

Use and Abuse of Wine, etc.

The testimony of the Bible to the:

with a notice of the corresponding terms in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, and remarks on the chief objections of modern times.

W. Kelly.

Table of Contents

THE USE AND ABUSE OF WINE.....	2
§ 2. Tirosh, NEW WINE.....	16
§ 3. Chamar, RED WINE.....	20
§ 4. Soveh, WINE DRINK.....	20
§ 5. Asis, SWEET WINE.....	22
§ 6 Mimsak, MIXED WINE.....	22
§ 7. Shekar, STRONG DRINK.....	23
§8. Shemarim, LEES.....	24
§ 9. Yekev, WINEFAT.....	25
§ 10. Ashisheh Anavim, GRAPE CAKES.....	25
§ 11. Devash, GRAPE HONEY.....	25
§ 12. Dema, LIQUORS.....	26
§ 13. Chometz, VINEGAR.....	26
§ 1. OINOE, WINE.....	26
§ 2. AKPATOE, PURE WINE.....	30
§ 3. ΓΛΕΥΚΟΕ, SWEET WINE.....	30
§ 4. ΕΙΚΕΡΑ, STRONG DRINK.....	31
§ 5. ΓΕΝΝΗΜΑ ΑΜΠΕΛΟΥ, FRUIT OF THE VINE.....	31

[The Hebrew characters are inserted with a transliteration only at the first mention of each word, thereafter only the transliteration is given.]

CONTENTS.

Introduction, — sin and its remedy

Estimate of each, by faith and by unbelief

The Teetotal system

The Gospel

Use and abuse of Wine in the Old and New Testaments

General result of this review

Twofold division of Teetotallers

Scriptural argument of the extreme party

Scriptural argument of the moderate party.

Summary of the various words in the Bible translated "wine," etc., or connected therewith, and all their occurrences:

THE HEBREW OLD TESTAMENT.

§ 1. YAYIN

§ 2. TIROSH

§ 3. CHAMAR

§ 4. SOVEH

§ 6. ASIS

§ 6. MIMSAK

§ 7. SHEKAR

§ 8. SHEMARIM

§ 9. YEKEV

§ 10. ASHISHEH ANAVIM

§ 11. DEVASH and MAMTAKKIM

§ 12. DEMA

§ 13. CHOMETZ

THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT.

§ 1. Οἶνος

§ 2. Ἄκρατος

§ 3. Γλεῦκος

§ 4. Εἴκερα

§ 5. Γέννημα ἀμπέλου.

Heresies linked with extreme Teetotalism:

I. — Plenary inspiration denied

II. — The atonement ridiculed

Conclusion

THE USE AND ABUSE OF WINE

The question of sin, in one shape or another, has, from the first, agitated men's minds. It could not be otherwise. For God erects a tribunal in the conscience of all, — even of the Gentiles who had not His written testimony. (Rom. 2) Philosophy gave neither solution to the problems of the intellect, nor relief to the anxieties of the heart; for as it could not rise to the Infinite Source of all good, so it did not dare to descend to the depth of the sinner's need. Evading the difficulties as long as was possible, it ended at last with denying all truth as to either. "The world by *wisdom* knew not God;" and where He is unknown, so is sin in its source, its nature and its doom.

On the other hand, the family of faith have ever had a certain knowledge of God, and therefore of themselves. This gradually increased from the word of judgment on the Serpent, till the Seed came to whom the promise was made. Thus the knowledge, though true and received with a divine conviction, was necessarily partial, as indeed the revelation was, till, in these last days, God spake by His Son, the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person. In Him, specially in His death, the real character of everything was made manifest. There the badness of man, set on by Satan's craft, was met and overcome by the goodness of God. The darkness is past, and the true light now shineth. There is no veil, as there once was in Judaism. With the cross it could not co-exist. but was rent from top to bottom. And if the holy light of God displays what the sinner is in his wants and wretchedness, it cannot but display the ample provision which God has made in the blood of His own Lamb. Thus is the poor believer taught what sin is by what it has cost the Son of God; and he adores as he sees that where sin has abounded, grace did much more abound.

Hence the distance between the wisest unbeliever and the least instructed believer in their thoughts about sin. To the one, Jesus is nothing; he may admire, and ask what is truth, but, like Pilate, he goes out without waiting for an answer. To the other, Jesus is all, Jesus is truth, and he knows it to his peace and blessing. The former is satisfied with stepping into the troubled waters of Bethesda — with a reformation of man as he is. The latter sees in sin, not sickness only, but moral death, and therefore can rest in nothing short of the quickening power of the Son of God. He knows that for faith is reserved the resurrection of life, the complement of the spiritual resurrection which is already enjoyed. Alas! he knows too that those who hear not the Saviour's voice have not life, and cannot escape the judgment which shall be executed by and by. "We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." (1 John 5: 19, 20.)

Now, the Teetotal system, however modified, will be found to offend against these fundamental truths. Having a low estimate of sin, it presents as low a remedy. Even as to the single evil with which it seeks to deal, it barely skims the surface. It does not, it cannot touch the heart within, and so it wreaks its vengeance upon the liquors without. Pharisaism washed the hands, Teetotalism washes the lips. But the same word of the Lord detects the inadequacy of both. "Hearken unto me every one of you, and understand: there is *nothing from without* a man that, entering into him, *can defile* him; but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man. If any man have ears to hear, let him hear." (Mark 7: 14-16.) The entire spring of moral action, the heart, is corrupt before God. What man *is*, taints what he *does*. Hence, while the human method is to cut off this and that, the divine is, first of all, to make the tree good. If that be done, good fruit is sure to follow: if not done, the more men work about it they only get more bad fruit.

It is a new life which the sinner requires as the starting point; not a step Godward can be taken previously. But it is precisely this which the Gospel proclaims at once, without money and without price. The gift, the free gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. And God will own no way, no truth, no life, no Saviour but His Son. Therefore, to occupy men with a teetotal pledge, is in fact to divert them at best with a quack medicine, and this, not for the root of the disease, but for a particular symptom — to divert them, I say, from the Gospel, which is as efficacious a cure in the drunkard's case as in all others. For it is the power of God unto every one that believeth.

Since the days of Cain, man has never wanted some new or revived invention wherewith to patch up his outcast condition. If Teetotalism, then, had come forward merely as a medical discovery, or even as a branch of philanthropy, it might have passed unnoticed save by those whom it concerns. But

seeing that, in its grossest form, it taunts the servants of Christ with their vain efforts, and professes to outdo the Gospel; seeing that, in its least offensive shape, it claims Scriptural authority, and aspires to be the pioneer and the handmaid of the Gospel, the subject calls for a passing notice.

The Christian reads the Old Testament. He finds that wine intoxicated Noah and Lot, (Gen. 9, 19) and that it afterwards afforded occasion for frequent and solemn remonstrance. (Prov. 20, 23 Isa. 5, 28, etc.) Again, he finds wine brought as a natural comfort to Abraham and Isaac, (Gen. 14, 27) and often so treated, literally as well as figuratively. (Deut. 14, Ps. 104. Prov. 9: 31: 6. Cant. *passim*, etc.) He sees in the New Testament neither contradiction nor difficulty. The Lord commenced His miracles by making water into wine, (John 2) was invidiously compared with His forerunner because He abstained not, (Luke 7) and made *bread and wine (which John the Baptist never used)** to be the chosen, constant memorial of His dying love till He come again, the symbol also of our communion with each other. Finally, the Holy Ghost more than once dwells on the end of the drunkard, (1 Cor. 6, Gal. 5) corrects the unhallowed licence of the Corinthian church at the Lord's Supper, (1 Cor. 11) and warns believers, especially such as were prominent, against excess in daily life. (Eph. 5, 1 Tim. 3 Titus 2) At the same time, He takes pains (1 Tim. 5: 23.) to remove the scrupulousness of a devoted young servant of Christ, and en joins the use of a little wine, rather than water, for his stomach's sake and often infirmities. So graciously does God deign to interest Himself even in the bodily weakness and wants of those who love Him! The conclusion is irresistible. Total abstinence, as a *general* rule, has not, nor ever had, divine sanction. It is a device at issue with the plain facts and doctrine of Scripture, and this as to Christians no less than as to Jews. In the Old Testament *yayin* and in the New Testament *οἶνος* — that is, the ordinary words for "wine" in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures — are used both in a good and in a bad connection; because the moral evil lay not in the thing itself, nor in its use, but in its abuse. There were different kinds of wine then, (Neh. 5: 18,) as there are now. But not a single text intimates a particular sort of *yayin* which could not inebriate. Nay, more: what Scripture does say, disproves the fancy, as the sequel abundantly shows. Thus, Num. 6: 3 plainly marks off *yayin* as *fermented grape-juice*, and that in the vinous as distinguished from the acetous stage; excluding other fermented drinks, vinegar, unfermented grape-liquors, as well as the solid fruit of the vine. We who adhere to the regular sense of the word are not bound to produce specific proofs; we are entitled to take it in the same sense everywhere, unless positive cause be shown to the contrary. But those who affirm that in certain places the word has a different meaning, are, in each instance, bound to give Scriptural reasons adequate to produce conviction. This they can never do. We deny their affirmation: upon them falls the burden of proof.†

* Will it be said that the use of either is, abstractedly, wrong? was John the Baptist more pure than his Lord and Saviour? Note well, too that he abstained from bread as well as from wine. Are we, therefore, to abandon either or both?

† Hence the fallacy of reasoning upon such words as "Pagan," "Knave," etc., *which are known* to have shifted their meaning. This cannot be assumed as to *yayin*. Besides, the alleged parallel does not hold good. When "Pagan." was first used, it *had not* the sense of "idolator;" whereas, when *yayin* is first used in Scripture it *has* the sense of "fermented grape-liquor." (See Gen. 9: 21; Gen. 19: 32 35.)

Not to anticipate, however, the Temperance Reformers may be divided in twain. One party consider that alcoholic liquors are essentially poisonous* and therefore evil as a beverage; that in Scripture times there were two distinct genera of wine, etc., — the one unfermented and a blessing, the other fermented and a curse. But the moderate own that the use of alcohol is not in itself sinful; that inspired men, and even Christ Himself, did not abstain; that the *habitual* use of fermented beverages may be sanctioned by the Bible: still they plead that, though lawful, it is not expedient. It is plain that

the latter system destroys the former. Among themselves the difference is keenly felt, if we may judge by the unusual acrimony of their recriminations. The partisans of expediency pronounce the doctrine of the ultra-teetotalers to be "preposterous and pestiferous lucubrations," "mischievous error," and "modern delusion," and hear in return that, in its present shape, their theory is "an absurd and blasphemous abomination, and the sooner it is universally scouted and scorned, *the better*" — "a fraud and a counterfeit of the worst description." Since this is their spirit to each other, he who is forced to condemn them both, can expect little courtesy from either.

* Writers on Toxicology include alcohol in the list. But so the ablest consider the chloride of sodium, or common salt. See Taylor on Poisons, pages 2, 3, 291. is then the use of *salt*, as a condiment of food, evil or immoral? — The same principle applies to vinegar.

Let us, however, examine their arguments; and first, of those who advocate "thorough and consistent Teetotalism."

The words for wine, say they, "must have been, *at first*, necessarily applied and restricted to *fresh unfermented juices*. The primitive process of wine-pressing is well expressed in Gen. 40: 11, and also by Milton," etc. Now, every Scripturian must know that this statement is not only without Bible evidence, but contradicted by it. Noah "drank of the wine and was drunken." This is the *first* recorded application of the word "wine." Is it restricted to fresh unfermented juice? Or does it not necessarily mean the fermented liquor of the grape? This case was *long before* the dream of Pharaoh's butler, even if the process described there had been called wine-pressing in the chapter, which it is not. Nor are the reveries of "Paradise Lost" as to Eve, of weight on such a question.

