

Theology on *the Web.org.uk*

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

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

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

ARTICLE V.

WHAT WINE SHALL WE USE AT THE LORD'S SUPPER?

BY REV. T. LAURIE, D.D., FORMERLY MISSIONARY OF A. B. C. F. M.

ALL good men desire to remove social evils. They differ only as to the method of removal. Among them we may distinguish two classes. One devises its own method for removing them, and plies it with untiring zeal; the other goes to the Bible for the remedy, feeling that there we have the counsel of a present God, and that we are safe only while we follow his guiding.

Intemperance is one of the evils which good men long to bring to an end. It has occasioned untold misery to man. The tears it has caused to flow have never known intermission; the sorrow of angels over it has known no pause. The greatest marvel is the madness with which its victim clings to his destroyer. No sooner does he recover from one attack than he cries: "I will seek it yet again." Open a door of escape to any other sufferers, and they do not wait to be told to flee; but these beat down iron barriers to get back into the fire.

All good men agree that the use of intoxicating drinks is dangerous; that even the weakest of them drunk to excess involves drunkenness; that there are special reasons, both physical and moral, why children should be trained to avoid them; for physicians testify that their use in medicine is not so dangerous to the man of mature age, as to the young. We are to see that they shun this road to ruin, that they pass not by it, but turn from it and pass away; they are not even to "look on the wine when it is red; for at the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder."

All agree, moreover, that if our example tends to lead others astray, the spirit of Christ will induce us to abstain from things lawful in themselves, that we may not be an

occasion of stumbling to a weak brother for whom Christ died. It is evident also that the man who has fallen under the power of intemperance must not only flee out of Sodom, but he must not tarry in all the plain if he would not be destroyed. The least indulgence may involve such in the guilt of self-destruction. So far it is to be hoped that good men are of the same mind.

But when some insist on banishing all that intoxicates from the *Materia Medica*, and proscribe what they call fermented wine at the communion table, many draw back. Their consciences will not allow them to do otherwise. Their desire for the most extensive and permanent triumph of the temperance reformation, leads them to protest against such teachings. Leaving the medical part of the question to others, we now inquire: What is the wine proper to be used at the Lord's table? And here, to forestall prejudice, it may be proper to say that we practise on the principle of total abstinence from intoxicating liquors as a beverage, and, both in the pulpit and at the ballot-box, have stood among the friends of prohibitory law. We are also free to assert that the wine proper to be used on that occasion is not that which has been enforced by the addition of distilled liquors, but hope to be able to show that it is such wine as the pure juice of the grape becomes when left to the regular processes of nature.

None deny that wine was the element originally used by our Saviour, and appointed by him to be the emblem of his blood in showing the Lord's death till he come. Some, however, would condemn the use of it if fermented; but what if it be its nature to be fermented? What if fermentation be essential to its becoming wine? What if the liquid called unfermented wine be unknown in the Bible or in Bible lands, and known in history only as one of the unnatural and rare luxuries of the most corrupt period of the Roman empire?

If wine is the element to be used, it would certainly seem proper to learn what it is from those works which give us

the meaning of words, not according to the private opinions of any, but as fixed by general usage. We can make no progress in any discussion, and as little can we commend a good cause to general confidence, if in order to do so we must use the names of material objects in a sense different from their established meaning; but if that meaning is so fixed that rival lexicographers, while differing widely where usage is divided, agree perfectly in their definition of wine, ought we not to accept it without question? What then is their testimony?

Webster gives four definitions: “(a) The fermented juice of grapes; (b) the juice of certain fruits prepared with sugar, sometimes with spirits, etc., etc.; (c) intoxication; (d) drinking.” The only one of these definitions with which the present question has to do is the first, and the same remark is true of Worcester who gives two definitions: “(a) the fermented juice of the grape, a spirituous liquor resulting from the fermentation of grape juice; (b) the fermented juice of certain fruits, resembling in many respects the wine obtained from grapes, but distinguished therefrom by naming the source whence it was derived, as e.g. currant wine, elderberry wine, etc., etc.” Appleton’s American Cyclopaedia defines it as “originally and properly the name of the liquor obtained by the fermentation of the juice of grapes, and in less strict usage beverages prepared in like manner from the juices of many other fruits.”

Now why prejudice a good cause by denying the fixed meaning of a well-known article, and arraying against that cause the settled use of language? There is no greater hinderance to a favorable reception of the arguments for temperance among those who have not yet become the slaves of a debasing appetite, than the suspicion that, however plausible they appear, yet they contain a lurking fallacy, which needs only to be brought out to spoil them all. Now why confirm such prejudices by doing violence to the acknowledged meaning of words? What is an intelligent man to think of the unfermented wine which some insist

shall be used at the sacrament when he reads such definitions?

