

the *Pensées*, which embody both in substance and form that which most interests all who think seriously on the great problems of our being. Such thoughts are both old and new, because they are immortal, and exhibit the highest species of originality that can exist. They are free from every taint of plagiarism, because the ideas are evolved by their author without any suggestion save that which is common to the race. The skill of the master is shown in shaping them into living realities, and constitutes him, as Neander so aptly says, "the seer for all the centuries."

ARTICLE V.

DO THE SCRIPTURES PROHIBIT THE USE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES?

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

3. *Passages in which the reference is obviously to an intoxicating beverage.* Gen. ix. 20, 21, 24. "Noah planted a vineyard, and he drank of the *yayin*, and was drunken. And Noah awoke from his *yayin*," or dead drunkenness caused by his wine.

In this first instance of the use of wine on record, two characteristic facts are referred to,—Noah had degraded himself before his children, and fallen asleep *naked* in his tent. The *narcotic power* of fermented drinks is asserted: "Noah *awoke* from his wine." The same term is used in one of the Proverbs of Solomon. The drinker is represented as saying: "When shall I *awake*?" The reference in both is to the *coma*, or unnatural sleep produced by even a small quantity of alcohol, so strong is its affinity for the brain and nervous system.

In Gen. xix. 32–35 the daughters of Lot are represented as saying: "Come let us make our father drink *yayin*, and we will lie with him." The bare statement of these cases

with the results imply *sin* on the part of Noah, Lot, and his daughters, and *God's displeasure*. The narratives have stood out before all subsequent ages as warnings of the danger of using intoxicating drinks. It is safe to say, no candid reader has misunderstood this intent.

Deut. xxxii. 33. Moses discriminates between the beverages of the Hebrews and those of their idolatrous enemies. "*Their yayin* is the poison of dragons, and the cruel venom of asps." Was there ever a more appropriate description of the alcoholic and drugged wines of those who live for the indulgence of their appetites, and resign all self-control! The remark implies that the moral and pious among the Hebrews reprobated such wines.

Eli chided Hannah for having drunk (as he supposed), intoxicating wine (1 Sam. i. 14, 15), "Put away thy *yayin*," etc. This term occurs again in the history of Nabal, who is represented as making himself "very drunken," on the occasion of a feast in his house (1 Sam. xxv. 36, 37). In a preceding verse, one of the servants calls him "a son of Belial;" here he is represented as a beastly drunkard, and in vs. 38 we read: "About ten days after, the Lord smote Nabal that he died." Brought into so close connection with his drunkenness, the narrative is intended as a rebuke of such a use of wine as Nabal indulged in. It was intoxicating wine. It was drunk for stimulation, not for nourishment. The intent was sinful, and it determined the nature of his drinks.

Esther i. 7, 10. Ahasuerus made a feast "unto all the people that were in Shushan. And they gave royal *yayin* [the *yayin* of the kingdom] in abundance. . . . On the seventh day, when the heart of the king was merry with *yayin*," he sent for the queen to come into the banqueting hall, who refused to submit to the degradation, and was deposed from her office by the drunken king.

Prov. xx. 1: "*Yayin* is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise."

Solomon, as we have seen, had proved this truth in his own experience. He pronounces a judgment upon intox-

icating drinks themselves, as well as upon *an excessive use* of them.

Prov. xxiii. 20, 29-32 : "Be not among wine-bibbers," literally, *among topers of yayin*, מְסַבְּבֵי יַיִן. "Who hath wo? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? who hath babbling? who hath wounds without cause? who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the *yayin*, they that go to seek mixed wine. Look not thou on the *yayin* when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder."

The verb translated, "it is red," מִתְּצַבֵּב, is defined (in the Hith. form here used) "to be red, e.g. wine in the cup, to blush, to sparkle" (Prov. xxiii. 31, *Lex.*).

The use of the reflexive form implies that the power which causes it to blush or sparkle resides in itself, fixing the reference unmistakably to fermented wine. In like manner the clause that follows : "when it giveth his color in the cup, — literally, *his eye*," מֵעֵינָיו, — the *bead* or *bubble* that crowns the surface, when spirituous liquors are shaken or poured. What characterization of old, sparkling, alcoholic wine could be more perfect than this! In all ages and climes this is the beverage sought by the "topers of *yayin*." But the inspired writer forbids us to be associated with those who drink it; forbids us to "look upon" wine when it is in this state, that is, to regard it with favor, as fit for use; and he gives his reasons, which it should seem ought to be sufficient. It would bring "woe, sorrow, contentions, babblings, wounds, redness of eyes, the bite of the serpent, and the adder's sting." And the rest of the chapter about seeing strange women, the sensations of sea-sickness, of being beaten, of awaking from coma, and seeking it yet again, in obedience to the imperative demands of an artificial craving, completes one of the most impressive warnings against the use of alcoholic wine that were ever written.

Prov. xxxi. 4-7 : "It is not for kings, O Lemuel, to drink *yayin*. Give *yayin* unto them that are of heavy hearts," etc. (See under *Shekhar*, p. 815).

