

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE IV.

DO THE SCRIPTURES PROHIBIT THE USE OF
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES?

BY REV. A. B. RICH, D.D., WEST LEBANON, N. H.

A DIFFICULT subject to discuss, confessedly. A difficult question to answer, if we may judge from the different and opposite answers given to it by good men, men of learning, men having equal respect for the authority of the word of God, equal interest in the temperance reform.

Why so difficult? Is the legislation of God upon this subject yea and nay? We cannot believe it. It must be, taken as a whole, a unit. It must be the final and authoritative appeal.

Is there any want of testimony? No; for there is, perhaps, no other subject, if we except idolatry, respecting which the legislation of God is so voluminous. But its testimony is found in promises and in threatenings. The fruit of the vine is used as a symbol of the direst judgments of God, and of the richest blessings of his grace. It is represented as filling the cup of his indignation, and it filled the cup in the hand of our Lord at the last paschal supper. Now it is said to have "a blessing in it"; now we are forbidden "to look upon it." And in every conceivable relation it comes in by way of illustration, sometimes implying one characteristic, sometimes another exactly the opposite; while again it is referred to in a way that sheds no light upon its nature or the judgment of God respecting its use. It is not, perhaps, a matter of wonder that men are divided in their methods of interpreting these apparently contradictory statements.

It has resulted, therefore, that, notwithstanding all that has been written upon the subject, we are yet very much in

the condition of the ancient astronomers, who had a mass of material before them out of which to construct a theory of the universe, but had not yet discovered the law which was needed to reconcile its apparent contradictions and unify the whole.

What is that law in the case before us? What hypothesis will reconcile the entire legislation of God respecting "wine and strong drink," as the law of gravity did the phenomena of the heavenly bodies?

In presenting the results to which several years of thought and careful study of the subject have brought me, I do not assume to be a Newton, or venture to hope that I can solve the problem before us for all minds and all coming generations, as Newton did the problem of his age. But I wish to present some features of the subject in a new light, give increased emphasis to others, question some of the statements that pass current among the advocates of prohibition, and meet the arguments of its enemies — so far, at least, as they are drawn from the Scriptures — by a new classification and exegesis of all the terms found in the Bible designating the beverages and condiments of the Hebrews, and all the instances of their use. Let us consider:

I. The *nature* of the beverages referred to in the Scriptures.

They were, in their origin, *saccharine* substances, such as the product of the vine and the palm-tree. They were originally *nutritious* substances, and therefore adapted to be used as food. They satisfied the natural cravings of the human system for food and drink, and might be used for a lifetime with an equal relish, as often as the natural appetites craved them, without producing any unnatural state in the system, any abnormal desire for them.

But one of the most characteristic features of all *saccharine* substances is, *a tendency to ferment*. And fermentation changes their nutritive properties to alcohol, which, being *indigestible* and *innutritious*, at once removes them from the list of alimentary substances.

"If it be shown," says Dr. Edward Smith, "that alcohol

whilst in the system is not transformed, and does not enter into new combinations, but leaves the body as it entered it, its action cannot be that of food. Hence the proof is diligently sought as to the transformation or non-transformation of alcohol in the system.”¹

This subject has for several years past enlisted the attention of the first physicians and chemists of Great Britain and France. And all writers upon the subject agree that after alcohol is taken into the stomach of men and animals it is found in its pure state in the blood and tissues of the body, and is eliminated from the system unchanged by every outlet. But as no one has been able to collect all the alcohol imbibed in any given case, some physicians contend that the remainder has been digested, and has performed the office of food. But, as Dr. Smith, whom I have quoted above, observes, “To collect all the products of respiration and perspiration for so long a period as thirty-six or forty-eight hours was a Herculean, if not impossible, task; and if collected it would be most difficult so to isolate it as to measure and weigh it. To ask for so much proof is scarcely reasonable; and may we not add, from the analogy of other foods, that any large portion passing off unchanged is a strong argument that all is unchanged, and particularly, when, after so long a period as nearly two days, some remains in the body unchanged?”²

Dr. Munroe,³ of Hull, puts this argument in a forcible form, when he asks: “Is it reasonable to suppose that the body will treat one portion of alcohol as a rogue and vagabond, or an inveterate foe, and retain the other portion as a welcome friend?”

If we define food, as Dr. Smith has done, “A substance which when introduced into the body supplies material which renews some structure, or maintains some vital action,”⁴ it will be difficult to show that alcohol answers either of the conditions of an alimentary substance. For

¹ International Scientific Series, “Foods,” p. 419.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 420, 423.

³ “Is Alcohol Food?” p. 15.

⁴ “Foods,” p. 1.

1. *We have no certain evidence that it is digested in the human stomach.*—Professors Lallemand and Perrin of Paris, at the close of a careful series of experiments, declared: “We have never found, in either the blood or tissues, any of the derivatives of alcohol. . . . Alcohol is rejected from the economy by different sources of elimination—by the lungs, by the skin, and by the kidneys, . . . not only after the ingestion of a considerable quantity of this substance, but even after the ingestion of very small doses of alcoholic liquors.”

In 1874 Drs. Anstie and Dupré conducted another series of experiments, which showed the impossibility of recovering all the alcohol after it had passed into the animal system; but they were not able to determine what had become of it, nor to “come to a decision as to its physiological value, or the precise nature of its influence within the body.” Said Dr. Anstie: “Alcohol is (theoretically) capable of generating an enormous amount of force. It is equally certain that that force does not show itself under the form of heat. If it does not disappear by oxidation, it must undergo some as yet quite unknown transformation, after which it must make its escape unrecognized in the excretions. I have heard various attempts to suggest such modes of disappearance, but nothing which wears even the air of plausibility.” Dr. Anstie was engaged in another series of experiments to throw light, if possible, upon this subject, when his life was cut short by death, on the 12th of September, 1874.

It is conceded, then, on every hand, that, so far as we yet know (whatever we may conjecture), alcohol undergoes no change in the animal system that enables it to perform the office of food. Whenever we come upon it in the system it is alcohol. When we capture it as it is expelled from the system by the vital forces, it is alcohol still. But so far as we can judge of its character from its effects, we find it to be, as expressed in the British Medical Journal for 1872, “the genius of disintegration.”

2. *It is not a source of heat.*—Dr. Anstie’s testimony on

this point, given above, is positive: "Alcohol is (theoretically) capable of generating an enormous amount of force. It is equally certain that that force does not show itself under the form of heat." It was formerly assumed by physiologists, and supposed to be proved by experience, that it was oxidized in the blood, or used as fuel in maintaining the temperature of the body. For did not the drinker feel the warmth and glow over the whole surface of the body, attended with heightened color? It is now known that these appearances and sensations are deceptive; that these phenomena are not due to a combustion of alcohol, and a creation of internal heat, but to a temporary derangement of the circulation; that, in fact, "the internal temperature is declining."

Says Dr. Benjamin W. Richardson:¹ "The progressive stages of change of animal function from alcohol are four in number. The first is a stage of excitement, when there exists a relaxation and injection of the blood vessels of the minute circulation. . . . In this stage the external temperature of the body is raised; . . . the internal is declining. . . . In the second stage the temperature first comes down to its natural standard, and then declines below what is natural. The fall is not considerable. In man it is confined to three fourths of a degree; and it lasts, even when the further supply of alcohol is cut off, for a long period, viz. from two and a half to three hours. It is much prolonged by absence of food. During the third degree the fall of the temperature rapidly increases; and as the fourth stage is approached it reaches a decline that becomes actually dangerous. There is always during this stage a profound sleep or coma; and while this lasts the temperature continues reduced. . . . Under favorable circumstances a long period is required before the body recovers its natural warmth after such a reduction of heat as follows the extreme stage of alcoholic intoxication. I have known as long a period as three days required in man to bring back a steady natural return of the full animal warmth."