Leaving the dictionaries, let us next inquire whether there are any traces in Bible lands to-day of an unfermented wine. We say in Bible lands; for the prodigalities of Roman luxury are not safe guides in determining a Bible usage. It would be just as legitimate to infer that, because a Roman emperor provided at his feasts dishes prepared from the brains of rare birds at a fabulous cost, therefore such food was eaten in Palestine, as to infer that, because we find traces of an unfermented wine in a few classical writers, therefore such a drink was common in Judea in the days of our Saviour. Even those writers speak of it as very rare and found only in small quantities. Pliny says:¹ “Medium inter dulcia vinum est quod Gracci ἀειγλεῦκος vocant, hoc est, semper mustum. Id evenit curâ quoniam fervore prohibetur, sic enim appellant musti in vinum transitum” (the medium quality among sweet wines is that which the Greeks call ἀειγλεῦκος, i.e. always must—the fresh juice of the grape. This is made with care, since it is not allowed to ferment; for so they term the passing of must into wine). Pliny evidently regards this as an exceptional fact, since he expressly says that fermentation is the process by which grape-juice becomes wine. Even then we must remember, as Dr. F. R. Lees tells us, that “the Jews carefully eschewed the wines of the Gentiles,” and the reason he gives why the Mishna forbids the use of smoked wines in offerings, is that “the prohibition had reference chiefly to the Roman practice of fumigating them with sulphur, the vapor of which absorbed the oxygen, and thus arrested fermentation.”²

Should modern science ever secure the general manufacture of wine, free from its present possibilities of evil, and yet retaining all its beneficial effects, we shall rejoice with exceeding great joy; but the present inquiry relates to what has been and is, and not to what may be.

Writers generally agree that our Saviour used the ordinary

¹ Hist. Nat. xiv. 9.

² Kitto's Cycl. of Bibl. Literature, ii. 956.

wine provided for the Passover. Thus L. Coleman, D.D., says:¹ "The common wine of Palestine is of a red color. Such was the wine which our Saviour used at the sacrament, as it would seem both from the nature of the case, and from the declaration : 'This is my blood.'

We have no accounts of the customs of Bible lands so reliable as those of missionaries familiar with biblical literature, and equally so with the daily life of the people among whom they dwell. Let us hear their testimony :

Dr. Justin Perkins says:² "Inquiries have often been made of me on the subject of the wines of Persia, and I may here state the facts in the case. The juice of the grape is used in three ways in Persia. When simply expressed it is called "sweet," i.e. sweet liquor. It is not drank in that state, nor regarded as fit for use, any more than new, unsettled cider at the press in America ; nor is it even called wine till it is fermented. A second and very extensive use of the juice of the grape is the syrup, made from boiling it from this sweet state, which resembles our molasses and is used in the same way for sweetening but is never used as a drink. This is in fact neither more nor less than Oriental molasses. The third use of the juice of the grape is the distillation of it into arrak, or Asiatic brandy. The wines of Persia are in general much lighter than those of Europe, but they are still always intoxicating. In making these statements I throw down no gauntlet for controversy on the much vexed wine question, but wish simply to communicate information. Were I to hazard the expression of personal feeling and opinion on the general subject, it would be that of the deepest regret for any approximation in the tendency of the age to the removal of the sacred landmarks of scripture institutions."

Rev. Benjamin Labaree, Jr., who has been seven years a missionary among the Nestorians, writes to his father, Dr. Labaree, late President of Middlebury College (I copy from

¹ Ancient Christianity Exemplified, p. 437.

² Residence of Eight Years in Persia, p. 236.

the original manuscript which Dr. Labaree has kindly allowed me to use) : "The inquiries which you recently made in regard to the wines and habits of wine drinking in Persia, are not the first which have been addressed to me on the same subject. . . . Let me state some of the facts ; and

"First, in regard to the character of the wines produced. With the most careful inquiries I have been unable to learn that any wine is ever manufactured in the country which is not intoxicating. The various kinds made differ more or less in their intoxicating powers, but all are fermented, and all, sooner or later, produce the same effect. The simple, unfermented juice of the grape is never used as a beverage. The very Syriac word for wine, *سُكَّه*, by its etymology, signifies fermented."

It may give this testimony of Mr. Labarce more weight with the friends of temperance to add that the whole letter earnestly maintains the principle of total abstinence, in opposition to the moderate drinking, so-called, of Europe and the East.

Dr. Eli Smith, long resident in Syria, and to whom Robinson's Biblical Researches are largely indebted for their minute and accurate information, gives an account of the "wines of Mount Lebanon" in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*,¹ from which we condense the following information.