Eccl. ii. 3 : "I sought in my heart to give myself unto *yayin*." "To strengthen my body with *yayin*" (Lex.). Solomon was giving his experience with all frankness. When a young man he made the experiment that thousands make, in the belief that stimulating wines would make the system robust, prolong life, and add greatly to its joys. But wisdom corrected his error, and he confessed (vs. 11) that such a use of *yayin* was "vanity and vexation of spirit." And with this decision all his future references to wine in his writings correspond.

Isaiah pronounces a wo upon those who become "inflamed with *yayin*," who provide it "in their feasts," who are "mighty to drink *yayin*"; a wo upon the "drunkards of Ephraim," who are "overcome with *yayin*," who are "swallowed up of *yayin*" (Isa. v. 11, 12, 22; xxviii. 1, 7).

Jeremiah uses the coma of the drunkard to illustrate the stupor and horror that came upon himself by reason of the judgments that he was commissioned to declare: "I am like a drunken man, and like a man whom *yayin* hath overcome" (Jer. xxiii. 9).

Amos, too, pronounces a "Wo upon those who are at ease in Zion, who drink wine in bowls" (vi. 1, 6), implying that they are so given to indulgence that ordinary wine-cups are too small. The word here means properly *basins*. The prophet selects a large vessel to set forth vividly their greed of wine, and strengthen his rebuke.

In enumerating the sins of Judah the prophet Micah makes the love of wine and strong drink the climax of their guilt: "He who should prophesy of *yayin* and strong drink would be their prophet" (Mic. ii. 11).

The prophet Zechariah uses the phenomena of drunkenness by way of illustration. He represents the Jews as achieving a great victory over their foes in this language: "The Lord of hosts shall defend them, and they shall devour and subdue with sling-stones. And they shall drink [i.e. the blood of their foes], and make a noise as through *yayin*" Zech. ix. 15.

In like manner Asaph represents the Lord as "awaking

out of sleep, like a mighty man that shouteth by reason of *yayin*. And he smote his enemies" (Ps. lxxviii. 65, 66).

Joel gives us a picture of the drunkard that is true to the life when he represents the appetite of the nations that oppressed the Jews for drink as so great as to lead them to "sell a girl for *yayin*, that they may drink" (Joel iii. 3). What has not the drunkard sold to appease his thirst for alcohol!

The prophet Habakkuk, referring to the proud and haughty Chaldean, exclaims: "He transgresseth by *yayin*" (Hab. ii. 5). Henderson, however, regards the *yayin* as the subject, which seems to agree better with the context. The translation will then be, "Wine is treacherous," reminding us of the proverb of Solomon, "Wine is a mocker."

In verses 15, 16 he exclaims: "Wo unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken, that thou mayest look on their nakedness. Thou art filled with shame for glory; drink thou also, and let thy foreskin be uncovered. The cup of the Lord's right hand shall be turned unto thee, and shameful spewing shall be upon thy glory."

This allusion to the "cup of the Lord's right hand" reminds us of another phase of this subject, of terrible significance — the use of the intoxicating cup as a symbol of the wrath and judgments of the Almighty. By no other method which we can conceive of could the condemnation of intoxicating wine be made so emphatic.

Said David, recalling the judgments that had come upon Israel for their sins: "Thou hast made us to drink the *yayin* of astonishment" (Ps. lx. 3), תַּרְעִילָה, of *reeling, drunkenness*.

Isaiah refers to the cup of reeling in these words: "They are drunken, but not with *yayin*. Thou hast drunk at the hand of the Lord *the cup of his fury*, the dregs of the cup of trembling [or the goblet-cup of trembling] thou hast drunk, thou hast sucked out. . . . Wherefore hear now this, thou afflicted and drunken, but not with *yayin*. . . . Behold I have taken out of thine hand the cup of reeling, the goblet-

cup of my fury. Thou shalt no more drink it again; but I will put it into the hand of them that afflict thee" (Isa. xxix. 9; li. 17, 21, 22, 23).

Said Jeremiah: "Take the wine-cup [cup of *yayin*] of this fury at my hand, and cause all the nations to whom I send thee to drink it. . . . The nations have drunk of her *yayin* [referring to the ruin Babylon had brought upon them], therefore the nations are mad" (Jer. xxv. 15-28; li. 7).

Ezekiel, too, used similar language when threatening Judah with judgments: "Thou shalt be filled with drunkenness and sorrow, with the cup of astonishment and desolation, with the cup of thy sister Samaria. Thou shalt even drink it and suck it out" (Ezek. xxiii. 33, 34).

Again, Asaph declares: "In the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the *yayin* is red, it is full of mixture, and he poureth out of the same; but the dregs thereof all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out and drink them" (Ps. lxxv. 8).

The verb here rendered "the *yayin* is red" is *רָחַץ*, an entirely different word from that found in Prov. xxiii. 31. It means 1. *to boil up, ferment, foam*; 2. *to be red*" (Lex.). The more natural rendering certainly would be, "the *yayin* foams"—a characteristic of spirituous wine. The added clause shows that it is also a drugged wine that is referred to, and hence it becomes a more fitting symbol of Jehovah's wrath.