¹ "On Alcohol, Cantor Lectures," pp. 112-115.

This evidence corresponds perfectly with "the experiences of the Arctic voyagers, of the leaders of the great Napoleonic campaign in Russia, and of the good monks of St. Bernard, — all of which testify that death from cold is accelerated by its ally alcohol."¹

Now, the first need of the body to be met by food is, the supply of animal heat; for it speedily dies if the sources of heat are removed or greatly lessened. But alcohol does not answer this need. In this respect, certainly, it is not a food.

3. *It does not supply power to the muscular fiber.* — Dr. Richardson conducted a series of experiments to ascertain the effect of alcohol upon muscular tissue with this result: "In man and in animals, during the period between the first and third stages of alcoholic disturbance, there is often muscular excitement which passes for increased muscular power. The muscles are then truly more rapidly stimulated into motion by the nervous tumult, but the muscular power is actually enfeebled. I would earnestly impress that the systematic administration of alcohol for the purpose of giving and sustaining strength is an entire delusion. I am not going to say that occasions do not arise when an enfeebled or fainting heart is temporarily relieved by the relaxation of the vessels which alcohol, on its diffusion through the blood, induces; but that this spirit gives any permanent increase of power, by which men are able to perform more sustained work, is a mistake as serious as it is universal."²

Now that men of science and the medical faculty have ascertained these facts by the most careful series of experiments, we need not wonder at the positiveness of the almost unanimous verdict against the claims of alcohol as a food. Said Dr. Richardson, at the meeting of the British Association in 1869: "Speaking honestly, I can no more accept the alcohols as foods than I can chloroform or ether."

Dr. Henry Munroe, an English lecturer on medical juris-

¹ Dr. Richardson, "Popular Science Review," April 1872.

² "Lectures on Alcohol," pp. 119, 121.

prudence and histology, testifies: "Alcohol cannot be considered either as a food or as a solvent for food."

Prof. Lehman, in his physiological Chemistry declares: "We cannot believe that alcohol belongs to the class of substances capable of contributing towards the maintenance of the vital functions."

Prof. Moleschott, of Erlangen, says: "Alcohol does not effect any direct restitution, nor deserve the name of an alimentary principle."

Dr. T. K. Chambers, medical adviser of the Prince of Wales, adds: "It is clear that we must cease to regard alcohol as in any sense an aliment, inasmuch as it goes out as it went in, and does not, so far as we know, leave any of its substance behind it."

After an extensive discussion in the British Medical Journal, in 1865, Dr. Markman, the editor, thus sums up the evidence that had been presented; "The grand practical conclusions are these: 1. That alcohol is *not food*; and that, being simply a stimulant of the nervous system, its use is hurtful to the body of a healthy man. 2. It is certain that our greatest and most esteemed authorities have come to the conclusion that it is not assimilated, that it does not undergo decomposition in the body, but, on the contrary, is eliminated as alcohol from it."

Dr. Willard Parker of New York, one of the most eminent of American physicians, and who has enjoyed exceptional opportunities for investigating the influence of alcohol upon the human system, in connection with our oldest inebriate asylum, declares: "Alcohol is not a food, though when taken in small quantities it sometimes acts as a condiment in promoting digestion when the stomach is weak. When taken in quantities it wastes force and produces the disease known as ebriety or alcoholism."

Over one hundred and twenty members of the medical profession, embracing the most eminent practitioners, professors, lecturers, and surgeons have united in this testimony: "We, the undersigned, members of the medical profession of

New York and vicinity, unite in the declaration that we believe alcohol should be classed with other powerful drugs; that, when prescribed medicinally, it should be with conscientious caution and a sense of grave responsibility. We are of opinion that the use of alcoholic liquor as a beverage is productive of a large amount of physical disease; that it entails diseased appetites upon offspring; and that it is the cause of a large percentage of the crime and pauperism of our cities and country. We would welcome any judicious and effective legislation — state and national — which should seek to confine the traffic in alcohol to the legitimate purposes of medical and other sciences, art, and mechanism.”

In these studies and experiments to ascertain the nature of alcohol it has been as convincingly proved that alcohol is a *poison* as that it is a stimulant, or indigestible. And certainly the former fact is as well established by experience as either of the latter. Prof. Munroe, to whom I have already referred, in calling attention to “the last verdict of science” on the question, Is alcohol a poison? says: “Every writer on toxicology has classified alcohol as a narcotic, or a narcotico-acrid poison. For proof I refer you to the works of Prof. Orfila, Dr. Pereira, Prof. Christisson, Dr. Taylor, and other eminent authorities. Alcohol is a powerful narcotic poison; and, if a large dose be taken, no antidote is known to its effects. The experiments of Böcher on the blood with spirits, wine, and beer, the results attested by the microscope, and the researches of Dr. Virchow, the celebrated pathologist, concur in proving that alcohol poisons the blood and arrests the development, as well as hastens the decay, of the red corpuscles.”

Dr. Lees, of Leeds, England, says of alcohol: “On the one hand, we have an agent that retains waste matter, by lowering the nutritive and excretory functions; and, on the other, a direct poisoner of the vesicles of the vital stream.”

Prof. E. L. Youmans, one of the most celebrated chemists in this country, testifies: “We know that the direct action of alcohol upon the tissues is that of a disorganizing poison.”

And Dr. Willard Parker adds: "What is alcohol? The answer is, a poison. It is so regarded by the best writers and teachers on toxicology. I refer to Orfila, Christisson, and the like, who class it with arsenic, corrosive sublimate, and prussic acid. . . . Stay the ravages of this one poison, alcohol, that king of poisons, the mightiest weapon of the devil, and the millennium will soon dawn."

No scientific principle, then, is better established than this: that the fermentation of a saccharine substance, by changing its nutritive properties to an indigestible, innutritious poison, removes it from the category of foods and unfits it for use as a beverage. But the laws of fermentation were always what they now are. The ancient Greeks, Romans, and Hebrews encountered them just as we do, and availed themselves of them in the manufacture of their alcoholic beverages.

At this point in our inquiry, the beverages of the Hebrews referred to in the Scriptures divide themselves into two great classes, *the nutritious* and *the alcoholic*: the former adapted to give health, strength, and vigor to the drinker, the latter to produce an unnatural excitement and stimulation of the nervous system, without affording any real strength, or answering any natural want.

But while this classification is natural, nay, necessary to all minds, the divine as well as the human (since the two states in which these substances exist are separated by chemical reactions, which change their nature completely), a difficulty at once presents itself in drawing the line of demarcation between them. For every saccharine beverage tends to ferment, and certainly will become alcoholic, and actually does, unless this tendency is held in check or destroyed by some artificial process, or the introduction of some antiseptic. Indeed the tendency alluded to is so strong that we can never affirm that the contents of the wine-vat, in their freshest state, are absolutely free from alcohol. A few over-ripe, bruised, or decaying grapes will give a product containing some small per cent of alcohol.

And then, again, there is no appreciable time after the fruit is crushed before the process of fermentation commences in the entire mass of the liquid. So that at no hour subsequent to the expression of the juice from the fruit can we obtain a perfectly sweet unalcoholic beverage, unless some expedient has been resorted to, to destroy or hold in check the tendency to ferment. And in default of this expedient every hour added to its age, for years, perhaps, adds to its stimulating properties.

