same ch.)

You could not answer my questions and hold your teaching; hence would not touch them. And you would not define "fermented grape wine," the principal term in your proposition, for you knew you could not limit it to "wine, fully and completely fermented," which you tried to make *yayin* mean, and which you want and think you have as soon as the *bubbling* ceases. But this is not so. "Wine, fully and completely fermented," is "dry wine" (Steele, p. 134), and this is not obtained until the *yeast* in the "quiet" fermentation (which follows the bubbling, or tumultuous, fermentation) has devoured all the sugar, and this may take years.

*Oinos*. Both *Yayin* and *tirosh* are translated *oinos*, and it may be used for either fermented or unfermented wine. And *shekar*, "sweet drink," *yayin*, *tirosh*, *gleukos* (Acts 2:13) are used for either kind of drink.

*Gennema*. —But Christ used *gennema* to express the communion drink, making it what "the vine" produces. It *does not* produce an alcoholic drink. It does produce a drink, grape juice, "unfermented wine." "And hav-

ing the Scriptures for this, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18, all can unite on it, and "Speak where the Bible speaks."