

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

and assurance of Christian faith. He believes in the reasonableness of faith, and in the sufficiency of the reasons by which he would justify it. The man who has been brought up with implicit faith in a creed of any kind, written or unwritten, may, in the first flush of freedom, on arriving at man's estate, go off into wild vagaries of thought. But the average Unitarian is in his youth accustomed to test all things and hold fast to what is good. The views of various Christian denominations and all forms of unbelief are discussed before him with perfect freedom, and he learns to put himself for the moment into the stand-point of each, only to return with more love and zeal to his own ground; whither reason and faith join hands to lead him, and where he stands happy in the conscious liberty of a child of God, rejoicing as a participant of the grace of Christ, opening his heart in gladness to the blissful influence of the Holy Ghost.

ARTICLE III.

THE BIBLICAL SANCTION FOR WINE.

BY REV. HORACE BUMSTEAD, ATLANTA, GA.

DEAN ALFORD asserted that his commentary was conducted on the principle "of honestly endeavoring to ascertain the sense of the sacred text without regard to any preconceived systems, and fearless of any possible consequences." Let us humbly endeavor to approach the subject at the head of this Article in the spirit of the scholarly and saintly dean.

I propose to consider, first, the nature of the wine sanctioned in the Bible; second, the manner in which the Bible gives its sanction to this wine; third, the limitations which the Bible places upon the sanction; and, fourth, the perpetuity of the sanction as thus limited.

I. THE NATURE OF THE WINE SANCTIONED.

It is generally admitted that the Bible sanctions the use of some beverage called wine. During the last half century

the idea has been conspicuously advocated by certain friends of reform in England and in this country that the wine sanctioned in the Bible was unfermented, and so free from alcohol. The voluminous arguments offered in support of this theory may be grouped in three divisions: the physiological, the historical, and the linguistic. These will be noticed in order.

1. *The Physiological Argument for the alleged Unfermented Wine.*

This argument asserts that alcohol is essentially a poison, unfit to be introduced into the human system, except possibly as a medicine; that it is not a food in any proper sense of the word, and that the character of God would preclude him from sanctioning a poisonous or innutritious beverage.

The argument contains a fallacy which has been exposed again and again. Admitting that alcohol is a poison and not a food, it by no means follows that beverages which contain it as an ingredient are poisonous or innutritious. It has been many times pointed out that some of our commonest articles of food contain poisons. Dr. George M. Beard of New York, well known as a popular writer upon physiological and social topics, remarks: "Phosphorus is one of the most virulent of poisons, but it is found in fish and meat; and partly for this reason is it that fish and meat are good diet for brain-workers. . . . To say that any substance is in general a poison gives, then, no clue to the question whether it does or does not serve a purpose in the animal economy."¹ Dr. Willard Parker of New York, an eminent physician and philanthropist, says: "It has been said on the one side that alcohol is a poison, and on the other that wine used in moderation is healthful. But the two assertions are not inconsistent; for the character and effect of substances are entirely changed by a change in their chemical combination. Nitrogen gas taken into the lungs alone is poisonous; but nitrogen gas taken into the lungs mixed with oxygen, as it

¹ Stimulants and Narcotics, pp. 34, 35.

is found in common air, is absolutely essential to life. The alcohol as it exists in a native and true wine, in the amount and with the combination that God employs, is harmless, if taken in moderation, and may be even useful; but when, by a mechanical process, it is eliminated from the mixture in which God put it, and put into a new and artificial mixture, it becomes a most dangerous and absolutely deadly poison.”¹ Dr. Parker repeatedly insists upon the distinction between pure alcohol or distilled liquors, on the one hand, and natural fermented wine, on the other. He calls it a fundamental distinction, and expresses his opinion that the temperance reformers, “by ignoring this difference, and putting both classes of liquors on the same footing and denouncing both alike, . . . are preventing the very results that they seek to accomplish.” This testimony is weighty as coming from one who has long been a prominent friend of the temperance reform.

So much for the oft-repeated fallacy that because alcohol is a poison therefore fermented wine is; and that, consequently, God could not have commended such wine in the Bible.

But in what sense and under what circumstances is alcohol a poison? Dr. Parker’s distinction between natural fermented wine and distilled liquors is a popular and practical distinction of great value. It is well, however, to look for more scientific statements. Some account of the recent investigations upon this subject will shed further light upon the physiological argument for an unfermented wine. These investigations have contained so much of practical value and of interest in connection with a subsequent part of our discussion that I shall give them here at somewhat greater length than might otherwise seem necessary.

We need go back only two decades to gain a fair idea of the present state of the alcohol question. In 1860 Messrs. Lallemand, Perrin, and Duroy of France, published a prize essay on alcohol, giving the results of a long series of care-

¹ Christian Union, Vol. xix. p. 221.

fully conducted experiments. These experiments seemed to furnish scientific confirmation of a suspicion previously existing among medical men that alcohol remains unchanged in the system, and is eliminated in a pure state by the various excretions. "They failed," says Dr. Anstie, "after repeated attempts, to discover the intermediate compounds into which alcohol had been represented as transforming itself before its final change; and, on the other hand, they detected *unchanged* alcohol everywhere in the body hours after it had been taken; they found the substance in the blood and in all the tissues, but especially in the brain and the nervous centres generally, and in the liver."¹ Other experimenters had come to similar conclusions, and for a brief time the scientific world settled down upon the belief that alcohol was altogether an intruder in the human system.

But the experiments of the learned Frenchmen were soon subjected to searching criticism. In the winter of 1863-64 Dr. Francis E. Anstie of England and M. Baudot of France called attention to the fact that only a small portion of the alcohol taken into the system was accounted for. In one of Anstie's experiments a dog was treated during ten days with nearly two thousand grains of absolute alcohol, which he received with comparative impunity. The dog was then instantly and painlessly killed; and when every fragment of tissue of the whole body, with all the fluid and solid contents, had been subjected to analysis, less than one fourth of the last administered dose of ninety-five grains could be discovered.² Facts like these pointed to the conclusion that alcohol is consumed in the system. This inference was strengthened by numerous instances which Dr. Anstie cited of the remarkable power of alcohol to sustain life with very little other food. Dr. Anstie also claimed that the effects of alcohol are different, not in degree merely, but in kind, according as a relatively small or large dose is administered.

¹ Anstie, *Stimulants and Narcotics*, p. 359, quoted in Fiske's *Tobacco and Alcohol*, p. 135.

² Richardson, *Cantor Lectures on Alcohol*, p. 110.

The effects of the former he called stimulant; those of the latter narcotic. Between the two runs the "poison line," which may vary for different individuals and for the same individual at different times; the same amount which is stimulant in one case being narcotic in another, and *vice versa*. While all narcotic effects are conceded to be injurious, the stimulant effects he held to be healthful in their character, and to be followed by no more recoil than is experienced after the digestion of any true food. At the time of his death, in September 1874, he was still engaged, in company with Dr. Dupré, in prosecuting his investigations as to the disposition of alcohol in the system; but his views as expressed above were essentially unchanged.

The last year of Dr. Anstie's life was the year of the women's crusade upon the drinking saloons in some of our Western states, and the subject of alcohol was at that time receiving an unusual amount of popular attention. As an offset to many reckless statements made in the newspapers, Dr. Edward Curtis, Professor of *Materia Medica* in the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons, published in the New York Tribune a carefully written statement of what he believed to be the opinion of the best medical authorities of the day. He said: "It has been proved beyond the possibility of a doubt that alcohol when drunk is not ejected from the system unchanged, except in trifling amount when taken in grossly intoxicating quantity. On the contrary, in ordinary amounts, it is wholly consumed, transformed in the system, and by the nature of its chemical composition is capable, like certain elements of ordinary food, of thus yielding force which can be used by the economy to do life-work, as the heat of the burning coal drives the engine. . . . This food-action is attended with no exciting or intoxicating influence, but the whole effect, like that of ordinary food, is seen in the maintenance or restoration, according to circumstances, of that balance of function called health. . . . Such action cannot be distinguished, either by the drinker or the physiologist, from that of a quickly digestible fluid food, and is no more an

'excitement' or 'stimulation,' followed by a 'recoil' or 'depression,' than is the action of a bowl of hot soup or of a glass of milk."¹ As an evidence of the carefulness with which Dr. Curtis draws the line between this food-action of alcohol and the poisonous effects of the same substance, let this statement of his be added: "And—again a point generally misunderstood—all signs of departure from the natural condition in the drinker, from the first flushing of the cheek, brightening of the eye, and unnatural mental excitement, to the general paralysis of complete drunkenness, belong equally to the poisonous effect of alcohol. That is, for I wish strongly to insist upon this point, even the early phases of alcohol-disturbance, which are often improperly called 'stimulating,' are part and parcel of the injuriously disturbing influence of overdosage, and must be put in the same category with the more obviously poisonous effects of pronounced intoxication."²

A month later, in May 1874, Dr. William A. Hammond, President of the New York Neurological Society, and formerly Surgeon-General of the United States Army, lectured in New York upon alcohol, and gave an account of experiments made upon himself with very great care. They consisted of three series, designed to ascertain the effect of alcohol, first, when the food was just sufficient for the wants of the organism; secondly, when it was not sufficient; and thirdly, when it was more than sufficient. During the first series, extending through five days, there was an increase of 0.45 lb. in weight, and a diminution of the excretions; but these effects were accompanied by a disturbed pulse, headache, and other abnormal symptoms. During the second series the food taken was such an amount as had previously been ascertained to involve a loss of 0.28 lb. daily. By the use of the alcohol this loss was overcome, and a gain of 0.03 lb. was made besides, while no abnormal results were produced in the general working of the organism. In the third series, when more food was taken than was necessary, the

¹ New York Tribune, April 1, 1874.

² *Ibid.*

ill effects of the alcohol were well marked. Dr. Hammond's inferences were as follows: "Where the system is supplied with an abundance of food, and where there are no special circumstances existing which render the use of alcohol advisable, its employment as a beverage is not to be commended." Its use is to be commended "when the quantity of food is not such as to admit of the due performance of such physical or mental labor as may be necessary; or (what amounts to the same thing), when the digestive or assimilative functions are not so efficiently performed as to cause the digestion and appropriation of a sufficient quantity of the food ingested to meet the requirements of the system."¹ Dr. Hammond also mentions another element of the problem which is often overlooked: "It must be remembered that we are not living in a state of nature. We are all more or less overworked; we all have anxieties and sorrows and misfortunes, which, gradually in some cases, suddenly in others, wear away our minds and our bodies. . . . Hard work exhausts all the tissues of the body, and especially that of the nervous system. Now, when a man finds that the wear and tear of his mind and body are lessened by a glass or two of wine at his dinner, why should he not take it?"

During the winter of 1874-75 Dr. B. W. Richardson, of England, delivered his well-known "Cantor Lectures on Alcohol" before the Edinburgh Society of Arts. The fact that these lectures have been republished in this country by the National Temperance Society, and that the author of them has for some years been an earnest advocate of total abstinence, will be sufficient guarantee of the conservative character of his teachings, and render the more weighty whatever concessions he may make to those who are unable to accept all his conclusions. Though he is widely regarded as the ablest scientific advocate of total abstinence now living, a careful examination of his writings will show that there is no such irreconcilable difference between his views and those of the later authorities already quoted as many suppose to

¹ *New York Tribune*, May 5, 1874.

exist. There is good reason to believe that his advocacy of total abstinence, in distinction from temperance, proceeds from a failure to recognize the true limits of moderation as they are now defined by the best authorities.

The Cantor lectures were delivered only a few months after Dr. Anstie's death, and it is very instructive to note how Dr. Richardson speaks of him and his work: "Respecting this observer, whose friendship I owned for many years, it is meet for me to pay this public tribute of respect: that no man I ever knew combined with vigor of mind more incomparable industry and courage, or a more honorable regard for scientific truth and honesty. The subject we are now considering has lost no investigator more ably learned for the work that still remains to be done. From Dr. Anstie came the earliest expressions of doubt relative to this hypothesis of what is called the direct elimination of alcohol by the secretions, and from him have come the latest objections. His arguments have been sustained abroad by Schulinus, and in this country by Drs. Thudichum and Dupré, whose work on wine will, even in another century, be more highly prized, if that be possible, than it is now."¹ Dr. Richardson then gives the substance of the labors of these observers, which he sums up as follows: "We are driven by the evidence now before us to the certain conclusion that in the animal body alcohol is decomposed; that is to say, a certain portion of it (and if a certain portion, why not the whole?) is transmutable into new compounds. The inference that might be drawn is fair enough that the alcohol is lost by being burned in the body. It is lost in the body; and out of the body it will burn. If it will burn in the organism it will supply force, for it enters as the bearer of so much potential energy."²

Dr. Richardson proceeds to give an account of his own experiments conducted with special reference to the questions just suggested. The inference which he says is "fair enough," that the alcohol is lost by being burned in the body, he subjected to the test of attempting to discover the heat which

¹ Richardson, *Cantor Lectures on Alcohol*, p. 107.

² *Ibid.*, p. 110.

would accompany such combustion and also the carbonic acid and water that would result from it. He describes four progressive stages which, he says, mark the influence of alcohol upon the system, and sums up the results of his experiments with regard to these stages as follows: "We are landed, then, at last on this basis of knowledge. An agent that will burn and give forth heat and product of combustion outside the body, and which is obviously decomposed within the body, reduces the animal temperature and prevents the yield of so much product of combustion as is actually natural to the organic life. . . . The inference is that the alcohol is not burned after the manner of a food which supports animal combustion; but that it is decomposed into secondary products by oxidation, at the expense of the oxygen which ought to be applied for the natural heating of the body."¹ Dr. Richardson states as follows the probable course of future investigation on this subject: "For some time to come the physiological world will be studiously intent on the discovery of the mode by which alcohol is removed from the organism. It is a subject on which I shall one day be able to speak, I hope, with some degree of experimental certainty, but on which at this moment I am not prepared to offer more than an indication of the probable course of research. I may venture to add in advance two or three suggestions, to which my researches, as far as they go, point. First, I believe there is a certain determinable degree of saturation of the blood with alcohol, within which degree all the alcohol is disposed of by its decomposition. Beyond that degree the oxidation is arrested, and then there is an accumulation of alcohol, with voidance of it in the unchanged state, in the secretions. Secondly, the change or decomposition of the alcohol in its course through the minute circulation, in which it is transformed, is not into carbonic acid and water, as though it were burned, but into a new soluble chemical substance, probably aldehyde, which returns by the veins into the great channels of the circulation."²

¹ Richardson, *Cantor Lectures on Alcohol*, p. 116.