Recent experiments, instituted by the French chemists Pasteur, Lechartier, Bellamy, Berard, and Fremy, upon the nature of yeast and the alcoholic fermentation of fruits, have established several facts of great significance respecting the question we are considering. One of these is, that "Ferments are not dead albuminoid matter, but actual living organisms." Another is, that "the germs of alcoholic ferments are found on the very surface of the fruit, on the grapes which contain the saccharine liquid, the decomposition of which they excite, as soon as they are placed in contact with it, when the fruit is pressed." And a third, of even greater significance, is, "that the elementary organs of plants in general are endowed, though in a less degree than the cells of yeast, with the property of exciting alcoholic fermentation. . . . The various kinds of fermentation appear as particular cases of the chemical activity of living cells."¹

In the presence of such facts we shall not wonder at the tendency to fermentation of the juices of all saccharine fruits. We shall see the difficulty that presented itself to the ancients in ascertaining, with precision, the boundary line between sweet and alcoholic wines. I have alluded to the efforts of the ancients to retain the saccharine properties of their beverages. They often exposed their grapes for several days in the sun before crushing them to thicken the juice by evaporation, and bring the saccharine fermentation to perfection. They smoked their wines in a fumarium to

¹ P. Schützenburger, International Scientific Series, "On Fermentation," pp. 173-74, 329, 168, and 186-87.

evaporate the watery particles. They poured them from vessel to vessel to rid them of the dregs, which act as a natural ferment. They sunk the casks in water to keep them cool. They took special pains to separate that which flowed from the press before pressure was applied, as being the purest and sweetest. And, more effective than any or all these processes, they boiled their wines to thicken them and destroy the ferment. The Hebrews, as we shall see, reduced a large proportion of the product of the vintage to the condition of a marmalade by boiling it down. Doubtless, they often restored this to a liquid state, and used it as a beverage ; but we have no evidence that they called it a wine.

Another difficulty in making a clear distinction between these two classes of wines presented itself. The natural process of fermentation would not ordinarily proceed to such an extent as to rid their alcoholic wines of all their nutritive properties. Fermentation is a gradual process, depending, for its successful working, upon several conditions, which would rarely all conspire towards the perfect result.

We cannot assume, then, that God commends in the Scriptures the use of those wines only that were absolutely free from the taint of alcohol, absolutely sweet. For we cannot suppose such wines existed to any considerable extent. Nor, on the other hand, can we assume that he prohibited those wines only that were absolutely innutritious and alcoholic ; for then he could have prohibited only the smallest proportion, if any at all. In other words, the discrimination which we find in the Scriptures does not lie between the absolutely sweet and the absolutely alcoholic. It has appeared to me that temperance advocates have sometimes pressed the argument drawn from the so-called sweet wines of the ancients and the estimation in which they were held, according to classic writers, to an extreme. It has often occurred to me to ask, may we not suppose that many of those writers were commending only those wines that were relatively sweet, meaning not unfermented wines at all, but wines containing so large a per cent of saccharine matter as to be sweet after

they have fermented? Thus Dr. Smith remarks:¹ "When the quantity of sugar which is formed during the process of ripening wine is not very large, all of it may be transformed into alcohol; but in larger amount a portion produces about twenty per cent of alcohol, which is sufficient to retard or prevent the transformation of the remainder, and the result is a sweet wine." And hence he calls the Hungarian Tokay a sweet wine, though containing over eighteen per cent of proof spirit. The Greek wines, *Lacrymæ Christi* and *Vinsanto*, made from partially dried grapes, he classes as "sweet," though containing respectively 17.13 and 15.61 per cent. And of another well known wine, he says: "Port wine is a mixed, and not a natural production of the grape; and is, in fact, more of a cordial than a wine. . . . After the juice has been pressed in the usual manner of all countries, whilst the fermentation is going on, a certain quantity of grape or other spirit is added, so as to impede the process and to retain some of the saccharine matter as well as the flavor of the grape, and by that means a wine of a sweeter character and of fuller body than French wines is obtained. Hence a wine is prepared which is sweet and strong, and only partially fermented, whilst its alcoholic strength is raised from thirty-five to forty-two per cent of proof spirit."

While, therefore, it has seemed to me well to utter this caution against basing a direct argument for the existence of unalcoholic wines among the Hebrews upon many of the classic allusions (which more probably related to wines only relatively sweet, but yet fermented), there are other witnesses among the ancients too positive to admit of mistake. There are *recipes* yet in existence which show the various expedients resorted to, about the age in which some of the Scriptures were written, to guard their beverages against fermentation, and retain all their saccharine properties. If these are not followed to-day, they are proof that they were followed for centuries. If the progress of science and the changed habits of Eastern peoples have led to the disuse of

¹ "Foods," pp. 391-398.

sweet wines (in the sense we are using the phrase), there can be no reasonable ground of question that they were extensively used in as nutritious a state as they could be kept with their imperfect methods of manufacture. While the commendations, numerous and decided, of wines that were presumably only relatively sweet, furnish an indirect argument of great force against the use of all alcoholic beverages. But, as we shall soon see, the wines commended in the Scriptures could not have been the present sweet wines of commerce — sweet, because still retaining a large per cent of nutriment, though fermented and highly intoxicating.

In this connection, I wish to emphasize a thought which has not had the prominence, in my judgment, it deserves. In the absence of data respecting the process of wine-manufacture in Palestine and among the Jewish people, we must suppose that they were familiar with the customs of the Romans, Greeks, and Egyptians, with whom they had commerce. We must suppose, again, that, as they were the Lord's people, under instruction from heaven, and favored with almost numberless statutes respecting this very subject, all designed (by common consent) to keep them from intemperate habits, and make them a self-possessed, virtuous people, — we must suppose, I say, that they would hold temperate, nutritious wines in higher esteem than the heathen around them, would carry their manufacture farther, and that they were, in fact, a more temperate people than they. To suppose the contrary would be to go in the face of all our knowledge of mankind, all the facts of history. If, therefore, the wisest and purest of heathen writers commended nutritious wines, and invented various methods to keep them from fermenting, it is presumptive evidence that the Jews did so likewise — that such wines would be especially approved by Christ, his apostles, and the early Christians.

But, to come back from this digression, if the discrimination whose ground and reason we are trying to find does not lie between the absolutely sweet and the absolutely alcoholic, neither, again, do I see evidence that it lies between the little

and the much that is drunk of beverages that were all (according to this assumption) capable of producing intoxication, if taken to excess. Rarely is this phase of the matter alluded to. The great bulk of the references, as we shall see, point to the beverages themselves, and they are referred to as having different characteristics — characteristics so manifestly opposite to each other as to make them appropriate symbols of love and wrath, blessings and curses. The prophets indulged in such a use of them without any fear of being misunderstood. All which implies that they stood out before the mind not only of God and inspired men, but of all the people, in two groups, radically distinct from each other; albeit they had a common origin, and neither could this be regarded as absolutely saccharine, or that as absolutely alcoholic. Albeit the saccharine tended, under certain conditions, to become fermented, constituting a wide border land, where all were tempted to tread, all were liable to fall.

The question returns, then, with renewed emphasis, What is the ground of discrimination between the beverages that were commended of God, and those that were forbidden? Can we find an answer to this question which will reconcile all the apparent discrepancies of the Scriptures, and show every man what is his duty in reference to the use or disuse of the beverages of the present day? To me it appears evident that nothing short of this was designed by the reiterated statutes of God — no one of which, so far as we know, has been repealed.

The design of God in the gift of the vine, the palm-tree, and the various fruits from which the beverages of the Hebrews were made, as well as of all the other fruits and grains, was to provide man with food. This is the original statute, making over to him all the products of the earth for his use. “And God said: “Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat” (Gen. i. 29).

Because in the process of the decay of these nutritious substances a point is reached where alcohol is evolved, it no

more follows that this was given to man for food, or for use as a beverage, than that the putrefaction and rottenness of the next stage of the process of decomposition is to be used "for meat." The importance of alcohol in the arts fully justifies the wisdom of God in the creation of the law of vinous fermentation, without supposing it was designed to be taken into the stomach as a beverage.