We are referred to Lev. 10, "where *Teetotalism* is proclaimed as the Eternal's selected remedy for intemperance." But, in the first place, the restriction applies simply to *Aaron and his sons*. Secondly, it was in force only *when* they went into the tabernacle. Is this to proclaim Teetotalism? Does it not rather imply the ordinary liberty of the priests to use what on a special occasion was forbidden? Another writer reminds us that under the New Testament all believers are priests. Does he forget that .if Aaron's sons are to be spiritually interpreted. so is the type of wine and strong drink? Thus natural joy and excitement seem to be shadowed under these drinks, as the uncovering of the head and rending of the garments were the symbols of natural sorrow. Neither becomes those who enjoy nearness to God. His presence was meant to silence both. Whether, therefore, we look at the type or the antitype, Lev. 10 does *not* proclaim Teetotalism.

Next, we are told of "the establishment of the *first* Teetotal Society among the Holy Nazarites." Now, not only is their case a peculiar one like the priests, but there are points essential to the Nazarite which differ alike from the theory and the practice of the Teetotal Society. *His* separation consisted in three grand heads; he was to eat or drink nothing that came from the vine, to let his hair grow and to come at no dead body. None of these things is put forth as a moral principle more than another. The whole was a carnal ordinance imposed until the time of reformation. To drink wine was defiling to the Nazarite, but it was equally so to cut the hair. Christianity is subject to no part of the ordinance as such, though we may well profit by the truths which it figures. Moreover, when the days of his separation were fulfilled, God ordained that the Nazarite should shave his head and might drink wine. (Num. 6: 13-20.) Does God ordain what is wrong? The Nazarite was then free to drink the very wine which before had been forbidden. Does this permission really square with Teetotalism? Lastly, what has the principle of a separation from *all* vine-produce, in common with the Teetotal pledge? The Nazarite was forbidden the unfermented as well as the fermented, the solid no less than the liquid. Does this accord with the reasoning of "*Tirosh lo yayin*," or of any other accredited work of Teetotalers? If *not one*

entire verse of Num. 6 can be honestly interpreted in favour of their society, why cite the Nazarite ritual as their precursor? And how do they seek to escape from the net in which they have entangled their own feet? They are forced to allow that from everything pertaining to the vine the Nazarites equally abstained; but, with self-complacent scepticism, they add, that we, with our better chemical knowledge, of course do not! Can Christians tamely listen to such contempt of God's Word? The folly, too, of these speeches is only less gross than the sin; for, what had a Nazarite to do with chemistry?

It is enough to remark on the message of the angel of the Lord to the mothers of Samson and of John the Baptist, that theirs was an extraordinary Nazariteship. Again, the Rechabites obeyed in neither building nor sowing, quite as much as in drinking no wine. Their case, if applicable at all, would prove far too much. If it proved that men ought to drink *no wine*, it would prove that they ought to build *no houses*. (Jer. 35.) So Daniel and his friends abstained from the king's meat as well as his wine. If they drank water, they eat pulse. It was a question of Jewish cleanness,* not of morality. Accordingly, Dan 10: 3 clearly implies that, save in special circumstances, as fasting, the prophet *did* eat flesh and drink wine. The cup offered to the Lord upon the cross, and refused, did not consist of wine merely, and therefore does not bear on the present question. The case of Timothy, as we have seen, proves the reverse of what it is cited to prove.

* Who is it that appeals to the priests or the Nazarites, Samson or Daniel? Is it not the teetotal advocate? And who, then, is chargeable with the fallacy that the record of a Jewish practice establishes its propriety as a Christian principle?

The reader has before him the Scriptural argument of the extreme party. Let him judge whether the case of the moderate section is not as decided a failure. They appeal to Rom. 14: 21 and 1 Cor. 8: 13. The question is: does the scope of these texts coincide with that of a Teetotal Society? Is a drunkard the "weak brother" for whose sake the Christian is to forbear using his liberty?*

* See the "Scriptural claims of Teetotalism. By Newman Hall, B.A.," pages 4, 10, 11, 15, 16, 24. (1848.)

The simple reading of 1 Cor. 8 shows that nothing is further from the mind of the Spirit. The question here is one "touching things offered unto idols." The Teetotal question has nothing to do with such offerings. That is, the essential features of the Corinthian difficulty do not exist in the case of Temperance. Rom. 14 (though it mentions wine, which 1 Cor. 8 does not,) is as little to the purpose. At Rome, the dispute grew not out of *Gentile idolatry*, but out of *the religious scruples of the Jewish converts*, who, on certain days, would not partake of meats and drinks. Thus have we seen Daniel abstain from his customary food for three whole weeks, and every Jew similarly testified the affliction of his soul on the Day of Atonement. But it is preposterous to apply such a principle to a Temperance Society. Some Gentiles in these days may refrain from fermented liquors; others may adopt a vegetable diet. Is the Christian to be tossed to and fro at the whim of a world which perverts everything? Is he to refuse anything which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth? Lastly, the way in which "the weak brother" is treated is as revolting as untrue. 1 Cor. 5 proves beyond cavil that a drunkard is a wicked person to be put away from the Church, not a weak brother to be borne with. But Rom. 14 describes a class as different as possible — not false professors of lax, unholy walk, but real Christians who had feebly realised their deliverance from all questions about things legally clean or unclean. Therefore they retained a conscience in bondage to days, meats and drinks. Where is the analogy between the Roman and the Corinthian cases, and a Teetotal Society? There is none. But if so, it is clear that their argument from Rom. 14 and 1 Cor. 8 totally perishes.

Let us now glance at the various words in the Bible rendered "wine," "strong drink," etc., and others connected with them. No wise man will deny the possibility or the fact of mistakes in human translations, nor will he say that the least error is of no moment. Yet, the believing soul will rejoice to prove afresh how God has watched over His Word, not indeed to keep the erudite from error, but to feed His babes day by day, even through the least exact translation. A show of learning may puzzle the unlettered Christian who meddles with it, as it will surely mislead those who trust it rather than the Spirit of God. But the minutest accuracy serves only to confirm the general teaching of Scripture, as might be expected by the heart that knows who and what God is.

The ordinary expression for "wine" in the Hebrew Scriptures is *h yayin* which occurs an hundred and forty-one times. Like the Greek *οἶνος*, the Latin *vinum*, the Italian and Spanish *vin*, the French *vin*, the German *wein*, and the corresponding if not cognate term in other languages, it designates the fermented juice of the grape. Gesenius conjectures that it comes from an unused root, conveying the ideas of "boiling," "foaming," etc., which is the parent of the word for "mud," as well as of that for "wine." The allusion seems clear to the frothy, turbid appearance which accompanies the process of fermentation; for, as Pliny, treating of this subject, observes, "*Fervet vinum, cum ex musto in vinum transit.*" The phrase also shows that, in the common parlance of his day, the naturalist drew the same line which moderns do between the fermented and the unfermented juice of the grape.* In Eichhorn's edition of J. Simonis *Lex. Man. Hebraicum*, it is derived from the same source, "a fermentatione," while it is added that others seek the sense of softness — "*sensum mollitiei et glabritiei quaerunt, et yayin h vertunt proprie molle, i.e. molliter per fauces descendens, conf. Prov. 23: 31 et Cant. 7: 10.*" Perhaps the author of "Anti-Bacchus" would no longer argue as he did, (page 94,) that the word is derived from the word "to press, squeeze," and therefore simply means an expressed juice.

* It is worthy of note that the passage which Dr. Lees cites from the same author (N.H. xiv. c. 9) proves the *reverse* of what it is quoted for and corroborates what I have stated in the text. "*Medium inter dulcia vinu mque est quad Graeci ἄεὶ γλευκός vocant hoc est, semper mustum.*" Clearly, we have wine and *sweets* discriminated with care, and not in the least confounded with the intermediate substance, "always-must." Does this show that *vinum* is applied to unfermented things? Does it not prove the contrary!

The usage of the term, as it is more important than the etymology, so is it clear, uniform and decisive. What we mean by "wine," unless it be modified by the context which surrounds it, is certainly an intoxicating vinous liquor.* That this is the force of *yayin h* will be apparent from the inspection of all the texts wherein it occurs. In Num. 6: 3, "liquor of grapes" is *distinguished* from *yayin h*, or "wine," as is plain to the English reader. The "wine" was evidently the fermented liquor: the other phrase denotes any unfermented drink of grape-juice, and, therefore, forbids the thought that it was comprehended under that word. Hence *yayin* was even employed to denote the *effect* of wine. Accordingly, Gesenius gives "*crapula*" as a secondary meaning, and refers to Gen. 9: 24. 1 Sam. 1: 14; 25: 37.

*In this note are presented the definitions of "wise" given in all the correct dictionaries of the English language to which I have access. The term is explained in its popular sense, as our adversaries demand That it may, by a natural license of speech, be transferred to the liquor which is going to be fermented, is readily allowed. The mind, anticipating that process, may thus, with a certain logical inexactness, give the name to the juice where it is just pressed from, or even while it is still contained in, the grape. Such is the plain usage of the term in the sentences which Dr. Lees has culled from the writings of Greek and Latin poets, etc., and of certain modern travellers, naturalists, lexicographers and others. Candid men, who have read passages with their context must be aware that the meaning grafted

on them by the too ardent defenders of Total Abstinence, differs from what was intended by the authors themselves. In the above use of the word, there is moral if not physical accuracy. It is a metaphorical application, which leaves the real import undisturbed. Where this import is departed from, it is incumbent upon any correct writer to supply by the context, plain, indubitable evidence of the sense in which it is employed. So we do nowadays in speaking of "home-made wines." Save in *exceptional cases* where *the contrary is clearly implied*, the original import, the popular usage and the scientific definition alike agree to include *fermentation* in the idea of *wine*. Thus it is explained: "1. The fermented juice of the grape. 2. Preparations of vegetables by fermentation, called by the general name of *wines*, have quite different qualities from the plant; for no fruit, taken crude, has the intoxicating quality of *grape*." (Johnson's Dictionary, and so Walker.) — "The fermented juice of the grape," etc. "A liquor drawn from vegetable bodies and fermented: but more especially the fermented juice of the fruit of the vine." (Maunder, — "The fermented juice of the grape; the juice of certain fruits prepared with sugar spirits, etc., as raspberry-wine, gooseberry wine," etc. [Of course, this latter clause applies only to modern liquors.] (Craig's Univ. Etym., etc, Dict vol. ii., page 1075.)

It has been said by Dr. Eadie, in his Biblical Cyclopaedia, that it sometimes seems to signify the growing fruit of the vineyard; (Deut. 28: 39. Jer. 40: 10-12;) as in Germany, the vine-dresser in spring or summer will say: "The wine" blooms or flourishes well — "the wine" will be good this season. Now, supposing that the expressions were parallel, (for the first text speaks of *drinking* the wine, and surely not the growing fruit,) it is manifest that the phrase is figurative. Nor can a figurative use alter the real force of a word in any language. In fine, *yayin* h and *Wein* simply and properly *designate* the fermented liquor made from vine-fruit, and not the fruit itself, nor the bare juice while issuing from the press, though *by a figure* common to ancient and modern tongues, the one or the other may be so *applied*.* The text already referred to (Num. 6: 3) separates *yayin* from "moist grapes or dried" not less clearly than from any unfermented "liquor of grapes."