Here, then, is a list of passages in which the *yayin* is evidently alcoholic. And how in this use of it is it regarded? In many instances it is directly and pointedly condemned, and the use of it is forbidden. In others it is so by implication. With a few exceptions, the references are not to excessive drinking, but to the use of the *yayin* as an intoxicant. God has put the stamp of his abhorrence upon the *yayin* itself, and then described it by its characteristics and its effects, so that none need mistake what kind of *yayin* he means in his reprobations. He calls it "the wine of reeling," "a mocker," "treacherous," "a deceiver," "the poison of

asps." He represents it as causing "drunkenness," "transgression," "sickness," "scorning," "divorce," "lewdness," "incest," "revelry," "wo," "sorrow," "contentions," "wounds without cause," "babblings," "redness of eyes," "forgetfulness of the law," "perversion of judgment," " vexation of spirit," a "disregard of the work of the Lord," "erring in vision," "stumbling in judgment"; as "taking away the heart," and making the drinker "mad." All are forbidden to be among the drinkers of it, forbidden "to look upon it." A wo is pronounced upon those who "give it to others and make them drunken"; and the sparkling wine-cup is selected from among all the agents of evil that exist in our world as the fittest symbol of God's judgments upon the wicked.

Is there, as is sometimes said, no distinction in the Scriptures between nutritious and alcoholic wines? No distinction between the *tirosh*, the *hasis*, the *hhemer*, and the *blood of the cluster*, on the one hand, and the *yayin* that foams and sparkles and deceives, degrades, stupefies, causes reeling and drunkenness, and is comparable to the poison of serpents and the venom of asps, on the other? Those, as we have seen, were always commended; this, never. Those were used as symbols of spiritual blessings, of great prosperity to the Jewish nation; this is never so used, but, contrariwise, is chosen as a symbol of the direst calamities that have come upon men and nations for their sins. Those are all characteristically sweet and nutritious. This is characteristically innutritious and alcoholic. Those were sought for nutriment, and used to the strength and vigor of the drinker. This was sought for stimulus, for artificial excitation, to the harm of the drinker in body, mind, and morals. Is there no distinction between nutritious and alcoholic wines in the Scriptures? Is it not rather as manifest as between the righteous and the wicked? God did not commend and reprobate the same beverages. The Jewish nation there is no reason to suppose were ever for a moment in doubt as to what his commendations and prohibitions meant.

4. *Passages in which yayin is used by way of illustration so as to leave it doubtful what variety, if any particular one, was in the mind of the writer.* — “Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass’s colt unto the choice vine, he [Judah] washed his garments in *yayin*, and his clothes in the blood of grapes. His eyes shall be red with *yayin*, and his teeth white with milk” (Gen. xlix. 11, 12). We have already seen that the allusions in vs. 11 are to the new wine, as it spurts from the cluster in the press. Verse 12 has been supposed to refer to the free use of intoxicating *yayin*, until the eyes had become blood-shotten, and referred to, as so used with approbation. Such an interpretation would imply that the tribe of Judah, which we know to have been the most pious of the tribes, and under the best religious instruction, was nevertheless to be especially given to the use of alcoholic wines, especially noted for intemperance. Such was not the fact in the history of Judah. Such an interpretation is not in harmony with the design of the allusion to wine, or with the illustrations that precede and follow it. The 11th verse refers by a double parallelism to the luxurious growth of the vine in the territory of Judah; the 12th, by a double comparison, to the health and vigor of the inhabitants. The phrases are both in the comparative degree, which in Hebrew is formed by the use of the preposition מִן, *from*. Thus three times in Solomon’s Song (i. 2, 4; iv. 10) is this form of the comparative used, and in each instance, as here, with an allusion to *yayin*. “Good is thy love (יְהִי לִי) *from wine*,” i.e. “Thy love is better than wine”; “We will remember thy love *from wine*,” i.e. “more than wine”; “How good is thy love *from wine*, i.e. “How much better is thy love than wine.”

In a similar manner we must render the passage under consideration, “His eyes shall be red with *yayin*,” יְהִי מִן, *from wine*, “redder than wine.” And the phrase that follows, “teeth white with milk,” יְהִי מִן, *from milk*, “whiter than milk.” This last clause evidently refers to full sets of sound and healthy teeth. The teeth were one of the most promi-

ment features of the Jewish face. The eyes and lips were the others. The chin, being covered with beard, is never mentioned in the Scriptures, and the lips rarely; the eyes more frequently than all the others.

What, then, is meant by "eyes redder than wine"? Does it refer to the blear, inflamed eyes of the drunkard? This idea does not correspond with the intent of the passage, which is all commendatory. It does not correspond with the parallel phrase that follows it, which obviously refers to one of the indices of health and beauty. What, then, is the force of the adjective "red" in this connection? It is a translation of the Hebrew אֲדָמָה, from the root אָדָה, "to be dark, obscure, e.g. spoken of obscure and unintelligible sounds or discourse, of any intricate piece of business, of the dull and cloudy eye of the drunkard" (Lex.). Another derivative from this root has evidently a reference to the "dull and cloudy eye of the drunkard," — "Who hath *redness of eyes*? They that tarry long at the wine." But, as has been said, this definition does not agree with the demands of the context, in this instance; nor with the facts of Judah's history as compared with other tribes, as intemperance was not his characteristic. Jacob was speaking in praise of Judah, was referring to the indices of health, intelligence, and vigor in the countenances of his posterity. It is much more reasonable, then, to take the word in the first meaning of the root, *darkeyes*, in the sense of dark-lustred, "dark-gleaming," as the great German commentator Lange has translated it. The LXX has *χαρροισι* that give delight (Δοῦν.), i.e. to the beholder, a thought the farthest remove possible from the impression made upon us by the bloodshot eyes of the drunkard. This translation has the more weight, since it was made with no reference to the subject we are discussing, but simply to the consistency of the thought and the integrity of the parallelism. The English of the Douay is, "*more beautiful than wine.*"

This view of the allusion brings it under this fourth head, though it probably referred to sparkling alcoholic wine. But

it is to be noted that neither the wine nor the milk, in these comparisons, is referred to as a beverage. The allusion in both is to a similarity in respect to color.