Nor, again, because in certain abnormal states of the human system an alcoholic stimulant may be useful in combating disease can we argue the right to use it as a beverage. That a substance has powerful medicinal qualities proves that it is not to be used as food or drink ; that it cannot be without detriment to health. There are two or three references in the Scriptures to the use of wine as a medicine. These passages may therefore be set aside as irrelevant to the question we are considering.

The product of the wine-vat and the juice of the palm-tree were adapted to be used as beverages. And we cannot doubt that God designed they should be used as such, as freely as the natural appetites for food and drink required. Keeping this fact in mind, — that they were given for meat, and that all the commendations and prohibitions of God took account of this design, and were addressed to rational beings, capable of discriminating between nutrition and stimulation, and the language of Scripture becomes intelligible.

The Hebrews saw the dire effects of alcoholic beverages upon the drinker as distinctly as we do. And they learned by experience that when their saccharine drinks were used in a state *characteristically* sweet and nutritious — a state in which they would produce no sensible stimulation — none of these effects occurred. Here, then, was the point where their beverages divided themselves, practically, into the healthful and the harmful. They could detect a poisoned beverage as easily as a rancid horn of oil or a tainted leg of mutton. And they knew that neither was fit for food. The power to produce a sensible stimulation condemned a beverage. The nervous excitement which it occasioned warned them

against its use. They could not drink it, with those characteristics, without the consciousness of sin in so doing. For they knew that it was on account of these characteristics that their Scriptures abounded with warnings and prohibitions when they referred to the use of wine.

Here, then, was the rational and righteous basis for the discriminating statutes of God. The beverage that was characterized by power to produce a sensible stimulation, a nervous excitement, was forbidden. The beverage that satisfied a natural appetite and afforded strength without stimulation was commended. If we will think a moment we shall see that this was the only rational basis God could have adopted, in the absence of the delicate tests of the presence of alcohol known to modern science. It was the only test they could have applied. It was a safe one.

Let us now take one other position of fundamental importance, and the whole subject will be brought before us, as I apprehend, in its true light. The legislation of the Scriptures upon this subject, as upon every other, had respect, not simply to the outward act, but took account especially of *the intent of the drinker*. Does he use a given beverage "for meat," or to produce an unnatural excitement? Is he answering a legitimate call of nature for "the staff of life," or is he ministering to and strengthening a depraved appetite? In the former case he will turn naturally to one class of drinks, in the latter to another. And this discrimination will correspond with the classification we have already made, and show that it is most fundamental. The man who acts rationally, who drinks for health rather than stimulation, will seek those beverages only that are *characteristically nutritious*, that will satisfy nature, and make him strong and vigorous. While he who seeks a beverage for the excitement it will afford will choose one that is *characteristically alcoholic*, and, as the appetite grows, will prefer stronger and stronger wines, and finally end with those that have been fortified by fiery and maddening drugs. Such we know was the fact, and that the Hebrews had both these varieties of "wine and strong drink."

It may be thought that in indulging in these remarks, at the outset of this discussion I am manufacturing laws for the Scriptures, rather than turning reverently to them to find what their legislation is. I have had a double object in view. First, to guard against a misconception respecting the nature of the sweet and alcoholic wines of the Hebrews. To remind the reader that the terms sweet and alcoholic are for the most part relative, rather than absolute ; and to show that the discrimination of God is based on the characteristic qualities of their beverages and the intent of the drinker. Secondly, to call to mind the laws of fermentation, and the methods of counteracting them, which were concerned in the manufacture of their several beverages, because they have a direct bearing upon the interpretation of the Scriptures relating to them. I need only to recall the revolution in the interpretation of some portions of Scripture a few years ago, caused by the discovery of the law of gravitation, or the revolution that is now going on in the interpretation of the book of Genesis, necessitated by the disclosures of the science of geology, to show that we must take account of the known principles of fermentation, in judging of the exact state of the vinous beverages to which the inspired writers referred. We shall soon see that their legislation is in harmony with those principles. Let us turn, —

II., to a careful study of all those passages of the Scriptures in which the beverages of the Hebrews are referred to, in order to find an unequivocal answer, if it be possible, to the question placed at the head of this Article. It will facilitate our investigation to classify them according to the terms by which they were familiarly known in the Hebrew and Greek languages.

1. טירוש, *Tirosh*.

We seem to be stumbled on the threshold by the definition Gesenius gives us of this term, "*must, new wine*, so called because it gets possession of the brain, inebriates, from root טק, *to take, to seize upon, to take possession of, to occupy, mostly by force.*" *Lex.* The reason he gives for the choice

of this term to designate the *must*, the *new wine*, must strike any one, I am sure, as very singular. Then it contains the least alcohol of any state in which it is found; as it flows from the press no appreciable amount. We shall not wonder that the propriety of his reasoning has been questioned by good Hebrew scholars.

Professor Stuart says of it; "Gesenius gives as the ground of it a reason which strikes me as somewhat singular, and without any good foundation. Much more facile and inviting is the etymology of Fürst, in his Hebrew Concordance, who says, that the word in question, being derived as above, means *das gewanne*, that is, *something won, or acquired*, which would, in our language, be equivalent to *good luck*, or, in vulgar parlance, a God-send."

Kitto remarks:¹ "The usual definition of *tirosh* is absurd, viz. that because it is derived from *שָׂרַף*, *to possess, to inherit*, it signifies a strong wine, which is able to get possession of a man and drive him out of himself."

To set the matter in as clear a light as possible, let us turn to the root *שָׂרַף*, which has three significations intimately related to each other: 1. *To take, to seize upon, to take possession of, to occupy, mostly by force*; 2. *To possess, to hold in possession*; 3. *To inherit, receive one's inheritance*. Now it will be seen that the reasoning of Gesenius derives all its force from the assumption that *tirosh* is derived from the first of the above definitions of the root. Is this a necessity? Suppose the second signification enters into it, and then its radical idea will be *possession*, implying that it was one of the important possessions given them in Palestine. Or suppose the third definition lends its meaning; then the germ-thought would be *inheritance*, which would point in the same direction as the last. That it may be derived from one of the secondary meanings of the root, I argue,

1. From the signification of the other derivatives from this root, of which there are five: (a) *רֶשֶׁת*, a net (Ps. lvii. 6); this is evidently derived from the first signification

¹ Bib. Encycl., Vol. i. p. 718; Vol. ii. 953.

of the root in the sense of *catching*; (b) *יְרֵשָׁה*, a *possession*; "I have given Mount Seir for a *possession* unto Esau; Ar for a *possession* unto the children of Lot," etc. (Deut. ii. 5, 9, 19); (c) *מוֹרֶשֶׁת*, *possession*; "The house of Jacob shall possess their *possessions*" (Obad. 17), *יְרֵשׁוּ אֶת מוֹרֶשֶׁתֵיהֶם*, referring to the promised possessions in Palestine; (d) *מוֹרֶשֶׁה*, *possession, heritage*; "I will bring you into the land concerning which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; and I will give it you for a *heritage*" (Ex. vi. 8); (e) *יְרֵשָׁה*, name of the mother of Jotham the king; in the sense of "*possessed*, that is to say, by a husband" (Ges.).

Of these five derivatives only one is taken from the first or primary signification of the root, while two of the last four designate the land of Palestine which God gave to the Jews for a possession, with all its products, from which "corn, wine, and oil" were often singled out as especially valuable. (See Gen. xxvii. 28, 37; Deut. vii. 13; xi. 14; xii. 17; xiv. 23; xvi. 13; xviii. 4; xxxiii. 28; 2 Kings xviii. 32; Hosea ii. 8; vii. 14.)