* See Burne's "Concordance of Scripture and Science," where, speaking of Isa. 16: 10 and Jer. 48: 33, the author says (in page 42) that *yayin*, being applied to *the juice while issuing from the press*, must of necessity have been unfermented; and in page 46, that these same texts seem, upon mature consideration, to refer, in reality, *to grapes*. That is, we are allowed our choice of meanings, provided we give up the real value of the word! So in page 41, Gen. 9: 21 and 14: 18 are compared, and the word is confessed to mean "intoxicating wine in the former, but in the latter "the *probability is great* that it was unfermented." In page 45, we are told a different tale: "It is not improbable that the 'bread and yayin' offered to Abram (Gen. 14: 18) was bread and grapes." The remarks on Eccles. 9: 7 and Cant. 2: 4 need no reply.

In the *Market Drayton Discussion* (page 30) it was alleged, and without contradiction, that in Num. 6: 4 the *wine* and the *vine* tree are synonymous phrases, — that the word *yayin* was employed for the *vine* itself. This is not the fact. The margin gives the original literally, whence the English reader may see that *gephen*, the regular word for the vine) is found, no less than h, (*yayin*,) which appears here as well as in Judges 13: 14, not as a synonymous expletive, but for greater accuracy. It is true that *gephen* alone is the general Hebrew term for "vine." Still, *yayin* is clearly added here, as conveying not the same but another idea, to complete and define the sense, because the word in itself was capable of being applied to other plants, as in 2 Kings 4: 39. That is, the allegation is unfounded. Yet, granting it, what does it prove? That there was, or was not, metonymy in such cases? Is it gravely sought to make h yayin, in its *proper sense*, interchangeable, not merely with the "liquor of grapes," from which the Spirit of God expressly distinguishes it, nor with the grapes, but even with the vine itself? That it may, by a bold but common form of speech, represent the fruit, is confessed on all hands.

Again, the Teetotal argument founded upon Ps. 104: 13-15 is worthless, because oil and bread, no less than wine, are said to be brought out of the earth. If the context prove "wine" to mean *grapes*, it equally proves "bread" to mean *corn*; and if the latter is unreasonable, (save in a figurative way, as in Isa. 28: 28,) so is the former.* In truth, to deny figures in Scripture is, so far as man can, to torture and degrade the Word of God. It is ignorance, or worse. And those who boast loudly of their own matter-of-fact exegesis will generally be found to literalize the figurative, to allegorize the historical, and so to stultify the *whole* divine record by forced human accuracy in a *part*, which coheres neither with itself nor with all the rest.

* In Lam. 2: 12, the swooning children say to their mothers, "Where [is] corn and wine?" (yayin) There is no more reason here to confound wine with grapes than corn with the food which was made of it. In 1 Sam. 25: 18, 2 Sam. 16: 1, 1 Chr. 12: 40, Neh. 13: 15, yayin is distinguished from grapes or raisins, which is enough to show the fallacy of the reasoning.

Perhaps it is not amiss to add some few testimonies taken casually as to the nature of wine, which are quite needless to the simple reader of the Bible, but which may possibly be of use where the mind is pre-occupied with the modern oppositions of science, falsely so called. "Wine, an agreeable spirituous liquor, produced by fermentation from those vegetable substances that contain saccharine matter." (Encycl. Brit. 3rd edition, vol. 18, page 809.) — "The simplest case of fermentation is that of must, or the expressed juice of the grape, which, when exposed, either in close or open vessels, to a temperature of about 70°, soon begins to give forth carbonic acid, and to become turbid and frothy. After a time, a scum collects on the surface and a sediment is deposited: the liquor, which had grown warm, gradually cools and clears, loses its sweet taste, and is converted into *wine*." (Brande's Dictionary of Science.) — "All that which is now called wine in the east," says Mr. Henry Homes, Missionary at Constantinople, "is as truly wine as that which is called wine in France. *Whether boiled or not, whether sweet or sour, all the known wines are intoxicating.** The boiling which the people of certain districts choose to give to their must, for the purpose of securing a wine that will keep better, should not be confounded with the boiling of the same must for the purpose of making sugar and molasses. In the former case, it is boiled perhaps half an hour, and not reduced one-twentieth in bulk; in the latter case, it is reduced more than three-fourths in quantity. And hence *an 'inspissated wine' should never be confounded with inspissated grape-juice.* The former gives us an intoxicating liquor, and the latter a syrup, or molasses. We might say the same of sweet wines, that although by drying the grapes in the sun, or by boiling the must, the wine is preserved sweeter than it would otherwise be, *such wines are still intoxicating, and some of them extremely so.* In some districts, the people regard *the boiled wines as stronger than the simple fermented ones.*† Those of Mount Lebanon are stronger than the majority of the wines of France." (Bibliotheca Sacra, page 292.) — Mr. Eli Smith, another Missionary in Syria, communicated to the same work the results of his own specific inquiry. "Unintoxicating wines," he says, "I have not been able to hear of. All wines, they say, will intoxicate more or less. So in regard to fermentation, when inquiring if there exists any such thing as unfermented wine, I have uniformly been met with a stare of surprise. The very idea seems to be regarded as an absurdity."

* In the face of their own canon that the Bible is not a *modern* book we are referred by a Teetotal Essayist to Mr. Buckingham's Travels' who informs us that the wines of Lebanon and Helbon are the principal wines of the present day, the former being a *boiled*, and the latter a rich sweet *wine*." Hence, it is evident (!) that the two wines most esteemed in the Holy Land were boiled wines, were thick and sweet, and consequently (!!) were not alcoholic: and these wines were the liquors which the Psalmist says make glad the heart of man," etc. !!! But even if we let pass this last assumption, Mr. Homes

proves as a fact, in the face of "Anti-Bachus," (page 102,) that boiled and sweet wines are intoxicating. Teetotal writers constantly and most confidently state the reverse — that the boiled and the sweet wines of ancient times could not intoxicate.

† Let those who desire to know how far the statements of "AntiBacchus" are trustworthy, compare pages 60, 76 77-88, where it is constantly reiterated that sweet wines are necessarily weak, and that boiled wines are destitute of strength It is supposed to be certain. But the supposition is unfounded, as appears from notorious facts stated by a Missionary, who seems to be friendly to Total Abstinence.

Ch. v.

GENESIS.

9: 21. — He (Noah) drank of the wine, and was drunken.

24. — Noah awoke from his *wine*.

14: 18. — Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and *wine*.

19: 32. — Come let us make our father drink *wine*.

33. — And they made their father drink *wine*.

34. — Let us make him drink *wine*.

35. — And they made their father drink *wine*.

27: 25. — And he brought him *wine*.

49: 11. — He washed his garments in *wine*.

12. — His eyes [shall be] red with *wine*.

EXODUS.

29: 40. — And the fourth of an hin of *wine* for a drink-offering.

LEVITICUS.

10: 9. — Do not drink *wine* nor strong drink, thou nor thy sons with thee.

23: 13. — And the drink-offering thereof [shall be] of *wine*.

NUMBERS

6: 3. — He shall separate [himself] from *wine*, and strong drink, and shall drink no vinegar of *wine*

4. — He shall eat nothing that is made of the vine tree (margin, vine of the *wine*.)

20. — And after that the Nazarite may drink *wine*.

16: 5. — And the fourth [part] of an hin of *wine* for a drink-offering.

7. — And for a drink-offering thou shalt offer the third part of an hin of *wine*.

10. — And thou shalt bring for a drink-offering half an hin of *wine*.

28: 14. — And their drink-offering shall be half an hin of *wine*.

DEUTERONOMY.

14: 26. — For oxen or for sheep or for *wine*.

28: 39. — But shalt neither drink [of] the wine, nor gather.*

29: 6. — Neither have ye drunk wine.

32: 33. — Their wine [is] the poison of dragons.

38. — Which drank the *wine* of their drink-offerings.

JOSHUA.

9: 4. — And *wine* bottles, old, and rent.

13. — And these bottles of *wine*.

JUDGES.

13: 4. — And drink not wine.

7. — And now drink no wine.

13: 14. — She may not eat of any [thing] that cometh of the vine (lit. vine of the wine) neither let her drink wine.†

19: 19. — And there is bread and wine also for me.

* The gathering does not refer to the wine in this passage, any more than the treading refers to the *vineyards* in Judges 9: 27. In both texts our translators have supplied "the grapes" as needed to complete the sense in English. To a Hebrew it was implied. The version of De Wette adheres rigorously to the original.

† Even Dr. Grindrod ("Bacchus," page 237.) cites the mothers of Samson and John the Baptist in order to prove the pernicious influence of alcoholic drinks during gestation. As usual, Mr. Parsons goes still lower in his remarks. "The command given to Samson's mother was not arbitrary, but physiological. . . . Alcohol might have made a weakling and a pigmy of Samson, and therefore (!) God enjoined '*total abstinence*' both on him and his mother." ("Anti-Bacchus," page 33.) "God works by means: and, in performing a miracle, rarely acts contrary to his own natural laws." (Ibid, page 112.) Passing by the medical view as foreign to our discussion, I am sure that spiritual men will resent these statements, because in truth they deny miracles. For that which is according to natural laws, cannot, for that reason, be a miracle. What are these manifestations of divine power, but effects contrary to the established course of things? — a suspension of, or departure from, knows physical laws? To attribute them to such laws is just to explain awry all that is really miraculous. Nor can any notion be more opposed by fact. Thus, what was the link between the all-over coming strength, and the uncut locks of Samson? "If I be shaven," said he, "then my strength will go from me." Is this a sequence of which physiology takes cognizance?

1 SAMUEL.

1: 14. — Put away thy wine from thee.

15. — I have drunk neither wine.

24. — And one ephah of flour, and a bottle of wine.

10: 3. — And another carrying a bottle of wine.

16: 20. — With bread, and a bottle of wine.

25: 18. — Two hundred loaves, and two bottles of wine.

37. — And when the wine was gone out of Nabal

2 SAMUEL.

13: 28. — Mark ye now when Amnon's heart is merry with wine.

16: 1. — And an hundred of summer fruits, and a bottle of wine.

2. — And the wine, that such as be faint may drink.

1 CHRONICLES.

9: 29. — And the fine flour, and the wine, and the oil.

12: 40. — And bunches of raisins, and wine and oil.

27: 27. — Over the increase of the vineyards for the wine cellars.

2 CHRONICLES.

2: 10. — And twenty thousand bathe of wine,

15. — And the barley the oil, and the wine.

11: 11. — And store of victuals, and of oil and wine.

NEHEMIAH.

2: 1. — Wine [was] before him: and I took up the wine.

6: 15. — And had taken of them bread and wine.

5: 18. — And once in ten days store of all sorts of wine.

13: 15. — As also wine, grapes, and figs.

ESTHER.

1: 7. — And royal wine in abundance.

10. — When the heart of the king was merry with wine.

5: 6. — And the king said unto Esther at the banquet of wine.

7: 2. — On the second day at the banquet of *wine*.

7. — And the king, arising from the banquet of wine.

8. — Into the place of the banquet of wine.

JOB.

1: 13. — Eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house.

18. — Eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house.

32: 19. — Behold, my belly [[is]] as wine [which] hath no vent.

PSALMS.

60: 3. — Thou hast made us to drink the wine of astonishment.

75: 8. — And the wine is red.

78: 65. — A mighty man that shouteth by reason of wine.

104: 15. — And *wine [that]* maketh glad the heart of man.

PROVERBS.

4: 17. — For they eat the bread of wickedness, and drink the wine of violence.