² *Ibid.*, p. 116.

Can these results of Dr. Richardson be reconciled with the views of Dr. Anstie, whom he so highly extols, and with the statements of Drs. Curtis and Hammond, already quoted, and with the views of other authorities soon to be mentioned? It seems to me that the reconciliation is very easily found in this fact: every one of the four stages of alcoholic excitement described by Dr. Richardson is a narcotic stage; while the earlier stage of true food-action is entirely ignored.

Let the proof of this, now offered, be carefully observed. In the third Cantor lecture Dr. Richardson speaks of the progressive change produced by the wine upon the guests at a large dinner-party: "The face begins to get flushed, the eye brightens, and the murmur of conversation becomes loud. . . . In a word, the first stage, the stage of vascular excitement from alcohol, has been established."¹ In his "Temperance Lesson Book," published by the National Temperance Society, he says: "Everything that alcohol can by any means do usefully for the world is seen in this stage. This is the *summum bonum*, or chief good. It was to enliven the feast after this fashion that wine first became fashionable in the history of man."² Dr. Curtis's statement has already been quoted, that the first flushing of the cheek and brightening of the eye belong to the poisonous effects of alcohol, and are the results of an overdose; the effects named being absent when a moderate amount is taken. But we shall find further confirmation of our statement when we compare Dr. Richardson's idea of a "moderate" quantity of alcohol with that of other eminent authorities. In his fifth lecture he speaks of persons who "confine their libations to four or six ounces of alcohol per day, a couple of glasses of sherry or of ale at luncheon, three or four glasses of wine at dinner, one or two at dessert, and a mixture of spirit and water before going to bed. Such is a common and a 'temperate day'; but reckoned up it means at least from four to six ounces of alcohol."³ In his Temperance Lesson Book he describes "a

¹ Richardson, Cantor Lectures on Alcohol, p. 83.

² Richardson, Temperance Lesson Book, p. 195.

³ Richardson, Cantor Lectures on Alcohol, p. 140.

very moderate drinker indeed," "an extremely temperate" person, "most moderate and temperate in respect to drink," as taking "two ounces of alcohol at least."¹ From two to six fluid ounces a day, then, constitute the limits of the smallest quantities which Dr. Richardson seems to think worth quoting as illustrating moderation in the use of alcohol. In another passage he speaks of persons who escape injury from alcohol, "because they only subject themselves to it on a scale so moderate they can scarcely be said to come under its spell. If they take it regularly they never exceed an ounce to an ounce and a half of the pure spirit in the day; and if they indulge in a little more than this, it is only at recreative seasons, after which they atone for what they have done by a temporary total abstinence."² Here Dr. Richardson again assumes that alcohol can produce no useful effect unless one comes under its "spell," or, in other words, has entered upon the primary stage of intoxication. But this amount which he seems to look upon as too small to consider, is the very amount which others set as the limit of the food-action of alcohol in the average constitution. Drs. Anstie and Dupré held that about one ounce and a half of absolute alcohol is the limit of the food use of that substance.³ Dr. Hammond's experiments were performed with an ounce and a half.⁴ Dr. Ganod of England, writing in the *Contemporary Review* places the limit of moderation at about nine tenths of an ounce.⁵ It will thus be seen that Dr. Richardson's estimate of a "moderate" quantity is several hundred per cent higher than that of other excellent authorities. Indeed it is the highest that I have met with in my reading upon this subject. It is easy to understand why Dr. Richardson should prefer total abstinence to such moderation as he describes. It is evident, however, that others are safer guides than he as to what the true limits of moderation are,

¹ Richardson, *Temperance Lesson Book*, pp. 178, 179.

² Richardson, *Cantor Lectures on Alcohol*, p. 139.

³ *Popular Science Monthly Supplement (New Issue)*, No. I. p. 43.

⁴ *New York Tribune*, May 5, 1874.

⁵ *Popular Science Monthly Supplement (New Issue)*, No. I. p. 54.

and hence better teachers of what alcohol can "usefully do for the world."

The practical value of Dr. Richardson's conclusions is further diminished by the fact of his confining the question so closely to the action of alcohol alone, and by his failure to emphasize sufficiently the distinction between distilled and fermented beverages. Dr. C. B. Radcliffe of England says: "Ardent spirits, all of them products of distillation, are wholly, or in great measure, deprived in distillation of the flavoring and saccharine principles which are naturally met with in wine and malt liquor and cider and perry; and for this reason these spirits may be, perhaps, mischievous. The cheering influence of wine, as is well known, is in no way proportionate to the amount of alcohol contained in it, and there is good reason to believe that a considerable portion of the work which is not due to the alcohol may be ascribed to these particular principles."¹ Such testimony as this also makes clear the fact that wine may cheer the guests at a feast without producing the incipient intoxication which Dr. Richardson seems to consider inseparable from that result.

One of the most prominent continental authorities upon the subject of alcohol, and one who has given to the world some of the most recent results of investigation, is Dr. Carl Binz of Bonn, Germany. Dr. Binz admits that alcohol is not food in the sense of supplying material to build up the tissues, but claims that it is food in the sense of supplying an easily burning fuel to generate heat and force. He also believes that, indirectly, it is a food in the former sense, because it spares the reserve supply of fat in the body which would otherwise have to be burned. He reaffirms the position taken by Dr. Anstie, and says: "I have convinced myself by a series of experiments that alcohol is completely destroyed in the animal organism. If pure it leaves no taint upon the breath, and where this is present it is attributable to some of the ethers or fusel-oil. . . . Aldehyde and acetic acid, the derivatives of alcohol, were absent. The facts

¹ Popular Science Monthly Supplement (New Issue), No. I. p. 42.

observed all seem to lead to the conclusion that alcohol in the body, just as in the flame of the spirit lamp, is oxidized to carbonic acid and water. Such being the case, it is evident that every molecule of alcohol burned within the system must yield, not only warmth, but that power to accomplish work with which the development of caloric is always accompanied."¹ Dr. Binz also regards alcohol as chiefly valuable when used as a medicine or tonic in depressed states of the system. He says: "While I thus share in the views of the late Dr. Anstie, so ably upheld in England, I do not hesitate, on the other hand, to declare, with respect to the requirements of the healthy organism, that I consider the use of alcohol in health as entirely superfluous."²

The Contemporary Review, a few years ago, published a series of interesting articles upon alcohol, by eleven different English physicians, which may be found republished in the Popular Science Monthly Supplement for December 1878 and in No. I. of the New Issue. Quotations have already been made from these articles. The views of the writers are in remarkable harmony with those of Anstie and his followers. They are especially valuable for the evidence they furnish that alcohol is useful to a considerable number of people who are in the border-land between health and disease. Such persons cannot properly call themselves sick, and yet they are not sufficiently well to do their work properly and endure the wear and tear which their lot in life brings them. They do not need medicine, but a tonic; and they need that tonic as a beverage to be taken with their food. They may need it, in the words of Dr. Curtis, already quoted (p. 51), for the "maintenance" as well as for the "restoration" of that "balance of function called health." The following extract from Dr. Kidd will suffice as an example of many similar utterances in these articles: "A large part of the ordinary workers in town have marks upon them of feebleness of some

¹ Quoted by the American Journal of the Medical Sciences for July 1876, p. 261, from an Article by Dr. Binz in London Practitioner for May 1876. See also "The State of the Alcohol Question" in Harper's Magazine for Oct. 1879.

² American Journal of Medical Sciences, p. 262.

organ or function, causing want of appetite, languor, inability for exertion of mind or body. In many such cases the most generous food, the most careful management of diet, does not avail to arrest the symptoms of declining health, yet a very small dose of wine or beer speedily restores the balance, enables the enfeebled organ to perform its function, and assists the performance of the daily duties." ¹

If now we try to sum up briefly the results of the investigations of the last twenty years in regard to alcohol, we shall find the following points very generally sustained :

1. The conclusions of Lallemand, Perrin, and Duroy, that alcohol is not changed in the system, have been wholly overthrown.

2. It has been established by Anstie and others that in moderate quantity alcohol is decomposed in the system ; that it is capable, in such case, of producing effects entirely different from those of a larger quantity, and that the poisonous effects are confined to the action of an excessive dose.

3. The experiments of Richardson show clearly the inability of alcohol taken in excess to produce heat or force, but are inconclusive as to the effect of what is *now* considered a moderate quantity.

4. It is now claimed to have been shown by Prof. Binz and others that alcohol in moderate quantities is *wholly* consumed in the system, and transformed, not, as his predecessors generally believed, into aldehyde and acetic acid, but into carbonic acid and water, as in the flame of the spirit-lamp.

5. The limits of true moderation in the use of alcohol have been considerably reduced ; effects which were formerly regarded as harmlessly stimulant, such as the flushing of the face, being now regarded as narcotic and harmful.

6. There is a practically unanimous verdict from all authorities that alcohol is not needed, and is likely to do harm, in a state of perfect health.

7. At the same time the limits of perfect health have been considerably narrowed, and the category of those who may

¹ Popular Science Monthly Supplement (New Issue), No. I. p. 44.

with benefit occasionally or even habitually use alcohol, in the moderation already indicated, has been considerably enlarged.

8. Alcohol should be taken either at or immediately after meals; at the *close* of mental or physical efforts rather than during their continuance; never in the form of distilled liquors, unless pure and very liberally diluted with water; always, if possible, in the form of light wine or beer.

9. Aside from the tonic and medicinal uses of alcohol, most adults, even in perfect health, may occasionally employ, as a luxury, the light fermented beverages, with inappreciable, if any, harm.

10. A minority of persons, from inherited or otherwise acquired infirmity, are unable safely to use even the least quantity of alcohol, and should wholly abstain from it.

Such is the verdict of the best and latest science in regard to alcohol. Is it possible in the face of evidence like this, showing the occasional or constant utility of alcohol to a large part of the human race, to claim that it is unfit for the divine sanction? Surely the advocates of an unfermented Bible wine must look elsewhere than to physiology for endorsement of their theory.

2. *The Historical Argument for the alleged Unfermented Wine.*

This argument makes an appeal to certain statements of the classical writers. Assertions are quoted that the most esteemed wines were sweet and would not intoxicate. Descriptions of certain processes employed upon the product of the vine are given, which show, it is claimed, that there must have been unfermented wines in antiquity. It is inferred that the Jews were acquainted with and practised those methods.

Of course no careful reader would accept as literally true the bald statement of a classical writer that a certain wine was unintoxicating. We are familiar in modern times with similar statements in regard to lager beer and other bever-

ages, which, it is well known, contain alcohol and can intoxicate if a sufficient quantity be taken. Such statements are popular and not scientific. They mean simply that the beverages alluded to are not intoxicating as ordinarily used.

So, too, the appellation "sweet" applied to a wine is far from proving it to have been unfermented. With the Greeks the product of the wine-press could be sweet in three different senses: first, as *γλεῦκος* (corresponding to the Latin *mustum*), when it was sweet from the lack of vinous fermentation; second, as *οἶνος γλυκίς*, when it was fermented, but sweet from the presence of considerable untransformed sugar; and, third, as *οἶνος ἡδύς*, when it was sweet from the absence of acetous fermentation, or souring. Of the last two terms Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities remarks: "The former signifies wine *positively sweet*, the latter, wine agreeable to the taste from the *absence of acidity*, in most cases indicating nothing more than *sound wine*."¹

The authority just quoted also throws light upon the question as to what were the "esteemed" wines of antiquity. That which the priest Maron gave to Ulysses, "so precious that it was unknown to all in the mansion save the wife of the priest and one trusty housekeeper," was also "so strong that a single cup was mingled with twenty of water." Another of the esteemed wines was the Pramnian, which is described as "remarkably strong." Of the Lesbian it is said that "the epithet 'innocens,' applied by Horace, seems to point out that it was light and wholesome." But it would hardly be necessary to apply the epithet "innocens" to simple grape juice or any liquid that did not contain some alcohol. It is further stated: "There is no foundation whatever for the remark that the finest Greek wines, especially the products of the islands in the Aegean and Ionian seas, belonged, for the most part, to the luscious, sweet class. The very reverse is proved by the epithets *αὔστηρός*, *σκληρός*, *λεπτός*, and the like, applied to a great number, while *γλυκίς* and *γλυκάζων* are designations comparatively rare, except in the vague language

¹ Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Art. "Vinum."

of poetry. . . . The ancients appear to have been fully sensible that sweet wines could not be swallowed either with pleasure or safety, except in small quantities.”¹ Yet it is to these very “sweet” and “luscious” wines of the ancients that we are so often referred for proof of an unfermented wine.

But it is claimed that certain processes were employed by the ancients for the express purpose of preventing fermentation, such as boiling, cooling, fumigation, and filtering. These processes, however, fail to sanction the idea of an unfermented wine. The ancients did sometimes preserve the grape-juice in the form of must by putting it in air-tight vessels and immersing it in cold water or burying it in damp sand, where it was kept for six weeks or two months; but in this case it was not called wine, but *ἀεὶ γλεῦκος*, or *semper mustum*. Some of the grape-juice was also inspissated by boiling and was called *ξψημα* or *γλύξις* by the Greeks, or, according to the extent of the evaporation, to one third, one half, or two thirds of the original volume, it was called respectively *carenum*, *defrutum*, and *sapa*, by the Romans. I have yet to learn that the name *οἶνος*, or *vinum*, was ever applied to any of these products, unless perhaps by some figure of speech. The Dictionary of Antiquities speaks of them thus: “These grape-jellies, for they were nothing else, were used extensively for giving body to poor wines and making them keep, and entered as ingredients into many drinks.” One of these which is mentioned is the *burránica potio*, made of *sapa* and milk, and another is *oenomelum*, a mixture of *defrutum* and honey. Of the *oenomelum* the Dictionary remarks: “This, therefore, was merely a very rich fruit syrup in no way allied to wine.”

Fumigation by sulphur was employed to arrest or prevent the *acetous* fermentation, or souring, after the vinous fermentation was complete; and also to give mellowness to the wine. The injection of alkaline substances was also resorted to for the former of these purposes. Sulphur is employed at

¹ Smith's Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Art. “Vinum.”

the present day to prevent the souring of wine in a partially empty cask. The oxygen of the air in the cask being consumed in burning the sulphur, and the sulphurous acid thus produced being confined in the cask the wine cannot sour. This process is also capable of preventing *vinous* fermentation when applied to grape-juice; but even if so employed by the ancients, which is doubtful, the evidence would still be lacking that a liquid so treated was called wine.