With these facts before me, I feel justified in adding to this list of derivatives (f) *יְרֵשָׁה*, *must, new wine*, in the sense of *possession* or *inheritance*, it being one of the most valuable products of Palestine, the promised possession of the descendants of Abraham.

2. If *יְרֵשׁ*, the acknowledged root of *tirosh*, were used to describe the effects of intoxicating drinks upon the drinker, there would seem to be some reason in the assumption that *tirosh* denoted such drinks. But I do not find that it is ever so used, notwithstanding the great variety of phraseology employed in setting forth their nature and effects. But it is used, in very many instances, of the possession of Canaan, as Gesenius acknowledges. Thus he says, under the first definition, "spoken very frequently of the occupation of the promised land" (as that was taken possession of by force) (Lev. xx. 24; Deut. i. 8; iii. 18, 20; Ps. xliv. 3; lxxxiii. 12). Under the second, "very frequent in the phrase *יְרֵשׁ אֶרֶץ*, *to possess the (promised) land*, spoken of the quiet occupancy

and abode of the Israelites in Palestine, promised of old to Abraham, and emblematic of the highest prosperity and happiness of life." Since, then, the product of the vine was one of the most important items of this promised possession, it would have been most natural to have derived the name by which it was to be known in its natural state, from *יָרַשׁ*, in the sense of its second definition, *to possess, to hold in possession*. But since I can find no allusion in any use of the radical word to intoxication, I must conclude that no one of its derivatives can have such an allusion, and therefore that the reasoning of Gesenius, by which so many have been led into the belief that the *new wine*, as commended of God, must have been intoxicating, is utterly without foundation. I must say with Professor Stuart, "I draw the conclusion that his view is incorrect."

8. If the term *tirosh* had been employed to designate a wine that was confessedly fermented and alcoholic, then the reasoning of Gesenius respecting its derivation would have had force. But it was chosen to designate the *must*, the wine in its freshest, purest state, in distinction from that which had fermented and lost thereby its natural characteristics. And hence the argument is seen to have no force.

4. But the crucial test will be the use of the term. In no one of the passages where it is found is it so much as implied that it designates an intoxicating drink.

I have felt justified in spending so much time over the derivation of *tirosh*, in order to dispel forever, if it be possible, the delusion that all the wines of Scripture were intoxicating. This has been inferred from the false reasoning of Gesenius, who, for the last sixty-eight years, has been generally regarded as the highest authority. For the Scripture commendations of wine, for the most part, as we shall see, had reference to the *tirosh*. Imperfect or false conceptions of the meaning of this word must vitiate all our thinking and reasoning upon this subject. Let us now bring the nearly two-score instances of its use under our eye.

"God will love thee and bless thee, the fruit of thy

land, thy corn, and thy *tirosh*, and thine oil" (Deut. vii. 13). "I will give you the rain of your land in his due season that thou mayest gather in thy corn and thy *tirosh* and thine oil" (Deut. xi. 14). "They shall come and sing in the height of Zion, and shall flow together to the goodness of the Lord, for wheat and for *tirosh* and for oil. And their souls shall be as a watered garden, and they shall not sorrow any more at all" (Jer. xxxi. 12). "And the earth shall hear the corn and the *tirosh* and the oil" (Hos. ii. 22); referring to the favor which the earth should show to the fruits God gave them for their sustenance. "Behold, I send you corn and *tirosh* and oil, and ye shall be satisfied therewith. And the floors shall be full of wheat, and the fats shall overflow with *tirosh* and oil" (Joel ii. 19, 24). Rabshakeh said to the Jews, when urging them to submit to the king of Assyria, "Until I come and take you to a land like your own land, a land of corn and *tirosh*, a land of bread and vineyards, a land of oil olive and of honey, that ye may live and not die" (2 Kings xviii. 32, repeated in Isa. xxxvi. 17). Isaac invoked a blessing upon Jacob in this language: "God give thee of the dew of heaven, and plenty of corn and *tirosh*. With corn and *tirosh* have I sustained him" (Gen. xxvii. 28, 37). Moses prophesied concerning Jacob, "The fountain of Jacob shall be upon a land of corn and *tirosh*" (Deut. xxxiii. 28). "Thou hast put gladness in my heart, more than in the time that their corn and *tirosh* increased" (Ps. iv. 7). "Honor the Lord with thy substance, so shall thy presses burst out with *tirosh*" (Prov. iii. 9, 10). "The sons of the strangers shall not drink thy *tirosh* for the which thou hast labored" (Isa. lxii. 8). "The *tirosh* is found in the cluster, and one saith, destroy it not, for a blessing is in it" (Isa. lxxv. 8). "Corn shall make the young men cheerful, and *tirosh* the maids" (Zech. ix. 17). The cheer here has no reference to the *tirosh* as an agent of stimulation. It is referred to as nutriment, just as the corn is in the first clause. The word "cheerful," נִיבֵב, is from נִיב, which has two significations; (1) to sprout, germinate; (2) to grow, in-

crease. The latter is evidently the meaning here. "*Tirosh* shall cause the young men and maidens to grow, thrive." There is no look towards the use of *tirosh* as a stimulant, but as food.

And so highly prized was *tirosh*, so great a luxury was it esteemed, that it was said (speaking hyperbolically) to "cheer God," as well as man. "And the vine said unto the trees, Should I leave my *tirosh*, which cheereth God and man" (Judg. ix. 13)? Being held in such esteem by all classes, its removal was regarded and threatened as a judgment. "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, which shall not leave thee corn, *tirosh*, or oil" (Deut. xxviii. 49-51). "The *tirosh* mourneth; the vine languisheth" (Isa. xxiv. 7). "Thou shalt tread out olives, but thou shalt not anoint thee with oil; and *tirosh*, but thou shalt not drink *gayin*" (Mic. vi. 15). This last was by implication, placed as it is in contrast with the *tirosh*, an intoxicating wine. "She did not know that I gave her corn and *tirosh* and oil; therefore will I return and take away my corn in the time thereof, and my *tirosh* in the season thereof" (Hos. ii. 8, 9). "The threshing-floor and the wine-press shall not feed them, and the *tirosh* shall fail in her" (Hos. ix. 2). "The corn is wasted; the *tirosh* is dried up" (Joel i. 10). "I called for a drought upon the *tirosh* and upon the oil" (Hag. i. 11).

The children of Israel were required to pay tithes, and make offerings of the *tirosh*. "All the best of the oil and all the best of the *tirosh*, the first-fruits of them, they shall offer unto the Lord" (Num. xviii. 12). "Thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithe of thy corn, or thy *tirosh*, or thine oil" (Deut. xii. 17). "Thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose to place his name there, the tithe of thy corn and of thy *tirosh* and of thy oil" (Deut. xiv. 23). "And this shall be the priest's due from the people, the first-fruits of thy corn and of thy *tirosh* and of thy oil" (Deut. xviii. 3, 4).

The following passages, referring to the gathering of the tithes of the *tirosh* into the chambers of the Temple for the

use of the priests, need only be referred to: 2 Chron. xxxi. 4, 5; xxxii. 28; Neh. v. 11; x. 37, 39; xiii. 5, 12.