“That which was prepared for me daily was one ox and six choice sheep, also fowls were prepared for me, and once in ten days store of all sorts of *yayin*” (Neh. v. 18). This statement confirms the position I have established, that the Hebrews had various kinds or varieties of wine, all of which were comprehended under the generic term *yayin*. It will not be necessary to give the passages in full under this head; but they should be referred to to make the list complete: Deut. xxviii. 39; Josh. ix. 13; 1 Chron. xxvii. 27; 2 Chron. xi. 11; Neh. ii. 1; v. 15; Job i. 13, 18; xxxii. 19; Prov. xxi. 17; Cant. i. 2, 4; ii. 4 (“banqueting house,” lit. *house of yayin*); iv. 10; Isa. xxii. 13; xxiv. 9, 11; Jer. xiii. 12; xxxv. 2, 5-8; Dan. i. 5-8, 16; x. 3; Hosea. xiv. 7; Amos ii. 12; v. 11; Zeph. i. 13; Hag. ii. 12; Zech. x. 7.

5. *Passages in which yayin is employed in religious services, or abstinence from it is enjoined as a religious duty.*—The drink-offerings were of *yayin* (Lev. xxiii. 13; Num. xv. 5, 7, 10; Deut. xxxii. 37, 38; 1 Sam. i. 24; Hosea ix. 4).

The priests were not allowed to drink any variety of wine when they went into the tabernacle or temple to officiate. The presumption of Nadab and Abihu in offering strange fire upon the altar (which was doubtless the result of intemperance) was the occasion of the enactment of this law (Lev. x. 8-10; Ezek. xlv. 21). Thus Josephus says: “Those who wear the sacerdotal garments are without spot, and eminent for purity and sobriety; nor are they permitted to drink wine so long as they wear the sacerdotal garments.”¹ Upon which his translator, Whiston, remarks: “The precept is equivalent to their abstinence from it all the while they ministered in the temple; because they then always, and then only, wore the sacred garments, which were laid up there from one time of ministration to another” (see Luke i. 8, 9).

¹ Ant. B. iii. xii. 1; W?B. v. v. 7.

The Nazarites, also, were forbidden to drink any variety of wine or strong drink (Num. vi. 3, 4, 20 ; Judg. xiii. 4, 7, 14).

I have now referred, I think, to all the instances of the use of *yayin*, except one, which will be found on p. 319. Being generic, it was used to designate all varieties of vinous beverages — wine that was commended and wine that was forbidden. If we had had no other term in the Old Testament, and no other references to wine-drinking than those containing this term, we should not have been in doubt respecting the import of God's legislation respecting its use. For whenever it is referred to, historically or symbolically, in connection with the fruits of the earth, or as used to satisfy man's natural wants, its use is approved. But whenever it is spoken of as an agent of intoxication, an inciter to sin, it is branded with the marks of God's disapproval. Under this term it stands out with special distinctness in opposite chemical states, with opposite characteristics, and sought for opposite effects upon the drinker. This contrast corresponds with and justifies — nay, compels — a method of legislation in respect to it which is alike positive in its commendation and its interdict. And such we find God's legislation to be. We come now to the term

8. שֵׁכָר, *Shekhar*.

“*Temetum* [strong wine], *strong drink*, any intoxicating liquor, whether wine (Num. xxviii. 7), or an intoxicating drink, resembling wine, prepared or distilled from barley, honey, or dates” (Lex.). Professor Stuart regarded it as “a liquor obtained from dates or other fruits, grapes excepted.” This view seems to be confirmed by the frequent use of the two terms *yayin* and *shekhar* together (indeed, *shekhar* is always accompanied by *yayin* save once), thus covering all alcoholic beverages. The definition of Gesenius seems to me to be defective in one other respect, viz. in assuming that it always referred to an intoxicating drink. From its use in the Scripture, from the use of palm-wine by modern nations, and from the history of the term *shekhar*, I

judge it was sometimes unalcoholic, indeed, a concentrated sweetness. Kitto, in his *Encyclopedia of Biblical Literature*, Art. "Drink," says: "The palm syrup or honey denoted by *shekhar* was used both as a sweet-meat or article of food, and as a drink. The derivatives of *shekhar* expressive of this signification are numerous. Eastward and southward, following the Arabian channel and the Saracenic conquests, we meet with the most obvious forms of the Hebrew word, still expressive of sugar. Thus we have Arabic, *sakar*; Persic and Bengali *shukkur* (whence our word for sugar-candy, *shukur-kund*, 'rock-sugar'); common Indian, *jaggree* or *zhaggery*; Moresque, *sekhour*; Spanish, *azucar*; and Portuguese, *assucar* (molasses being *mel-de-assucar*, 'honey of sugar,' abbreviated). The wave of population has also carried the original sense and form northwards, embodying the word in the Grecian and Teutonic languages. Gr. *σάκχαρ*; Lat. *saccharum*; Ital. *zucchero*; Ger. *zucker*; Dutch, *suiker*; Russ. *sachar*; Dan. *sukker*; Swed. *socker*; Welch *siogwr*; Fr. *sucre*; and our own common words, *sugar* and *saccharine*." To which we may add: "Old Eng. *sugre*; Icel. *sykr*; W. *sugr*; Armor. *suker*; Ir. and Gael. *siucar*; Skr. *sarkara*; Pracrit. *sakkara*."¹