9: 2. — She hath mingled her *wine*.

5. — Drink of the wine [which] I have mingled.

20: 1. — Wine is a mocker.*

21: 17. — He that loveth wine and oil shall not be rich.

23: 20. — Be not among wine-bibbers.

30. — They that tarry long at the wine.

31. — Look not thou at the wine when it is red.†

31: 4. — Not for kings to drink *wine*.

6. — And *wine* unto those that be of heavy hearts.

* It has been said that *yayin* and *shekar* have a generic sense so as to include unfermented liquors. But our text shows the contrary. In the strong sententious style of the book, a caution is given about wine not a hint drops about a particular sort. "*Yayin* is a mocker, *shekar* is raging." Most Teetotallers who cite or reason on it, alter the phrase to "the 'wine' which is 'a mocker.'" This obviously perverts the meaning. The passage warns against being "deceived by any wine or strong drink. vague terms as these are said to be, and, quite unrestricted seem inconsistent with the hypothesis. On the other hand, the warning agrees well with these two words, if they are the general terms for the fermented liquors of the grape, and of other fruit or grain, known in ancient times. And such is precisely the definition of them given by the most unbiased and the best judges.

† The reader will scarcely be prepared for the strange version and the still stranger interpretation of this verse which Mr. Walters ("*Alcoholic Wines*," pages 32, 33,) adopts from the *Truth Seeker*. "Look not then upon the wine, 'when it is turbid, when it giveth its eye in the cup when it moveth itself upwards,' that is, when it exhibits all the signs of having become alcoholic; and what is the reason assigned? 'For at last,' the process being finished, and the fruit of the vine being converted into alcohol, 'it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder.'" Now it is enough to observe here that the words translated "moveth itself upwards" might, as regards the sense, be far better rendered "goeth down sweetly," "smoothly" or "straightly." see Cant. 7: 9. Hence, in the former text, the Vulgate gives "ingreditur blande," etc.; in both texts De Wette has *sanft hinunter gleitet*. The verse portrays the process of intoxication, not of fermenting; the seductiveness clearly belongs to the wine-cup and not the slightest allusion is made to the signs exhibited by the liquor in the vat. Assuredly it does not become alcoholic after it is poured into the cup, as this extraordinary gloss insinuates.

ECCLESIASTES.

2: 3. — I sought in mine heart. to give myself unto wine.

9: 7. — And drink thy *wine* with a merry heart.

10: 19. — And wine maketh merry.

SONG OF SOLOMON.

1: 2. — For thy love is better than wine.

4. — We will remember thy love more than *wine*,

2: 4. — He brought me to the *banqueting* house. (margin, house of *wine*.)

4: 10. — How much better is thy love than *wine*.

5: 1. — I have drunk my *wine* with my milk.

7: 9. — Like the best wine for my beloved.

8: 2. — I would cause thee to drink of spiced *wine*.

ISAIAH,

5: 11. — That continue until night, [till] *wine* inflame them!

12. — The tabret, and pipe, and wine, are in their feasts.

22. — Woe unto [them that are] mighty to drink *wine*,

16: 10. — The treaders shall tread out no *wine* in [their] presses.

22: 13. — Eating flesh, and drinking *wine*.

24: 9. — They shall not drink *wine* with a song.

11. — A vying for wine in the streets.

28: 1. — The fat valleys of them that are overcome with *wine*.

7. — But they also have erred through wine. . . they are swallowed up of wine.

29: 9. — They are drunken, but not with wine.

51: 21. — Afflicted, and drunken, but not with *wine*.

65: 1. — Yea, come, buy wine and milk without money.

66: 12. — Come ye, [say they,] I will fetch *wine*.

JEREMIAH.

13: 12. — (bis) Every bottle shall be filled with *wine*.

23: 9. — I am like a drunken man, and like a man whom wine hath overcome.

25: 15. — Take the wine cup of this fury at my hand

35: 2. — And give them *wine* to drink.

5. — And I set before the sons of the house of the Rechabites, pots full of wine and cups, and I said unto them, drink ye wine

6. — We will drink no wine: for Jonadab commanded us, saying, Ye shall drink no wine neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed.

8. — To drink no wine all our days.

14. — He commanded his sons not to drink wine.

40: 10. — But ye, gather ye wine, and summer fruits and oil

12. — And gathered wine and summer fruits very much
48: 33. — And I have caused wine to fail from the winepresses.
61: 7. — The nations have drunken of her wine.

LAMENTATIONS.

2: 12. — They say to their mothers, where [is] corn and wine 7

EZEKIEL.

27: 18. — In the *wine* of Helbon, and white wool.

44: 2f. — Neither shall any priest drink wine, when they enter the inner court.

DANIEL.

1: 6. — Of the king's meat, and of the wine which he drank.

8. — With the portion of the king's meat, nor with the wine which he drank.

16. — And the *wine* that they should drink.

10: 3. — Neither came flesh nor *wine* in my mouth.

HOSEA.

4: 11. — Whoredom, and *wine*, and new wine take away the heart.

7: 6. — The princes have made [him] sick with bottles of *wine*.

9: 4. — They shall not offer *wine* [offerings] to the Lord.

14: 7. — The scent thereof [shall be] as the *wine* of Lebanon.

JOEL.

1: 6. — And howl, all ye drinkers of *wine*.

3: 3 — And sold a girl for *wine*, that they might drink.

AMOS.

2: 8. — And they drink *wine* of the condemned in the house

12. — But ye gave the Nazarites wine to drink.

6: 11. — But ye shall not drink *wine* of them.

6: 6. — That drink *wine* in bowls.

9: 14. — And they shall plant vineyards, and drink the *wine*

MICAH.

2: 11. — I will prophesy unto thee of *wine* and strong drink

6: 16. — And sweet wine, but shalt not drink *wine*.

HABAKKUK.

2: 5. — Because he transgresseth by wine

ZEPHANIAH.

1: 13. — And they shall plant vineyards, but not drink the *wine* thereof

HAGGAI.

2: 12. — Bread, or pottage, or wine, or oil, or any mess.

ZECHARIAH.

9: 15. — And they shall drink [and] make a noise as through wine.

10: 7. — And their heart shall rejoice as through wine.

§ 2. Tirosh, NEW WINE.

There are eight and thirty occurrences of the word *h* (*tirosh*) in Scripture. From the root obtain, and hence to *inherit*, Furst deduces the meaning *das Gewonnene*, i.e. a *something gained*, an *acquisition*. In this etymology Moses Stuart acquiesces. — "Sic dictum (says Eichhorn's Simonis) quod se *possessorem hominis faciat, ejus cerebrum occupando, ut ille non amplius sui compos sit.*" Parkhurst likewise considered it to mean *new wine*, so called from its strongly *intoxicating quality* in *taking possession* of a man, as in Hosea 4: 11, where the LXX give μέθυσμα and the Vulgate "ebrietas." Substantially alike is the opinion of Gesenius: "mustum (ita dictum, quia inebriando cerebrum occupat," etc.)* He adds, at the close, "de succo uvae Jes. 65. 8." So De Wette, *Wie wenn sich Saft in der Traube findet*: elsewhere he translates the word *lost*, save in two places, where he has *Wein*. In the same text, Luther renders it *Most*. The LXX render it ὁ ῥῶξ ἐν τῷ βότρῳ, and similarly the Vulgate, "granum in botro." There does not appear to be any greater difficulty in the phrase of the prophet than in the well known Latin verse, "Vixque merum capiunt grana quod intus habent." In four places the Vulgate has *vindemia*, while the English Bible makes it "new wine" in twelve passages, and once "sweet wine." Dr. S. Lee also and Mr. W. Osborne, Jugn., along with Fürst, hold the word to designate "new wine."

* In the Report of the Market Drayton Discussion, published by Dr. E. R. Lees, that gentleman (p. 29,) "beggd to say he entirely concurred with Gesenius as far as his definition went, for he interpreted this same *tirosh* by the Latin *mustum*." This statement is most astonishing, especially when it is added that, in p. 26, the same speaker had defined *Tirosh* to be "fruit of the vine," *in its natural or solid state*, comprehending "wine in the cluster," *vinum pendens*, grapes, raisins, etc.; in short, all "vintage fruit." Greek — "*Genneema tees ampelou*," So elsewhere Dr. L. has said, "That *tirosh* ranked amongst the class of *fruital* produce, however, we have not the slightest doubt." (*Temperance Topic* page 64, and *passim*.) Now, the definition of Gesenius right or wrong, is entirely different. *He* held *tirosh* in itself to mean a liquid Dr. L. holds it to be a solid. The one defines it as must, the other as grape fruit. And yet many, never seeing so plain a discrepancy, have swallowed this bold affirmation of entire concurrence with Gesenius' definition! Dr. L. does not interpret *tirosh* by *mustum*, unless he alter the recognised meaning of the Latin word to suit his explanation of the Hebrew, which is utterly unwarrantable. Where does *mustum* signify *solid grapes*. It was applied to the grape Juice when expressed and passing through the process of fermentation, which usually lasted for about nine days When that subsided, the *mustum* became *vinum*. (Dr. Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, page 1045.) It is notorious that the fumes of the liquor, while fermenting, may inebriate.

A strange hypothesis has been recently advocated by a few, that the word signifies every where the *solid* produce of the vine. But this is amply refuted by Isa. 62: 8, Prov. 3: 10, and Joel 2: 24, which texts clearly indicate its liquid nature.* Not but that *h* (*tirosh*) like *h* (*yayin*), may be used poetically for the vintage fruit, which produced the liquor. Thus Gesenius explained Isa. 24: 7, "*luget mustum* (i.e.

lugent uvae,") but this in no wise unsettled the proper meaning of the term. Stress has been laid by the author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* upon Micah 6: 15, as if it established plainly and beyond cavil the above distinction. "Thou shalt tread the olives, but thou shalt not anoint thee with oil; and *sweet wine*, but shalt not drink wine." To use the argument stated by Dr. Lees in its most pointed form, "Thou shalt tread *tirosh*, (not drink it,) for the thing trodden out was what usually was drunk. The first was *grapes*, the second *wine* — fresh, unfermented wine." But the Christian turns to the written Word, and finds the specious but shadowy structure dispersed into thin air by the touch of a single verse. The argument from Micah is that, though the h (*yayin*) was distinctively a liquid, i.e. wine, h (*tirosh*) being trodden must be a solid, i.e. grapes. Now, "it is written again" in Isa. 16: 10, "the treadingers shall tread out no WINE h (*yayin*) in their presses." The same Hebrew word expresses the "treading" or "treading out;" and if the one predicates treading of *tirosh*, the other intimates that it was equally possible in the case of *yayin*. Thus, the proof in Micah 6 for the solidity of *tirosh* turns out to be null. Precisely the same reason appears in Isa. 16 for the solidity of *yayin*, which was nevertheless alleged to be in contrast with *tirosh*, as wine with grapes! Even yet we have not reached the climax of absurdity. For the same controversialist who pleads the treading of *tirosh* as proving it to be grapes, in contradistinction to *yayin*, (or, what he calls "fresh unfermented wine,") had, only in the preceding page, urged the treading of *yayin* as a real, not figurative, thing! In other words, what was *emphatically a solid in page 31* becomes *distinctively a liquid in page 32*. And yet this crude and inconsistent reasoning has imposed with talismanic power upon many. Witness the works of Mr. Mearns, and of Mr. Burne, as well as of the original and more learned authors of the sophism.