Filtering through the *colum* or *saccus* was designed mainly to separate the wine from its dregs. It could not have been used to separate the albuminous ferment of the must, for this, being in a state of solution, would pass through the finest filter known to the ancients. Dr. Lees appeals to these words of Pliny: "Utilissimum [vinum] omnibus sacco viribus fractis. Meminerimus sucum esse qui fervendo vires musto sibi fecerit," which he translates as follows: "The most useful [wine] for everybody is that which has its strength broken by the filter. We must bear in mind that there is a juice [sucus] which by fermenting would make to itself *vires* out of the must."¹ But this rendering would require *faceret* or *fecisset* instead of *fecerit*, the case supposed being contrary to reality. The last clause should be rendered thus: "which by the fermentation of the must has made to itself strength." There were two ways in which the filtering process could break the strength of wine. First, the separation of the dregs by the *saccus* would prevent or greatly lessen the secondary, or after-fermentation.² Second, the *colum*, which was employed just before using the wine, was filled with ice or snow, which thus diluted, besides cooling and straining it.³ The fact that the wine had any strength to be "broken," and that the filter was used by the dissipated in order that they might drink the more without becoming intoxicated, should be sufficient proof of its alcoholic character. The idea that the young revellers of Greece and Rome

¹ Lees and Burns "Temperance Bible-Commentary" (4th edition), p. 436.

² Dr. Edward Smith, "Foods," p. 389.

³ Smith's Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Art. "Vinum."

filtered simple grape-juice to prevent its intoxicating them, is simply grotesque.

Finally, the very classical writers most quoted to prove the existence of an unfermented wine, clearly distinguish between wine and the unfermented juice of the grape. I quote from Dr. Lyman H. Atwater: "Pliny tells us that 'the passage of *must* into *wine*' is expressed by the term *fervere* (to ferment). 'Sic appellat *musti in vina transitum*.' . . . Columella says, 'Before you take the must from the vat, fumigate the vessels with rosemary, laurel, and myrtle, and fill the vessels full, that in fermenting the wine may purge itself well.' ' . . . ut in *effervescendo* vinum se bene purgat.' Varro says, that 'the must that is put into a dolium, in order that we may have wine, should not be drawn while it is fermenting, and has not yet advanced so far as to be converted into wine.'" ¹

3. *The Linguistic Argument for the alleged Unfermented Wine.*

We come now to the linguistic argument for an unfermented wine, drawn from the Scriptures themselves. It first presents itself in a general form. The Bible, it is said, speaks of wine as a blessing and as a curse; in terms of approval and in terms of condemnation; as a symbol of divine favor and as a symbol of divine wrath; it cannot, therefore, be speaking of one and the same substance, but of two different ones. "I cannot refuse to take this position," said Moses Stuart, "without virtually impeaching the Scriptures of contradiction, or inconsistency."² But an answer to this is easily found in the way in which the Bible speaks of other things. For example, it represents rain as a blessing given alike to the just and the unjust; it makes rain an emblem of doctrine, which, it says, shall drop as the rain, and of the favor of the Lord which is as a cloud of the latter

¹ Princeton Review, Jan. 1872, p. 111.

² Quoted by Rev. Wm. M. Thayer, "Communion Wine and Bible Temperance," p. 34.

rain. At the same time the Bible represents rain as a curse sent to destroy the inhabitants of the earth in a flood, and to sweep away the house of the man who had built upon the sand; and it makes rain an emblem of the fury of God's wrath and of the snares which he will rain upon the wicked; and it threatens rain against an enemy of God in connection with great hailstones, fire, and brimstone. Are there two kinds of rain spoken of in these passages, and does the Bible contradict itself if it refers to the same article, water, in the same fluid state, in all of them? If we reconcile these passages, as of course we must, by supposing that those of one class refer to rain in moderation and those of the other to rain in excess, why is it less legitimate to use the same method in explaining passages referring to wine?

But it is said that the approvals and denunciations are so distributed among the various Hebrew and Greek words which refer to wine, that the distinction between two different beverages is made clear. Let us, then, examine the words with reference to this assertion.

תִּירוֹשׁ, *Tirosh*.

The meaning of this word may be well summed up, I think, in the statement that it denotes wine in the process of growth and manufacture. This interpretation is amply supported by the manner in which it is used by the Hebrew writers.

1. In no one of the thirty-eight passages in which it occurs does it fail to have some reference, direct or indirect, to the soil or the press or the divine agency which had been instrumental in its production. It is said to be "found in the cluster" (Isa. lxxv. 8); to be "gathered" (Deut. xi. 14); to be "trodden" (Micah vi. 15); to "burst out" from the press (Prov. iii. 10); to make the vats "overflow" (Joel ii. 24); to be put into "storehouses" (2 Chron. xxxii. 28); to be the result of God's superintending care (Ps. civ. 15); and to be tithed like the other products of the soil (Deut. xii. 17). It seems thus to have been the husbandman's

word for wine; wine in its germinant state in the vineyard, in the process of manufacture in the press and the vat, and, after fermentation, in its finished state, either in the storehouse, where it was regarded as the reward of the husbandman's care and toil, or among the tithes, where it was expressive of gratitude to God for the fruitfulness of the earth.

2. Another fact of great significance is that *tirosh* is never spoken of as being drunk except in one instance, where the reference to husbandry is perfectly plain: "The sons of the stranger shall not drink thy *tirosh* for the which thou hast labored" (Isa. lxii. 8). There are two other passages where the drinking of *tirosh* is intimated by the figure of speech called *zeugma*: "Thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithes of thy corn, or [drink] thy *tirosh*, or [consume] thine oil" (Deut. xii. 17, and similarly in Deut. xiv. 23); but here the reference to the tithes shows us that the *tirosh* is spoken of as a product of the land, as is the corn and the oil. Significant, also, is the passage in Micah where the treading of *tirosh* and the drinking of *yayin*, the common word for wine, are brought together in the same sentence; and the significance is increased by noticing the Hebrew parallelism which may be shown thus:

"Thou shalt eat, but not be satisfied;

Thou shalt sow, but thou shalt not reap;

Thou shalt tread the olives, but thou shalt not anoint thee with oil;

And *tirosh*, but shalt not drink *yayin*" (Micah vi. 14, 15).

The purport of the divine threatening is found in the disappointment which shall follow the various actions of the rebellious people of God. Just as the oil, which is the finished product of the olives, is withheld, so also is the *yayin*, which is the finished product of the *tirosh*. Again, when we read the very inclusive and carefully-worded list of the various beverages and other products of the vine from which the Nazarite is commanded to abstain (Num. vi. 3), it is not a little singular that so common a beverage as *tirosh* is sometimes represented to be, is entirely absent from the list. The

phrase which comes nearest to it is "liquor of grapes" (מִסְרָה דְּבַיִת, maceration, or steeping of grapes,), but even if this were synonymous with *tirosh*, it is unaccountable that in so important a passage the common word should be replaced by an expression so rare, occurring, so far as I can find, nowhere else.

3. Moreover, *tirosh* is never bought or sold or given by one person to another on occasions of hospitality and festivity; it is never given at all except to the priest as a part of the tithe from the product of the soil. But *yayin*, the completed product of the wine-press, is used in all of these ways in which *tirosh* is not. The inference is irresistible that *tirosh* was not regarded as an article of merchandise or fit for use as a beverage until it had become *yayin*. In one passage, to be sure, the selling of *tirosh* is intimated by the command to "turn it into money"; but here again the reference is to the wine as a part of the tithe, and so a product of the soil (Deut. xiv. 25). If the way to the place appointed for consuming the tithe should be too long for its easy transportation thither, the Hebrew could "turn it into money" at his home, and then, carrying the proceeds to the place appointed, could bestow that money for whatsoever his soul might desire, including wine (*yayin*) and strong drink (*shechar*) and consume them before the Lord. Why is he not told to buy *tirosh*, such as he had sold at his home? Probably he *did* buy just such an article as he had sold; but while the article which he sold was called *tirosh*, as being the product of his own land and labor, yet, when he comes to buy the same article of another man — *that* man's *tirosh*, perhaps, — it is properly called *yayin*, because in relation to the buyer, of whom the sacred writer is speaking, the idea of husbandry is lost sight of, and the common mercantile word, that which denotes the finished product, naturally takes its place. I believe that this passage and the one already quoted from Micah vi. 14, 15 constitute an unanswerable argument for the meaning of *tirosh* which I have given.

It will now be readily understood why one may consider

it, as I do, of very little importance to insist upon the correctness of the derivation which Gesenius gives of תִּירוֹשׁ from טָרַף, to *get possession of*, "so called because it gets possession of the brain, and inebriates." Bythner, quoted by Dr. Lees, and Fürst, quoted by Professor Stuart, derive *tirosh* from the same verb, but in the sense of *something won*, i.e. *a possession*. This latter derivation, besides being simpler, harmonizes much better with the interpretation of *tirosh* as the husbandman's word for wine — the product of the soil and press and the gift of God to the cultivator. Being used constantly in this way, and never where the act of drinking is involved, except in the rare cases already referred to, *tirosh* would naturally be dissociated from evidences of the intoxicating power which it would possess only in its finished state. For this reason, also, I am quite ready to abandon the solitary text which has been so much relied upon to prove the intoxicating character of *tirosh*: "Whoredom and wine (*yayin*) and new wine (*tirosh*) take away the heart" (Hosea iv. 11). I can readily assent to the interpretation which makes this passage refer to the abuse of God's temporal blessings, which, by their very abundance, have led the children of Israel into idolatry (whoredom). This is precisely what is related in prophetic vision in the dying song of Moses, Deut. xxxii. 14, 15, 16. In this passage from Hosea whoredom seems to refer merely to the allurements of the idol worship, made more attractive by the *yayin*, the finished wine — whether used to excess or not, it does not matter — and by the *tirosh*, in this case the unfinished wine which the husbandman is preparing for future use, and both of which blessings are counted as gifts of the gods to whom the idolatrous Israelites have turned. The climax, if there be any, in this passage, lies in the abundant supply of wine, not only for present, but also for future use.

The conclusion, then, to which our examination of *tirosh* brings us, is that the word may denote, according to circumstances, the solid fruit, the unfermented juice, or the fermented product of that fruit and juice; but that when it

refers to fruit or juice it refers to them not as fruit and juice merely, but as the raw material which is to become the future wine. Further, the marked absence of any proper reference to *tirosh* as a beverage is conclusive proof that its occasional reference to unfermented grape-juice cannot properly be cited as evidence of an unfermented wine. It may be called wine by metonymy before it becomes such properly. When the housewife places her dough in the oven she says she has "put her *bread* to bake." One might as reasonably infer from this that unbaked dough was a common article of food because it is thus called bread, as, from the other, that unfermented grape-juice was a common beverage because, in a precisely similar manner, it was called wine.

It is incumbent upon those who object to this interpretation to explain why *tirosh* is never associated with bread, but always with corn; why nobody ever put it in cups or on the banqueting board; why it was never offered to the passing traveller or the invited guest; why the Scriptures only inform us about it as it is found in the cluster or the press or the vat or the storehouse or among the tithes, and why they leave us entirely in the dark as to how its "pure," "sweet," "luscious," and "nutritious" qualities were appreciated by those who drank it and bought it and sold it. Surely among the thirty-eight instances of its use we ought to find at least two or three references to these matters. The only possible answer to these questions is that the Hebrews had another word to denote the completed product of the wine-press after it had passed the sphere of production. This word was

יַיִן, *Yayin*.

The definition of this word has been anticipated in the explanation of passages already quoted. The way in which it is used in connection with *tirosh*, as in Micah vi. 15 and Deut. xiv. 25, shows clearly that it was regarded as the finished product of the wine-press. The frequency of its use, occurring as it does one hundred and forty-one times, and

consequently far out-numbering all the other Hebrew words put together which mean wine in any sense, shows that it was the common, every-day word for wine; the word of the consumer, the entertainer, the merchant, as *tiros̄h* was the word of the husbandman and manufacturer.

It was *yayin* that Melchizedek "brought forth" as a gift to Abram (Gen. xiv. 18); Abigail gave two bottles of it to David (1 Sam. xxv. 18); Nehemiah provided stores of it, in all varieties, for his laborers on the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. v. 18); Nabal and Ahasuerus became "merry" over it (1 Sam. xxv. 36; Esth. i. 10); Noah and Lot drank so much of it as to become beastly drunk (Gen. ix. 21; xix. 33); the merchants of Damascus traded in it (Ezek. xxvii. 18); we are exhorted by Isaiah, speaking in a figure, to buy it (Isa. lv. 1); it is found in cups and pots (Jer. xxxv. 5); in bottles (1 Sam. xxv. 18); on the banqueting board (Esth. v. 6); and associated with bread (Gen. xiv. 18).

But it is said that *yayin* is a generic word, that *tiros̄h* is one of its species, and that consequently *tiros̄h* may often be intended where *yayin* is used. But the relation between the two words, as already explained, shows us that *tiros̄h* could not as a beverage be a species of *yayin*. One might as well call unbaked dough a species of bread. In two or three passages *yayin* does seem to usurp the place of *tiros̄h* in referring to the growing wine of the vineyard and the juice of the wine-press: "Gather ye *yayin* and summer fruits" (Jer. xl. 10 and, similarly, 12); "I have caused *yayin* to fail from the wine-presses" (Jer. xlvi. 33). But these exceptional cases are plainly instances of metonymy from which no argument can be drawn that *tiros̄h* was a proper species of *yayin*.

It is said of *yayin* (and also of *shechar*, soon to be mentioned,) that they must sometimes have designated unfermented beverages because they were commanded to be offered to the Lord in sacrifice, while all leavened things were excluded from the offerings. It may be replied, first, that leaven was excluded only from the *meat*-offerings and in general from offerings made by fire, while the *yayin* and

shechar were used in the *drink*-offerings. Secondly, even if *yayin* and *shechar* were poured upon the burning altar, for which there is only inferential evidence, and if the term "leaven" was meant to apply to them, it is inexplicable that *tirosh*, *asis*, or some word of milder derivation than *yayin* and *shechar* should not have been used. The same remarks apply to the assertion that the prohibition of leaven from the passover would also exclude wine, and that, consequently, it must have been an unfermented beverage which our Lord used in instituting the sacrament of the supper. The Pentateuch makes no mention of wine at the passover, and if it was generally used, as is probable, the reason given for the exclusion of the leaven, viz. that the people might be reminded of the haste with which they left Egypt (Deut. xvi. 3), having no time to put leaven in their dough, would not apply to the wine.

