

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

DO THE SCRIPTURES PROHIBIT THE USE OF ALCOHOLIC
BEVERAGES?

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

III.—NEW TESTAMENT VIEW OF WINE AND STRONG DRINKS.

IN coming to an examination of the New Testament view of wine and strong drink, I shall assume that the principles that controlled the writers of the Old Testament may be expected to appear in the New. No important changes had taken place in the customs and habits of the people. The nature of fermentation had not changed. The mind of God and good men respecting the nature and use of alcohol had not changed. We must expect, therefore, that Christ and his apostles will bear the same testimony as did the prophets under the old dispensation. The liberty which Christ comes to proclaim will not be *freedom to drink intoxicating wine and strong drink, but freedom from the bondage of appetite for them*. As we have found hitherto, so may we expect to find as we advance, that the argument is cumulative, gaining strength by every new allusion to saccharine drinks in history or in symbol.

The translators of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament failed to discriminate between the different varieties of wine, by the use of different terms, as the Hebrew writers had done, using for the most part the term *oivos, oinos*, whenever the referencé was to a vinous beverage. The writers of

the New Testament, being familiar with that version, did the same with a single exception. They referred once also to the Hebrew *shekhar* by its Greek equivalent. The translators of our English Bible followed their example, so that we have but three terms for consideration, and two of these appear only once.

1. Γλεῦκος, *gleukos*.

This was the *tirosh* of the Hebrew, "*must, new wine*. In New Test. *sweet wine*, Acts ii. 13" (Lex.). The name is derived from the adjective γλυκός, *sweet*, which implies that it designated the *must* in its *freshest, sweetest* condition. "A certain amount of juice exuded from the ripe fruit from its own pressure, before the treading commenced. This appears to have been kept separate from the rest, and to have formed the γλεῦκος, or sweet wine noticed in Acts ii. 13" (Smith's Bib. Dic.).

When the Spirit was poured out on the day of pentecost, some were amazed, "others mocking, said, these men are full of *gleukos*." They meant by the cavil that the disciples and others had been drinking a wine somewhat intoxicating. Why did they use the term *gleukos*, and not rather *oinos* or *sikera*? Because, as we have seen, p. 120, this was the variety tithed and brought up to the feast. The remark was made in mockery, and must be so interpreted. And it sounds very much like the cavil we have all heard respecting "sweet cider." It implied that while parties pretended to have used it in its sweet, unfermented state, they had, in fact, drunk it in its fermented state, at least sufficiently so to intoxicate those who were "full" of it. The remark confirms all we have said respecting the nature of the wines used at their feasts, for if the cavilers could have assumed that they had used strong wines, with any show of reason, they would certainly have done so, and made a much stronger case. They did the best they could under the circumstances, by assuming that they had used a corrupted specimen of *gleukos*, and were "full" of it. Remembering that

somewhat over six months had passed since the autumn vintage, we can take in the case perfectly. A weak or spurious or neglected *gleukos* would very probably have been corrupted, though still bearing the name, as we saw under *hasis*, p. 125. Peter had no time to enter into the formal proof that they were not intoxicated, but stopped their mouths at once by reference to a fact that showed its impossibility, even upon their own assumption, "It is but the third hour of the day"—nine o'clock in the morning.

2. *Oivos, oinos.*

When not rendered specific by the adjectives *old* and *new*, *oinos* is used *generically* like the Hebrew *yayin*, of which it is the Greek equivalent. It simply designates a vinous beverage, but gives no clew to its nature. This must be determined by reference to the context, if at all.

Said our Lord, "Neither do men put new wine (*οἶνον νέον*) into old bottles; else the bottles break, and the *oinos* runneth out, and the bottles perish. But they put *οἶνον νέον* into new bottles, and both are preserved." And he adds to this illustration, in Luke, "No man also having drunk old (*παλαιόν*, the *οἶνον* being understood,) straightway desireth new, for he saith the old is better" (Matt. ix. 17; Mark ii. 22; Luke v. 37-39). These remarks were in answer to some who asked why he and his disciples did not fast as they did? He showed them by three illustrations—taken from a wedding, from an old garment mended with new cloth, and from new wine put into old bottles—that there would be a want of fitness in such austerities in their case; and by reference to the use of wine as a beverage he rebukes them for rejecting the blessings of the new dispensation, of whose freshness and sweetness his disciples were partaking. The "new wine" of vs. 37 ("no man putteth new wine into old bottles"), represented the grace and favor which constitute the glory of the gospel dispensation. It was appropriate that it take on new forms, or be put in new bottles, and not in the old. The old fermented wine represented the austerities of the Levitical

economy, which Christ had come to displace, — represented the tithes, fasts, and ritualistic burdens, all of which he was to nail to his cross, and from which he was already freeing his disciples.