* Even the author of "Anti-Bacchus" (page 95) and Prof. Stuart have bowed to the force of these Scriptures and rejected this chimera unless they have changed their mind since. The former, it is true, like others of the same school, is rather self-contradictory. Thus, in pp. 94, 95, he says *Tirosh* supposed to come from a root meaning head, chief, or beginning " may refer to the head or berry of the grape, or to the first or chief-juice that begins to *flow*, from the fruit; it is, therefore, (!) promiscuously rendered in the English version *by the terms "wine," or "new wine."* In Isa. 65: 8, it alludes we are told, to the juice in the ripe fruit before it was expressed, in Ps. 4, it refers to the growth of the unripe grape so other Scriptures which associate corn and *tirosh*. But in Joel 2: 24, and Prov 3: 10, it is, according to the same writer, the fresh juice which bursts from the winepress.

Much to the same effect has been built upon the expression "laid by heaps," in 2 Chr. 31: 5, 6. Advantage is taken of the marginal rendering "dates" instead of "honey," i.e. honey of grapes, dates, etc. It is sought to dispose of the other liquids by making *tirosh* and *yitzhar* mean, not "wine and oil," but *grapes* and *orchard fruit*. Now, waiving other questions, *is it not plain that the difficulty of applying "heaps" to wine and oil, is not greater than in the case of oxen and sheep?* Besides, what more natural than that the liquids (supposing them to be such) should be preserved in suitable vessels and thus literally be "laid by heaps?" Details are not given; they might well be deemed unnecessary where the nature of the thing implies the sense. But to alter the force of words, because of these or kindred difficulties which owe their existence to the reader's ignorance, is too serious trifling with the Word of God. Still less to the purpose are such texts as Deut. 11: 14; (comparing 15;) Deut. 12: 17; (if you read verse 16; 2 Kings 18: 32; Neh. 10: 37; Neh. 13: 5; Isa. 65: 8; Hosea 2: 9, 22; Hosea 9: 2; Joel 1: 10, 11: they are in no way adverse to the common and correct interpretation. Haggai 1: 11 has been cited as more formidable, the argument being that a drought could only affect growing fruit, and, therefore, that *tirosh* must mean grapes, not wine. But the rest of the verse refutes this slavish literalism. If the drought could affect men, cattle and the labour of the hands, why not *wine and oil?*

The last criticism I would notice on this head, is that given in Burne's Concordance, pages 70-73. It

originated with Dr. Lees, who has attempted to make the term *shekar* (translated "strong drink") mean, in Deut. 14: 26, no drink at all, but solid dates, the fruit of the palm. The opinion is founded upon the supposed analogy of expression in the context. Thus, in verse 22, we have *tirosh* and *yitzhar*, and in verse 26 we have *yayin* and *shekar*. What more evident than their respective correspondence! It matters not that elsewhere the same writers insist most strongly upon their distinction, nay, contrast. *Here* it serves a purpose, that *yayin*, as a specific term, should bear exact correspondence to the generic term *tirosh*, and even that *shekar* should correspond to *yitzhar*! In such reasoning, which is best answered by being simply enunciated, it is hard to say whether positive error or suicidal incongruity is most conspicuous.

Ch. v.

GENESIS.

27: 28. — And plenty of corn and *wine*.

37. — And with corn and *wine* have I sustained him.

NUMBERS.

18: 12. — All the best of the *wine*,

DEUTERONOMY.

7: 13 — Thy corn, and thy *wine*, and thy oil.

11: 14. — That thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy *wine*.

12: 17. — The tithe of thy corn, or of thy *wine*.

14: 23. — The tithe of thy corn, of thy *wine*.

18: 4. — Firstfruit [also] of thy corn, of thy *wine*

28: 51. — Not leave thee [either] corn, *wine*; or oil

33: 28. — A land of corn and *wine*.

JUDGES.

9: 13. — Should I leave my *wine*.

2 KINGS.

18: 32. — A land of corn and *wine*.

2 CHRONICLES.

31: 5. — The firstfruits of corn, *wine*, and oil.

32: 28. — The increase of corn, and *wine*, and oil.

NEHEMIAH.

5: 11 — The corn, the *wine*, and the oil

10: 37 — Of *wine* and of oil; unto the priests.

39. — Of the *new wine* and the oil unto the chambers.

13: 5. — The tithes of the corn, the *new wine*, and the oil.

12. — The tithes of the corn, and the *new wine*, and the oil.

PSALMS.

4: 7. — Their corn and their *wine* increased.

PROVERBS.

3: 10. — And thy presses shall burst out with *new wine*.

ISAIAH.

24: 7. — The *new wine* mourneth, the vine languisheth.

36: 17. — A land of corn and *wine*.

62: 8. — The sons of the stranger shall not drink thy *wine*.

65: 8. — As the new *Wine* is found in the cluster.

JEREMIAH.

31: 12. — For wheat, and for *wine*, and for oil.

HOSEA.

2: 8. — And *wine*, (margin, *new wine*,) and *oil*.

9. — And my *wine* in the season thereof

22. — The earth shall bear the corn, and the *wine*, and the oil.

4: 11. — Whoredom and wine and *new wine* take away the heart*

7: 14 — Assemble themselves for corn and for *Wine*.

9: 2. — And the new *wine* shall fail in her.

JOEL.

1: 10. — The *new wine* is dried up.

2: 19. — I will send you corn, and *wine*, and oil.

24. — The fountains shall overflow with *wine* and oil.

MICAH.

6: 15. — And *sweet wine*, but shalt not drink wine.

HAGGAI.

1: 11. — Upon the *new wine*, and upon the oil.

ZECHARIAH.

9: 17. — And *new wine* the maids.

* In the body of "Anti-Bacchus," Mr. Parsons observes, (page 95,) that "it is classed with wine, and certainly (!) may mean *clusters of grape, eaten with the wine* which the sensualists there mentioned were drinking at their luxurious feasts;" and in a note he adds, that "to say wine and wine take away the heart, would be tautology." But this *is not* what Scripture says, and it is hard to see the impropriety of classing wine and *must* together as instruments in the seduction of the heart from God. The text shows,

first, that yayin no more includes *tirosh* than tirosh includes *yayin*; and, secondly, that the effort to distinguish them as "*Tirosh lo yayin*" attempts to do, is fallacious. They are distinct but not to be set the one against the other, as if the former were good and the latter evil: for as many texts elsewhere show the either may occur in a connection of blessing, so this Scripture proves that both may be the occasion of sin. It is singular that "Anti-Bacchus" has the same text cited thus in page 13: "Wine and strong wine," says Hosea, "take away the heart." That is, what was "*strong wine*" at the beginning of the essay may mean *clusters of grapes* at the end. In truth, the term means neither the one nor the other. The authorised version is right, and these proposed but conflicting renderings are both of them baseless and untrue.

§ 3. Chamar, RED WINE.

The Chaldee *chamar* and the Hebrew *chamar* appear, in slightly varied forms, in the appended texts. According to Prof. Stuart, the word comes from a root which means to ferment. So Gesenius, "a fermentando dictum." In Ps. 75: 8, the root is found, which Stuart and De Wette view in the sense of "ferments;" our translators preferred "is red;" and Gesenius, "aestavit, ferbuit," though he also gives "rubuit" as a secondary sense. In Deut. 32: 14, Stuart understands it to mean "fermentable liquor," the LXX οἶνον, the Vulgate merum, and De Wette Wein. Khamr is the name in Arabic for ordinary wine, as distinguished from Nebidh, a home-made fermented raisin-liquor, but so mild that its alcoholic quality is often undetected.

Ch. v.

EZRA.

6: 9. — Wheat, salt, wine, according to the appointment of the priests.

7: 22. — And to an hundred baths of *wine*, and to an hundred baths of oil.

DANIEL.

8: 1. — Belshazzar the king drank *wine* before the thousand.

2. — Belshazzar, while he tasted the *wine*, commanded.

4. — They drank *wine*, and praised the gods of gold.

23. — Thy wives, and thy concubines, have drunk *wine* in them.

DEUTERONOMY.

32: 14. — And thou didst drink the *pure* blood of the grape.

ISAIAH.

27: 2. — A vineyard of *red wine*. [Some copies read *Daleth* for *Res* which, if right, would alter the meaning to "*pleasant vineyard*," but most read as given in the text.]

§ 4. Soveh, WINE DRINK.

The word *h soveh* is found thrice, and evidently means an intoxicating liquor. It seems analogous, in many respects, to μέθυ (Lat. temetum,) which competent scholars say was perhaps at first any strong drink. Gesenius explains it "1) vinum Jes. 1: 22; Nahum 1: 10. 2) *compotatio* Hosea 4: 18." It is formed from a verb meaning to *swill*, ("*potavit, idque intemperantius, ingurgitavit.*" Gesenius) and is a

different thing from the *debash* or *mel uvarum*, i.e. must boiled down to one half (*defrutum*) or one third. (*sapa*.) Pliny and Columella treat these preparations not as wine, but as allied to it. They were syrups used as medicaments for their wines, and, naturally enough, are described in the treatises which discuss the nature and kinds of ancient wine. We have already seen that, even if the word meant a boiled wine, such a liquor inebriates.

The author of "Anti-Bacchus," (p. 97,) in the face of the Bible, maintains, from what he calls science, that the alcoholic wines of Palestine, if they did exist at all, were too weak to make persons reel, and therefore that, in such a case, they must have been drugged. Nevertheless, he regards *soveh* with suspicion. It is never, says he, "recommended in Scripture." Not so the "Concordance of Scripture and Science," though the author confesses "it is somewhat remarkable that such an innocent preparation (!) should bear a name derived from a verb signifying to 'guzzle.'" In *Tirosh lo Yayin*, it is treated as the "most superior wine." But *sapa* and *defrutum*, with which various Teetotal writers would identify the Hebrew term, refer to grape jellies. "They were nothing else," says Prof. Ramsay, whom they are bold enough to cite, as if he agreed with their view; whereas, in fact, he destroys it.

Ch. v.

ISAIAH.

1: 22. — Thy silver is become dross; thy wine mixed * with water.

* The word above rendered "mixed." means "*circumcised*," "*cut*:" a mode of expression common to the East and West, even to the present day. Prof. Stuart admits that the liquor in question was, in its original state lively and *sparkling*, and perhaps *alcoholic*; but if so, a chemist would say there was no doubt of the latter. — Let me take the opportunity of saying that, in the Teetotal publications I have seen, the references to the profane writers of antiquity are not a whit more accurate than their use of Scripture. A partial view of the author cited is ? day; of frequent occurrence, and not the gravest fault. Thus, In "Anti-Bacchus," much emphasis is laid upon the wine described by Homer. It was *μελιηδής*, and therefore! free from alcohol. But, how comes it that the reader is never told of the praise lavished on the vine of these times, because it was *αἶθοψ*, i.e. fiery or sparkling? Does the latter epithet prove that the wine was not fermented? or that it owed this characteristic to drugs? — Again, it is said, all writers seem to agree that the Greek wines were lusciously sweet. Now, without multiplying proofs to the contrary, we are assured by Prof. Ramsay that "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 *ἀύστηρός* *σκληρός*, *λεπτός*, and the like, applied to a great number, while *γλυκός* and *γλυκάζων* are designations comparatively rare, except in the vague language of poetry. '*Vinum omne dulce minus odoratum*,' says Pliny. (H.N. 14: 11, and the ancients appear to have been fully sensible that sweet wines could not be swallowed either with pleasure or safety, except in small quantities. The mistake had arisen from not perceiving that the expressions *οἶνος γλυκός* and *οἶνος ἡδύς* joys are by no means necessarily synonymous. 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." (Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, page 1050) Further, what unbiased person could argue from the expressions of a Roman poet that Lesbian was absolutely without alcohol? That it was among the weakest wines, and therefore termed comparatively "innocent," all admit but that it was an unfermented liquor is mere assumption. Those who assert it are bound to adduce something like evidence.

