

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XX.

APRIL, 1916.

No. 2.

THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT THE BIBLE IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Active efforts are being made at the present time in various quarters for the reintroduction of the Bible into our public schools. This movement gives rise to a controversy very similar to the one which raged on the occasion of the elimination of the Bible as a text-book from the American public school system. The following brief historical consideration of that earlier struggle, therefore, seems appropriate at the present time.

The opposition to the Bible as a text-book began about 1840, especially in the large cities,¹⁾ and at the instigation of the Roman Catholic Church. According to Goodrich,²⁾ the Catholics at this time numbered 800,000, out of a total of about 10,000,000 church-members in the United States. The Roman Catholics favored legal exclusion of the Bible from the public schools; Daniel Webster opposed legal exclusion.³⁾

The controversy was really due to the rise of state-supported public schools. Denominational schools wanted state support; but it became the established policy of the State not to give such support. The controversy involves the interpretation of the Constitution and the question whether the Bible is a sectarian book.

1) Monroe's *Cyc. of Ed.*, I, p. 373.

2) Peter Parley's *Tales about the U. S.* (1883), p. 227.

3) Cheever, *Right of the Bible in Our Public Schools.* (New York, 1854.)

LEAVEN AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The question, "Grape-juice or wine in the Lord's Supper?" has been discussed in the THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY (Vol. XVII, July, 1913) with sufficient comprehensiveness and thoroughness for all practical purposes, both from the historical and exegetical view-point. There is one argument, however, which has been advanced by the opponents that has sometimes perplexed the defenders of the Eucharist. The National W. C. T. U., at the Omaha convention, 1909, passed the resolution: "We deplore the use of alcoholic wine in the Church of God as representing the blood of Christ. Science tells us that alcohol is the product of decay, and we know it to be the cause of crime and misery, and we protest against its use in the sacred ordinance." In the accompanying letter we read as follows: "Alcohol is known to be the deadly enemy of the cause of Christ. When He established the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, He gave His followers the 'fruit of the vine.' In no instance is it recorded that He used the word wine, and it was during Passover week, when ferment was not found in the house of a Jew (under a penalty), and we can use the

'fruit of the vine' as God gives it to us, and not after (as science teaches us) the process of decay has converted it into the poisonous alcoholic wine of commerce. Also in using the 'fruit of the vine' pure and sweet, we have a correct emblem of His shed blood, but in no sense can a decayed, destructive substance such as alcohol represent Christ, His blood, or His mission, neither are we scientifically correct in calling alcohol the 'fruit of the vine.'"

In this presentation there is one assertion that concerns us here, namely this, that *at the Passover feast of the Old Testament, and therefore at the institution of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament, fermented wine could not have been used*, and that all Christians should therefore discontinue the use of wine when celebrating Holy Communion. The principal texts which the writers of the above communication apparently had in mind are Ex. 12, 15, 19 and 13, 7, as well as the corresponding passages in Deuteronomy. In the former passage (Ex. 12, 19) we read: "Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses; for whosoever eateth that which is leavened, even that soul shall be cut off"; and in the latter (Ex. 13, 7): "Unleavened bread shall be eaten seven days, and there shall no leavened bread be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters." The question is: What does the word "leaven" mean here, and does this command touch drinking as well as eating? In the Hebrew we have here the word *seor*, of which there can be no doubt that it means only the "leaven, yeast, or ferment" used in making leavened bread. This is evident from Ex. 12, 15: "Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread (*mazah*); even the first day ye shall put away leaven (*seor*) out of your houses; for whosoever eateth leavened bread," etc. Lev. 2, 11: "Ye shall burn no leaven (*seor*) in any offering of the Lord made by fire"; cf. v. 7: "And if thy oblation be a meat-offering, it shall be made of fine flour with oil." Deut. 16, 4: "And there shall be no leavened bread (*seor*) seen with thee in all thy coast." That *seor* always means "leaven, yeast, or ferment"

used in making bread, we see also from the New Testament passages, in which the Greek word *zyme*, the translation of *seor* in the Old Testament, is used: Matt. 16, 12 (leaven of bread); Matt. 13, 33 and Luke 13, 21 (leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened); 1 Cor. 5, 6 and Gal. 5, 9 (a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump). The other Hebrew words which concern us here are *chamez* and *mazah*, from the verb *chamaz*. The word *chamez* is used parallel to, and indiscriminately with, *seor*, and therefore also means "leaven or ferment" used in making bread, and, figuratively, the leavened bread itself. Lev. 2, 11: "No meat-offering shall be made with leaven (*chamez*)"; Deut. 16, 3: "Thou shalt eat no leavened bread (*chamez*) with it." (Amos 4, 5.) The word *mazah* means unleavened bread. It is the *terminus* for the bread of Passover: Deut. 16, 3 (unleavened bread, *mazot lechem*); 1 Sam. 28, 24, Gen. 19, 3, Ex. 23, 15 (unleavened bread); Ex. 34, 18, Lev. 2, 5 (flour unleavened); Lev. 8, 26 (unleavened bread, unleavened cake); Num. 28, 17 (unleavened bread).