There remain two other references to *tirosh*, which need a few words of explanation. "They [the children of Ephraim] assemble themselves for corn and *tirosh*, and they rebel against me" (Hos. vii. 14). God is not chiding them for using the *tirosh* more than the corn, but for not seeking the blessings of life from him, and rendering to him thanks for them. The verses preceding make this very apparent: "Wo unto them! because they have fled from me. Destruction unto them! because they have transgressed against me, and they have not cried unto me with their heart when they howled upon their beds. They assemble," etc. God had withheld the corn and *tirosh* from them as a judgment for sins. "Whoredom and wine (*yayin*) and *tirosh* take away the heart" (Hos. iv. 11). It has been argued that because *tirosh* is found here in company with whoredom and intoxicating wine, and is said to take away the heart, it must itself be intoxicating. Whoredom is here used tropically for idolatry, of which the first six chapters of Hosea's prophecy are a rebuke. How idolatry and intoxicating wine take away the heart we know. But how, it may be asked, can *tirosh* be said to do the same, if it be not an intoxicant? In the verse preceding this remark God says: "I will punish them for their ways, and reward them for their doings. For they shall eat, and not have enough. They shall commit whoredom, and shall not increase, because they have left off to take heed to the Lord. Whoredom and wine," etc. The remark implies that they were abusing the products of the earth by sacrificing them to the idols in whom they trusted, and therefore God had determined to cut them short. This thought had been again and again referred to in the two preceding chapters. "She did not know that I gave her corn, *tirosh*, and oil, and multiplied her silver and gold, which they prepared for Baal. For she said, I will go after my lovers [idol gods] that gave me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, mine oil and my drink. Therefore

will I return and take away my corn in the time thereof, and my *tirosh* in the season thereof. And I will destroy her vines and her fig-trees, whereof she said, These are my rewards that my lovers have given me." No thought was more prominent in all these rebukes than the grievous abuse of mercies by regarding them as the gifts of their idols. Idolatry, intemperance, and the nutritious product of the vintage (which stands virtually, in this "moral adage," as Henderson has called it, for all the products of the earth above enumerated) turned the heart away from God. The use of the two terms *yayin* and *tirosh* shows that they refer to entirely different substances, and strengthen the force of the statement. God convicts them on three counts, entirely distinct from each other: idolatry, intemperance, and such an abuse of their temporal blessings as led him to withhold them in judgment.

Such are the facts respecting the use of the term *tirosh*—*must, new wine*. Running our eye over these passages, we shall see that the *tirosh* refers to the wine in its natural state, at least in a state characteristically sweet and nutritious. All of these allusions are to a nutriment, an article of food. There is no hint of any alcoholic properties, or any stimulation attending its use. It is everywhere commended, directly or by implication. No restriction is laid upon the freest use of it. It is referred to as one of the most desirable products of Palestine. It is habitually classed with corn and oil, and placed with them in the list of foods. Its abundance was indicative of the favor and blessing of God; its removal by climatic causes or the depredations of the enemy was an index of his displeasure. Offerings were to be made to God of the first-fruits of it, and they were required to give tithes of it, as well as of the corn and oil, for the maintenance of the priests.

A question arises at this point: How long, and under what conditions, was the term *tirosh* applicable to the product of the vintage? If only when it was first expressed, and before fermentation had had time to change essentially its nature,

it is difficult to see how it could have been esteemed so great a blessing as it was, or what could have justified so many references to it. If, on the other hand, it was used to designate it when preserved in its nutritious state by any artificial process, and so long as its natural characteristics as a nutriment remained, all is clear. It formed no inconsiderable portion of their diet from vintage to vintage.

It has been argued by some that *tirosh* designated the vintage crop, and not a liquor at all. True, it is coupled with corn, as an article of food ; so, also, it is coupled with oil, which was used by the Hebrews as food. It seems to have occupied the same place with them as an article of diet as the various beverages, coffee, tea, cocoa, etc., do with us ; and therefore as properly classified as a food. There are, it is true, two or three instances where it refers evidently to the fruit. But in them the reference is rather to the prospective wine, to the juice of the grape. The fats were said to "overflow with *tirosh*," which implied that it was a liquid. God promised that the sons of the stranger "should not *drink* of their *tirosh*," and in Ex. xxii. 29 the *tirosh* and oil are referred to as "liquors," literally, *tears*. For these reasons, I think it evident that *tirosh* refers normally, according to the definitions quoted, to wine, and not to vintage fruit. And to me it seems equally evident that it was applied to it as long as it retained its natural characteristics — as long, in other words, as it was characteristically nutritious and fit for food.

2. טֶרֶף, *Hasis*.

The definition of this term is the same as of the preceding, *must, new wine*. Derived from the verb טָרַף, *to tread down, tread in pieces*, it means *something trodden*, something prepared by the act of treading, referring to the well-known custom of crushing the grapes in the press with the feet. This term would be applied to it during the process of treading it out, and therefore it would denote fresh, sweet wine, though the term might be applied to it after it had

fermented. It would still be something trodden out, and therefore we cannot judge of its characteristics from its derivation. The following are the only instances of its use :

“I would cause thee to drink of spiced wine, of the juice (*hasis*) of my pomegranate” (Cant. viii. 2). “Among the Greeks and Romans certain leaves, or aromatic substances, were infused in the expressed juice, or must, for their flavors” (New Am. Cycl.). The *hasis* refers here to the newly expressed juice of the pomegranate, rendered aromatic and high-flavored by the addition of spices. It was a delicacy fit for an offering by the bride to her beloved. Nothing indicates that it was a fermented drink. Doubtless, the spices added to the fresh juice of the pomegranate would retard or destroy the tendency to ferment. Professor Cowles says of the references to wine and spices in this song, “According to the sentiments of that age, wine and the fragrance of sweet spices filled their highest ideal of things delightful. Here the spices were added to the wine.” “Awake, ye drunkards, and weep; and howl all ye drinkers of *yayin*, because of the *hasis*, for it is cut off from your mouth” (Joel i. 5). The *hasis* was cut off as a judgment for their sins by an irruption of locusts (vs. 4) and a great drought (vs. 11, 12), so that the drunkards could have no (*yayin*) intoxicating wine. The contrast between the two varieties implies that the *hasis* was a sweet wine, the *yayin* an alcoholic. “The mountains shall drop down *hasis*, and all the hills shall flow with milk” (Joel iii. 18). The *hasis* is here used as a symbol of great abundance of food. Amos ix. 13 uses the same figure. “I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh; and they shall be drunken with their own blood as with *hasis*” (Isa. xlix. 26). The verb here rendered “They shall be drunken,” *יִשְׂכְּרוּ*, means, (1) “to drink to the full, to drink to hilarity, to be merry; oftener (2), to drink deeply, to be drunken, intoxicated (Gen. ix. 21; Isa. xlix. 26).” (Lex.). We should have good sense if we were to adopt the first definition, and read, “they shall drink their blood to the full as *hasis*,” i.e. as one drinks *hasis* to

surfeiting. But when we find, as we shall, that it is always the intoxicating cup and drunkenness that are used by the sacred writers as symbols of evil, of judgment, and slaughter, we shall see the propriety of adopting the second definition here, as Gesenius has done, justifying the rendering of our common version, "They shall be *drunken*," ect. If, in the four preceding instances, the *hasis* was evidently sweet and unalcoholic, and as evidently regarded as a blessing and a delicacy, in this (the only remaining instance of its use), it is as evidently regarded as partially fermented, slightly alcoholic, and therefore a suitable emblem of a terrible slaughter in the distance. But why did not the prophet choose one of the most fiery, most alcoholic beverages he was acquainted with? This would have weakened rather than strengthened his threatening. He wished to express a *great* slaughter of their foes. God would make them drink their own blood in great draughts, as one would be compelled to drink wine that was only slightly fermented, in order to become drunken. It will be seen at a glance that, as the prophet here used the term, the less alcoholic the beverage adopted for a symbol, the more terrible the slaughter symbolized; provided only its excessive use would produce drunkenness.