Ch. v.

HOSEA.

4: 18. — Their *drink* is sour. (margin, *gone**)

NAHUM.

1: 10. — *And while they are drunken* [as] drunkards.

* There seems to be strong reason to prefer, with the margin, the natural sense of *soor*, as "departed," "past." ("*recessit*, i.e. *transiit*," Gesenius Compare Amos 6: 7. So the Vulgate, "*Separatum est convivium eorum*," and De Wette, *Ist ihr Zechgelag vorüber*.)

§ 5. *Asis*, SWEET WINE.

Besides occurring once as spiced wine of the *juice* of pomegranate, it is found in four places and translated *sweet*, or *new wine*. It is unquestionably derived from a root which means to *tread*: "*succus, calcando expressus, spec. succus uvarum, mustum*." (Eichhorn's *Simonis*.) In its origin, then, the word may have denoted no more than "trodden juice." Its usage is a different question. Thus, it was employed to express the juice of fruit irrespective of treading; and the context of Isa. 49: 26, and Joel 1: 5, is decisive as to its intoxicating quality where it denotes wine: Prof. Stuart himself admits this, as regards the former passage. Lowth, in his *Notes on Isaiah*, gives it as his opinion that even Cant. 8: 2 means wine, made inebriating by the mixture of more powerful ingredients.

Ch. v.

CANTICLES.

8: 2. — To drink of spiced wine of the *juice* of my pomegranate.

ISAIAH.

19: 26. — Drunken with their own blood, as with *sweet* (margin, *new*) *wine*.

JOEL.

1: 5. — Howl, all ye drinkers of wine because of the *new wine*.

3: 18. — The mountains shall drop down *new wine*.

AMOS.

9: 13. — And the mountains shall drop *sweet* (margin, or *new*) *wine*.

§ 6 *Mimsak*, MIXED WINE.

The word occurs twice. It is explained by Gesenius as "*vinum aromatibus mixtum. i. q. .*" The mingling here was not, as in some cases, to dilute the liquor, but rather to increase its strength, like Pliny's "*vinum aromatites*,"* and the *τρίμμα* of Athenaeus. Accordingly, in the the LXX we have *κέρασμα* in Isa. 65: 8. The Vulgate is more like the authorized version, "*libatis*." The meaning seems to be "preparing *the mixed wine* for Meni," i.e. Fate. De Wette adopts Mills' view of the word here, as "the goblet" in which the *mingling* took place; in Prov. 23 he renders it "the mixed wine." The word *mezeg* occurs in Cant. 7: 2, where it is vaguely rendered "liquor," but better represented in the margin as "*mixture*." "*Vinum mixtum, i.e. aromatibus conditum*," is the explanation of Gesenius. So also the kindred *mesek* "mixture," in Ps. 75: 8. The verb-form occurs in the sense of mingling spice with wine in Prov. 9: 25 and Isa. 5: 22, which Gesenius classes together. One is a good, the other is an evil connection. Nor is the word *mesek*, but *mimsak*, in Prov. 23: 30, contrary to the statement in the

"Concordance of Scripture and Science," pages 62, 63. It is also the strange assertion of another writer (*Temperance Topic*, page 129) that the Greek ἄκρατος answers to the Hebrew *meseq* in reality, the latter means "mingled;" the former, "unmingled." The same writer gives *merum* to another Hebrew word, whereas it is the Latin term for ἄκρατος.

* When the same writer says that "the most wholesome wine is that which has nothing added to the must," he does not mean that the liquor in its unfermented state, was wine, properly so called; but that the mixture of drugs (which, according to the Roman custom, was previous to or during fermentation, and not, as with the Greeks, afterwards) is injurious. Neither does he intimate that this most wholesome wine would not inebriate. Again, the filtering which he describes was meant, not to make the wine more moral, if we may use the absurd term of Theophrastus, but more useful to debauchees who wished to drink an immense quantity with the least possible danger of intoxication.

Ch. v.

PROVERBS.

23: 30. — They that go to seek mixed wine.

ISAIAH.

65: 11. — And that furnish the drink offering unto that number.

§ 7. Shekar, STRONG DRINK.

Shekar is to which the Greek σίκερα evidently corresponds, is connected by Fürst with *ker*, a Sanscrit root, signifying to *burn*; by others, with an Arabian word, (whence our *sugar*,) which denoted a saccharine substance, whether in a liquid or in a concrete state. The verb-form* is frequently used in Scripture (as in Gen. 9: 21; 1 Sam. 1: 14; 2 Sam. 11: 13; Isa. 29: 9, etc.) to denote intoxication. Accordingly, Gesenius explains the term, "*temetum, potus inebrians, sive vinum Num. 28: 7, sive potus vini instar inebrians,*" etc. The ancient versions, the Greek and Latin fathers, and the lexicographers of early and recent times coincide in representing it as a liquor possessed of inebriating properties. See especially Prov. 20: 1, and Isa. 28: 7. In one passage only it is clear, if we compare Num. 28: 7, with Ex. 29: 40, that wine is meant. Elsewhere, it was an artificial wine made of barley, wheat, honey, or any fruits, excepting grapes. So Jerome says: "*Sicera Hebraeo sermone omnis potio, quae inebriare potest, sive illa,*" etc. In Eichhorn's *Simonis* it is explained as *an intoxicating drink*, 1) *a sort of ale*. 2) *palm-wine*. Bishop Lowth prefers the rendering "sweet drink," yet considers that its name is "from its remarkable inebriating qualities." De Wette agrees with the English translators, in rendering it "strong drink," which is obviously better than "sweet drink;" because the latter does not, and the former does, convey the idea of the intoxicating power which the very best authorities connect with *shekar*. It occurs in Scripture twenty-three times, where its force is evident. That it refers to sweet fruit in Deut. 14 is, as we have seen in § 2, a mere and groundless fancy. The word "eat" (*akal*) is no valid objection to the liquid interpretation, as the reader may gather from Isa. 55: 1. See also Eichhorn's *Simonis* and Gesenius on Isa. 7: 15, 22.

* It is thus explained by Gesenius, "1) *bibit ad satietem* (i. q. *ravah*) Haggai 1: 6, *ad hilaritatem usque* Cant. 5: 1; Gen. 43: 34. Saepius est 2) *inebriavit se,*" etc.

Ch. v.

LEVITICUS.

10: 9. — Do not drink wine nor *strong drink*.

NUMBERS.

6: 3. — He shall separate [himself] from wine, and *strong drink*, and shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of *strong drink*

28: 7. — In the holy [place] shalt thou cause the strong wine to be poured unto the LORD for a drink-offering.

DEUTERONOMY

14: 26. — For wine, or for *strong drink*, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth.

29: 6. — Neither have ye drunk wine or strong drink.

JUDGES.

13: 4. — And drink not wine nor *strong drink*.

7. — And now drink no wine nor *strong drink*.

14. — Neither let her drink wine or *strong drink*.

1 SAMUEL.

1: 15. — I have drunk neither wine nor *strong drink*.

PSALMS.

69: 12. — The song of the drunkards. (margin, drinkers of *strong drink*.)

PROVERBS.

20: 1. — *Strong drink* [is] raging

31: 4. — Nor for princes *strong drink*.

6. — Give *strong drink* unto him that is ready to perish.

ISAIAH.

5: 11. — Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning that they may follow *strong drink*.

22. — Men of strength to mingle *strong drink*

24: 9. — *Strong drink shall* be bitter to them that drink it.

28: 7. — Through *strong drink are out* of the way: the priest and the prophet have erred through *strong drink* they are out of the way through *strong drink*.

29: 9. — They stagger, but not with *strong drink*.

56: 12. — And we will fill ourselves with *strong drink*.

MICAH.

2: 11. — I will prophesy unto thee of wine and of *strong drink*.

§8. Shemarim, LEES.

The term is twice (Isa. 25: 6) translated "*wines on the lees*," twice "*lees*," (Jer. 48: 11. Zeph. 1: 12,)

and once "*dregs*." (Ps. 75: 8.) It is said that a kindred word is found in the Coptic, where it means "fermentation." In the first of these texts De Wette gives *Hefen-weinen*, and in the others *Hefen*, which means lees, as well as yeast. Most lexicographers derive the Hebrew word from a root meaning to *preserve*, but their explanations are various. That rich old wine is figuratively referred to in Isa. 25: 6, they admit, as many accurate versions have done. The link is easy between *lees* and *wine*, not so with "sweetmeats," whereby some would render the word.

§ 9. Yekev, WINEFAT.

It may be well to notice that *h yekev*, rendered "wine" in Deut. 16: 13, means "wine-press," or specifically, "winefat." (ὕπολήνιον, lacus torcularis.) See Num. 18: 27, 30; Deut. 15: 14; Judges 7: 25; 2 Kings 6: 27; Job 24: 11; Prov. 3: 10; Isa. 5: 2; Isa. 16: 10; Jer. 48: 33; Hosea 9: 2; Joel 2: 24; Joel 3: 13; Haggai 2: 16; Zech. 14: 10, which are all the other passages of the Old Testament where the word occurs. The *vat* is used figuratively for the wine it produced, as the *floor* is for the corn. De Wette preserves the figure thus: *Wenn du einsammelst von deiner Tenne und von deiner Kelter*, as the LXX and the Vulgate had done before him. The margin of the English Bible gives the literal force in the only instance where the text departs from it.

§ 10. Ashisheh Anavim, GRAPE CAKES.

In Hosea 3: 1, we find the expression *h Ashisheh Anavim*, which is rendered in our version "flagons of wine." (Margin, grapes.) Gen. 40: 10, 11; Gen. 49: 11; Jer. 25: 5; Num. 6: 3; Num. 13: 20, 23; Deut. 23: 24; Deut. 32: 14, 23; Neh. 13: 15; Isa. 5: 2, 4, Jer. 8: 13; Hosea 9: 10; Amos 9: 13, are all the passages where the former term occurs, and thereby the marginal translation is justified. This is confirmed by the connected word which means, says Gesenius, "*liba*, spec. qualia ex uvis passis in certam quandam formam constipatis parare solebant." "Cakes of grapes," or "raisins," would appear to be the right rendering. So De Wette gives *Rosinen-kuchen*, not only here, but in 2 Sam. 6: 19; 1 Chr. 16: 3; Cant. 2:5.

§ 11. Devash, GRAPE HONEY.

Besides this confection of dried grapes, a kind of grape-jelly, or jam, is mentioned in Scripture. (See §4.) For this the Hebrews employed the term *h devash*, which was used to denote not only common and wild honey, but also an artificial syrup made of grapes, dates, etc., as probably is meant in Gen. 43: 11, 2 Chr. 31: 5, and Ezek. 27: 17. Gesenius adds, that it was must boiled down to one-third or one-half — Gr. ἔφημα; lat. *sapa*, *defrutum*, etc. "The finest grapes" (says a modern traveller in Palestine, Dr. Robinson,) "are dried as raisins; and the rest being trodden and pressed, the juice is boiled down to a syrup, which, under the name of *dibs*, (debesh in Hebrew, signifying honey and syrup of grapes,) is much used by all classes, wherever vineyards are found, as a condiment with their food." There is no reason whatever to confound, either with this syrup or with the grape-cakes of Hosea 3: 1, any one of the terms for wine which have been already explained. These preparations of the grape, whether solid or liquid, were probably unintoxicating.* Not so the *soveh*, the *asis*, and the *shemarim*, with which some modern writers have sought to identify them. (See §§ 4, 5, and 8.)