These facts show that the *shekhar* was at its base especially noted for its sweetness, not for its stimulating properties. And then it would follow that when fermented it would be characterized by alcoholic strength. For the strength of a fermented beverage will depend upon the amount of sugar it contained before fermentation. Hence it came to be denominated "strong drink," not in the sense of our strong drinks,—distilled liquors,—but relatively to their other fermented beverages. The sap of the palm and the syrup of dates, when fermented, was more intoxicating than the simple juice of the grape. Still, it must be remembered that the adjective "strong" is never found in the Hebrew. It is simply *shekhar*. And we shall find, if I mistake not, that it is referred to both in its sweet and its alcoholic state, more generally the latter.

¹ Webster, Unabridged, Art. "Sugar."

It was forbidden to the priests, together with *yayin*, when engaged in their official duties; forbidden to the Nazarites, to the mother of Samson, and to her son from his birth (Lev. x. 8, 9; Num. vi. 3, 13, 20; Judges xiii. 4, 7, 14).

When Hannah was rebuked by Samuel for the use of some intoxicant (as he supposed), she declared that "she had drunk neither *yayin* nor *shekhar*" (1 Sam. i. 15).

In Prov. xx. 1 it is coupled with the *yayin* that is "a mocker," and declared to be "raging" and "a deceiver." In Prov. xxxi. 4-7, the mother of King Lemuel says: "It is not for kings to drink *yayin*, nor for princes *shekhar*; lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of the afflicted. Give *shekhar* unto him that is ready to perish, and *yayin* unto those that be of heavy hearts. Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more." How often has this remark been quoted to justify the use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage. But this would contradict the spirit of the counsel in the preceding verse. We are bound to give a writer the credit of consistency in the two consecutive clauses of one statement. Assume that the reference in the last verse is to the medicinal properties of *yayin* and *shekhar*, and they are consistent. They may not be drunk, in the alcoholic state referred to, as a beverage; they may be used as a medicine. Or, suppose the reference to be to the intoxicating and drugged liquors which were given to condemned criminals (hence called in Amos ii. 8 "the wine of the condemned") to make them forgetful of their miseries and insensible to pain, and they are consistent with each other, and with the entire legislation of the Scriptures. The passage, taken as a whole, was designed to forbid the use of intoxicants, of whatever nature, as a beverage, and was very good advice for a mother to give her royal son.

Isaiah pronounces a "Wo upon those who rise up early in the morning that they may follow *shekhar*, and continue till night till *yayin* inflame them. Wo unto those who are mighty to drink *yayin*, and men of strength to mingle *shekhar* (Isa. v. 11, 22). In xxviii. 7 he complains that

“they have erred through *yayin*, and through *shekhar* are they out of the way. The priest and the prophet have erred through *shekhar*, and are swallowed up of *yayin*. They are out of the way through *shekhar*; they err in vision; they stumble in judgment.” How faithful a portraiture of the state of the drunkard and the results of ebriety!

In chap. xxiv. 9, 11 the prophet represents them as suffering from so grievous calamities that they had no joy over their *yayin*, and their *shekhar* was bitterness. The very earth seemed to be “reeling to and fro like a drunkard” (vs. 20). Again, he represents them “as drunken, but not with *yayin*,” as “staggering, but not with *shekhar*,” when the beverages they had used are made symbolic of their downfall (xxix. 9). And finally, he calls them “blind,” “ignorant,” “dumb dogs,” and “greedy dogs,” who “fetch *yayin*, and fill themselves with *shekhar* (lvi. 10-12).

And by the prophet Micah God threatens to leave them under the instruction of prophets who should “prophesy of *yayin* and *shekhar*” (Mic. ii. 11), than which it is difficult to conceive of a greater judgment.

It will doubtless be said that all these prohibitions and judgments refer to an excessive use of alcoholic *yayin* and *shekhar*. True; for all use is excessive that the drinker is conscious of as producing a nervous stimulation. But there is no threatening, or prohibition, or visitation of judgment, as I remember, based on this discrimination between an excessive use and a limited or temperate use (as it is called) of intoxicants. Wherever the results of stimulation appear, they are reprobated. Whenever a beverage is referred to that has the power of deceiving and debasing and causing injury to the physical system, and mental and moral degradation, it is directly or by implication interdicted, if any reference is made to its character. Never has God said, “Use intoxicating *yayin* and *shekhar*, but use it prudently.” Never has he constructed a scale to determine how far one may go in their use with safety. Nor has any man of any age been able to do so.