The point to be particularly noted in the use of this term is, that so long as the *hasis* is regarded as fresh, nutritious, and fit for food, it is esteemed as a temporal good, and a suitable symbol of spiritual good. But as soon as it comes to mind as an agent of intoxication it is made symbolic of bloodshed and terrible slaughter.

8. חָמֵר, *Hemer*.

The root from which this term is derived is חָמַר, which signifies, (1) *to boil up, to ferment, to foam*; (2) *to be red*, from the idea of boiling, foaming, becoming heated or inflamed; (3) *to swell, to rise up in bubbles* or heaps, from the idea of boiling up, foaming, as the sea, leaven, etc.; (4) *to daub with bitumen, to pitch*. (*Lex.*) *Hemer*, then, might

denote, so far as its derivation is concerned, a beverage that had been boiled, that had fermented, or that was red. It occurs only twice, and seems to be used in the latter sense in both.

“Thou didst drink the pure blood of the grape” (Deut. xxxii. 14); literally, “Thou didst drink *hhemer*, the blood of the cluster.” In their forty years journey in the wilderness, of which Moses was speaking, they pressed wine from the grapes and drank it, as Pharaoh in Egypt was accustomed to drink it, at the hand of his chief butler (Gen. xl. 11). “A vineyard of red wine (of *hhemer*). I, the Lord, do keep it; I will water it every moment” (Isa. xxvii. 2, 3). The reference in both these passages is to the red juice of the colored grape, in the cluster, or newly pressed from it, and hence called in the former passage

4. דָּם-חֵנָב, *Dam-Henabh*.

“Thou didst drink *hhemer dam-henabh*, the red wine, the blood of the cluster.” Jahn says (Arch. § 66): “The grapes of Palestine are mostly red or black, whence originated the phrase, ‘blood of grapes.’” The office of the juices of the cluster makes the term especially appropriate; they are its blood. This poetic expression is found only in one other passage. “He (Judah) washed his clothes in the *blood of grapes*” (Gen. xlix. 11); *dam-henabh*, i.e. in the act of treading them in the press.

Here, then, are two other terms used to denote the unfermented juice of the grape; and we have brought to light another method of preparing it for use as a beverage, viz. pressing it into the cup from which it was to be quaffed. The Hebrews had learned this method in Egypt; and no doubt practised it, at least upon occasions, in after years.

We have now brought under our eye four terms used by the Hebrews to designate their saccharine drinks. All the evidence we can get respecting their import and their use shows that they were unfermented, nutritious wines, at least wines characteristically sweet, adapted to satisfy the natural

appetite and promote health and strength. They were given for this purpose. Their abundance was the token of God's favor to them. Their destruction by the incursion of enemies, by drought, insects, or mildew was an indication of God's displeasure and a warning to repentance. In these forty-five passages there is only one reference to a drink that was alcoholic, and that only slightly so. But in that one instance it is referred to as a symbol of a terrible slaughter of their enemies on the field of battle.

In view of these facts, how foolish and erroneous the assumption that the wines of the ancients were always intoxicating, and that we can find no line of demarcation between the sweet and the alcoholic. If the passages we have cited were all the references to wine found in the Scriptures we should not know that the Jews had any knowledge of intoxicating wine; we should have had no warnings against its use; no instance of drunkenness would have been recorded.

It will give completeness to our conception of the value of the vine-crop, and the purpose of God in the gift of the vine, to add two other terms with their references; though neither of them was, properly speaking, a wine.

5. ~~רֶחֶק~~, *Ashishah*.

The translators of our version of the Bible seem to have been ignorant of the meaning of this term; for they translate it in two instances "*flagons of wine*," italicizing the last two words; in one they used the same phrase without the italics; and in the fourth we find simply "flagons." The Douay translators seem to have been in still greater doubt; for they render in two instances "flour fried with oil"; in one, "flowers"; and in the remaining instance, "the husks of the grape." It is now known to mean, "cakes prepared from grapes or raisins" (*Lex.*).

"David dealt among all the people to every one a cake of bread and a good piece *of flesh* and a *flagon of wine*" (2 Sam. vi. 19) — *ashishah*, a raisin cake. 1 Chron. xvi. 8; Cant.

ii. 5; Hos. iii. 1. Though this term does not refer to a drink, as our version implies, it shows us another of the methods by which the Hebrews preserved the grapes from vintage to vintage for use as food; and it gives us a clearer conception of the worth of the vine to a people inhabiting, as were the Jews, a rocky, mountainous district, upon large tracts of which the cereals could not be cultivated. The same lesson is taught by the frequent references to another term:

6. דְּבַשׁ, *Dbhash*.

The primary meaning of this word is, "honey of bees"; its secondary, "honey of grapes," i.e. "syrup, the newly-expressed juice of the grape, *must*, boiled down to the half or third part" (Lex.). This is never called wine; but, thinned by the addition of water, it was doubtless used as a beverage, though ordinarily, perhaps as a condiment. It was manufactured in Palestine in the earliest ages of which we have any record, even monumental, as Champollion has shown. In the days of the prophets it was exported to foreign nations, as it has been extensively ever since. It is now called by the natives *dibs* (retaining the same radical letters), and is accounted by all classes a great luxury. This was, without doubt, the honey referred to in the following passages: Gen. xliii. 11; 2 Kings xviii. 31, 32; 2 Chron. xxxi. 5; Isa. vii. 22; Jer. xli. 8; Ezek. xxvii. 17.

And may not the term "honey" be used in this sense in the promises of God to give to Israel "a land flowing with milk and honey" (Ex. iii. 8, 17; xiii. 5; Lev. xx. 24; Num. xiii. 27; Deut. xxvii. 3; Josh v. 6; Ezek. xx. 6)? The term is the same; and though bees were abundant, and their honey is sometimes clearly referred to, they had it in no such quantity as the honey of grapes, and its value, in comparison with the latter, was a mere trifle.

Thus far all our references to the fruit of the vine have brought to light only instances of its legitimate use, in its nutritious state, for food, and with the expressed or implied favor of God. But as we advance we shall soon begin to

discover the sinful inventions of men to turn God's blessings into curses. The most important of the remaining terms, and the one more frequently found than any other, is :

יַיִן, *Yayin*.

Gesenius defines this word, "*Wine*, so called, perhaps, from its fermenting, effervescing. See root יַיִן, *to boil up, to ferment*; unless we prefer to regard it as a primitive."

In the doubt that exists on this subject, I am inclined to adopt the latter alternative—that it is a primitive word. This view seems to my mind to be sustained (1) By the frequency of its use—nearly one hundred and fifty times; (2) By its referring to different qualities of wine; (3) By its great antiquity. It is older than Babel. It made its impress upon the Japhetic dialects, which were finally merged in the languages of modern Europe. Thus we find: Gr. *olvos*; Lat. *vinum*; Sax. *win*; Goth. *wein*; Ger. *win* and *wein*; Dut. *wiin*; Icel., Swed., and Fr. *vin*; Dan. *viin* and *vin*; Russ., Ital., and Span. *vino*; Welch, Ir., and Gael. *fion*; Slav. *wino*; and Eng. *vine* and *wine*.

Since this term is used in all possible connections, in illustrations, and figuratively, it will obviously be impossible, in many instances, to determine what particular variety was in the mind of the writer, or that any *variety* was in mind. It was used *generically*, as we use the terms "wine," "beer," "tea," "cider." In many cases, however, *the use* will determine whether a sweet or an alcoholic wine was in mind. We may group the passages containing this term under the five following heads :

1. *Those that refer to wine that is obviously nutritious and unalcoholic.*—Of Judah it was said: "He washed his garments in *yayin*, and his clothes in the blood of grapes" (Gen. xlix. 11). The parallelism, as also the well-known process of treading out the grapes referred to, limit the meaning of *yayin*, in this instance, to the juice of the grape as it spurted from the clusters upon the garments of the treader.