"The methods of making wine in Lebanon may be reduced to three : (a) The must is fermented without desiccation or boiling. Little is made in this way, and except in cool localities it does not keep well, though "possessing rather strong intoxicating powers." (b) The must is boiled down about four or five per cent, and then fermented. (c) The grapes are dried in the sun from five to ten days, till the stems are dry ; they are then pressed, and must, skins, stems, and all are put into open jars to ferment about a month. This wine keeps better, and will sometimes burn ; but it is only about one third of the weight of the grapes that are used in making it. The best wines yield thirty-three per

¹ *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1846, pp. 385-389.

cent of what is called good brandy. Bhamdoon, four thousand feet above the sea, has vineyards two miles long and half a mile wide. The grapes are the principal food of the people for three months; then they make about one hundred and eighty thousand pounds of raisins, and twenty-four thousand pounds of dibs, all of which last is used in the village. To make it, the must, fresh from the press, is mixed with clay, to destroy the tartaric acid, and is boiled down till the product is twenty-five per cent of the weight of the grapes, and is as thick as molasses. Sometimes it is beaten to the consistency of ice-cream. It is classed among eatables, and not among drinks. It is generally eaten with bread or used in cooking. (Does Exod. xvi. 31, wafers made with honey (דָבָן), refer to this last use of dibs?) Wines are never enforced with brandy, but says Dr. Smith, "unintoxicating wines I have not been able to hear of. All wines, they say, intoxicate more or less. So also when inquiring for unfermented wine, I have uniformly been met with a stare of surprise. The very idea seems to be regarded as an absurdity. The name for wine in Arabic  (Hebrew שֵׁנַׁי) is derived from the verb to ferment. It is cognate with the word for leaven, and itself also signifies fermentation. I have not been able to learn that any process is ever adopted for arresting vinous fermentation before it is completed"; and if Dr. Eli Smith could not learn it, the world may rest very sure that it was not to be learned, in Syria at least.

"In regard to the wine used at the sacrament, I have questioned both Papal and Greek priests, and received the same answer. It must, they say, be perfect, pure wine. If unfermented it will not answer, nor will it if the acetous fermentation be commenced. The acknowledgment of the necessity of fermentation by the Papists is worthy of special notice, inasmuch as they reject fermented bread. This rejection is owing to their belief that our Saviour used unleavened bread at the institution of the ordinance, and their admission of fermented wine consequently indicates a belief that he used fermented wine. To this, so far as I have ob-

served, the custom of the Jews in Palestine now corresponds. In 1835 I called on the chief Rabbi of the Spanish Jews in Hebron during the feast, and was treated with unleavened bread and wine. Finding the wine fermented, I asked him how he could consistently use it, or have it in his house. He replied that as the vinous fermentation was completed, and there was no tendency to the acetous, it did not come within the prohibition of the law; and that if any wine was found at the beginning of the feast in danger of running into the acetous fermentation, it was in that case removed."

Dr. C. V. A. Van Dyck, who has been for more than a quarter of a century in Syria, and is perhaps more familiar with the Arabic language and literature, and more intimately acquainted with the customs of the people than any other foreigner, writes to me as follows :

"In reply to your question about wine for communion, there is not, and as far as I can find out, never was (in Syria), anything like what has been called unfermented wine. The thing is not known in the East. Syrup is made of the juice of the grape, and molasses, as you know, but nothing that is called wine (خمر نبيذ) is unfermented. They have no unfermented drinks, but water of liquorice root. Raisins are sometimes soaked till they swell, and then eaten, and the water drank; but it is never called wine, or supposed to be related to wine. The name of the unfermented juice is مصطَار. Wine is called خمر, because it is fermented from ستر = سَتَر, he concealed, as the Kamûs¹ says :

سُتِيْ خَمْرًا لَانَه يَخْمُر لَعْقَلْ اَيْ يَسْتَبِرْهُ

'It is called *Hhamr* because it *Hhamrs* the understanding or covers it up,' whence eighth form اختمار, *fermentation*, and خمير, *leaven*."

"In Syria, and as far as I can learn in all the East, there

¹ The Kamûs is a Lexicon explaining Arabic in Arabic, and is a standard authority among scholars in Syria.

is no wine preserved unfermented, and they never make wine of raisins, but they do make dibs or molasses of raisins, and they ferment them, and make arrack of them (by distillation); but they could not keep grape-juice or raisin-water unfermented, if they would; it would become either wine or vinegar in a few days, or go into the putrefactive fermentation."

"The native churches, Evangelical, Maronite, Greek, Coptic, and Armenian, all use fermented wine at the communion. They have no other, and have no idea of any other."

"The Jews not only use fermented wine at their feasts, but use it to great excess, especially at the feast of Purim (Esth. ix. 26-28), when according to the Talmud 'a man is bound to get so drunk with wine as not to know the difference between 'Cursed is Haman' and 'Blessed is Mordecai.' At the Passover only fermented wine is used. As I said before, there is no other, and therefore they have no idea of any other."