In Deut. xxix. 6, in recounting the dealings of God with the people in the wilderness, God said to them : " Ye have not eaten bread, neither have ye drunk *yayin* or *shekhar* ; that ye might know that I am the Lord your God." He had fed them on manna from heaven. They had not had access to their accustomed food and drink. As he was referring to the sources of nourishment, he was doubtless referring to both the *yayin* and the *shekhar* in their nutritive state, as they had been sought and used as food. He had sustained them forty years without them miraculously. There is no reference to stimulation, and therefore no implied censure for the use they had formerly made of them in satisfying the calls of their natural appetites. Remembering what was said of the history of *shekhar*, and the extensive use made of the natural and inspissated juices of the palm^{*}tree and decoctions of dates in all ages, we should expect *shekhar* would be referred to as a nutriment, as well as *yayin*.

" Thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for *yayin*, or for *shekhar*, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth. And thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy household " (Deut. xiv. 26). The Jew was required to give a tenth of the natural produce of his land to support the social festivals held at Jerusalem, in connection with their three annual feasts. Those who lived at a distance were permitted to convert their produce into money, and with that purchase the necessaries for those feasts at Jerusalem. Among other things *yayin* and *shekhar* are enumerated. The question we are to consider, in this connection, is, Were these beverages nutritious or alcoholic ? We must not decide it by reference to the bacchanal feasts of the heathen around them, which were always characterized by drunkenness and lust ; nor by the customs of modern wine-drinkers, the principal feature of whose feasts are drinking-bouts of all varieties of intoxicants. We have to do with a religious people, who were under the direct tuition of God, and had been educated by all the statutes we have referred to respecting *yayin* and *shekhar*. We should consider :

1. That the Jews were assembled for religious purposes, primarily — instruction in the law, the offering of sacrifices, and confession of their sins.

2. The design of this social feasting — “Thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God, that thou mayest learn to fear thy God always” (vs. 23) made it a religious, as well as a social, ordinance, and would govern every decision respecting food, drink, and conduct.

3. The permission to buy and indulge in the use of intoxicating *yayin* and *shekhar* to the extent of their lusts would have sent them to their homes a nation of drunkards. No pious Jew could have so interpreted the command.

4. Such a supposition is not necessary; since the *yayin* and *shekhar* were both extensively used in their natural state — a state that adapted them to use as food.

5. The law respecting the tithe of the *yayin* required that it be the *tirosh*: “Thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose to place his name there, the tithe of thy corn, of thy *tirosh*, and of thine oil” (vs. 23). It is reasonable to assume that the *shekhar* would also be sweet and nutritious.

6. To assume that they might provide alcoholic *yayin* and *shekhar* for these feasts would set the law of the feast in opposition to every other reference to fermented drinks we have found. To assume that they would understand that the command referred to nutritious beverages makes it harmonize with all the other statutes of God.

7. A circumstance occurred at the restoration of the Jews from Babylon, and the re-institution of their ancient rites and customs, which places the question we are considering beyond controversy. They were assembled at the feast of tabernacles, dwelling in booths eight days, and listening to the reading of the law by the priests. “And all the people wept when they heard the law. Then Ezra said unto them, Go your way, eat the fat and drink the sweet, and send portions unto those for whom nothing is prepared. . . . And all the people went their way, to eat and drink, and to send

portions, and to make great mirth, because they had understood the words declared unto them" (Neh. viii. 9-12).

Their joy was holy joy; their mirth was inspired by the instructions of the law; and their feasting was upon "the fat," *מִשְׁמַנֵּי* "*fatnesses*, i.e. the fat pieces of flesh, delicacies, tidbits" (Lex.), and "the sweet," *מִשְׁתֵּקִים*, "*sweetnesses, sweet things*" (Lex.).

"In the holy place shalt thou cause the *shekhar* to be poured unto the Lord for a drink-offering" (Num. xxviii. 7).

Thus we find that *shekhar* is used twenty-two times, in every instance but one in connection with *yayin*, which suggests the probability that, like *yayin*, it may have been used in both the sweet and alcoholic states. Six times they are found in the law of Nazariteship and the restrictions laid upon the priests while engaged in their ministrations. These statutes prohibited every variety of wine and strong drink, to prevent the possibility of the persons concerned coming under the influence of alcoholic *yayin* and *shekhar*. The history of the Nazarites was and is a lesson to the world. And the prohibition laid upon the priests was to avoid the great scandal of a drunken priesthood. These laws strike a powerful blow at alcoholic drinks, not at nutritious. They never would have existed had it not been for the deadly influence of alcohol, as we all very well know.

In twelve instances of the use of these terms they are reprobated in decided terms, and language used which shows that they were so because they were the agents of ebriety. In two instances they are spoken of with approbation, as they are used with other articles of food for nourishment or as condiments. In one instance it is spoken of approvingly as a medicine, and in one it is poured out as a religious rite. Thus confirming all the principles established in our study of the preceding terms.

9. *מִשְׁכָּר*, *Mesekh*.

This was mixed or spiced wine, the term being derived from *מִשְׁכָּר*, "to mix, to mingle, to mix wine, i.e. to season it with spices" (Lex.).