The new and old wine of the last illustration must have the same meaning. He sets forth their folly and sin in rejecting his gospel by the conduct of men who have so vitiated their taste by the use of fermented wines that they have no relish for the new, sweet, and healthful. "The old," say they, "is better." This was not the judgment of Christ respecting the superiority of old, fermented wines, but of drunkards, whose habit it had been to drink them. So using the figure, he sets new wine in favorable contrast with the old, the *tirosh* with the intoxicating *yayin*. Some, however, regard the illustration as apologetic, rather than as a reproof, excusing the parties for not embracing his doctrines at once, emphasizing the *εὐθείως*, *straightway, immediately*. But this does not alter the bearing of the illustration upon the subject we are considering — the acknowledged superiority of sweet nutritious wines over intoxicating.

3. Σίκερα, *Sikera*.

This was the *shekhar* of the Old Testament, used only once, and then in connection with *οἶνος*, as in the original statute respecting the Nazarites (Luke i. 15). "He [John] shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither *οἶνος* nor *sikera*." This prohibition, as we saw on p. 321, embraced every variety of saccharine beverages. The Jews, therefore, in their cavils, charged it upon John that "he had a devil," because he came neither eating bread nor drinking *oinon*." And when Christ lived as other pious and temperate Jews lived, they charged him with being "a wine-bibber" — *οἶνο-πότης* (Luke vii. 33, 34).

The one cavil had as much foundation in truth as the other. There was nothing in the life of Christ that justified the belief that he used wine for the purpose of stimulation (for that was the import of the cavil), but only as a nutri-

ment ; as there was nothing in the life of John that showed that he had a devil.

In the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke x. 34), Christ represents him as using wine medicinally — “ pouring into his wounds oil and *oinon*.”

We come now to the first miracle of our Lord — turning water into wine (John ii. 1–10 ; iv. 46). This narrative has always been the stumbling-stone of the New Testament, — “ The Saviour made wine at a wedding. Yes, wrought a miracle rather than that the guests should be without it.” A stone of stumbling truly (Isa. xxviii. 7), if it were inebriating wine, both to those who drank it, and to all who should ever read the narrative ! But perhaps it was *not* inebriating. Perhaps it was like that which he had always been making since the world began. Every husbandman had found the clusters full of wine when the autumn vintage came round. But no one ever found a drop of it intoxicating. Perhaps he made that variety which he everywhere commended in the Old Testament — the nutritious *tirosh*. We are compelled to put this and that together, and to assume, unless forbidden on exegetical grounds, that the one hundred and twenty-five gallons Christ then and there created were sweet, nutritious, and healthful. He was able, it is true, to make one variety as well as another. But as he had always first made it in a nutritive, and never in an alcoholic state through the laws of nature, it is reasonable to assume that he would do so miraculously. As he had, all through the Old Testament made nutritious wines the symbol of good, temporal and spiritual, and alcoholic the symbol of evil, it is very difficult for us to assume that he would now have filled those water-pots with the latter, rather than the former, when it was his wont “ to live by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.”

But it will be replied, “ The ruler of the feast pronounced it the ‘ good wine,’ i.e. better than that which had been served.” Certainly. But that is not saying it was more intoxicating. We bring that idea to the word “ good ” by reason of the vitiated tastes of the present day, and our

ignorance of nutritive, unintoxicating wines. But it is an anachronism, altogether out of place here. Suppose the remark had reference solely to other qualities, it would have been equally appropriate. Or suppose the master of the feast to have been a temperate man, regarding nutritious wines as preferable to alcoholic. Then the remark would prove such to have been the wine Christ had provided. This latter supposition is certainly more admissible than its opposite at a wedding party to which Christ, his mother, and disciples had been invited, and with the legislation of the Old Testament and the habits of pious Jews in mind.