"From the above you can easily infer my judgment as to the proper wine for the sacrament. The same as the blessed Saviour used when he instituted the ordinance, namely, the juice of the grape so fermented as to be capable of producing intoxication when taken in sufficient quantity. The wines of the East differ in the percentage of alcohol which they contain, but all the various kinds are used by the native churches and by the Jews. They take that which chances to be at hand, just as the Saviour took that which was at hand at the Passover."

Dr. Van Dyck, as the result of extensive and protracted inquiry, is decided in the opinion that such a thing as unfermented wine never has been known in Syria.

The word "wine," according to the best lexicographers, means "the fermented juice of the grape." However they differ on other points, all agree in this. Bible lands now know nothing of any other wine, and the most diligent in-

¹ See also Dr. McCaul's "Old Paths," p. 25 (London, 1837), who quotes Megillah, fol. 7, col. 2.

quiries of those longest on the ground and most familiar with the people, satisfy them that no other has ever been known there; but does not the Bible speak of an unfermented wine? As considerable pains have been taken to show that it does, let us give the subject a more thorough examination than otherwise had been necessary.

A remarkable instance of striving to commit the Bible to the figment of an unfermented wine, is found in the Articles under the words "Wine" and "Fruit" in Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, written by Dr. F. R. Lees. But nothing could be better fitted to prejudice an Oriental scholar against the temperance reformation than to put those Articles into his hands. In the improved edition of this valuable Cyclopaedia, just completed by Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander, Professor of Theology to the Congregational churches of Scotland, the Article of Dr. Lees is left out, and a much more accurate and reliable statement of the whole subject by Rev. Isaac Jennings, a Congregational minister in Kelvedon, Essex (England), is inserted in its stead.

The Bible uses a variety of words to denote wine, but before examining them, let us notice some which have been erroneously supposed to refer to intoxicating drinks. Among these are:

מַלְכָּרֶת, our version renders this "flagon" in the four passages where it occurs, 2 Sam. vi. 19; 1 Chron. xvi. 3; Hos. iii. 1; Cant. ii. 5. In all except the last the Septuagint translates it some kind of pastry or cake, and there it renders it "unguents or perfumes." Gesenius renders it "raisin cakes," from **מַלְכָּרֶת**, *to squeeze or press together*, and the appropriateness of this meaning will be manifest to any one who will read the passages referred to. The Targum of Jonathan has **מַלְכָּרֶת** where our version has "wafers" (Exod. xvi. 31).

גְּרֹרֶת, *vinegar*, from **גְּרֹרֶת**, *to be sour*, as fermented bread, occurs only five times in scripture. **גְּרֹרֶת** as a noun occurs ten times, and in our version is always rendered leaven or leavened bread.

מִבְּרָה גָּנְבֵּים, *the steeping of grapes*. A drink made in that

way, and drank before it ferments, occurs only in Numb. vi. 3, and is not counted wine any more than the moist grapes or dried, in the same verse; all of which were alike forbidden to the Nazarite.

שְׁבַע, often rendered "honey," means also the grape molasses already described. This, rather than wild honey, may be referred to in the expression "a land flowing with milk and honey." Though שְׁבַע is sometimes called wine by western scholars, no dweller in Bible lands would call it so, any more than our own molasses. The word occurs fifty-four times in the Old Testament.

We now come to the Hebrew words for fermented, and therefore intoxicating, drinks. One of these is אֶבֶד from אָבֶד, *to tope, to absorb, to drink to excess* (Gesenius). The noun אֶבֶד means *drunkard*, and with the verb sufficiently indicates the character of the wine; indeed, the second definition of Gesenius is "a drinking bout," "a carouse." He translates Hos. iv. 18: "When their carousal is over, they indulge in lewdness"; and Nah. i. 10: "For though they were closely interwoven as thorns, and thoroughly soaked with their wine," etc. The word occurs only three times.

לְבִיאָה, *lees of wine*, from לְבִיאָה, *to preserve*, because wine is kept in full strength and color by letting it stand on the lees. This word occurs four times, but only twice in connection with wine (Ps. lxxv. 8; Isa. xxv. 6). Gesenius renders this last "Generous old wine, purified from the lees." See also Smith's Dictionary of the Bible (large ed.), Article "Lees." This word marks the strongest and most intoxicating wine, and the use of it in Isaiah to symbolize the blessings of the Gospel, shows that the favorable mention of wine in scripture does not depend on the absence of intoxicating power.