* Nevertheless, Mr. W. E. Lane, author of "The Modern Egyptians," speaks of *zebeed* as a name given to an *intoxicating conserve*, as well as to raisin-liquor.

While upon this we may refer to *Mamtakkim*, the plural of a word which means "sweetness."

Besides in Cant. 5: 16, which is not to our purpose, it occurs in Neh. 8: 10, where our Bible gives "the sweet." It is used to express sweet drink, without defining any particular kind, and so may have included *yayin* and *shekar*. Some may be inclined to view it as οἶνόμελι of the Greek, or mulsum of the Roman. *This was of two kinds; in the one honey was mixed with wine, in the other with must.* The latter, therefore, says Prof. Ramsay, was merely a very rich fruit syrup in no way allied to wine. The context, however, seems to favour the less determinate sense.

§ 12. Dema, LIQUORS.

Moreover, in Exodus 22: 29, we have another word which is as yet unnoticed, h dema. In the text, it is rendered "liquor," and in the margin "tear," which is its literal force, though, being here used metaphorically of must and oil *dropping* from the press, our version gives the sense. De Wette has *Mit der Fülle [deiner Tenne] und dem Ausflusse [deiner-Kelter]* as the LXX, with equal indefiniteness, ἄπαρχὰς ἄλωνος καὶ ληνοῦ. A similar application of "tears" occurs among the Arabs, as well as in Latin and Greek authors. Thus Theophrastus has τῶν δένδρων τὰ δάκρυα, and Pliny, *arborum lacrimas.* (N. H. lib. xi. c. 6.)

§ 13. Chometz, VINEGAR.

Prof. Stuart has attempted, but in vain, to disturb the common rendering of h *chometz* in Num. 6, where the Nazarite, it is said, "shall drink no *vinegar* of wine, or *vinegar* of strong drink." So the LXX ὄξος ἐξ οἴνου καὶ ὄξος ἐκ σίκερα οὐ πίνεται, and the Vulgate, "acetum ex vino, et ex qualibet alla potione." It occurs also in Ruth 2: 14, Ps. 69: 21, Prov. 10: 26, Prov. 25: 20, and in all is translated "vinegar." But in the Nazarite's case, the American Professor would have it to mean *fermented wine*, or fermented *shekar*, because of its derivation. Now, it is clear that, if this notion had been well founded, it would destroy his own main position, that *yayin* and *shekar* are *generic* terms, including fermented as well as unfermented liquors. Again, it is certain, first, that fermentation is *equally* predicable of acetous as of vinous liquors; and, secondly, that if, strictly speaking, h *chometz* means *acidification*, then *acidulated* wine or strong drink, is a phrase *more* applicable to the acetous than to the vinous fermentation. Thus, then, the true restriction laid down in the chapter respects: 1, the fermented liquor of grapes, h (*yayin*) and of other fruits or of grain, etc. h (*shekar*); 2, the vinegar of these liquors; 3, any liquor of grapes* ("*potus ex uvis solutis s. maceratis,*" Gesenius.) This might include such a liquor as is described in the dream of Pharaoh's butler, which certainly was not wine† or vinegar, and was called neither the one nor the other in Gen. 42; 4, moist grapes or dried; and 5, any thing made of the vine, from the kernels even to the husk.

* Green grapes are, to this day, used in various ways in making a sour-sweet drink, as we are informed by the Missionary Homes. — In Eichhorn's *Simonis*, we are told that F. M. Lufft understood it to be the sherbet of the Arabs.

† "Aegyptii enim (says Rosenmüller) ante Psammetichi regis aetatem neque ipsi biberunt vinum, neque Diis libarunt, docti a sacerdotibus vino inesse pestiferum aliquid."

It remains to notice the corresponding words in the New Testament.

§ 1. OINOE, WINE.

Οἶνος, (vinum,) is unquestionably "the general term for the fermented juice of the grape." (Smith's

Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, page 1044.) When accompanied by qualifying terms, it was, like our own "wine," capable of being applied to wines made of palm-juice, lotus-juice, etc. Similarly modified, it was even used of the fermented juice of apples, pears, etc., and of barley, wheat, etc. There was, besides, a large class termed οἴνοι ὑγίεινοί into which drugs were introduced for medicinal purposes. Not only, says Prof. Ramsay, were spices, etc., steeped in wine or incorporated during fermentation, but even the precious perfumed essential oil (*unguenta*) were mixed with it before it was drunk. In Rev. 6: 6, οἶνος is used, by *metonymy*, for the vine-fruit.* But such a case affords not the slightest ground for the notion that it ever does or can denote, *properly*, anything else than *wine*, i.e. fermented grape-liquor. Such reasoning would unsettle the basis of all language. And yet this is the ground on which some† have ventured to assail the ordinary meaning which has been hitherto attached to ה תירוש and ה יין — to the former in every passage, and to the latter in certain texts of the Old Testament! Here, as there, we have the corn (distinguished, it is true, in a remarkable way) and the oil. And it is the association of the corn and the oil with the wine, which, among other considerations, has led to the fancy that their Hebrew equivalents, so often joined together, mean really, and not metonymically only, the solid produce or ingathering of the field, the orchard and the vineyard. Nobody denies that we may so understand the words by the familiar figure which takes the wine and oil as the chief representatives of all the other products. From this *figurative application* to argue that ἔλαιον and οἶνος *really mean* olives and grapes respectively — from a similar premise to draw the same deduction as to *yitzhar* and *tirosh* ‡ — is a sample of the critical ingenuity of our day, which makes up in temerity what it lacks in truth and even the appearance of reason.

* Just so, we speak of "*a wine-grower*," instead of employing the more literally correct phrase, "*a grower of vines*." But no sensible person would say, on this account, that "*wine*" means "*vine fruit*." The same principle applies to the figurative usage of *vinum* (for grapes) in Plantus, or Varro, and to *vinum pendens* in Cato: it explains the remark of Gesner, that *vinum, vitis, uvae, and vinea*, as kindred terms, are sometimes used synonymously. If unlimited there is no sense in it, but this the learned critic never meant — While upon the point, it may be observed that Livy does not speak of any invaders being "*captivated by the lusciousness of the fruits, especially of the grape*." His real words are: "*Eam gentem, traditur fama, dulcedine frugum, maximeque vini nova tum voluptate captam, Alpes transisse, agrosque ab Etruscis ante cultos possedis: et invexisse in Galliam vinum illiciendae gentis causa*," etc. No scholar can have the least hesitation as to the meaning of the historian. By *vini* and *vinum*, he means "*wine*," and nothing else. Dr. Lees has no warrant for asserting that "*the grape*" is meant in Livy v. 33. Compare ix. 30; x. 23; xxv. 23; xxvi. 14; xxix. 8; xxxvi. 11, 14; xl. 19; xli. 4; xliv. 30, where, as in the passage so needlessly questioned, the word has its ordinary sense.

† See, for example, Dr. Kitto's "*Physical History of Palestine*," page 324., and the articles by another, on Drink, Fruit, and Wine, in his "*Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*." It is only fair to add, that in his "*Pictorial Bible*" (Standard edition, 1848) the author is understood to have returned to the older and sounder view, if we are to judge by the note on Micah 6: 16.

‡ For a specimen of the inconsistency which goes hand in hand with error, compare, as to *yitzhar* and *shemen*, Burne's Concordance, pages 44, 43, and 56. The real difference between the two words is, that the latter means oil in general, the former means new fresh oil — "*oleum*," says Gesenius, "*maxime recens et hornum*." The relation is similar to that between *tirosh* and *yayin*. Pliny's phrase — *mustum olei* — may illustrate this.

Ch. v.

MATTHEW.

9: 17. — Neither do men put new *wine* into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the *wine* runneth out and the bottles perish; but they put new *wine* into new bottles.

MARK.

2: 22. — And no man putteth new *wine* into old bottles: else the new *wine* doth burst the bottles, and the *wine* is spilled, and the bottles will be marred: but new *wine* must be put into new bottles.

15: 23. — They gave him to drink *wine* mingled with myrrh.*

LUKE.

1: 15. — And shall drink neither *wine*.

5: 37. — And no man putteth new *wine* into old bottles; else the new *wine* will burst the bottles.

38. — But new *wine* must be put into new bottles.†

* The corresponding text in Matthew 27: 34 seems to show that the wine in this case was a sour small liquor, ὄξος, translated vinegar, and occurring in verse 38 of the same chapter, Mark 15: 36, Luke 23: 36, John 19: 29 (bis), 30. The mingling with myrrh was to produce stupefaction, and the Lord refused that cup.

† In commenting on verse 39, the author of "Anti-Bacchus," (pages 107, 108,) first urges that it may simply allude to taste, some preferring old wine, and others new. This notion at least derives no countenance from the text, which seems to insinuate the reverse. But another explanation follows, — "Old wines, among the Romans, signified weak wines, very thick wines, wines that had not fermented and would not ferment. Pliny says, etc. . . . A sweet weak wine was therefore (!) the old wine most sought after," etc. Now, without pausing more than to state that the opening and closing remarks of the same paragraph are at open war, a citation from Prof. Ramsay's art. VINUM, is sufficient to show how far the second explanation is more successful than the first. "The ancients considered old wine, not only more grateful to the palate, but also more wholesome and invigorating, (Athen. i. p. 26. a. ii. p. 36. e.) and, curiously enough, *Pliny seems to suppose that it grew more strong and fiery by age, in consequence of the dissipation of the watery particles.*" (H. N. vii. 3.) From the preceding page of Dr. Smith's Dictionary, it will be seen that the great majority of *inferior* wines were *thin, watery* and *contained little alcohol*. See pages 1047-1049. After this it is needless to expose the many wild statements of Archdeacon Jeffreys in his sermon on the wine made and used by our Lord. Of these, two may be cited as samples: "the unfermented wines of the ancients were the *only* wines that would keep." "The *most esteemed and highly valued* wines of the ancients, were *totally different* from what we *now* call wines were unfermented and unintoxicating." Even Dr. Lees, extreme a partisan as he is, admits that the unfermented liquor was best when new, while of fermented wine we say "the *old* is better." (*Temperance Topic, page 130.*) This frank avowal; will also dispose of Prof. Moses Stuart's argument in page 53 of the same publication.

Ch. v.

7: 33. — Neither eating bread, nor drinking *wine*.

10: 34. — Pouring in oil and *wine*.

JOHN.

8: 3. — And when they wanted *wine*, the mother of Jesus said unto him, they have no *wine*.

9. — The water that was made *wine*.*

10. — At the beginning doth set forth good *wine* thou hast kept the good *wine* until now.

4: 46. — Where he made the water *wine*.

ROMANS.

14: 21. — Neither to eat flesh, nor to drink *wine*.

EPHESIANS.

5: 18. — And be not drunk with *wine*, wherein is excess.†

* Is it right to quote Augustine (in Joann. tract 8) as a Teetotal witness in any way or degree? In truth, he argues *against* the Manicheans, and taxes them with perverseness in attributing wine to the devil whilst they would eat grapes. The reasoning may be indifferent, as the language is overstrained. Of this, advantage is taken to prop up the delusion which the illustrious Bishop of Hippo was exposing! For what is the theory of "*Tirosh lo Yayin*" but the Manichean error in new dress? Nor was it confined to these heretics. Theodoret, Epiphanius and Basil the Great describe other sects which maintained views about wine similar to those held by modern Teetotalers of the ultra ranks. Dr. Grindrod admits the fact, but denies the analogy, on the ground that these ancient parties were heterodox in matters of faith. Now, first, the analogy is in reference to wine, and this does not depend upon other matters. Secondly, it will be shown presently that, as in ancient so. In modern times, heterodoxy in matters of faith accompanies these views.