But it will be asked, again, "Does not the remark of the ruler of the feast, 'When men have well drunk, then that which is worse,' refer to the results of the use of intoxicating wine?" I answer, Yes. The verb "well drunk," *μεθύσκει*, means "to make drunk, Mid., to become drunk, to be drunken, common English, to get drunk, and by implication, to carouse" (Lex.). Another verb from the same root has a similar signification, and a cognate noun is defined "a drunkard." It is impossible, then, to interpret the passage in any other way than as referring to the excessive use of intoxicants, which rendered the guests incapable of judging as to the quality of a new variety set before them. The ruler of the feast was referring to a well-known custom. But the phrase, "Every man at the beginning doth set," etc., is not to be taken in the strictest sense, in a universal sense, but is equivalent to our expression — "People do, say, this or that." He was referring to the custom of those who served alcoholic wines. He was not confessing that every body served such wine at weddings. Least of all was he confessing that such wine had been served at that feast, and that he himself and the guests were so drunken as to be incapacitated to pass a judgment upon the new wine. He was passing a judgment as a sane and sober man. He was contrasting the state of things at that feast with those that were common where alcoholic wines were served. The remark implied that the bridegroom had not furnished them for his guests. The

spirit of the remark was, "This last wine is the best that has been served, unlike the custom where alcoholic wines are provided." I repeat, then, it is not so much as hinted that there was drunkenness at *that* wedding feast, that they had been using intoxicating wine, and that Christ had ministered to that intoxication by creating over a hundred gallons more. The implication is all the other way, and in condemnation of the customs alluded to.

Let not, then, the example of Christ be pleaded by the makers, or venders, or drinkers of wine to justify the use of modern stimulants, of whatever kind, even at a wedding. The argument would have no weight, unless it were first proved that the contents of the "six water-pots" were alcoholic. But this can never be done. The circumstances and surroundings of the feast are all against the supposition; the argument of the governor is a decided negative.

Nor could the example of Christ be pleaded in justification of the use of modern intoxicants, unless it were proved, secondly, that the wine he created was as noxious and deadly as the fabricated wines of commerce, and the concentrated poison of the still.

The evangelist Mark (chap. xv. 23) informs us that when Christ was suspended to the cross, "They gave him to drink *oinon* mingled with myrrh, but he received it not." Matthew uses the phrase, "Vinegar mingled with gall" (*ὄξος μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον*), copying the terms from the Septuagint of Ps. lxi. 21. If we ask, Was it then wine or vinegar? the answer would be, Wine-vinegar, a vinegar made of a weak wine, that had passed into or through the acetate fermentation, just as we speak of cider-vinegar, or a vinegar made from cider. This, when mingled with water, was a common drink of the soldiers. In the case before us, however, it was drugged with something intensely bitter, to stupefy him. The Hebrew term in Ps. lxi. 21, "They gave me gall," is *שֶׁמֶר*, *the poppy*. Christ refused it, because he wished to come to his death in the full possession of all his faculties. When, at a later hour, they offered him the vinegar only he

received it, to quench his dreadful thirst (Matt. xxvii. 48 ; Mark xv. 36 ; John xix. 29).

The only remaining passages in the Gospels where wine is spoken of refer to the last Paschal supper and the institution of the Eucharist. The term "wine," however, is not found in this history, but we know that the cup at the Paschal feast was filled with some variety of *oinos*. In a full discussion of the subject, I should endeavor to show that the wine at this feast was unfermented, or unleavened, the pure "fruit of the vine," as Christ called it.¹ But as the ritual use of wine has nothing to do with the question under discussion, I pass these allusions to *oinos* without further remark.

We come, then, to the references to wine in the Epistles and the Revelation.

In Rom. xiv. 21 the apostle Paul, in urging the duty of "following after peace, and things whereby one may edify another," adds, "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink *oinon*, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or made weak." He strengthens the remark by choosing for his illustration important articles of food and drink — two of the staples of diet, meat and wine. Even these, which it was right to use freely as food under other circumstances, it was duty to refrain from, if they had been offered to idols, so that the use of them would seem to justify idolatry. Indeed, so clear and so important did this duty seem to him, that he declared (1 Cor. viii. 13) that "if *meat* made his brother to offend, he would eat no meat while the world should stand." The reference being to wine as an article of diet shows that it was the nutritious wine to which he was referring. But, standing on this platform of doctrine and duty, and with the intemperance of the Jewish people, and the drunken orgies of heathenism on every side of him, he could not have hesitated a moment in renouncing all mere luxuries, as many account alcoholic wines to be, all harmful drinks, as fermented wines everywhere proved themselves to

¹ See "Proceedings of the New England Ministerial Temperance Conference." Boston, 1876, p. 53.

be. Indeed, he included these in the added phrase, "nor *anything* whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or made weak."