But the true character of *yayin* is unmistakably indicated by the derivation which Gesenius gives of the word יַיִן from יָרַח (prob. to boil up, to be in a ferment), and which he defines "wine, so called from its fermenting, effervescing." It is not denied by any one that *yayin* many times refers to an intoxicating beverage. The presumption is that it always does so, and that, when evidences of intoxicating power are lacking, it is because the *yayin* was not consumed to an intoxicating extent. The derivation which Gesenius gives harmonizes with very many of the uses of the word, and is not inconsistent with any of them. Is it worth while to abandon a derivation so well authorized for the sake of admitting, as a species under *yayin*, an unfermented liquor whose existence as a common beverage is absolutely unproved?

Moreover, if *yayin* be made a genus for some unfermented beverage as a species, the same treatment will also have to be accorded to other words, which in their derivation and use give proof of the intoxicating power of the beverages which they denote, and which yet show evidence of being divinely sanctioned; such as the two next to be named.

שֶׁכָר, *Shechar*.

Gesenius derives this word from שָׁכַר, "to drink deeply, to be drunken," and defines it, "temetum, strong drink, any intoxicating liquor, whether wine or an intoxicating drink resembling wine prepared or distilled [?] from barley, from honey, or from dates." While this definition is not inconsistent with the derivation, yet the constant use of the word in connection with *yayin* would seem to indicate that it referred more properly to the other beverages named, and did not ordinarily include grape-wine. It could not have resembled the distilled liquors of the present day, since our art of distillation was unknown to the ancient Hebrews. Pfarrer Rüetschi, writing in Herzog's Encyclopaedia, says it included among other drinks a kind of beer (eine Art Bier).¹ Aside from its derivation there is abundant evidence of its intoxicating power. It is described as "raging" and likely to "deceive" (Prov. xx. 1); as bringing woe upon those who rise up early in the morning to follow it (Isa. v. 11); as causing priest and prophet to err (Isa. xxviii. 7). On the other hand, while it was, together with *yayin*, forbidden to the priests on entering the sanctuary, it was, by a legitimate inference, allowed to them when they came out (Lev. x. 9). It was tithed and commanded to be consumed "before the Lord" (Deut. xiv. 26), and to be offered in sacrifice (Num. xxviii. 7). It was the lack of a continued supply of *shechar*, as well as of wine and bread and clothes and shoes, which afforded God an opportunity to display his preserving power to the children of Israel during their forty years wandering in the wilderness (Deut. xxix. 5, 6.), and the natural inference is that all those things including the *shechar* were regarded as blessings temporarily withheld. These references show the incorrectness of the statement sometimes made that the use of *shechar* as a beverage is condemned in every instance.² *Shechar* seems to be a generic word to the extent

¹ Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie, Vol. v. p. 100.

² Rev. Wm. M. Thayer, "Communion Wine and Bible Temperance," p. 47; Rev. Wm. Ritchie, "Scripture Testimony against Wine," p. 84.

of including various species of fermented beverages other than wine. The objections already given against making *yayin* a genus for any unfermented beverage hold with even greater force against a similar treatment of *shechar*, because of the unquestionable significance of the word as indicated by its derivation and use. The same remark will also apply to the word which we are next to consider ; viz.

חֶמֶר, *Chemer* ; or חָמַר, *Chamar* ; or חֶמְרָא, *Chamrâ*.

Gesenius, and Vicar Bevan in Smith's Bible Dictionary, give the second and third of these as Chaldaic forms of the first. Gesenius defines *chemer* as "*wine*, so called as being fermented"; and derives it from חָמַר, which, as first defined, means "*to boil up, to ferment, to foam*." His second definition of this verb is "*to be red*, from the idea of boiling, foaming, becoming heated or inflamed. . . . Spoken of wine, according to some (Ps. lxxv. 9 [8])." Vicar Bevan says, "it may equally well apply to the process of fermentation or to the frothing of liquid freshly poured out, in which latter case it might be used of an unfermented liquid." But the same writer elsewhere expresses his dissent from the theory of an unfermented wine.¹ The manner in which the word, in its various forms, is used, would seem to confirm the derivation as signifying a fermented beverage. It is used only eight times in all, and four of these occur in Daniel's description of Belshazzar's feast (Dan. v.), which could hardly have been a grape-juice carousal. Delitzsch, in commenting upon "a vineyard of red wine" (*chemer*), in Isa. xxvii. 2, points out its poetical character ("ein exquisites, poetisches Wort"), and indicates the strength and preciousness of the liquid when he adds that the passage denotes "einen Weingarten feurigen edlen Weins." While the reading in this passage is doubtful, (the LXX and other authorities giving חֶמֶר instead of חָמַר, and so making it a field or vineyard "of desire,") still the suggestion of the poetical character of the word seems to afford a striking explanation of its origin and use, and con-

¹ Smith's Dict. of the Bible, Art. "Wine."

sequently of the true nature of the beverage. The word reminds us of similar expressions in English, such as "the foaming cup," "the sparkling glass"; or, if we connect its derivation with the idea of being "red," we have as corresponding terms in English the "ruby" or "rosy" wine, or simply "the rosy," that favorite expression of Dick Swiveller's in the "Old Curiosity Shop" of Dickens. We might, then, without impropriety, call it the reveller's word for wine. This well accords with its use in the description of Belshazzar's feast. It is twice used by Ezra (vi. 9; vii. 22) where no poetical exigency seems to call for it, but his familiarity with Babylonian luxury may account for its use in his case, especially as he uses no other word for wine. The only remaining instance of its use is in the prophetic song of Moses composed just before his death: "Thou didst drink *chemer*, the blood of the grape" (Deut. xxxii. 14). Here the poetical character of *chemer* is intensified by a most striking metaphor. It would seem to require a painfully prosaic turn of mind to understand "the blood of the grape" as meaning simple grape-juice, especially when associated with such a word as *chemer* has already been shown to be. Moses has just been speaking of "sucking honey out of the rock and oil out of the flinty rock; butter of kine, milk of sheep," etc.; surely any one can appreciate the poetry here. Nor, when we remember the boldness of the oriental imagery, need we be surprised at Moses's use of the reveller's word for wine. Jacob indulged in still stronger hyperbole when, in his dying song, with clear reference to the Messiah, he made a similar prophecy in regard to Judah; and it is not a little remarkable that he couples it with the very same metaphor, "the blood of grapes": "He washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes; his eyes shall be red with wine [Gesenius: "*his eyes darkly flashing from wine*, implying abundance of wine"], and his teeth white with milk" (Gen. xlix. 11, 12). The washing of the garments *may* refer to their getting stained in the wine-press; but the hyperbole is far more effective if we refer it to an

actual washing of the garments in a lavatory, with the implication that wine was as plenty as water. So thinks Keil, who quotes Calvin as follows: "Tantum enim vini abundantiam fore intelligit, ut promiscue ad lotiones, perinde ut aqua effundi queat sine magno dispendio." But the point to be specially noticed is that in connection with a Messianic prophecy, Jacob, in most daring hyperbole, uses unmistakable signs of intoxication to typify the abundance and prosperity of the Messiah's reign. How little reason, then, for surprise that Moses should use the reveller's word for wine.

דַּם־עֵנָב, *Dam-enab, blood of the grape.*

This expression has been sufficiently explained in what has just been said of *chemer*, with which it is associated by Moses. So far from being the means of proving *chemer* to be unfermented, it is itself shown to be fermented, beyond reasonable doubt, by its association with *chemer*, which is elsewhere proved to be intoxicating, as well as by the restriction of its use to highly poetical passages, which would render improbable so literal an interpretation as unfermented grape-juice.

In connection with this expression it is well to say a word in regard to the oft-repeated statement, founded in Gen. xl. 11, that Pharaoh was accustomed to drink grape-juice, though it is difficult to suppress a smile in doing so. In the first place, the statement of the butler that he pressed the grapes into Pharaoh's cup, and gave the cup into Pharaoh's hand, is not a statement of what he did, but of what he *dreamed* that he did; and dreams are not usually regarded as very good historical evidence. In the second place, the unreliability of this particular dream as historical evidence, is shown by that part of it which represents the vine as budding, shooting forth blossoms, and bringing forth ripe grapes, — all while the butler was standing by ready to take the clusters and squeeze the juice into Pharaoh's cup. It is amazing that any one, with even a moderate amount of imagination, should blunder over the pictorial condensation of this dream. The marvel-

ously rapid growth suggests a similarly rapid fermentation. A picture in my possession represents an infant Bacchus in a tipsy state holding a cup in his hand, and surrounded with a garland of grapes. Shall we be so prosaic as to infer from this, not only that fresh grape-juice was a common beverage among the ancients, but also that it was intoxicating? Yet a similar representation found at Pompeii has been appealed to, to substantiate the literal accuracy of the butler's dream!

טֹשֶׁת, *Asis*.

This is the only other word, besides those already mentioned, for which any claim can be made of referring to an unfermented beverage. The claim is founded in part upon the derivation which, by general consent, is from טֹשֶׁת, to tread. Gesenius defines it, "what is trodden out," and so put for *new wine*, the product of the same year, like new wheat, intoxicating, Isa. xlix. 26; also from pomegranates, Cant. viii. 2." This definition suggests at once a striking resemblance to *tirosh*. In three of the five passages where it occurs (Joel i. 5; iii. 18; Amos ix. 13), there is a plain reference to husbandry. In every instance of its use it is found in a poetical passage. The conclusion seems to be justified that it is a poetical substitute for *tirosh*, with which it is nearly identical in meaning. It is a product of the soil in Amos ix. 13 and Joel iii. 18, where "the mountains shall drop down *asis*." According to Joel i. 5 the drinkers of *yayin* are told to howl, because — speaking by metonymy — the *asis*, the raw material of their future *yayin*, has been cut off from their mouth by the invasion of the palmer-worm, the locust, and the canker-worm, described in the preceding verse.

In Isa. xlix. 26 a more literal rendering would give us: "And like *asis* shall they drink to the full their own blood." This threat against the enemies of God can be better understood by a reference to the first six verses of chap. lxiii., where Isaiah introduces in various forms the figure of the wine-press as an instrument of divine vengeance, the last of

which is in these words: "And I will tread down the people in mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury" (Isa. lxiii. 6). As the trodden grapes are, figuratively speaking, made drunk in their own expressed juice, so shall it be with the people in the wine-press of God's wrath. Also, in Rev. xix. 15, Christ is represented as treading "the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God." This figure seems, beyond a doubt, to lie in the background of the passage before us, and to explain the otherwise unaccountable use of *asis*. Expand it thus: "And they shall drink to the full (or become drunk upon) their own blood, as if it were the *asis* trodden out in God's avenging wine-press." The point of the comparison lies not in any intoxicating power of the *asis*, but in the manner in which the *asis* is produced by the process of treading. The intoxication, if we so interpret it, is only a figurative one; and it does not at all demand that *asis* should possess an intoxicating power, even in the slightest degree. I must dissent from those who seek proof of such power in this passage, or in Joel i. 5. We have seen that *asis* like *tirosh* denoted wine in the process of growth or manufacture, and so could be intoxicating only when the process was completed by fermentation. As in the case of *tirosh*, therefore, we should not expect to meet with any signs of its intoxicating power. Yet in Cant. viii. 2, its association with וַיְיָרֵךְ יַיִן, spiced, or mixed wine, together with the pervading voluptuousness of Solomon's imagery, leaves little room for doubt that a fermented beverage was intended. The "*asis* of pomegranate" is evidently a poetical term for pomegranate wine, a species of *shechar*. This of course is an exceptional use of the word. The remaining three or four terms which have been translated wine in our Bible can be disposed of in a few words.

סָבָא, *Sobe* from סָבָא, "to drink to excess, to tops" (Gesenius).

Delitzsch in commenting on its use in Isa. i. 22, "Thy silver is become dross, thy *sobe* mixed with water," speaks of it as "edlem Wein wie Zecher ihn lieben;" and again, as

“dieser reine, starke, köstliche Wein.” We might reasonably call it, then, the toper’s word for wine, or for such strong wines as could best suit his purpose of intoxication. This interpretation is confirmed by the use of the word in the remaining two passages where it occurs. In Hosea iv. 18 we should render, according to Gesenius, “Their drinking-bout is past,” or, following Keil, “Ausgeartet ist ihr Saufen;” in both cases the cause standing for the effect. Keil says (in loc.), “כֶּסֶם ist wahrscheinlich starker, berauscher Wein.” In Nahum i. 10, the sense is, “soaking as with *sobe*.”

מֶסֶק, *Mesek*; מִמְסַק, *Mimsak*; and מֶזֶג, *Mezeg*.

These are all cognate with the Latin *misceo*, and denote mixed or spiced wine; possibly, in some instances, wine mixed with water. The wine then would have its strength increased by the spices in one case and moderated by the water in the other. The word in its various forms occurs only four times, viz. Ps. lxxv. 8; Cant. vii. 2; Prov. xxiii. 30, and Isa. lxxv. 11. It seems to be another toper’s or *bon-vivant’s* word for such beverages as would best suit the purposes of that class. The same may be said also of the following:

שֵׁמָרִים, *Shemarin*.

Gesenius defines this as “*dregs, lees* of wine, so-called because wine is *kept preserved* in strength and color by letting it stand upon the lees.” It occurs four times. In Isa. xxv. 6, it is the word employed to typify the Gospel-feast; “a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined;” which Gesenius explains as “generous old wine purified from the lees;” and Vicar Bevan calls it “wine that had been kept on the lees for the purpose of increasing its body.”¹ It is also used of the dregs in the cup of God’s anger in Ps. lxxv. 8. In Jer. xlviii. 11 and Zeph. i. 12 it is used of men who have settled on their lees, i.e. are at ease.

¹ Smith’s Dict. of the Bible, Art. “Wine.”

דבש, *Debash*,

Honey of bees or of grapes ; the latter being equivalent to the Latin *sapa* or *defrutum* (Gesenius), i.e. grape-juice boiled down one third or one half. Travellers tell us that it is known in Palestine to-day as *dibs*, and that it is regarded as a syrup or molasses rather than as a wine.

אֶשְׁחָה, *Ashisháh.*

This is several times rendered "flagons of wine," is generally conceded to mean not wine at all, but a cake of pressed raisins.

In the New Testament we find :

Oivos.