שְׁמַרְתָּ, Deut. xxxii. 14; Isa. xxvii. 2; שְׁמַרְתָּ, Ezra. vi. 9; vii. 22. שְׁמַרְתָּן, Dan. v. 1, 2, 4, 23. The two last are Chaldee forms of the first, and all are from the root שְׁמַרְתָּ, *to ferment, to foam*. They are identical with the Syriac حَمْرَة, Hhamro, as the Jacobites pronounce it, or Hhamra, according to the Nesto-

rian pronunciation (see Mr. Labaree's letter, page 168). It is also written حمّر Hh'mor or Hh'mar, from which حمراء Hhameero or Hhameera, *leaven*, and we have already noted the Arabic خمر, *wine*, and خمير, *leaven*, pages 169, 170. In Daniel it is the word used to denote the wine drank by Belshazzar and his princes, his wives and his concubines, in the night that he was slain. Was the wine used on that occasion unintoxicating; or any wine so identified with the idea of fermentation in Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic?

הַמְּבָרֵךְ, Ps. lxxv. 8 from **מְבָרֵךְ**, *to mix*. A mixed wine is obviously intoxicating, from the connection. The same is true of **מְבָרֵךְ**, Prov. xxiii. 30. It occurs again (Isa. lxv. 11) as a drink offering to an idol. **מִשְׁׂבֵב** (Cant. vii. 3) means wine flavored with spices, though some understand it as mixed with water; but even then, why is wine mixed with water, unless to diminish its intoxicating qualities?

שֶׁבֶר occurs twenty times, and is rendered "strong drink" in our version. It denotes, according to Gesenius, "any intoxicating liquor, whether wine, or prepared from barley, honey, or dates," and so corresponds to Webster's and Worcester's second definition of wine. That it is intoxicating is manifest from the prohibition of it and wine to the priests when on service in the tabernacle (Lev. x. 9); from Hannah's denial of the charge of drunkenness (1 Sam. i. 15): "I have drunk neither wine (**יְנֵי**) nor strong drink (**שֶׁבֶר**)"; and from Isa. xxviii. 7: "They also have erred through wine (**יְנֵי**), and through strong drink (**שֶׁבֶר**) are out of the way. The priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink (**שֶׁבֶר**), they are swallowed up of wine (**יְנֵי**)," etc. The verb **שָׁבֵר** means "to drink to the full," "to be drunken," as (Gen. ix. 21) Noah was drunken; see also Isa. xxix. 9. The Piel form "to make drunk" is used (2 Sam. xi. 13) to tell us that "David made Uriah drunk." See also Isa. lxiii. 6 and Jer. li. 7. The Hiphil form has the same meaning, as in Deut. xxxii. 42, "I will make mine arrows drunk with blood." See also Jer. li. 39, 57. The Hithpael form means "to act

like one drunk," as Eli supposed that Hannah did (1 Sam. i. 14). Different forms of this verb occur in the Old Testament nineteen times, and in every instance, either in the text or marginal rendering our version associates it with the idea of drunkenness. The derivative שְׁבִירָן, means "drunkenness" (Ezek. xxiii. 33). In Syriac the verb ְשַׁבֵּר is "to be drunk," and in Arabic سَكَرْ has the same meaning, and سَكَرَانْ is the common name for "drunkard."

צֶבֶת, new wine, from צַבֵּת, to tread, i.e. the wine-press. This word occurs only five times, and in two of these its intoxicating qualities are manifest. At first, of course, it is not fermented. But James F. W. Johnson¹ says: "Within half an hour, in ordinary summer weather, the clearest juice of the grape begins to appear cloudy, to thicken, and to give off bubbles of gas. Fermentation has already commenced; and within three hours a sensible quantity of alcohol has been formed in the body of the liquid." How much time, then, is needed in a Syrian climate for צֶבֶת to ferment? That it intoxicates we learn from Joel i. 5: "Awake, ye drunkards, and weep and howl all ye drinkers of wine (כָּיִן), because of the new wine (צֶבֶת), for it is cut off from your mouth." Here it is the loss of the צֶבֶת that calls for weeping and howling. Why do drunkards lament for it if it does not intoxicate? And Isa. xl ix. 26 makes its qualities very plain, when it says: "They shall be drunken with their own blood, as with new wine (צֶבֶת)."

יין occurs about one hundred and forty times in scripture, and is the most common name of wine. The Greek ὄνυος the Latin *vinum*, and the names for wine in most of the languages of modern Europe seem to bear some relation to this word. Gesenius derives it from an obsolete root signifying to ferment, and Dr. Lees has controverted this derivation; but it is hardly needful to prove that it is fermented, when we find it in such scriptures as Gen. ix. 24: "Noah awoke from his wine," i.e. stupor of intoxication, the cause by

¹ Chemistry of Common Life, Vol. i. p. 262.

metonymy being put for the effect; and 1 Sam. xxv. 37: "When the wine (i.e. intoxication) was gone out of Nabal." So also 1 Sam. i. 14, however Eli was mistaken as to the fact, shows his idea of the meaning of the word, when he said to Hannah: "How long wilt thou be drunken? put away thy wine from thee." There could be no meaning in such words if בַּיִן does not intoxicate. It was בַּיִן that made Lot so oblivious to passing events (Gen. xix. 33, 35). Let these suffice to prove its intoxicating qualities. True, it is not always associated with drunkenness, because it was not always used to excess, but often in a commendable way, as we shall see, and also on the most sacred occasions, and for the most holy purposes. Contrary to a frequently expressed opinion, the non-condemnatory mention of בַּיִן in scripture by actual count is found greatly to exceed in frequency its unfavorable mention.