Eph. v. 18: "Be not drunk with *oinos*, wherein is excess." It would be strange if the Spirit of inspiration did not sometimes rebuke excess, drunkenness, etc. But because this is so, many are disposed to draw an argument therefrom for the temperate use, as they call it, of intoxicants.

It is said that several years ago a Scotch deacon advertised for a second wife, on the ground that Paul had said "a bishop must be the husband of *one* wife;" from which he argued that a deacon might have two or more. This Edinburgh deacon may have originated the above plea for tippling. But the rebuke of one sin does not license another. To prohibit drunkenness, does not, by implication, sanction every indulgence short of excess. The sixth commandment does not permit us to trespass upon the property of our neighbor provided we do not *steal* it. The eighth does not justify any trespass upon his health provided we spare his life. On the other hand, to forbid stealing, covers all trespass, killing all harm, and drunkenness all habits that lead to drunkenness, all agents that make us drunk; just as the lustful look is adultery (Matt. v. 28), and hatred is murder (1 John iii. 15).

1 Tim. iii. 2, 3: "A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, . . . not given to wine." Of the fifteen qualifications for the office of a Christian minister here enumerated, three have a bearing upon the question we are considering. 1. *Vigilant*, *νηφάλιον*, "*Sober, temperate, abstinent*, especially in respect to wine" (Lex.). This was also required of aged men and the wives of deacons (v. 11), and by the use of the verb *νήφω* from which this adjective is derived, both Paul and Peter lay the same injunction upon all (1 Thess. v. 6, 8; 2 Tim. iv. 5; 1 Pet. i. 13; v. 8.) 2. *Sober*, *σώφρονα*, "*of sound mind, sane*; in New Test., *sober-minded, temperate*, having the mind, desires, passions,

moderated, and well-regulated" (Lex.). This also was required of aged men, in Titus ii. 2. 3. *Not given to wine, μὴ πάροικον*, "not by wine, not given to wine" (Lex.).

The first two terms imply habits, and a state of body and mind that no one can be in who is under the influence of stimulants to any degree. But the last phrase, "not by wine," goes further, and requires "the double degree of purity," as Josephus expresses it, which God enjoined upon the priests during the period of their ministrations, and upon the Nazarites while under their vow, viz. entire abstinence from all varieties of wine. Whiston, the translator of Josephus, says upon this passage, "The lawgiver of the Jews required of the priests a double degree of purity, in comparison of that required of the people, of which he gives several instances immediately. It was for certain the case also among the first Christians of the clergy, in comparison of the laity, as the apostolical constitutions and canons everywhere inform us."¹ Professor Stuart so understood the passage. Hence, when Paul was referring to the same subject in Tit. i. 7, he uses again the same phraseology: "A bishop must be blameless, not given to wine."

This interpretation is still further strengthened by the fact that when he refers to the qualifications of a deacon, in vs. 8, he changes the phraseology, and writes, "not given to much wine," *μὴ οἶνον πολλῶν προσέχοντας*, "not holding to, or devoting themselves to much wine" (Lex.). And in Tit. ii. 3, with a slight variation from this last, "The aged women, likewise, that they be not given to much wine," *μὴ οἶνον πολλῶν δεδουλωμένας*, "not in bondage to, or devoted to much wine" (Lex.). This change in the phraseology was evidently designed to allow all but the clergy a certain use of wine, but not a use that would put them in the least degree under its control, under bondage to it. He characterized the habits and condition of wine-bibbers by the phrase, "given to much wine," and forbade it. For only those who used alcoholic wines were "given to wine." He forbids all use of wine in obedience to an artificial appe-

¹ Antiq., iii. xii. 2, note.

tite. The implication is that they might use it in its nutritious state, for that would not bring them under bonds. The *prohibition* covers every use of wine and every variety of wine that would bring them into bondage to it. We know what he meant by the bondage referred to — the craving of an artificial appetite. They knew it as well as we. We know what enemy he was warning them against — alcohol. They knew it as well as we. We know that no one does or will obey the command who uses a wine that is sensibly stimulating. They knew it as well as we. No rational exegesis, then, can extract from this prohibition a permission to use as a beverage anything intoxicating or sensibly stimulating.