This word seems to be the counterpart of *yayin* as the general term for wine. Paul cautioned the Ephesians (v. 18), against the excess of becoming drunk with it. It was *oivos* which Jesus made at Cana, and the character of it in that instance is clearly indicated by the remark of the master of the feast, in which the same good wine which it was customary to set before guests at the beginning of the feast when they were best able to appreciate it, and which is represented as being able so far to dull the senses as to render the guests unable afterwards to detect an inferior wine, is used to describe the wine which Jesus made. There is no reason to suppose that the comparison was not an accurate one. Nor, in saying this, are we obliged to suppose that the guests at Cana were intoxicated when Jesus gave them this good wine ; for the remark of the master of the feast was a general one concerning a custom of the times. That Jesus himself drank *oivos*, we have from his own lips when he asserts that while "John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine (*oivov*) the Son of man is come eating and drinking," — the same bread and the same wine (Luke vii. 33, 34). It was the same *oivos* which Paul recommended to Timothy (1 Tim. v. 23). The fact is not without significance that in these passages the sacred writers did

not use the only Greek word which clearly refers to an unfermented liquid, viz. :

Γλεῦκος.

This, as in classic Greek, corresponds to the Latin *mustum*, meaning the newly expressed juice of the grape, and so has a less wide range of meaning than *tirosh* or *asis*. It occurs only once, and I see no necessity for trying to prove it intoxicating, as some have done, including Robinson. Others mocking said, "These men are full of *γλεῦκος*" (Acts ii. 13). The irony of this charge seems to be clearly indicated by the word "mocking," and the meaning to be: "These men, too abstemious, forsooth, to touch anything stronger, have made themselves drunk on grape-juice." If this was not the point of their "mocking," how can the use of *γλεῦκος*, instead of the common word *οἶνος*, be accounted for? Vicar Bevan says, "St. Peter would hardly have offered a serious defence to an accusation that was not seriously made."¹ But Peter replies, not to the absurdity of getting drunk on grape-juice, but to the *real* charge which that absurdity so satirically covers up, viz. that they were drunk on *something*. "These men are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day." It seems to me that Alford, and others, in arguing for the intoxicating character of *γλεῦκος*, as a *sweet* wine, have lost sight of the classical distinction already pointed out (p. 62) between *γλεῦκος* = *mustum*, sweet, because unfermented grape-juice, and *οἶνος γλυκίς* = sweet wine, so-called, because, though fermented, it was rich in sugar. This leads us to consider one more expression found in the New Testament, viz.

Οἶνος νέος, new wine.

This occurs in Matt. ix. 17, and parallel passages: "Neither do men put new wine into old bottles, else the bottles break; but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved." This cannot be the same as *γλεῦ-*

¹ Smith's Dict. of the Bible, Art. "Wine."

κος, because, if the liquid were entirely unfermented, not even the new bottles, or skins, would be able to resist the power of the fermentation. It cannot be the same as fully fermented οἶνος, because, if the fermentation were complete, old bottles would be as serviceable as new ones. It must then have been new wine which had not fully fermented, but which had come so near the completion of that process that it could with safety be put into the new skins, whose elasticity would be sufficient to resist the "after-fermentation" which would ensue. It may also, in a passage presently to be quoted, have denoted wine that was fully fermented, but which had not acquired that mellowness which only age can give. That wine in either of these imperfect states was not a favorite beverage with the Jews, is plain from Luke v. 39, "No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new; for he saith: The old is better;" or as Alford puts it, "good enough."

We may pause here to state the conclusion to which our examination of these various Hebrew and Greek terms has brought us, and it is this:

1. It is clear that some of these terms, sometimes or always, refer to things that were unfermented and destitute of intoxicating power.

2. Nevertheless, these very terms are signally devoid of evidence that they ever denoted beverages in common use, or beverages that were regarded as species of wines.

3. On the other hand, the most important of the terms just referred to show striking evidence of being regarded as names for wine in the process of growth or manufacture; or, occasionally, as finished wine viewed in relation to that process.

4. Not a single passage can be found in the whole Bible where any two of the various words for wine are so brought together that the liquid denoted by one of them is sanctioned, and that denoted by the other is condemned. This is entirely unaccountable on the theory of so vital a distinction between two classes of wines as is insisted upon by some writers.

5. Such a distinction is also rendered untenable by the existence of several words which give ample evidence both of divine approval and of intoxicating power, in connection with the liquid which they represent.

6. The above conclusions are equally fatal to any such modification of the theory referred to, as supposes a distinction between wines which had a comparatively large, and those which had a comparatively small, amount of alcohol in them. Such a theory was broached by Dr. Nott.¹

We are thus brought, on physiological, historical, and exegetical grounds, to the irresistible conclusion that the beverages to which the Scriptures refer under the various terms which we include under the general name of wine, were fermented beverages, capable of producing intoxication if taken to excess.

Having thus determined the nature of the wine sanctioned, let us pass to the consideration of

II. THE MANNER OF THE SANCTION.

Much light has already been thrown upon this point in connection with what has been said of the nature of the Scripture beverages. That we may better understand the fulness of the divine approval let us make a general classification of the passages which contain a sanction for the use of wine.

1. The Bible sanctions the use of wine by speaking of wine as a blessing: "Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it" (Isa. lxxv. 8); "wine which cheereth God and man" (Judg. ix. 13).

2. The Bible sanctions the use of wine by promising it to the people of God: "He will also bless the fruit of thy womb, and the fruit of thy land, thy corn and thy wine and thine oil" (Deut. vii. 13).

3. The Bible sanctions the use of wine by its praise of God for the gift of wine: "He causeth the grass to grow and wine that maketh glad the heart of man" (Ps. civ. 14, 15): "For how great is his goodness, and how great is his

¹ Nott's Temperance Lectures, pp. 116-119, quoted in Bacon's Church Papers, p. 284.

beauty! Corn shall make the young men cheerful [or cause them to thrive], and new wine the maids" (Zech. ix. 17).

4. The Bible sanctions the use of wine by threatening its scarcity as a punishment and promising its abundance as a reward: "The new wine mourneth, the vine languisheth, all the merry-hearted do sigh; they shall not drink wine with a song; there is a crying for wine in the streets" (Isa. xxiv. 7, 9, 11); "Behold, I will send you corn and wine and oil, and ye shall be satisfied therewith" (Joel ii. 19).

5. The Bible sanctions the use of wine by direct inculcation. We have already seen that it was commanded to be used in offerings and sacrifices; and to this we may add here the promised reward for faithfulness in that duty: "Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first-fruits of all thine increase; so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine" (Prov. iii. 9, 10). Its use as a medicine is recognized in the injunction of Lemuel's mother: "Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy hearts. Let him drink, and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more" (Prov. xxxi. 6, 7). (Of this passage more presently.) Its use as a tonic is recognized in Paul's advice to Timothy to use a little wine for his "stomach's sake" and his "often infirmities" (1 Tim. v. 23). But the injunction of Lemuel's mother seems also to recognize the use of wine for a purpose not strictly medical or tonic, and for which no better term can be found than that of Von Bibra, "a care-breaking luxury."¹ The force of the advice to "drink and forget" is not broken by contending that it recommends drunkenness, and so must be spoken in irony. The poverty and the misery could be forgotten, in a free and entirely natural sense of that term, by a temperate as well as by an intemperate use of wine. Once more, the use of wine is inculcated as an ordinary article of diet without reference to any abnormal condition of body or mind: "Go thy way, eat

¹ Quoted in Harper's Magazine for Oct. 1879, p. 736.

thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart, for God now accepteth thy works" (Eccl. ix. 7). The blessings of bread and wine are associated in the context with the joys of conjugal life as a legitimate reward of man's earthly labor.

Whatever doubt may attach to the interpretation of these quotations from Lemuel's mother and from the Preacher will be relieved by the point next to be noticed.

6. The Bible sanctions the use of wine by the example of good men and women who used wine without ever being reprov'd for so doing. We may mention Melchizedek and Abram (Gen. xiv. 18); Isaac and Jacob (Gen. xxvii. 25); Jesse and Saul (1 Sam. xvi. 20); Abigail and David (1 Sam. xxv. 18); the men of war who "came with a perfect heart to Hebron, to make David king over all Israel," to whom their friends brought "wine" and other things "abundantly, for there was joy in Israel" (1 Chron. xii. 38-40); Solomon and Hiram (2 Chron. ii. 10); Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxxii. 28); Nehemiah as cup-bearer to king Artaxerxes (Neh. ii. 1); and as entertainer of the workmen on the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. v. 18); Queen Esther (Esth. v. 6 and vii. 1); the good Samaritan (Luke x. 34); Paul and Timothy (1 Tim. v. 23). Even Daniel, so often held up to Sunday-school children as an example of total abstinence, must have drunk wine both before and after the period referred to when he says: "In those days I Daniel was mourning three full weeks. I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine into my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all, till three whole weeks were fulfilled" (Dan. x. 2, 3). This is the man of whom it is said that he "was faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him" (Dan. vi. 4).

It is not claimed that each of these citations taken by itself would establish the rightfulness of wine-drinking. Some of the persons mentioned did things that were not pleasing to God, and the example of any one would not, perhaps, have much weight by itself; but, on the other hand, the example of so many good men and women drinking wine with as

little hesitation as they would eat bread, and never rebuked by the Lord for doing so, does have considerable weight. And if this argument be still unsatisfactory to some, we have the record of one perfect example, the sinless Saviour.

7. The Bible sanctions the use of wine by the example of Christ. This sanction is undeniable and emphatic. Undeniable because we have the statement of the fact in Christ's own words; emphatic because his example as a user of wine is expressly contrasted by himself with the example of his forerunner, John the Baptist, who, being a Nazarite, was an abstainer from wine. "John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine, and ye say he hath a devil; the Son of Man is come eating and drinking, and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners" (Luke vii. 33, 34). It will be shown further on that the Nazarite and other vows of abstinence recorded in the Bible were exceptional in their character. Let it be noted here that the Son of Man did not give the weight of his personal example to that exceptional form of piety. He who said of himself "I must decrease," refrained from using wine. The One greater, who came after, and of whom it was asserted in the same breath, "He must increase," did not refrain from using wine. Christ came to be an ensample unto us, and in doing so ate and drank what the common people of his day, with whom he delighted to mingle, ate and drank. So far as it is possible for personal example to sanction anything, Christ has sanctioned the use of wine by his own use of it in ordinary, every-day life. Let him who denies this consider with what tenacity he would hold to the binding force of the example of Christ had it been an example of abstinence like that of John. But as if to make his example more emphatic still, we find him, at the marriage-feast in Cana, turning the water into wine by miracle — and this the very first manifestation of his miraculous power — for the sake of contributing to the enjoyment of a festive company, and thus sanctioning the use of wine as a luxury. And then, once more, as if to secure the permanence of his example in

regard to wine even to the remotest parts of the earth and to the latest periods of history, he chooses wine for one of the elements to be employed in his memorial feast throughout all lands and during all ages.

We might safely rest the argument here; but for the purpose of rebutting the interpretation often put upon certain passages by those who oppose the use of wine, let us add two more points.

8. The Bible sanctions the temperate use of wine by the condemnation of its intemperate use. "Be not among wine-bibbers, among riotous eaters of flesh, for the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty" (Prov. xxiii. 20, 21). It is plainly the excessive use of both flesh and wine which is here forbidden; and as a temperate use of flesh is impliedly sanctioned, so is also a temperate use of wine. It is the excessive use of wine, also, that is denounced in the following passage: "Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? who hath babbling? who hath wounds without cause? who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine" (Prov. xxiii. 29, 30). It is the tarrying long at the wine, and the epicurean tasting or trying, as wine-bibbers are accustomed to do, of the luxurious spiced wines, and this, impliedly, during the long tarrying, which is condemned. This passage also throws light forward upon the warning which immediately follows it: "Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder" (Prov. xxiii. 31, 32). It is the gloating look of the wine-bibber against which the warning is directed (see Gesenius under *רָאָה*), as the previous passage would prepare us to understand. And yet, with an intense literalism, this passage is often pressed to mean an entire prohibition of wine. With a similar perversion of meaning the passage "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise" (Prov. xx. 1) is often quoted as a total prohibition of wine. But the man who is deceived by wine

is he who allows wine to intoxicate him, as is evident from the meaning of $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota$, which Gesenius renders "to wander in mind from wine, hence to reel, to stagger." It is not the man who drinks wine that is not wise, but the man who allows wine to get the mastery of him and cause him to reel and stagger. Excess is plainly meant by Isaiah when he says, "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink; that continue until night, till wine inflame them" (Isa. v. 11).

Peter refers to the time when "we walked in excess of wine" (1 Pet. iv. 3). Paul exhorts: "Let us walk not in rioting and drunkenness" (Rom. xiii. 13); and again: "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess" (Eph. v. 18). To connect $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \phi$ with $\acute{\omicron}\nu\varphi$, as some do, instead of with $\mu\epsilon\theta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon \acute{\omicron}\nu\varphi$, is inconsistent with the employment of so strong a word as $\mu\epsilon\theta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$. If Paul had meant that the excess was in the wine itself, why should he not have said 'do not drink wine,' instead of 'do not be made drunk with wine'? He says again that the deacons must "not" be "given to much wine" (1 Tim. iii. 8), and the same of the aged women (Tit. ii. 3). When he urges that a bishop must "not" be "given to wine" (1 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. i. 7), it is also indisputable that it is excess which is forbidden, for the original, $\mu\grave{\eta} \pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\upsilon\omega\nu$, means "not over wine," or "not sitting long by wine" (Robinson); or "not fierce or violent over wine" (Ellicott); "not drunken" (Tyndale); "not a dronkharde" (Coverdale); "non temulentum" (Bengel); "nicht ein Weinsäuffer" (Luther); "non sujet au vin" (French version). Paul also mentions drunkenness among the works of the flesh (Gal. v. 21); says that no "drunkards shall inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. vi. 10); and commands "if any man that is called a brother be a drunkard" not to keep company with nor even to eat with him (1 Cor. v. 11). The Bible surely would not contain so many condemnations of the excessive use of wine if it did not mean, at the same time, to sanction the moderate use.

An effort is sometimes made to break the force of this

argument by an attempted *reductio ad absurdum*. Thus Christ's words, "lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness" (Luke xxi. 34), are quoted ironically in justification of moderate drunkenness. But a reference to the original shows us that βαρηθῶσω, which our version gives as "overcharged," has the sense of "weighed down"; while its unemphatic position in the middle of the sentence precludes the distinction between excessive and moderate drunkenness which the objector ironically seeks to force into it. Again, the words of James, "Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness" (Jas. i. 21), are quoted in ironical justification of moderate naughtiness. But περισσεῖαν κακίας is a Hebraism, the genitive of an abstract noun being used for the kindred adjective,¹ and the meaning plainly is, 'lay apart all evil excesses,' or all outcroppings of evil. Such passages form no parallel to those in which the excessive use of wine is condemned.