בְּרִיאָה, *new wine*, from בָּרַא, "to seize, to take possession." "So called because it gets possession of the brain, incubriates" (Gesenius). This derivation has also been controverted by Dr. Lees. But when a thorough Hebrew scholar, with no special theory to maintain, gives the results of his researches as to the meaning and origin of words, and another striving to maintain a favorite theory of his own, gives us assertions on the opposite side, and especially such assertions as Dr. Lees has made, it is not difficult to decide which to follow. In the discussion of this question we have purposely adhered to the definitions of the prince of Hebrew lexicographers, because it is *prima facie* evidence of the unsoundness of an argument when it cannot be made to agree with the generally received results of science, and its advocates must find some other foundation whereon to build. The Rabbins say that "בְּרִיאָה is the juice of the grapes first pressed out, which easily takes possession of the mind of man." The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan render it by בְּרַאֲשָׁה, which we have seen is an intoxicating wine. The word בְּרִיאָה occurs thirty-eight times in the Bible.

Dr. Lees advances the strange notion that it is not a

liquid at all, but a solid. One looks for the bones of the old Rabbies to move in their graves at the announcement. It would seem as if Joel ii. 24 were enough to correct such an idea: "The floors shall be full of wheat, and the fats (vats) shall overflow with *תְּרִזֵּשׁ* and oil." But the Doctor, no ways disconcerted, proceeds in all soberness to explain that scripture thus: "The floors are full of winnowed wheat, and the press is running over with grapes and olives." The rendering "winnowed wheat" is perfectly correct, for that is the meaning of *בָּשָׂד*; but did not the writer see the incongruity of making the threshing-floors full of the finished product, i.e. wheat already threshed and cleaned, and the press full of the new material, i.e. grapes not yet subjected to the process for which the press was made? How quickly does scripture cry out against the violence that is done to it! The want of fitness between the parts forced into unnatural contact, bears witness to the dislocation that wrenched them from their true position. But the want of congruity is not all. Our version rightly renders *רַקְבִּים* *vats*, but he translates it "the press." Why? evidently because "vats" would not suit his purpose. He could not say that the cisterns into which the *תְּרִזֵּשׁ* flowed down from the press above were full of grapes, for these are only in the press. So he changes the rendering, and doubtless some scriptures would seem to justify the change; for in other books of the Bible the word sometimes stands for the whole apparatus used in wine-making; but how does Joel use the word? The only other place where he uses the word is iii. 13 (Hebrew iv. 13): "The press (*בָּשָׂד*) is full, the fats (*רַקְבִּים*) overflow." Here Joel uses another word for press, and the one in question for the vats below it; and yet in full view of this Dr. Lees reverses the meaning. If it is said that *תְּרִזֵּשׁ* must mean grapes because it is trodden (Micah vi. 15), then for the same reason *בָּשָׂד* must be solid also (Isa. xvi. 10).

The misuse of one scripture involves the misuse of others; for scripture is so jointed together that one dislocation cannot stand alone; so making *תְּרִזֵּשׁ* a solid involves a corres-

ponding change in וְצַדְרָה; that must mean olives and not oil. Now a large room designed for storing the meat-offerings, תְּמִימָה, frankincense vessels, etc., was turned into a chamber for Tobiah the Amonite (Neh. xiii. 5). Admit then that this was liquid, and it follows that it is fermented; for how long could the juice of the grape be stored away in Syria without becoming so? Our Saviour tells us that only new bottles could bear the strain of the imprisoned fermentation. So to avoid this, וְצַדְרָה must also change into solid olives. But this storehouse was for the offerings and tithes; and what form did the fruit of the olive tree assume in these? Every one who has lived in Syria knows how largely olive oil enters into household stores, for cooking and for light, and these offerings of oil were for the support of priests, Levites, and temple attendants. Then there was pure olive oil for the light that burned continually in the sanctuary (Exod. xxvii. 20); there was the anointing oil (Exod. xxx. 24); there were unleavened cakes tempered with oil and anointed with oil for consecration of priests (Exod. xxix. 2); the leper at his cleansing not only offered fine flour mingled with oil, but a log of oil besides (Lev. xiv. 10); the continual meat-offering which was offered with the sacrifices was to be mingled with oil, or anointed with oil, and if baken in a pan it was to have oil poured over it (Lev. ii. 4-7); the twelve princes offered each one a silver charger and a silver bowl, both full of fine flour mingled with oil, on twelve consecutive days (Num. vii.); peace-offerings were unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil, and cakes mingled with oil of fine flour fried (Lev. vii. 12). To this day the Nestorians mingle wine and oil with the flour that makes the sacramental bread. In Mount Lebanon the rent of an olive grove is paid to the proprietor in the form of oil.¹ But we will not pursue the argument further. Enough has been said to show how the disturbance caused by one rash change of the meaning of a word, may extend much beyond the original design of the innovator.