Such being the instructions of Paul to Timothy respecting the total abstinence of the clergy, enforced by his own example, we may expect to find Timothy a total abstainer. And so we do find him. His beverage was water. But being out of health, Paul advised him (1 Tim. v. 23), “Drink no longer water [or water only], but use a little wine, (οἶνον ὀλίγον χρώ), for thy stomach’s sake, and thine often infirmities.” He was to mingle “a little wine” with his water. And note here the limitations under which he was to use wine — only “a little,” and as a medicine — “for thy stomach’s sake, and thine often infirmities.” How consistent are all these statements with each other, and with all the precepts and prohibitions of the Old Testament! The ministry must refrain entirely from all varieties of *yayin* and *shekhar*, except as a medicine, that they may be absolutely above reproach. Others are to be free from bondage to it, without any artificial craving for it, having perfect self-control, which allows its use for nutrition, but forbids all stimulation.

We come now to the testimony of another apostle (1 Peter iv. 3). “The time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, [οἶνοφλυγίαι, “wine drinkings, drunkenness, vinolency (Lex.),] revellings, banquetings [πότοις, “drinking-bouts” (Lex.)], and abominable idolatries.”

No one can read this description of the former lives of

some of the early disciples without seeing that they had been accustomed to indulge in the use of alcoholic drinks, and in social "treating," as the term is. But Peter looks back with shame and sorrow upon it all, condemns it all, and exhorts them (vs. 7), to be "sober" (*σωφρονήσατε*); and in the second Epistle, chap. i. 6, to add to their knowledge temperance," (*ἐγκράτειαν*) "*continence, abstinence, temperance, self-control*" (Lex.), which lift the life entirely above the use of stimulants. "The time past may suffice us" (*ἄρκυτός*), is "sufficient, enough," spent in such a life. We are to have none of it now.

In the Revelation made by the ascended Saviour we find several references to *oinos*, which add to his testimony already given, and finishes the chain of evidence that runs through the entire Scriptures. In chap. vi. 6 there seems to be a reference to the vine and its fruit: "See that thou hurt not the oil and the *oinon*." In chap. xviii. 13 wine is mentioned as one of the articles in which Babylon was accustomed to trade before her downfall; while in chaps. xiv. 8, xvii. 2, and xviii. 3 it is used symbolically, in the expression "wine of the wrath of her fornication" (*ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας*), which signifies "a love-potion with which a harlot seduces to fornication (idolatry), and then brings upon them the wrath of God" (Lex.). What contempt Christ puts upon the inebriating cup, by using it in such a figure as this! His abhorrence of it in the phrases — "Babylon is fallen, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication"; "the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication," and "all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication," — is exceeded only by his use of it as a symbol of his own wrath, in the threatening, "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the *oinon* of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation" (chap. xiv. 9, 10). The phrase, without mixture (*κεκερασμένον ἀκράτου*), "*mixed unmixed,*" refers to *fiery, drugged wine, undiluted, em-*

phasizing, by all the power of language, the terrors of his cup of wrath, and it is added, in chap. xvi. 19, "Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give her the cup of the *oinos* of the fierceness of his wrath."

And with these uses of the foaming, fiery, drugged, intoxicating wine-cup, God's legislation concerning the saccharine beverages of his ancient people ends. How voluminous a legislation it is! How consistent a legislation it is! Harmonious with itself, in every statute of Old Testament and New. In harmony also with the laws of nature, with all the lessons of experience, with the principles of health, the conditions of human prosperity, and the normal necessities of the human body. And this perfect harmony affords all the confirmation needed of the truth of the exegetical principles assumed at the outset, as the foundation of all our reasoning.