The ancients, as we have seen, were accustomed to mix various ingredients with their wines, and for different and opposite purposes. Some to dilute, as water and milk; others to increase their saccharine strength, as honey; and others, again, to give them flavor, or to heighten their alcoholic or stupefying qualities. We cannot, therefore, determine beforehand what variety the term will indicate. The decision must be based, in each case, upon the general principles already established, or upon incidental evidence.

“In the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the *yayin* is red [ferments, foams, p. 310]; it is full of *mesekeh*, and he poureth,” etc. (Ps. lxxv. 8). The reference is to a wine not only fermented, but mixed with stimulating or narcotic spices or drugs.

In Prov. xxiii. 30 Solomon ascribes “wo, sorrow, contentions,” etc. to those who “go to seek *mesekeh*.”

In rebuking the idolaters of his day, Isaiah says (lxv. 11: “Ye are they that forsake the Lord, and forget my holy mountain; that prepare a table for that troop, and that furnish *mesekeh* unto that number.” A very imperfect translation. The phrase “for that troop” is גַּדִּי, for *Gad*, the god of fortune, which was worshipped by the Babylonians and Jewish exiles. The LXX has τύχη, *luck, chance*; Vulg. *fortuna*. In the other hemistich, “unto that number,” מֶזֶגַל, unto *Destiny*. This was an idol goddess, which the Jews worshipped in Babylon, together with *Gad*. In vs. 7 God threatens to “measure their iniquities into their own bosom.” Twice the *mesekeh* is pointedly reprobated as a vile compound, and in the last instance regarded as a detestation when poured out to an idol goddess.

10. מֶזֶגַל, *Mezeg*.

This word is nearly allied to the former, coming from the obsolete root מִזַּג, to *mix*. Though occurring only once, and then translated “liquor,” it doubtless referred to a variety of wine, probably a fermented wine; though it is not possible to determine, as it occurs in a comparison somewhat obscure.

Cowles translates it "mixed wine." "Thy navel is like a round goblet, which wanteth not *mezeg*" (Cant. vii. 2).

11. סֹבֵחַ, *Sobhe*.

As the verb from which *sobhe* is derived means *to drink to excess, to tope*, while its present participle is defined a *drunkard*, and its passive *drunken*, there can be no doubt that it refers to a beverage that would intoxicate. It is found only twice, and is used figuratively in both instances to set forth the degeneracy of the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem.

"Thy silver is become dross, thy *sobhe* mingled with water" (Isa. i. 22).

"Their *sobhe* is sour; they have committed whoredom continually" (Hosea iv. 18).

12. חַמְרָא, *Hhamra*; חַמְרָה, *Hhamar*.

These are Chaldaic forms, derived from the same root as חָמַר (No. 3), which, as we saw, might denote etymologically a boiled, fermented, or red wine. The former term is found in Dan. v. 1, 2, 4, 23, and refers, no doubt, to an intoxicating beverage; designating, as it does, the wine that was drunk at the idolatrous feast of Belshazzar. For his intemperance, as well as his other vices, doubtless, the mysterious hand wrote his doom upon the palace wall. The latter is found in the decree of Cyrus concerning the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the establishment of the temple-service, and was commanded to be given to the priests "for sacrifices of a sweet odor to the God of heaven" (Ezra vi. 9, 10). Artaxerxes, also, his successor used the same term in confirming the order of Cyrus (Ezra vii. 21, 22).

13. שְׁמֵרִים, *Sh'marim*.

This term is found only in the plural form, and signifies "*lees of wine*, so called because wine is kept, preserved in strength and color, by letting it stand upon the lees; from שָׁמַר, *to keep safe, protect, preserve*" (Lex.). Kitto defines

it, "preserves of jellies, since it is derived as above." Perhaps both authorities are correct; the former giving the primary signification; and the latter, a secondary use of the word. Any variety of wine would have its sediment or lees, and the characteristics of these would depend upon the nature of the wine, as fermented or sweet, spiced or drugged. The prophet Isaiah evidently referred to the lees of concentrated, sweet, or honeyed wine, which was regarded as a delicacy or condiment, when he said: "In this mountain [Zion] shall the Lord of Hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things [literally a *banquet of fatness*], a feast of *sh'marim*, of fat things full of marrow, of *sh'marim* well refined" (Isa. xxv. 6). No one can suppose, surely, that the dregs of fermented wine were accustomed to be eaten as a delicacy. They were especially nauseous and repulsive. It was "a banquet of fatness," implying very rich viands, and the *sh'marim* are described as "fat things full of marrow," thus accumulating imagery to set forth a feast of highly concentrated nutritious substances.

Over against these representations stand three other passages of a different import: "Moab hath been at ease from his youth, he hath settled on his *sh'marim*, and hath not been emptied from vessel to vessel, therefore his taste remained in him, and his scent is not changed" (Jer. xlvi. 11). It is implied, in this illustration, that if he had been "emptied from vessel to vessel" he would have been less corrupt; which shows that the removal of the dregs from wine, so as to prevent or lessen its fermentation, was understood by all to add to its purity and value.

Again, the "scent that remained in him, and the taste that was unchanged" symbolized the sinful character of the nation, which was then calling for judgments. The reference was to the spirit and bouquet of old, mature wines, caused by the presence of the *sh'marim*. Both of the phrases of this verse, then, imply that it was well understood that fermented wine was corrupt, a suitable symbol of sin, both because of the presence of the fermenting dregs, and the spirit and fragrance which it produced and conserved.