There remains but one more word, the word *machmezet*, a form of the verb *chamaz*. That this also, however, refers to solid food which might be made or become sour, we see from the very words of the text: "Whosoever eateth that which is leavened." (Ex. 12, 19 b.) The same word refers to bread, to solid food, Hos. 7, 4: "until it be leavened." We, therefore, say in regard to the command of God about leaven and leavened bread: "Non solum panis fermentatus, sed etiam aliucibus acidus aut acescens" (*Goodwin*), Not only leavened bread, but also other food which was sour or becoming sour, was prohibited by God. But that the command of God also referred to wine (*yayin*) or other intoxicating liquors (*shekar*) after fermentation cannot be proved from any text. Where the word *chomez* is used, it always refers to vinegar (Num. 6, 3; Ps. 69, 22; Prov. 10, 26; 25, 20). Wine and strong drink, far from being regarded as impure by the Jews, was, on the contrary, used in certain sacrifices. We read Num. 28, 7: "In

the Holy Place shalt thou cause the strong drink (*shekar*) to be poured unto the Lord for a drink-offering." Ex. 29, 40 (wine for a drink-offering); Hos. 9, 4 (wine-offerings to the Lord). (See Baehr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Kultus*, II, p. 303.)

But that is not all. The liquors that were barred during Passover week according to Jewish law are enumerated in the *Mishna*: "The law [prohibiting leaven to be seen or found in the house on Passover] is transgressed by the following articles: Babylonian kuthach [a mixture of moldy bread with milk and salt, used as a sauce for food], Median beer [made of wheat or barley], Edomite vinegar [made by the fermentation of barley and wine], Egyptian zeethum [a mixture of barley, salt, and wild saffron], the dough of bran, used by dyers, the dough used by cooks [to attract the impurities in a pot where food was boiling], and the paste used by scribes [to paste the sheets of paper together]." And far from finding a passage prohibiting the use of wine at the Passover meal, we are told that all partakers were obliged to drink four cups of wine during the meal, the last of which was drunk in the intervals of the second part of the Hallel. (Rodkinson's *Babylonian Talmud*, Tract Pesachim, V, 210.) "Each cup must contain wine, which, when mixed with three parts of water, will be good wine. . . . The cup must contain the taste and the color of red wine. . . . Because it is written (Prov. 23, 31): 'Do not look on the wine when it is red,'—whence we adduce that wine must be red." (*L. c.*, pp. 68, 226.) There can, therefore, not be the slightest doubt, on *historical* grounds, that our Lord, in instituting the Eucharist, used wine, true, fermented, intoxicating wine, though it may have been diluted, after the Jewish custom, and known as *krama*.

But there is also sound *exegetical* basis for the use of wine, even in the words of institution, Matt. 26, 27—29, Mark 14, 23—25, Luke 22, 18—20. The *genema tes ampelou* was not a term used by Christ to permit the greatest latitude, but it is the *terminus* of the Jews for the *Passover wine*. Their blessing of wine which they used upon all occasions, but es-

pecially at the Passover, was: "Benedictus sit, qui creavit fructum vitis", Blessed be He who created the fruit of the vine! (*L. c.*, pp. 215. 221, and elsewhere.) Whenever the expression "fruit of the vine" was used, it *always* meant *wine*, fermented, intoxicating wine, and nothing else.

The only conclusion we can reach, then, is this: The essential elements in the Lord's Supper are bread and wine, fermented, intoxicating wine. Without wine, there is no Lord's Supper. About the *accidens* or *adiaphoron*, as to whether this wine be red or white, pure or mixed with water, and whether the bread should be made of wheat, rye, or barley flour, leavened or unleavened, there may be different opinions, since here historical, and not exegetical, reasons only come into consideration.

St. Paul, Minn.

PAUL E. KRETZMANN.