¹ Churchill's Mount Lebanon, i. 123.

Isa lxv. 8, where תְּרִזֵּשׁ is said to be found in the cluster is claimed as favoring the idea that it was a solid; but so does lxii. 8 speak of it as being brought together as grapes are in the vintage, and yet, as if the misconstruction was foreseen, the next verse (9) speaks of it as being drank. The critic must be very prosaic who can suppose that the prophet uttered such a truism as, "The grape is found in the cluster," that too prefaced by a formula so solemn as, "Thus saith the Lord." The same verse (lxii. 9) speaks of those who gather the corn also eating it. Did the Jews therefore eat corn as it came from the field, and not in the form of bread or cakes? Because Exod. xvi. 4 says that God rained down bread from heaven, must we believe that Israel found loaves ready baked lying on the ground? Because Solomon's bread (Hebrew) for one day was thirty measures of fine flour and sixty measures of meal (1 Kings iv. 22), does bread mean flour in the ordinary use of that word? That must be a desperate cause that has to resort to such hypercriticism to carry its point. Job says xxviii. 5, that "as for the earth out of it cometh bread," i.e. that which makes bread; just as Isaiah says that new wine is in the cluster, i.e. that which yields new wine. Hos. iv. 11 settles both the fluidity and the intoxicating qualities of תְּרִזֵּשׁ: "Whoredom, wine, and new wine (תְּרִזֵּשׁ) take away the heart." Only think of reading that "whoredom, wine, and grapes take away the heart," or as we would say, take away the reason! See Exod. xxxv. 35, "wisdom of heart"; Matt. xiii. 15, "understand with their heart"; also Job xxxviii. 36. It seems as if the desperate attempt to make תְּרִזֵּשׁ a solid, was a virtual admission that if liquid, it must be intoxicating. But why is תְּרִזֵּשׁ added after בַּן had expressed the general idea of wine, if it be not intoxicating? How it is so may appear from another portion of the letter of Rev. B. Labarée, Jr., already referred to.

"It is quite possible that a traveller passing through the country at some seasons of the year might not see a single case of intoxication, and hastily infer that drunkenness was a total stranger in the land; but let such an one make a

tour from village to village during the months that occur between the vintage and the beginning of Lent, when the *new wine* is abundant, and he would find intoxication in its most disgusting forms. This is the favorite season for betrothals and weddings, the principal attraction of which occasions is a plentiful supply of wine. It follows that drunkenness in its various grades is too common to excite surprise; even priests apologize with the greatest coolness for some impropriety in their conduct, by stating that they were under the influence of wine at the time; to apologize for being in that state is rarely thought of, as scarcely any disgrace attaches to the lighter degrees of intoxication, provided a man keeps the peace."

The idea is advanced by some that חַרְבָּה is the word uniformly used when the Bible makes favorable mention of wine, and בַּרְבָּה when it is mentioned unfavorably; but such is not the fact.

חַרְבָּה occurs eleven times in the expression "corn and wine," קָנָא, grain, representing the edible productions of the earth, and בַּרְבָּה those which are drank. Hence bread and wine are symbolical. It occurs also fourteen times in the formula "corn and wine and oil," which is a more full expression of the same idea. Four times it refers to tithes, four times to first-fruits, and once to an offering to God. Israel was allowed to drink both חַרְבָּה and בַּרְבָּה at their feasts (Deut. xiv. 23, 26).

On the other hand, much less than half the passages in which בַּרְבָּה occurs indicate a reprehensible use: It is once an offering to God (Hos. ix. 4), and eight times it denotes the drink-offering (Ex. xxix. 40; Lev. xxiii. 13; Num. xv. 5, 7, 10; xxviii. 14; Deut. xxxii. 38; 1 Chron. ix. 29. Melchisedec brings forth bread and wine (בַּרְבָּה) to Abraham (Gen. xiv. 18). The Nazarite might drink it without blame at the expiration of his vow (Num. vi. 20); Hannah carries up a goat-skin full, with little Samuel, to the house of the Lord in Shiloh (1 Sam. i. 24); Saul meets a man going up to God at Bethel carrying the same (1 Sam. x. 3); Jesse sends the same, with