Moreover, the New Testament idea of temperance (ἐγκράτεια) was that of being "in strength" to resist all temptation to excess in the use of anything. In a broad sense it might include abstinence as one of its occasional manifestations, but abstinence was not the strict sense of the word. To express the idea of wholly abstaining, the New Testament writers used the verb ἀπέχομαι, "to hold one's self off from," as in 1 Pet. ii. 11, "Abstain from fleshly lusts." It is noticeable that this verb is never used in connection with wine.

9. The Bible sanctions the use of wine by the exceptional and limited nature of the instances of abstinence from wine which it contains.

The priests were commanded to abstain during the period of their service in the tabernacle (Lev. x. 8, 9). The implication plainly is that they were allowed to drink at any other time. This implication is confirmed by the fact that wine and strong drink constituted a part of the perquisites of the priests (Num. xviii. 12, 28, 29).

The Nazarite was not permitted, during the period covered

¹ Winer's N. T. Grammar (Thayer's translation), p. 39.

by his vow, to drink wine or strong drink, or liquor made from grapes, or to use vinegar made from wine or strong drink, or to eat grapes or raisins; in short, he was to "eat nothing that is made of the vine-tree from the kernels even to the husk" (Num. vi. 1-4). He was also forbidden to shave his head and to come near a dead body, even though it be that of a near relative. The vow could be taken for a limited period or for life. The following circumstances will help us to appreciate the bearing of the Nazarite's example upon the rightfulness of drinking wine. First, the exceptional character of his vow is evident in his prohibition from contact with the dead, which would be manifestly impracticable for all, and in his wearing his hair long, which Paul, some centuries later, declared to be a shame for a man (1 Cor. xi. 14). Secondly, the fact that every product of the vine was prohibited, including solid grapes and raisins, shows that the danger of intoxication could not have been the sole motive for the prohibition of wine. Thirdly, it is significant that only three examples of life-long Nazarites are recorded, those of Samson, Samuel, and John the Baptist; that each of these was the son of a previously barren mother, and was devoted to the Nazarite life before birth, Samson and John by divine appointment, and Samuel as an expression of his mother's gratitude to God. Fourthly, it is evident from the preceding considerations that the purpose of the Nazarite vow was to present to the people a striking example of purity, self-control, separation from the world and devotion to God; all this being effected through certain austerities of life which, from the nature of the case, could not have been designed for general and literal imitation. Finally, the limited and exceptional character of the Nazarite's abstinence is put beyond the possibility of a question by the provision which is made for his return to the ordinary life of men, "when the days of his separation are fulfilled" (Num. vi. 13). He is to shave the hair of his head and burn it; he is to bring to the priest, among other things, drink-offerings of the very wine from which he had been required to abstain; and when all the

ceremonies are over, this permission is expressly given : "after that the Nazarite may drink wine" (Num. vi. 20). A more direct and explicit sanction of the use of wine in the ordinary life of the Jews it would be hard to imagine.

Resembling the Nazarites in austerity of life were the Rechabites, or descendants of Jonadab the son of Rechab. They drank no wine, built no house, sowed no seed, planted no vineyard, nor owned any ; but dwelt in tents, and led a roving, primitive kind of life, like that of the Bedouins of the desert. All this they did in obedience to the command of their ancestor Jonadab the son of Rechab, of whom we first hear when Jehu took him into his chariot and said, "Come with me, and see my zeal for the Lord" (2 Kings x. 16). The following considerations will help us to estimate the bearing of the Rechabites' example upon the question of abstinence from wine. First, the exceptional character of their mode of life is evident in their separation from settled abodes and the cultivation of the soil—two of the most important prerequisites of our Christian, or indeed of any civilization. Secondly, their abstinence was in obedience not to a divine, but to a human command. Thirdly, this command was designed, as near as can be learned, to be a protest against the luxury of the Phoenician civilization, which, through the influence of the Phoenician Jezebel, was spreading its influence over the kingdom of Israel ; and in this view it was a protest not against the sinfulness of house-building and agriculture and wine-drinking, but against the sinful luxury and extravagance to which all these things, though lawful within certain limits, were capable of leading the people. Fourthly, the Rechabites themselves when asked by Jeremiah (Jer. xxxv. 5, 6) to drink wine, refused not on the ground that wine-drinking was wrong, but on the ground of the command of their ancestor. Fifthly, the abstinence of the Rechabites is nowhere commended in the Bible except as an act of obedience to the command of their ancestor (See Jer. xxxv. 12-17).

It is time now to ask, what is the impression which an

unbiased reader would naturally receive from the scriptural references to wine as thus set forth? Can that impression fail to be this: that the Bible sanctions the use of wine in moderation, not only as a medicine and a tonic for persons in imperfect health, but also as a luxury, and even as a common article of diet for all in the ordinary circumstances of life, and that this sanction is given in a remarkable number of ways and with remarkable clearness? That this sanction, however, is not an unlimited one will appear from the next division of our subject, to which we now advance.

III. THE LIMITATIONS OF THE SANCTION.

1. The first limitation which the Bible places upon the use of wine is the prohibition of all excess. This has already been referred to, and the passages cited need not be repeated here. (See p. 87 ff.)

2. A second limitation is the duty of entire abstinence on the part of persons who are practically unable to avoid excess if they use wine at all. This limitation is not explicitly stated in the Bible. It is, however, fairly inferred from the general spirit of the Bible, and especially from our Saviour's command, "If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee" (Matt. v. 30). Indeed it is so much a dictate of that plain common sense which the Bible supposes its readers to possess that it scarcely needs to be mentioned.

3. A third limitation is the duty of abstinence, either partial or entire according to circumstances, on the part of some who are strong, as a means of help to those physically weak ones just now referred to. This limitation also is destitute of explicit inculcation in the Bible, but is plainly taught by its general spirit and by such a passage as "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ" (Gal. vi. 2). It may also be deduced by analogy from certain teachings of the New Testament to be presently discussed. The extent and duration of the abstinence must depend upon the circumstances of each particular case to be determined by the individual conscience in the light of the law of love.

The physically weak, to whom this limitation has reference, must not be confounded with the ethically weak, now about to be mentioned.

4. A fourth limitation is the duty of abstinence, partial or entire according to circumstances, on the part of some who are strong for the sake of those whose consciences in regard to the use of wine are weak. This duty is set forth in the New Testament with very great plainness in regard to indulgence in certain articles of food and drink, including wine, and to certain other matters of casuistry about which the apostolic church was divided in opinion.

That we may better understand the application of this teaching, let us notice the different classes of weak brethren who are referred to in the New Testament. First, there were the Judaizers, or Jewish converts to Christianity, who sought to retain, as Christians, some or all of the ceremonial law of Moses, and to make it binding also upon the heathen converts. It was this class that troubled the church at Antioch. The apostolic council at Jerusalem refused to sanction their claim so far as it concerned circumcision, but enjoined upon the Gentile converts the duty of yielding to the scruples of their Jewish brethren so far as to abstain from certain things which were especially offensive to the Jewish conscience (Acts xv. 1, 19, 20, 28, 29).

A second class of weak brethren consisted of Gentile converts to Christianity who had scruples about eating the meat or drinking the wine that had been offered in sacrifice to idols, because they regarded such acts as compromising themselves with heathen worship. Such as these were found at Corinth. Paul plainly set forth the groundlessness of such scruples, yet exhorted the more intelligent Christians, out of love to their weaker brethren, to avoid giving them offence. "For if any man see thee, which hast knowledge, sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols; and through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died? But when ye

sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ. Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend" (1 Cor. viii. 10-13).

A third class of weak brethren consisted of the ascetics in the Christian church. These went beyond the other two classes in practising an abstinence which neither the requirements of Jewish law nor considerations connected with idol worship seemed to call for. This excessive abstinence may have been prompted by a desire so to "fence" the law, after the manner of the Pharisees, that even accidental defilement might be avoided; or by a more general notion of the necessity of asceticism to a truly devout life. Meyer traces their doctrine to the influence of the Essenes.¹ Weak brethren of this class were connected with the church at Rome. Paul describes them (Rom. xiv) as eating no flesh and drinking no wine, and as being overscrupulous in regard to the observance of days. Not content with maintaining this scrupulosity themselves, they were in the habit of judging their stronger brethren, while at the same time the stronger did not refrain from despising the weak; and thus "doubtful disputations" sprang up to mar the peace and harmony of the church. Yet the sincerity of both parties seems to have been so great that Paul rebukes them with gentleness. In calling the abstainers "weak" he plainly indicates his opinion as to the merits of the controversy itself, and he shows them their presumption in undertaking to judge their stronger brethren: "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth" (Rom. xiv. 4). At the same time, for the sake of peace, he counsels the strong to yield to the scruples of the weak. Though he is persuaded by the Lord "that there is nothing unclean of itself," yet "to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean to him it is unclean"; therefore, in order that they might "follow after the things that make for peace and things wherewith one may edify another," he gives them this general rule of con-

¹ Meyer, *Des Paulus Brief an die Römer*, 4te Aufl. S. 488.

duct: "It is good not to eat meats, nor to drink wine, nor to do anything in which thy brother stumbles, or is scandalized or is weak" (following in part Alford's and Meyer's rendering).

There was a fourth class of persons in the church, allied in doctrine to those already mentioned, but in regard to whom Paul speaks with a very different tone. In various degrees they manifest an increased divergence from the simplicity and freedom of the gospel. The palliating epithet "weak" is no longer applied to them, but instead of this we meet with much harsher terms. Among the Galatians they are "false brethen unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage; to whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you" (Gal. ii. 4, 5). In regard to circumcision, the disuse of certain meats and drinks, and the observance of certain holy days, these persons seem simply to have shared the views of the classes of the weak brethren already mentioned. But they held their views in such an unworthy spirit, and sought to bind them upon the whole church in such utter forgetfulness of the rights of Christian liberty, that forbearance ceased to be a virtue, and Paul plainly counsels resistance to their claims. Among the Colossians this class appear as the advocates of the worship of angels in addition to their ascetic dogmas. They are spoken of as "puffed up" in their "fleshly mind," and "not holding the Head" (Col. ii. 19). Paul writes to the Colossian church in regard to them: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ" (Col. ii. 8); "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days" (Col. ii. 16); "Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, ([such as] touch not, taste not, handle not, [in reference to

things] which all are to perish with the using [and so cannot produce permanent defilement] ;) after the commandments and doctrines of men ") (Col. ii. 20-22). In the pastoral epistles this class are described in still stronger language. Thus Paul in writing to Timothy speaks of them as departing from the faith, "giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron ; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving ; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer " (1 Tim. iv. 1-5). It would seem that Timothy had so far come under their influence as it related to an ascetic life, that he required apostolic advice before he would use wine even as a dietary agent. Paul says in the next chapter ; " Be no longer a water-drinker, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities " (1 Tim. v. 23). In writing to Titus Paul speaks of this class as " vain talkers and deceivers " (Tit. i. 10) ; " liars " (vs. 12) ; " whose mouths must be stopped " (vs. 11) ; and he goes on to say : " Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith ; not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men that turn from the truth " (vs. 13, 14).¹

We have now passed in review the various classes of weak and false brethren whose legalistic and ascetic tendencies gave such trouble to the early church. The apostolic principle was to yield much to the former, but nothing to the latter. The weak brethren were to be received into the church, and their scruples were to be tenderly regarded even at the cost of some personal sacrifice on the part of the strong, without, however, admitting that the weak brethren were right in their position. But when these weak brethren came to demand as a principle what had been yielded in love,

¹ Concerning these classes, see Alford, *Prolegomena to the Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 74 ff. ; and Meyer, *Des Paulus Brief an die Römer*, pp. 487 ff.

when they sought to bind the consciences of their more enlightened brethren, then they were to be resisted and sharply rebuked. Paul illustrated this difference of action when, on the one hand, he caused Timothy to be circumcised because of the Jews (Acts xvi. 3), the silent appeal of whose spiritual need seemed, under the circumstances, to justify the act, and then, on the other hand, refused to have Titus circumcised because of the false brethren who came in privily to spy out their liberty, and insisted on the act as a matter of principle (Gal. ii. 3, 4). In a similar spirit it is said that so devout and holy a man as Dr. Archibald Alexander would, on rare occasions, drink a glass of wine in rebuke of those who denied his right to do so, and in practical assertion of Christian liberty, although habitually practising entire abstinence.¹

Several facts need to be emphasized in connection with our fourth limitation of the sanction of wine. One is that the abstinence so repeatedly and forcibly inculcated is always for the sake of those who are ethically weak — weak in the possession of an over scrupulous conscience. The duty of abstinence for the sake of those who are physically weak, does not appear to have been in the apostle's mind; yet such a duty may be fairly drawn from his words by analogy. Again, Paul's rule of abstinence for the sake of those who were ethically weak involved no concession of principle on the part of the strong, nor did it set aside the duty of reasonable and kindly effort to bring the weak brethren to a better mind. Again, the alleged duty of abstinence from the use of wine or other things because of some possible but unforeseen abuse of it by another person is not to be found in these passages or elsewhere in the Bible. Indeed, the non-existence of any such duty is plainly deducible from Paul's words to the Corinthians: "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no questions for conscience' sake. . . . If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go, whatsoever is set before, you eat, asking no question for conscience' sake. But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacri-

¹ Princeton Review, Oct. 1871, p. 623.

vice unto idols, eat not, for his sake that showed it, and for conscience' sake conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other" (1Cor. x. 25-29). Here the presumption was in favor of the harmlessness of an indifferent act until specific evidence to the contrary was presented. Once more, the abstinence inculcated in the passages we have been studying was always exceptional in its character, applying to certain persons, communities, or times. It was never designed to become universal and perpetual. Paul's hyperbole that he would eat no flesh "while the world standeth" has never convinced any scholar, to my knowledge, that he thenceforth lived upon a vegetable diet. We are thus brought to the last division of our subject, viz.

IV. THE PERPETUITY OF THE SANCTION.

It is conceded by all Christians that the principles of scriptural ethics are perpetual. The application of those principles, however, may change with a change of circumstances. The position is taken by a considerable number of Christian people that circumstances have so changed as materially to modify our duty. While admitting the sanction of wine in Bible times and Bible lands, they declare it to be inapplicable to our modern and occidental civilization, and assert that, on grounds of Christian expediency and love, a universal abstinence from wine is now called for. It is plain that the burden of proof rests upon those who assert this change. The presumption is, that a specific act which was sanctioned by the Bible in so many and unmistakable ways as we have seen that the use of wine would not be wrong or inexpedient now. Still, such a change is not, in itself, impossible. Let us see if it can be established.