Servants were appointed to "oversee the fine flour and the *yayin* and the oil" (1 Chron. ix. 29) in the Temple. But, as we have already seen, it was the new wine — the *tirosh* — that was tithed.

"God brings forth food out of the earth; and *yayin* maketh glad the heart of man, oil maketh his face to shine, and bread strengtheneth man's heart" (Ps. civ. 14, 15). The *yayin*, oil, and bread are brought out of the earth for food. The verb rendered "maketh glad" means "to rejoice, to be joyful, to be glad. The primary idea seems to be that of a cheerful and joyful countenance" (Lex.). Though used in some instances of shouts of joy, as of those who are making merry, I do not find it applied to the boisterous mirth of the drunkard, but rather to the joy of the saints in God, as when David says: "I will be glad and rejoice in thee; I will sing praise to thy name, O thou Most High." There is an allusion, in connection with the oil and bread, to the sources of the happiness of one who is abundantly provided with food and drink, whose hunger and thirst are satisfied. A noun derived from this same verb is found in Eccl. ix. 7: "Eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy *yayin* with a merry heart; for God now accepteth thy ways." "Merry," מְרִיב, *good*. Of the seven definitions Gesenius gives of this word no one of them refers to the state of exhilaration produced by the use of wine or any other stimulant. He defines the word, as here used, "cheerful, joyful," and classes the phrase with the same in 1 Kings viii. 66: "The people went into their tents joyful and *glad of heart*, מְרִיבֵי לֵב, for all the goodness, יְשׁוּבָה, that the Lord had done for David his servant and for Israel his people."

Yet I have found instances in which מְרִיב refers to the state of the drunkard. "Nabal's heart was *merry* within him; for he was very drunken" (1 Sam. xxv. 36). "Mark ye now when Ammon's heart is *merry* with wine" (2 Sam. xiii. 28). Also Esth. i. 10. These seem to be exceptional uses of the term; the writers referring to the drunkards' estimation of their condition as "good." But I cannot sup-

pose that Solomon uses the term in this sense in the exhortation, "Drink thy wine with a merry heart," commending drunkenness. He is referring to the common use of wine with food, and as food, as in several other parts of the book. Thus: "There is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink, and that he should make his soul enjoy the *good* in his labor" (Eccl. ii. 24. See also iii. 12, 13; v. 18). And perhaps he had in mind only the ordinary cheer of convivial gatherings in Eccl. x. 19: "A feast is made for laughter, and *yayin* maketh merry," וְיַיִן מְשַׂמֵּחַ הַיָּמִים, *And wine makes the lives joyful*, i.e. of those who partake of the feast.

In Eccl. ii. 3 Solomon gives us a phase of his early experience: "I sought in mine heart to give myself unto *yayin*, yet acquainting mine heart with wisdom; and to lay hold on folly, that I might see what was that good for the sons of men, which they should do under the heaven, all the days of their life." He doubtless refers here to indulgence in the use of intoxicating wine, for he says he resolved to be on his guard, to govern himself by the dictates of wisdom (by which he acknowledges that he knew he was on dangerous ground), but he soon found that, like mirth and laughter, numerous servants and money-getting, it was "vanity and vexation of spirit" (vs. 11). He does not contradict himself in the references above referred to, and commend the free use of stimulants after that experience, but of wine characteristically sweet and nutritious, and therefore adapted to use as food. Such I regard to be the teaching of the book of Ecclesiastes upon the point in question. Though if one think otherwise it will not affect our argument at all, as no one can suppose that Solomon was inspired in the several decisions to which he came, in the search to find the chief good.

In Prov. ix. 2, 5, wisdom is represented as mingling her *yayin*, and inviting all to partake; "She hath killed her beasts, she hath mingled her *yayin*. . . . Come, eat of my bread and drink of the *yayin* that I have mingled."

The ancients were accustomed to reduce their inspissated and honeyed wines with water and milk. Thus Isaiah (chap. liv. 1) invites the world to the feast of the gospel in this language: "Come, buy *yayin* and milk." And the bride says, in Cant. v. 1, "I have drunk my *yayin* with my milk." There are two other references in this Canticle to nutritious wines: chap. vii. 9, "The roof of his mouth is like the best *yayin* (כַּיִין חֲטִיב) for my beloved, that goeth down sweetly," לִטְוֵי-פִי, with *uprightness, in sincerity*. "The phrase 'roof of the mouth,' seems to be put, by way of delicacy, for the saliva or moisture which accompanies a kiss" (Lex.). A similar expression occurs in chap. v. 16: "His mouth is most sweet," literally, *sweetnesses*. In chap. viii. 2, already referred to, the "juice (*hasis*) of the pomegranate" is referred to as *yayin*, יַיִן חֲרִיקָה, *spiced wine*. Isaiah evidently refers to sweet, newly-made wine. "The treaders shall tread out no *yayin* in their presses" (Isa. xvi. 10).

Jeremiah also: "Gather ye *yayin* and summer fruits and oil, and put them in your vessels" (Jer. xl. 10). "I have caused *yayin* to fail from the wine-presses; none shall tread with shouting" (Jer. xlviii. 33). In Lam. ii. 11, 12, he represents "the children and sucklings as swooning in the streets, and saying to their mothers, where is corn and *yayin*?" They cry out for their accustomed food, bread and *yayin*.

Referring to the abundance God would give them after the captivity, Amos, chap. ix. 13, 14, represents them as planting vineyards and drinking the *yayin*, which he identifies as the *hasis*, or sweet wine. (See p. 124.) Two other passages may be included under this head, referring to "wine and strong drink," which will be found on a following page.

Thus the evidence accumulates, under this term *yayin*, that the Jews made extensive use of nutritious wines as food, or to satisfy the natural appetites of all classes, even of young children; always to their profit, always with the approbation of God. The *yayin*, being generic, embraced the sweet and unalcoholic wines, by whatsoever means they were kept from fermentation, or by whatsoever specific names they may have

been called. They were all *yayin*. The term is not restricted to alcoholic wines, though including them, as we shall soon see.

2. *Passages in which the probable reference is to nutritious wines.* — They are statements of fact. No doubt many good men drank alcoholic wines then as now. If, therefore, any one prefers to classify these passages differently our argument will not be affected thereby. The decisive question is, What has God said in those passages that express his mind ?

“Melchizedek brought bread and *yayin*” (Gen. xiv. 18). Jacob brought Isaac *yayin* (Gen. xxvii. 25). “There is bread and *yayin* also for me and for thy handmaid” Judg. xix. 19). “Then Abigail made haste and took two hundred loaves and two bottles of *yayin* and five sheep,” etc. (1 Sam. xxv. 18). See also 2 Sam. xvi. 1, 2; 1 Chron. xii. 40; 2 Chron. ii. 10, 15; with 1 Kings v. 9; Neh. xiii. 15; Jer. xl. 10, 12; Ezek. xxvii. 18; in most of which, it will be observed, the *yayin* is regarded as food, is presumably nutritious or characteristically sweet. We must not judge of them by a modern bill of fare, but by what we have learned of the habits of the Hebrews, and what we know of the opinions of the wise and good of that day among the Greeks and Romans, who, heathen as they were, spoke in praise of nutritious wines.

Thus far we have had only the merest hint of God’s disapprobation of the use of wine. We have not had an instance of drunkenness; not even a reference to drunkenness, save that in which God threatened to feed the enemies of his people with fermented *hasis*; we have not had a prohibition or a warning. But as we turn the next leaf in the statutes of God all is changed. And the reason of the change is not concealed from us.

(To be continued.)