We have now brought under our eye every passage in the Scriptures in which a vinous or other saccharine beverage is referred to directly and by name. There are many other allusions to the use of stimulants or their effects, which, if there were time to consider them, would confirm the position taken, the conclusions arrived at. They can only be alluded to. A blessing is pronounced upon the land, when "her princes eat in due season for strength, and not for drunkenness," where a contrast is drawn between timely meals of the healthful products of the earth, and the luxurious feasts in which inebriating wines abounded (Eccl. x. 16, 17).

A woe is pronounced upon the man "who gives his neighbor drink and makes him drunken" (Hab. ii. 15, 16). The men of a city wherein was a drunkard were to stone him to death, and his own parents were to testify against him (Deut. xxi. 20, 21).

The Lord declared that his anger and his jealousy should smoke against the man who should "walk in the imagination of his heart, to add drunkenness to thirst" (Deut. xxix. 18-20).

Christ declared that the servant who should neglect to

watch for his lord's coming, and should "eat and drink and be drunken, should be cut asunder, and his portion should be assigned with the hypocrites" (Matt. xxiv. 48-51).

In 1 Cor. ix. 24-27 Paul commends the temperance of the athlete, whom Horace tells us, at that day, as at the present day, abstained (*venere et vino*) from lewdness and wine. And he commanded the Corinthian church "not to eat with drunkards, whom he declared should not inherit eternal life" (1 Cor. v. 11; vi. 9, 10).

But a full consideration of these less direct statutes would swell our essay to a volume. Nor are they at all necessary to the completeness of our argument. The temptation has been great at every step of our progress to confirm the position taken by reference to history, the classics, books of travel, etc., but this, too, was forbidden by the narrow limits of a magazine article. It has been my aim to interpret Scripture by Scripture, to give the reader the benefit of all the legislation of God upon the subject, and to rest the argument upon a careful study of every term employed, and a careful exegesis of every passage in which it occurs.

I close with a brief summary of the topics which have been considered, and the results to which they bring us :

1. The beverages of the Hebrews were in their origin *nutritious*.

2. They stood over against the natural appetites of man, and were given for *food and drink*.

3. They were fermentable, and in the process of fermentation became *alcoholic*.

4. Alcohol is an indigestible, innutritious poison, which is incapable of affording aliment, strength or heat to the system; but which produces *unnatural stimulation* of the nervous tissue, and carries disease, if its use is persisted in, to every member, and weakness to every function.

5. Hence these beverages divided themselves, before all minds, into two great classes—those which were *characteristically nutritious*, on the one hand; those that were *characteristically alcoholic*, on the other.

6. The dividing line between them, in the experience of all, was where they became *sensibly stimulating*.

7. On one side of this line they were sought and freely used for *nutrition*; used for a life time without danger of the formation of any unnatural wants. On the other, they were mainly sought and used for *stimulation*, resulting in the creation of artificial appetites and all the dire evils of intemperance.

8. To avoid these evils, the wise and good among the Hebrews and contiguous nations, resorted to various expedients to prevent the fermentation of their beverages, and retain their nutritive properties.

9. Those who valued their beverages for their alcoholic properties took measures to perfect their fermentation, and increased their stimulating and narcotic power by the addition of poisonous drugs.

10. It was to meet such a state of things among the Jewish people, and among all people who abuse his mercies to their hurt, that God made known his will upon this subject, in the voluminous legislation of the Scriptures.

11. That legislation was adapted to the circumstances of the case. It is made up of commendations here and prohibitions there; the one as well as the other for *cause*, and having reference to the *nature*, of the beverage referred to, as nutritious or alcoholic.

12. The Hebrew Scriptures employed eleven terms to designate the vinous and other beverages of the Hebrews and neighboring nations, of which four — *tirosh*, *hasis*, *hhemer*, and *dam-henabh* — designated new and sweet wines. They are together used forty-seven times, always with the approbation of God, save once, when the reference is to a wine partially fermented, and for that reason it is made a symbol of a terrible destruction upon the foes of his people.

13. The term of most frequent use is *yayin*, a generic term, used therefore as we use wine, bread, meat, or milk, comprehending all varieties. It is often referred to casually, and without respect to its nature. But sometimes the cir-

cumstances alluded to in connection with its use, prove, without the possibility of mistake, that a nutritious or an intoxicating variety was in the mind of the writer or speaker. But never was *yayin*, when characteristically sweet and nutritious (as determined by the context), reprobated; never, when characteristically alcoholic (as determined by the same data), was it commended.