“ I will punish the men that are settled upon their *sh'marim*, that say in their heart, The Lord will not do good, neither will he do evil ” (Zeph. i. 12). Here, again, wicked men are compared to wine whose strength has not been weakened by the removal of the *sh'marim*.

The only remaining passage of the Old Testament which we are to consider is: “ In the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the *yayin* foams; it is full of *mesekh* [mixed or drugged wine], and he poureth out of the same; but the *sh'marim* thereof all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out and drink them ” (Ps. lxxv. 8). We have already considered the force of this judgment-symbol, on pp. 310, 322. But its full force could not be seen till we should come to this last term, *sh'marim*. And even now it is obscured somewhat by the defective rendering of וְאֵי , that immediately precedes it, and is joined to it by the $\text{וְ$ or hyphen. It is rendered as though it were the disjunctive “ but,” and not rather by its primary signification, as an affirmative, strengthening the thought — “ *surely* the *very dregs* of the cup [after it is emptied] all the wicked shall suck out [וְשָׁמוּ , *to suck, suck out* (Lex.)] and drink.” How could words have been found, imagery chosen, or language framed that would have made a more terrific declaration of God's purpose to visit judgments upon the wicked, who “ lift up their horn on high.” The cup in his hand is filled with inebriating *yayin*. It is the wine that “ foams.” In this fact, as all can see, consists the force of the imagery. It would have had no relevancy if it had contained *tirosh* or *hhemer*, *hasis* or the *blood of the cluster*. It was “ the cup of reeling.” It had the power to make the drinker “ mad.” But this was not all. It was “ full of *mesekh*,” mixed wine. Its poisonous, maddening qualities were increased by the addition of stupefying drugs. And he would not only press this cup to their lips till they had drained it to the dregs, but compel them to “ suck out and drink down ” even the nauseous and more deadly *sh'marim*.

We have now threaded our way through the labyrinth of

the thirteen terms of the Hebrew Scriptures of the Old Testament designating the beverages and condiments of the Jews, and referred to all the instances of their use, numbering over two hundred and thirty. Some of them, it is true, have no direct bearing upon the question we are discussing. Many more show merely the trend of inspiration, though by themselves alone they would prove nothing decisive, either *pro* or *con*; while the remainder afford evidence that directly affects the verdict. But it has seemed desirable to place all the data, so far as relates to the terms employed, under the eye of the reader.

We have sought for a principle of interpretation which should harmonize the whole revelation of God's will, and place it in harmony also with the principles of science, and the laws of health and life, all of which "come forth alike from the Lord of Hosts, who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working." We have found such a principle in the distinction between wines that were characteristically sweet, fit for food, and harmless in respect to any power to create artificial appetites; and wines characteristically alcoholic, rendering them unfit for use as food, and liable to produce habits of intoxication in the drinker. The former were in their natural state characteristically; the latter, in an artificial state. The former were sought with one intent; the latter for another. This discrimination, sometimes assumed, sometimes asserted, necessitated the twofold method of alluding to saccharine beverages in the divine legislation.

The test of any theory is that it meets all the facts of the case. When Newton had hit upon the principle of gravitation to explain the motions of the heavenly bodies, he at once put it to this test. And because it reconciled all their known phenomena, it was accepted as a "law of nature."

It has seemed to me that the principle contended for in this discussion will stand a like severe test. As I read the foregoing statutes, whatever the term employed, whether a beverage is referred to historically or in symbol, in a com-

parison or a warning, a provision for the supply of a human want or a prohibition — not in a solitary instance is a drink that is manifestly alcoholic commended as a beverage, nor in one instance is a beverage that is characteristically nutritious condemned.

(To be continued.)

ARTICLE VI.

HARTMANN'S PHILOSOPHY OF THE UNCONSCIOUS.¹

BY REV. CHARLES F. THWING, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

THE critical philosophy of Kant was an attempt to limit the field of human knowledge to the boundaries of experience and phenomena. It laid down, as he himself said, the "indispensable prolegomena necessary for any future philosophy." It gave what seemed to be, in 1787, the date of the second edition of the "Critique," the death-blow to all attempts to establish a philosophy of the Absolute. But within forty years of the death of the great Königsberger three philosophies of the Absolute arose in Germany. Fichte, with his "subjective idealism"; Schelling, with his "polar logic"; and Hegel, with his "pure being" and "pure nothing," attempted to discover the Unconditioned. After the uselessness of the dialectic of Hegel had been fully proved, Schopenhauer's "Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung" attempted a new solution of the old problem; and in the closing years of the last decade Eduard von Hartmann took up the glove which Kant threw down eighty years before, and pub-

¹ Eduard von Hartmann is one of the youngest as well as one of the last of German philosophers who have achieved a trans-Atlantic reputation. Born at Berlin in 1840, he was educated at a gymnasium of his native city, and at the school of artillery. In 1861, entering the army, he received an officer's commission; but in the next year an accident to the foot, followed by an incurable disease, obliged him to retire from his chosen profession. Confined by the disease to his room, he began to devote himself to literary pursuits, and in them he soon proved himself a master-workman. In 1868 he published the first edition of his principal philosophic work, "Philosophie des Unbewussten,"