It is said that there is more drunkenness now than in Bible times; that this results largely from the existence of distilled liquors, which were unknown to the ancients; that it is aggravated by the wide-spread adulteration of both distilled and fermented beverages, by the feverishness of our modern life, and, in America, by the dryness of the air, or

other peculiarities of the climate ; and, finally, that whether these things be so or not, the wide-spread existence of conscientious scruples against the use of wine as a beverage should lead others, for the sake of these weaker brethren, to abandon it altogether.

These all constitute elements of the problem which cannot be overlooked, and which no one should wish to overlook. It may be admitted at once that the limits of wise indulgence in the use of wine have been narrowed, while the sphere of prudent and benevolent abstinence from its use has been enlarged. Science has shown that less alcohol than was formerly supposed can be taken with benefit by any one. It is probable that just now in our country more people than in ancient times and oriental lands should practise a benevolent abstinence on account of the physical infirmity of their friends. There are also many communities, especially in our country, where sincere scruples of conscience against the use of any intoxicating beverage are so prevalent and deeply rooted as to call for considerable abstinence on the part of those who hold to a freer view of gospel ethics. Furthermore, let us acknowledge that there exists now, as always, what Mr. John B. Gough so eloquently calls, "the liberty of abstinence," by which, in the spirit of the ancient Nazarites, individuals here and there, and sometimes whole communities, may make a standing protest against intemperance by constantly foregoing the enjoyment of wine. All this must be conceded by any thoughtful and conscientious Christian.

But the concession of all this is very far from involving the conclusion that universal abstinence is now required, or is desirable, as a substitute for the biblical method of temperance which has already been unfolded. This will appear from considerations of a twofold nature ; first, that the change in our circumstances from those of ancient times is not sufficient to justify the expedient of universal abstinence ; and, secondly, that the expedient itself tends to produce worse evils than those which it seeks to cure.

In the first place, the difference between the evils connected

with wine-drinking in ancient and in modern times is not so great as is often represented, and is not sufficient to justify the expedient of universal abstinence as a remedy for the evils of intemperance. He must be a very careless reader of the Bible who cannot see that drunkenness was a very common vice in the times of the Bible writers. The governor of the feast at Cana bore testimony to this fact when he said to the bridegroom, "Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now" (John ii. 10). What significance could this remark have had if it did not imply that men so commonly drank to excess in those days that it was the custom always to give the best wine first and the poorer afterwards, when the guests had become unable to distinguish the poorer from the best? Moreover, what mean all the denunciations of wine in the Old Testament and the woes pronounced upon the drunkard if, in the climate of Palestine and in the days before Christ, there was, as is so often said, little or no evil attending the use of wine? What mean the cautions against the excessive use of wine found in the New Testament? How does it happen that Paul speaks of the greediness of certain members of the Corinthian church as leading them to excessive drinking at their *agapae* in connection with the Lord's Supper? (1 Cor. xi. 21.) But besides the evidence thus furnished by the Bible itself, abundant testimony is given by the secular writers of antiquity and by the monuments of art, that drunkenness was a common and degrading vice. So, too, we have evidence from Hebrew words already noticed (p. 79) that the art of adulterating wines with poisonous drugs, so as to make highly intoxicating beverages, was not unknown to the ancients.

On the other hand, the extent and degree of the modern adulteration of wine and other fermented beverages is often very grossly exaggerated, as is also the difficulty of obtaining such beverages in a pure and wholesome state. The testimony of Dr. Richardson upon this point is very significant.

In discussing the evils of adulteration he qualifies his statements by the admission "that we very often hear accounts of the effects for evil of bad wine, when, in fact, the evil is due to the excess of ordinary alcohol that has been taken by the complainant."¹ Dr. Richardson also gives the result of an extensive research conducted by himself upon the ales sold in London with a view to the detection of adulteration. For many weeks beers and ales were collected from retail houses in the most diverse parts of the metropolis, and neither trouble nor expense was spared in the examination of them. "I may state at once," says Dr. Richardson, "that I did not, in any one instance, find a truly dangerous adulteration."² He adds that the most common adulterations were water, salt, and sugar. In regard to the asserted employment of *cocculus indicus* and similar substances as an adulteration in malt liquors, while not denying their use, he says: "I content myself with stating that I have never detected any foreign body of the kind, and that in the whole of my experience of the effect of malt liquors on man I have never known a symptom produced indicative of the effects of such substances."³ As to the production of calculous disease from the salts of lime sometimes used to correct the acidity of wine, he says: "I have not had experience of the slightest evidence that would support it, nor do I think there is sufficient of such wine consumed to warrant any conclusion of the kind."⁴ Again he says: "The presence of acetic acid in wines is, on the whole, not injurious if the wine in other respects be free of adulteration."⁵ It should be remembered that these statements come from one who is, perhaps, the most prominent medical advocate of universal abstinence now living. The impression which he constantly gives is that the evils of adulteration have been overestimated.

To the same purport is the testimony of Dr. George M. Beard of New York, who has given much attention to social and hygienic subjects. He says: "While adulteration is, as

¹ Richardson, Cantor Lectures on Alcohol, p. 127.

² *Ibid.*, p. 129.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 131.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

all know, the rule rather than the exception in this country, yet the *injurious* character of the adulterations of liquors is *by no means so great as has been commonly supposed*. All of them contain alcohol as a basis, and most of the other ingredients are either harmless or are in such small quantities that they can exert but little evil effect on the system. Some of the adulterations of our ordinary food, and especially of our candies, are far more harmful than those which are used in imitating or adulterating liquors.”¹ The italics are Dr. Beard’s. I have myself been assured by a practical chemist, thoroughly acquainted with the manufacture of wine in Germany, and to some extent also in this country, that he believes that very large quantities of California wine are brought over the mountains from that state every year perfectly free from adulteration; and that both California and Rhine wines of wholesome quality can be secured, with reasonable care, by all who are likely to want them. It does not require a very extensive acquaintance with the better classes of society in our larger cities to bring one to the conviction that there are multitudes of good people who have no more difficulty in finding pure wine or beer than in finding pure sugar or coffee or tea.

Another fact which is often overlooked by those who compare the evils of ancient and modern intemperance is the great extent to which wine is temperately used at the present time, and the great improvement in this respect which has taken place in various parts of the world in recent years. Dr. Beard says in regard to the drunkenness in English society: “The last half century, and even the past quarter of a century, has witnessed a vast reform in this matter, and among the middle and upper classes drunkenness is no longer honored, and the reputation for a habit of excess in drinking is a bar to social advancement.”² The same writer says: “Among the abjectly poor and ignorant intemperance has at the same time increased, even in those countries where the agitation on the subject and the results

¹ Beard, *Stimulants and Narcotics*, p. 68.

² *Ibid.*, p. 76.

of agitation have been most decided.”¹ Yet he adds: “That the great middle and upper classes of Great Britain, and the leading classes of the United States, are more temperate than they were half a century ago there is no question. It is conceded by the temperance reformers, and by philanthropists of all kinds who have had opportunity for comparative observation.”² Dr. Leonard Woods of Andover wrote in 1836 that he could remember the time, before the temperance reformation began, when he could count up forty intemperate ministers at no very great distance from his home. This statement is quoted by Rev. L. W. Bacon, D.D., and the significant fact pointed out that the improvement which Dr. Woods implies had taken place when he wrote, was brought about before the pledge of abstinence from wine was adopted by the temperance reformers.³ This fact weakens the assumption often made that whatever improvement we now witness in the matter of temperance has been the result of the total abstinence reformation. To the same effect, also, is the testimony of Mr. T. W. Higginson, in a recent speech: “I stand here to say that, although the proportion of total abstinence is no larger in Harvard College than it was forty years ago, I know that the actual proportion of drunkenness that one sees going through the college yard by day or night, or going in or out of Boston even, is less among the eight hundred under-graduates to-day than it was among the two hundred under-graduates thirty-five years ago.”⁴ Such testimonies as these bring before us the fact of a widespread and general improvement over large parts of the world, and among classes of society where the total abstinence reform has had scarcely any power. This is certainly no more than we should naturally expect from the general progress of Christianity and its increased power in the hearts of men.

The first answer, then, to those who call for universal abstinence on the ground of our changed circumstances is, that the change is not sufficient to justify the expedient.

¹ Beard, *Stimulants and Narcotics*, p. 125.

² *Ibid.*, p. 125.

³ Bacon, *Church Papers*, p. 279. ⁴ *Boston Daily Advertiser*, May 10, 1880.

The second answer confirms the first by showing the character of the expedient itself and the almost inevitable evils which attend a reformation conducted upon it as a basis. To some of these let us now turn our attention.

1. The demand for universal abstinence involves a departure from the biblical ideal of temperance. This ideal, as already shown, is that of self-restraint in the use of any lawful thing. Abstinence is enjoined under certain circumstances; but this is an exceptional feature of temperance. As an exception, abstinence may be wisely employed in circumstances already indicated. When, however, the fact that it is an exception is lost sight of, and it is made to take the place of the rule, a dangerous departure from biblical ethics has been entered upon. The biblical ideal of temperance stands alone in the world. It is remarkable for its wise avoidance of the extremes of the stoic and epicurean philosophies. It is neither ascetic nor selfish. It regards both the enjoyment of the individual and the welfare of his neighbor. It says, 'Use; but do not abuse; and abstain when occasion requires, for your own or your brother's sake.' The demand for universal abstinence loses sight of the former part of this ideal, and in doing so detracts much from the moral power of the latter part.

The former part of the ideal just named contemplates the self-restraint of the individual in the use of a good thing, and the resistance of incident temptations, as a higher virtue than abstinence. This idea pervades the moral system in which God has placed us; a system in which we find ourselves surrounded with a multitude of things that minister to our enjoyment and growth, every one of which has its own peculiar snare for body or soul. Human wisdom has often said, 'Flee from all these things because of their dangers.' This is asceticism. Divine wisdom says, 'Use the world as not abusing it.' This is Christianity.

Again, as to the latter part of the ideal named. The sweetness and light of the gospel abstinence for another's sake consist in its perfectly voluntary and personal character.

It is the giving up of a permitted enjoyment through motives of love to another. But when abstinence is made the constant rule for all, the enjoyment practically ceases to be a permitted one, however much it may be called so in theory. Moreover the biblical abstinence is an expression of love to a particular individual or company of individuals, under definite circumstances of time and place. But when abstinence is grounded on the general need of society at large, with no clearly defined limits of time or place, the personal character of it is inevitably obscured, and then easily passes out of view altogether.

Both in regard to indulgence and abstinence the biblical ideal contemplates a constant training of the character through the exercise of the conscience and the will under the varying circumstances of our human life. The educational value of it consists in its freedom from outward prescription as to details, and the constant responsibility which is thus thrown upon the individual soul. To substitute for this an unchanging rule of abstinence is to make temperance almost wholly a mechanical virtue bereft of the soul which constitutes its greatest charm. Such a virtue is of course better than none. Many individuals, sad to say, must have that or none at all. Others, here and there, must be content with it for the sake of their friends. But that all should ever be called upon to adopt it as a permanent rule is never so much as hinted at in the word of God.

2. This departure from the biblical ideal of temperance is disastrous in its influence upon character. As already intimated, this is true especially in regard to the conscience and the will. Both are strengthened by successful conflict with temptation. The hermit escapes some of the allurements of the world by his seclusion, but he fails to secure that robustness of character, to develop which was a part of the divine purpose in placing him in the world. No wise parent keeps his son altogether from the company of other boys lest they should contaminate him. It is better to run some risk of this, that the conscience and the will may be strengthened by action, and that thus something more than the hot-house order of

virtue may be secured. But this negative kind of goodness is all that the policy of universal abstinence is likely to secure.

But worse than this loss is the damage which comes to the conscience in another way. It is practically impossible to require universal and permanent abstinence from a thing without, sooner or later, bringing about the conviction that that thing is inherently wrong. There are multitudes of people in America who have been led by their early teaching to entertain such a conviction in regard to wine-drinking. This departure from the biblical teaching concerning wine has produced a factitious conscience, and brought many into bondage to a command which is not of God, but of men. Now notice the result. Some of those who are thus conscience-bound do not have grace to keep the altered law which has been given to them. Questioning its validity, yet without the full consent of their conscience, they some day partake and thus come into the condemnation of him who doubts while he eats. The circumstances may be such as, under the divine law, would fully justify the act; yet, since the partaking has not proceeded from faith in that law, but has involved a violation of what was *supposed* to be the law, the partaking soul has sinned. Just such a sin as this may prove to be the Rubicon of one's moral history, whose crossing shall lead the doubting soul to ruin. His blood shall be upon his own head; but how shall they deliver their souls who, from motives of human expediency, have so modified the law of God as to put a fatal stumbling-block in their brother's way?

3. Another evil result of this departure from the biblical ideal of temperance is that it narrows the sphere of efforts at reform. It offers one, and only one, avenue of escape from intemperance. It studiously discourages the idea that there is safety for any one in any course but abstinence. The first glass is said to commence a downward road. Temperance is constantly represented as incipient intemperance. Whoever indulges, however temperately, is warned that he does so at a great risk. To counsel moderation in such a one, to commend his avoidance of excess, to throw around

him the safeguards of Christian companionship and confidence, — these things are zealously avoided, lest they prove an encouragement to evil. Hands are washed of all responsibility unless the one method of abstinence is adopted. It is plain that in this way Christian help is cut off from some of those who most need it, and who have a right to expect it so long as they adhere to any method of temperance that is sanctioned by the word of God. In that marvellous fourteenth chapter of *Romans*, in which Paul with such an even balance weighs the rights and duties of the conscientious user and abstainer, he expressly says of the former: "God hath received him. . . . Yea, he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand" (*Rom. xiv. 3, 4*). But what if those upon whom God relies to communicate his preserving grace withdraw their helpful sympathy and counsel? What warrant can human expediency furnish for thus turning away from those whom God hath received, and for refusing to countenance or help them in a course of action in which God expressly countenances them and promises to help them? Yet this is constantly being done, and the result must be that some temperate users of wine, whom Christian association and counsel might preserve in perpetual temperance, are cruelly allowed to drift into intemperance and on to ruin. Who shall say that the number of such may not equal or exceed the number of those who may be saved by the exclusive employment of abstinence as a method of reform?