14. Next to *yayin*, in the frequency of its use, is *shekhar*. This also seems to have been a generic term, a concentrated sweetness at its base, but for that reason, when fermented, increasingly alcoholic. With one exception it is always used with *yayin*. In two instances it seems to designate a delicacy, used with, and as, food. In most other instances it is obviously referred to as an intoxicant, and its use brought the displeasure of God upon the drinker.

15. Of the five remaining terms, *mesekeh*, which was a fermented and drugged wine, and *sobhe*, whose etymology shows it to have been an intoxicating variety, are, in every instance of their use regarded as a detestation. *Mezeg* is found but once, in an illustration, that gives no clew to its nature, *Hhamra*, or *hhamar*, was the wine used at Belshazzar's feast — of course intoxicating, and reprobated in the judgments brought upon that wicked king. And *sh'marim* was the sediment of wines, nutritious and fermented. The former, a highly flavored conserve, was made a symbol of the redeeming grace of God; the latter, a most nauseous and repulsive draught, was used as a symbol of God's most fearful judgments upon sinners.

16. Two other terms are found in the Old Testament, which refer to preparations of the vine-crop in concentrated forms — *ashishah*, pressed raisin-cakes, improperly translated in our English Bible, "flagons of wine;" and *d'blash*, wine honey, new wine boiled down to a state of marmalade, and used as a condiment with other food, but never denominated wine.

17. The Greek Testament has three terms only, — *gleukos*, *sikera*, and *oinos*, which answer to the *tirosh*, *shekhar*, and

yayin of the Old Testament. These are translated in our English version of the New Testament, "new wine," "strong drink," and "wine." The first two terms are found only once each, the latter twenty-eight times.

18. The testimony of the New Testament writers harmonizes perfectly with that of the authors of the Old, making the same discriminations, but adding numerous precepts and warnings as a safeguard against all associations, indulgences, and habits, that cultivate an appetite for stimulants or minister to fleshly lusts.

19. The symbolic use of several of the terms we have considered affords an illustration most convincing of the mind of God respecting the two opposite classes of wine. Judging from the terms employed, and the references to them in the context, we have seen that only sweet, nutritious, and healthful drinks were employed as symbols of good; only alcoholic and intoxicating as symbols of evil.

20. If, now, the question be asked, in the light of the foregoing studies, "Do the Scriptures prohibit the use of alcoholic beverages?" I am compelled to give it an unqualified affirmative answer. Considering the informal manner in which the subject is discussed in the Scriptures—in the use of several terms of different etymological import; by commendation here, prohibition there; in narrative, in prophecy, in illustration, and in symbol; here enforcing a promise, and there a threatening—it is difficult to see how the judgment of God and good men could have been more forcibly or more decisively expressed. The wonder is that the question has been so long under debate, or could ever have been brought into serious doubt. It is to be accounted for, in part, by several defective translations of terms and phrases found in the original Scriptures, and by the suppression of several terms found in the Hebrew descriptive of different kinds of wine, in the Septuagint and English versions of the Old Testament; and in part by the false views that have been entertained respecting the nature of alcohol. The drinking habits of past ages have left their mark not only in the hereditary

traits of families, in the shattered estates of thousands once in affluence. the records of crime and pauperism in all lands, and the insanity and idiocy so increasingly prevalent on all sides of us, but in these imperfect translations of the Scriptures, in commentaries based upon them, favoring the use of stimulants, and even in the reasonings of lexicographers when defining the terms in which the original Scriptures were written. Oh, "Wine is a mocker and strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise."

Our studies of this subject have brought to light the only consistent type of temperance legislation, the righteous basis of all laws for the suppression of the evils of intemperance. God *prohibits*. Man is bound to echo his prohibition. God never licenses the sale and use of alcoholic drinks. A community cannot do so without arrogating to itself a wisdom superior to his, an authority in defiance of his.

Our studies have brought to light the most impulsive arguments in urging on the temperance reform. Too long the advocates of temperance have failed to urge the sanction of God's word; too often have they surrendered it to the enemy. But only when they found their cause on the word of God will their positions be impregnable. Let them not hesitate to stand where Luther stood in respect to the Reformation, when he clasped the holy Scriptures, and pressed them to his heart, exclaiming, "Great God, if this cause be not of thee, let it fall. Amen."