other provisions, by his son David to Saul (1 Sam. xvi. 20); Abigail brings a much larger supply of provisions and two goat-skins full of wine (**יְנֵי**) to David (1 Sam. xxv. 18); Ziba meets David when he flees before Absalom with stores of food and a goat-skin of wine (**יְנֵי**), for such as are faint in the wilderness to drink (2 Sam. xvi. 1, 2); Solomon gives Hiram twenty thousand measures of wheat, the same amount of barley, twenty thousand baths of wine (**יְנֵי**), and the same quantity of oil (2 Chron. ii. 10); a good commentary on “the corn, the wine, and the oil.” In the song of Solomon both bride (i. 2) and bridegroom (iv. 10) say to each other, thy love is better than wine (**יְנֵי**). Isaiah lv. 1 sets forth the blessings of the gospel under the symbols of wine (**יְנֵי**) and milk. Zephaniah denounces it as a judgment from God (i. 13): “Ye shall plant vineyards, but shall not drink the wine (**יְנֵי**) thereof.” That is a touching lamentation of Jeremiah (Lam. ii. 12): “The children say to their mothers where is corn and wine (**יְנֵי**)? when they swooned as the wounded in the streets, when their soul was poured out into their mother’s bosom.” That holy man of whom his enemies said, “We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God,” describes his fasting thus (x. 3): “I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine (**יְנֵי**) into my mouth till three whole weeks were fulfilled.” How was it, then, before and after those three weeks? Other passages of the same tenor might be quoted, but in view of these now given, how can it be said that “the lawful use of wine in scripture is always connected with **שָׁרֶב**, and that **יְנֵי** is always mentioned with disapproval”? No doubt “**יְנֵי** is a mocker, **שָׁרֶב** is raging, and whoso is deceived thereby is not wise” (Prov. xx. 1); but it does not aid us in keeping men from being so deceived to suppress a part of God’s truth, or explain it away. The end does not sanctify the means. No good cause is promoted by unsound arguments. Our warnings are best heeded when men see that we state the truth precisely as it is. It is much better for the cause to follow reverently

the teachings of God's word, than to wrest one scripture in favor of what some might deem the most telling arguments. The temperance reformation cannot afford to meet the terrible reaction that must inevitably follow such a course. Even on the low ground of expediency it is not wise to place the cause in antagonism with a book which is moulding the character of the world, and every day exercises a mightier and more extensive sway; a book, too, that never requires the use of wine except at the communion table, or as a medicine prescribed by another than the party who is to use it.

It only remains to notice the Greek terms for wine in the New Testament. These are *οἶνος* and *γλεῦκος*. "*Oἶνος*, sour wine, or *vinegar*, does not concern our present inquiry.

Oἶνος is the same as *יין*, and is sufficiently characterized in Matt. ix. 17, where new wine, i.e. not yet fully fermented, in completing the process bursts the skin bottles that are old and weak. Eph. v. 18 makes its intoxicating qualities very plain: "Be not (made) drunk with wine."

Γλεῦκος is the word used by the mockers on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 13), "These men are full of new wine." If they did not deem it intoxicating, or did not mean to charge the Christians with drunkenness, why did Peter reply, "These men are not drunken, as ye suppose"? Or if he knew that *γλεῦκος* would not intoxicate, why did he refute the charge at all? Or why did he not do so by reminding them that *γλεῦκος* was powerless to intoxicate? We do not quote the favorable notices of wine in the New Testament, for our sole object is to show that all the kinds of wine mentioned in the Bible were fermented; and for that purpose the passages quoted are abundantly sufficient.

Is it needful to sum up the argument? Has it not been shown from the established meaning of the word, from the customs of Bible lands, and from the testimony of holy scripture, that wine is the fermented juice of the grape, and that such is the element appointed by the Saviour to be the memorial of his blood in the sacrament of the supper.

Before leaving the subject it may be well to learn a lesson

from Mohammedan experience. Most of their writers teach that it is a sin to taste wine, and a crime to make or to sell it. They even affirm that it is unlawful to eat the flesh of cattle that have eaten grass from ground on which wine had been spilt. Turkish law forbids a Moslem to use an earthen vessel that has contained wine, or one of metal till it has been washed ten times. To have tasted a drop of wine is enough to convict of drunkenness, and to drink it openly in the month of Ramazan is a capital offence. Yet with all this strictness, no sooner had the Moslems conquered Syria, than they drank wine freely. Several caliphs were notorious drunkards, and Sultan Selim Second was surnamed "the sot." In his reign even their religious teachers drank it openly. We do not speak of the drunkenness prevalent in Turkey and Persia to-day among the followers of "the prophet," for that may be charged to the account of a waning religion. But if such excess of zeal was so powerless without the grace of God when Mohammedanism was in its prime, is it worth our while to seek the same end by setting ourselves against one jot or tittle of his word? The history of Moslem temperance is written; and if any other reformation treats lightly either Bible truth or Bible ordinances, let us remember that the history of its success is not yet written.