† Two words in this verse have been subjected to no little violence. First, it is said that μεθύσκεσθε means *drenched* rather than "drunk;" secondly, that ἄσωτία means danger, not "excess." Now, it is certain that in the New Testament the regular word for drunkenness is μέθη, for drunkard μέθυσος, for making drunk μεθύσκω, and for getting drunk μεθύω, or, what is equivalent the preceding word in Mid. as in our text. That μεθύει, in 1 Cor. 11: 21, means "plentifully fed," is the mistaken notion of Mr. Ewing in his N. T. Lexicon. But πεινᾶ compels us to no such violence. Our own version faithfully represents the original, and makes good sense, in spite of the strictures of Archdeacon Jeffreys, The Septuagint translation of Ps. 36: 8 is not parallel, because wine is not in question, and the expression is certainly figurative. The Vulgate also has the same — *Inebriabunter ab ubertate domus tuae.*" Here, on the contrary, it is a question of literal eating and drinking. All admit that μ. may *metaphorically* mean "soaked," "steeped," as in oil or water. Hence it may also be transferred from the effect of wine to that of passion. But all this does not in the least weaken the proper meaning of the word. Accordingly, even in 1 Cor 11: 21, we have the same idea given in the versions of Wiclif, (1380,) Tyndal, (1534.) Cranmer, (1539,) Geneva, (1557,) Rheims, (1582,) and the authorized. (1611.) It is the same sense in John 2: 10, save in the Bible of Wiclif, who has "fulfilled." The ruler evidently *did* know the good wine from the bad: he is merely describing the custom of substituting a worse wine when men could not discern the difference. That is, the context favours the common rendering. — Next, that ἄσωτία in the New Testament, means "excess," "prodigality," "dissoluteness," is manifest. It has just the same force in classic Greek. He who has read Aristotle's Eth. Nicom. may remember the sentence (ii. 7) — περὶ δὲ δόσιν χρημάτων καὶ λήψιν, μεστῆς μὲν ἐλευθεριότης, ὑπερβολὴ δὲ καὶ ἔλλειψις, ἄσωτία καὶ ἀνελευθερία. Not danger but waste is the thought. So in Rhet. ii., where it is contrasted with φοιδῶ. This may justify our translators: though "riotousness" as given in the Rhemish, accords well with their own version of Titus 1: 6, 1 Peter 4: 4 and of a kindred word in Luke 15: 13. Wiclif translated the last clause "wherein is lechery." But to say that he understood the evil to be a property of the wine, is as unwarrantable as to say that our translators meant "the excess" to be in the first drop. Just apply this notion to 1 Tim. 5: 23, and we should have the Spirit of God advising Timothy to use a little "danger," or "excess," or even worse, for his stomach's sake. Their absurdity is not the worst thing about these

pseudo-criticisms. It is evident, I think, that ἄσωτία refers to μεθ. οἴνω, not to one only, but both.

Ch. v.

1 TIMOTHY.

3: 8. — Not given to much wine.

5: 23. — Use a little wine [or thy stomach's sake.

TITUS.

2: 3. — Not given to much wine.

REVELATION.

6: 6. — Hurt not the oil and the wine.

14: 8. — The *wine* of the wrath of her fornication.

10. — The *wine* of the wrath of God.

16: 19. — The *wine* of the fierceness of his wrath.

18: 2. — Drunk with the *wine* of her fornication.

18: 3. — The *wine* of the wrath of her fornication.

13. — And frankincense, and *wine*, and oil.

19: 15. — And he treadeth the *wine*-press.

§ 2. ΑΚΡΑΤΟΕ, PURE WINE.

In Rev. 14: 10, we have the expression τοῦ κεκρασμένου ἀκράτου, more fully describing "the wine of the wrath of God." Lowth and others consider it to convey an antithesis which does not appear in our version — "the mingled unmingled;" that is, the figure is taken from wine unmixed with water to weaken, but mixed with drugs to increase, its strength. See § 6. The reader may compare an illustration in the Septuagint version of Ps. 75: 8, οἴνου ἀκράτου πλήρες κεράσματος. Here, as in Revelation, the word is an adjective, and so understood in the best translations. Since, however, it is beyond doubt used substantivally, like the Latin *merum*, in classic authors, it seems well to notice a word, which is included in most Teetotal lists of New Testament terms.

§ 3. ΓΛΕΥΚΟΕ, SWEET WINE.

Γλεῦκος appears to be used properly and ordinarily in classic Greek to denote the sweet unfermented juice of the grape. Nevertheless, it is certain, from Acts 2: 13 compared with verse 16, that this is not its New Testament sense. That a word may bear a meaning here different from what it has in classic authors is confessed. (*Temperance Topic*, pages 95, 96.) The context shows that a wine which was familiarly known to possess intoxicating properties, is meant. Mere *irony!* exclaim Dr. Lees (*M. D. Discussion*, p. 18) and Mr. Burne. (*Concordance*, pp. 100, 101.) But if the insinuation of the Jewish scoffers had been ironical, would an apostle have gravely replied, "These are *not drunken*, AS YE SUPPOSE" — not merely as ye say? Do men in these days pretend to understand the taunt better than St. Peter did? Or if *he* be allowed to have understood, do they mean that he chose to allude to it as if he had not? Alas! what is such reasoning; if it be not taking pleasure in unrighteousness? The sense is

perfectly simple to those who believe the Word of God. Mr. Burne tells us, that "no part of Scripture is better calculated to support the wine question doctrines of Total Abstinence, than this." It may be so; but the Christian will thence conclude how far the Bible sanctions Teetotalism, and how far such interpretations inspire him with confidence in the judgment of its advocates.

Ch. v.

ACTS.

2: 13. — These men are full of *new wine*.

§ 4. ΕΙΚΕΡΑ, STRONG DRINK.

Είκερα is explained by Liddell and Scott as "a sweet fermented liquor, strong drink." As it is clearly the Hellenistic form of h *shekar* the reader is referred to the Hebrew word. Like γλεῦκος, it is found but once in the New Testament.

Ch. v.

LUKE.

1: 15. — And shall drink neither wine nor *strong drink*.

§ 5. ΓΕΝΝΗΜΑ ΑΜΠΕΛΟΥ, FRUIT OF THE VINE

To these we may add a phrase used by our Lord in Matt. 26: 29, Mark 14: 25, Luke 22: 18, τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, "the fruit or product of the vine." Those who consider *tirosh* to mean all vintage-fruit, treat γ. τ. ἄ. as being synonymous with that Hebrew term. (*Market Drayton Discussion*, p. 26.) Now, every text where the Greek expression occurs gives a clear and decisive negative. The three Gospels prove that "*this* fruit of the vine" was a *liquid capable of being drunk*, not a solid, as the grape or vintage-fruit is. Yet this gross inconsistency appears, not only in the same page, but in the same line of the leading Teetotal champion! Nor is this all. The same individual, in the *Temperance Topic*, p. 130, affirms that the language of our Lord is only applicable to old unfermented wine, or to raisin-wine! Does *tirosh* mean either, even on his own scheme? or on the scheme of any body else?

Having now, expressly or tacitly, exposed the character of the principal statements, reasonings and criticisms, put forth by those who claim Scriptural support for the Teetotal Society, I would gladly close. But it is my painful duty to warn brethren in Christ, who may be here and there among them, of two baleful heresies which appear in the recent expositions of the extreme school. One is the impious folly which seeks to undermine the plenary inspiration of God's Book. They assert that Genesis e. g. is not a literal inspired history of creation, that it opens with a fable which is the vesture of great spiritual truths, that it is a book with distinct and composite elements — its Elohim and Jehovah documents dovetailed in the history. (*Temp. Topic*, pp. 118-120. See Burne's *Concordance*, pp. 10-12, 78.) Hence the change of the common rendering of 2 Tim. 3: 16, without a reason or even a notice to the unsuspecting reader. Thus, the author of "Anti-Bacchus" (p. 112) silently reads "all Scripture, given by inspiration of God, is profitable,"* etc. Obviously the object is to turn the edge of the text, nay, to make it appear to sanction an error which its correct sense utterly condemns! The practical consequence also is clear. Man sits in judgment upon that word which shall judge him at the last day, and censures with various degrees of incredulity the Pentateuch of Moses, Canticles, Daniel, the Gospels, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. *He* cannot find what *he* expects *a priori*, and at once stigmatizes such and such books

as at issue with his ephemeral notions, and therefore not given by inspiration of God. That is, his poor, proud mind, constitutes itself the umpire of what God *ought to be and to reveal*, and condemns whatever is *against* or *above* itself!

* I am prepared, if this were the proper place and, season, to prove that the authorized version contains the only right translation of the verse: that for the proposed alteration there is no warrens either in Scripture or (so far as I know) in any correct Greek writing; and that the Holy Ghost elsewhere, by a similar construction, owns the common rendering with approval and shows the change to be the offspring of man's meddling semi-erudition.

The real question, then, is between the present day, and (not the Jews nor even Moses, but) the Holy Ghost. And what do these self-blinded men? Fairly scouting what they slightly call the doctrine of *verbal* and *scientific* inspiration, they decidedly maintain the superior certainty of modern science, where it ventures to speak. Let us be thankful at least for their candour, and pray that God may be pleased to rouse such of His sheep as have listened to a voice far, far different from that of the good Shepherd. When men are fallen to such a depth of rationalism as to ridicule divine inspiration as divine ventriloquy, and to deny the exactness of scriptural history, which they would sublimate into a myth, it is time to remember that all men have not faith, and to shun profane and vain babblings, for they will increase unto more ungodliness.

Still more deadly is the second heresy. It is the open denial of the divine glory of the Lord Jesus and of his atonement. One clear passage may suffice where a doctrine is so revolting and blasphemous. It occurs in a critique on a volume of Rhymes, the theology of which is characterized as execrable and immoral. On what ground? "By a gross misunderstanding of Scripture, [it] represents the God of truth as charging one man's sins upon *another!* *i.e.* Adam's upon us! ours upon *Adam!!* and *all* upon Jesus Christ!!! Does not God look upon things *as they are?* Deals he in legal or theological fictions?" (*Temperance Topic*, p. 136.) Most readers probably know as little as I do about these Rhymes; their doctrine may not be unexceptionably propounded, but ever, Christian will feel the sentiments just quoted to be the slander of an enemy upon the cross and personal honour of Him who is God over all blessed for ever. To reason upon it would suppose an amount of ignorance and indifference about the Saviour's glory, which cannot be presumed in any who really know and love Him.

Such are the doctrines of accredited advocates of Teetotalism — not of all, but of some who rank as the ablest, the most active, and the most acceptable in the society, excepting perhaps the well-known Popish priest, Father Mathew. Alas! Romanism, Infidelity, and Latitudinarianism are rapidly finding and taking common ground against all who value the doctrine of Christ. But can you, dear brethren, countenance, in any way, those who hold, publish, preach these soul-destroying errors? If we walk in the light, we have fellowship one with another. And what fellowship hath light with darkness? Remember, he that biddeth such an one God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds. (2 John 9-11.) To those who are still in the darkness of nature I do not address these exhortations, but to you who are light in the Lord. Walk as children of light, proving what is *acceptable unto the Lord*, and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.

LITTLE CHILDREN, KEEP YOURSELVES FROM IDOLS.