4. Again, this departure from the biblical ideal of temperance alienates much needed help from the active work of reform. There are many men, both in the church and out of it, who could easily be enlisted in this work if they could engage in it in accordance with the temperance principles of Christ and his apostles. But in very many of our American communities such help, if offered, would be immediately spurned, and those who offered it would be promptly denounced as among the worst enemies of the cause. This has been the case in very recent years with more than one

worthy minister of Christ who might be mentioned. Can it possibly be wise or right so to restrict the methods of reform that such men shall be discouraged from undertaking active reform work by the prospect of having their efforts discredited or denounced by those with whom they seek to co-operate? The work of reform is too vast and its interests too momentous to allow of any schism in the ranks of good men. But there is no basis upon which, if rightly appreciated, so many good men could unite as the one so clearly set forth by the writers of the Old and New Testaments. If there is to be any exclusiveness in this matter of reform, it should be based upon the biblical standard rather than on a human substitute. To choose the latter to the exclusion of the former is schismatic and unjustifiable in the extreme. But biblical temperance is not exclusive, and is not capable of being made so, in any proper sense of the word; for it includes within its scope the employment of abstinence, whenever special circumstances render it advisable. It excludes only the exclusiveness of abstinence when it is transformed into a shibboleth and insisted on as the only method. Closely allied with this evil is the following:

5. This departure from the biblical ideal of temperance tends to establish false tests of Christian fellowship. There are churches of Christ in our land whose covenant privileges no Christian, however worthy, can enjoy who will not pledge himself to abstain from the use of one thing which Christ, in the most impressive manner, both sanctioned and sanctified. There are churches in our land whose members would not dream of settling as their pastor a man who frequented such scenes as Christ hallowed with his presence at Cana, or who would give such advice to a young preacher as Paul gave to Timothy.

6. More serious still is the fact that this departure from the biblical ideal of temperance renders unaccountable the example of Christ.

Let no one say that the appeal to Christ's example in the matter of wine-drinking is made in bondage to the letter and

in disregard of the spirit of that example. Unquestionably there are some things that Christ did which it would not be expedient for us to do, because of the difference between his circumstances and ours. But the use of wine cannot be put into this category for the simple reason that, in all essential particulars, there is a close similarity between his circumstances and ours. It is pre-eminently to the spirit of his example that the appeal is made.

Consider now that Christ began his ministry by the gift of wine at Cana, and ended it with a similar gift in the upper chamber at Jerusalem. Consider that he did this with a full knowledge of all the intemperance then existing and destined to exist in after time. He was aware of the gross intemperance both in food and drink which characterized the Roman world during the luxurious period of its history in which he was on the earth. He knew to how many in Palestine, who had misused it, wine had proved to be a "mocker." He could foresee how many in future time, this nineteenth century included, it would "bite like a serpent and sting like an adder." He was aware that his example would have a powerful influence on coming generations. Yet, with all this knowledge distinctly in mind, he created it for festive use and gave it to his disciples in an ordinance that was to be perpetuated by them to the end of time and throughout the world. This example of Christ is utterly irreconcilable with the theory of those who plead for universal abstinence. We have already seen the futility of the attempt to base universal abstinence on a comparison of ancient and modern intemperance. There is not enough difference between them. It is like comparing the rapids above Niagara with the whirlpool below. There is danger and ruin in both. If modern intemperance has the proportions of the mastodon the ancient had those of the elephant. If universal abstinence is demanded by the one it certainly was by the other. It is partly the recognition of the weakness of this attempted comparison that has driven so many of the less scholarly advocates of the doctrine to adopt the theory that Christ employed an

unfermented wine. Others have sought to escape from the difficulty by a method equally unsustained by the scholarship of the world, and of far more dangerous tendency, as we shall presently see.

7. This departure from the biblical ideal of temperance tends to impair confidence in the ethical teaching of the Bible. This is manifest in the fact that those who plead for universal abstinence on the ground of expediency, seldom, if ever, contemplate any return to the practice of biblical times in the matter of wine-drinking. They speak hopefully of the great reduction or entire removal of intemperance at some future time; but how many ever couple with that glad prophecy any suggestion that it will then be expedient to use wine with the same freedom that marked the use of it by Christ and his apostles? The advocates of universal abstinence who contemplate any abandonment of their method under improved circumstances are probably as rare as four-leaved clovers. This indicates how widely faith in the biblical method of temperance has been undermined.

But we have more positive utterances on this point which ought to cause serious alarm to all believers in inspired teaching. For instance, the example of Christ in regard to wine is set aside on the same ground that the example of the patriarchs in respect to polygamy or easy divorce or slavery is set aside; viz. the progressive development of the moral teaching of the Scriptures through various stages of imperfection. The times of ignorance God winked at; and so Moses allowed a lax theory of divorce because of the hardness of the people's hearts. It is said that Christ's use of wine was on a par with these other things, and that they were all simply tolerated because of the imperfect development of the theory and practice of morals in the successive ages of the Bible. The New York Independent, in an editorial article a few years ago, gave utterance to this view as follows: "But the fact that Christ used liquor and that the Bible allows it is no proof that we should. Things were allowable and right in the days of Moses that were not so in the days of Christ,

and there has been some progress since Christ's time in the application of the principles of abstract morals. . . . The line between moderate and excessive drinking is so indeterminable, while drinking at all is so unnecessary, and the evils of excess are so fearful and enormous, that the only safe way is to abstain entirely. This we have discovered since Christ's time, and it is as sound a discovery as that of the sin of slavery. . . . To appeal to the Bible in defense of alcoholic liquors is like appealing to it in defense of slavery. Christianity has educated the public conscience on these two subjects beyond the explicit teachings of Scripture."¹

It will be noticed that the comparison here attempted fails in one essential particular; viz. that neither slavery nor polygamy nor easy divorce are supported, as wine-drinking is, by the personal example of Christ. He did not marry many wives; he did not hold slaves; he expressly superseded the Mosaic divorce by a higher and holier regulation. Yet, in conspicuous contrast to his forerunner, John the Baptist, he came drinking wine.

But it is amazing that the writer of the above should not have seen how seriously his argument impeaches the perfection of Christ's teaching and example. If Christ's acts did not illustrate the application of the theory of abstract morals as well as his words taught the theory itself, of what value are any of his acts or words as a guide to holy living? How can we reconcile a defect in this matter with the omniscience and sinlessness of Christ? What becomes of the authority of the Bible in the matter of morals if the teaching and practice of the incarnate Son of God are to be regarded as less safe guides for us of the nineteenth century than the subsequent discoveries of uninspired men?

But it is a great mistake to speak of total abstinence as a modern discovery. The Nazarites and Rechabites practised it in Palestine in the days before Christ; and at the very time when he was upon earth the Essenes, a peculiarly devout sect among the Jews, were practising it as one of the

¹ New York Independent, March 11, 1874.

essentials of a truly holy life. It was because Christ did not ally himself with these men of monastic tendencies and engraft their principles upon his new religion that he was called a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, and a friend of publicans and sinners. Six hundred years after Christ Mohammed required total abstinence of his followers, and, according to some authorities, though not all, the same requirement was made by Buddha six hundred years before Christ. To say, then, that total abstinence has been discovered since Christ's time is a flat contradiction of the facts of history. Christ could not have been ignorant of these facts. Yet he did not abstain from wine, or practise any other form of asceticism. He chose rather to mingle with the masses of men and teach the application of religion to common life. Is it possible that in doing this he was less wise in the matter of wine-drinking than Buddha, Mohammed, the Nazarites, Rechabites, Essenes, and his own forerunner, John the Baptist?

This question must be answered to the disadvantage of Christ, if universal and perpetual abstinence be better than temperance. And it is one of the saddest results of a departure from biblical ethics that men should seem willing to abandon inspired for uninspired teaching, to consent to put the Saviour of men in the background, and even sometimes to enshrine Buddha and Mohammed in his place as exemplars in the matter of reform. Yet there are instances of such seeming willingness at hand. In an address on temperance by a Christian orator whose impassioned utterances have gained the attention of two continents, occur these words: "It is not improper to recommend to a very few metropolitan pulpits that, on one point, if they cannot preach Christianity they should preach Buddhism. If under any haze, exegetical or social, there are eyes that cannot find, in the letter or the spirit of Christianity, what is so plainly inculcated in Buddhism, then this fifth Buddhist commandment [Thou shalt drink no intoxicating liquor.] should be commended to them as a text."¹ More recently a distinguished dignitary of the

¹ Address by Joseph Cook before the Suffolk Temperance Union, May 23, 1870, p. 12.

English church, in a brief letter upon the subject of temperance sent to a Christian gathering in America, found space to refer to the "work achieved by Mohammed" as an encouragement to effort, but made no allusion whatever to any connection between the temperance reform and the divine Master in whose service he was engaged.¹

Such utterances as these give evidence of a widespread feeling among the advocates of universal abstinence that Christ is not a good patron for their cause. His own example and the explicit teachings of his inspired apostles stand directly athwart their pathway. There are only two ways of getting around this gigantic difficulty. One is by the fiction that Christ made and used an unfermented wine. This we have already shown to be untenable. The other is by declaring the divine example and apostolic teaching to be antiquated and unfit for the present age. This is essentially rationalistic and fatal to the moral authority of the Bible.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS.

We have now finished our examination of the Biblical Sanction for Wine. We have seen that it is a sanction for fermented wine; that it is established in a great variety of ways by the sacred writers, and especially by the example of Christ; that it is limited by a prudent regard for one's own welfare, and a benevolent regard for the welfare of one's neighbor; that the sanction as thus limited is perpetual, as, from its divine character, we should expect it would be.

It is easy to anticipate the objection which this presentation of biblical truth will meet with in not a few devout Christian hearts. It will consist of a fresh recital of the fearful evils of intemperance; the physical, mental, and spiritual degradation of the drunkard; the blasting of bright hopes; the desolation of homes; the multiplication of widows and orphans; the increase of crime in all its horrid phases; the heavy burdens which all these evils bring upon society at large; and the hinderance which they constitute to the coming

¹ Letter of Canon Farrar in *The Congregationalist*, March 17, 1880.

of the kingdom of God. It is a sad, sad story. No wonder that extreme measures should be demanded for so great an emergency. No wonder that from the depths of human anguish the cry should arise, "Away with everything that is capable of producing this great curse."

But, Christian brethren, in the treatment of so great an evil can we afford to drift away from inspired teaching and divine example? Is not this the very emergency above all others in which we should distrust our own unaided wisdom, and follow closely and confidently the principles revealed in God's word? Can it be wise to adopt a method of reform which obliges us to ignore, or even to obscure, any of these principles? In doing so, do we not cast away our surest pledge of success? Is it not probable that the Divine Mind in adjusting the doctrine of temperance has taken more things into the account than we with our limited vision? Is it expedient or safe to disturb the balance of divinely enunciated truth?

But in adhering closely to the biblical doctrine of temperance, we are faithful also to the broadest and clearest instincts of human reason. The doctrine has ever commended itself to the great majority of men, and to the great majority of Christians throughout the world. It provides for innocent indulgence and for prudent and benevolent abstinence. It combines liberty with wholesome restraint. Its flexibility adapts it to all the varying circumstances of human life. It involves the most thorough training of conscience and development of character. Its reasonableness precludes the possibility of successful opposition. It is only under the stress of exceptionally great abuse, or the influence of a partial and unbalanced view of social necessity that men have been tempted to swerve from the biblical doctrine.

There are some reasons for the belief that a better era is dawning. The demand for a biblical basis on which to conduct the temperance reform is seen in the widespread acceptance, among the common people, of the theory of an unfermented wine, despite the signal failure of that theory to

commend itself to the scholarship of the world. The same thing is made manifest by some of those who reject this theory, in the constant and exclusive appeal to that portion of Paul's precepts which inculcates benevolent abstinence, while at the same time the precepts declarative of Christian liberty are ignored. The erroneous and one-sided exegesis which is thus involved is, in itself, far from encouraging. But there is hope in the fact that the authority of God's word is thus widely recognized as an imperative necessity in the temperance reform. We must consider in connection with this the recent enormous increase in the study of the Bible in Sunday-schools and churches, and the multiplication of critical helps for biblical study by the common people, embodying much of the best results of modern scholarship. Erroneous interpretations must eventually yield to such a mighty force as this.

Another hopeful sign is found in the emphasis which has recently been given to the saving grace of a regenerate heart as the surest means of reclaiming the drunkard. Mere pledges of abstinence count for less than they formerly did as safeguards for the tempted. This increased reliance upon divine help, though still connected with some erroneous teaching, yet fairly deserves the name of "Gospel Temperance," which has been applied to it. It is a good augury of the coming day when that same divine help will be more generally recognized as sufficient, not only to keep the intemperate abuser of wine from relapsing into his old sin, but also to keep the temperate user from ever falling into the sin of intemperance at all.

Still another encouragement is found in the increasing influence which is being gained in this country by those who still adhere to the biblical doctrine of temperance. The societies organized in New York, and other cities, under the inspiration of men like Dr. Howard Crosby, are practically demonstrating the fact that universal and entire abstinence is not an indispensable requisite to a vigorous and efficient prosecution of the work of reform. It is stated on good

authority that so undoubted a veteran in this great work as Mr. John B. Gough recognizes the value and good sense of a modified pledge for those who are unwilling to take a more stringent one.

Finally, there is unlimited hope in the general progress of Christianity, and its increased power in the hearts of men. Never was the outlook so favorable as at the present time for the rapid coming of the kingdom of God throughout the world. Never was there less reason to doubt the entire sufficiency of biblical methods for hastening the glorious coming.

ARTICLE IV.

RELATIONS OF THE ARYAN AND SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

BY REV. J. F. MCCURDY, PH.D., PRINCETON, N. J.

WORDS FOR STRETCHING OR EXTENDING.

27. Proto-Aryan *tan*; Proto-Semitic ת to stretch, extend.

The Aryan root *tan* appears in Skr. *tan*, *tan-omi*, to stretch, strain; Zend. *tan*, to stretch out, spread out; Gr. *τείνω* for *τεν-ω*, *τι-ταίνω* for *τι-ταν-ω*, to stretch, extend; Lat. *ten-do*, to stretch, *ten-eo*, to hold, i.e. to keep on the strain; *tempto* (properly *ten-to*, according to Corssen), to try, or, primarily, as Curtius says, to stretch a thing till it fits; Goth. *than-yan*; A. S. *then-yan*, to extend. It is also found in many noun-stems in these and all the other Indo-European dialects, with kindred or derived meanings, in which the force of the primary idea is variously and vividly represented. This *tan* is really a nasalized form of *ta*, which appears as the stem before a consonant in Greek and Sanskrit. Thus *tan* in Skr. has the participle *ta-ta*, to stretch, and *τείνω* gives the aor. *ἐτάθην*, while we also meet with the form *τάσις*, a stretching, and *τάνν-μαι*, I stretch myself; cf. the note in Chap. IV. on nasal vowels in connection with the determinative *n*. — The Semitic ת shows itself most simply in the Heb. תָּ, to