COMMUNION WINE

AND

Bible Temperance,

BEING A

REVIEW OF DR. THOS. LAURIE'S ARTICLE

IN THE

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, OF JANUARY, 1869.

By REV WILLIAM M. THAYER.

NEW YORK:
National Temperance Society and Publication House,
172 WILLIAM STREET.
1869.

COMMUNION WINE

AND

BIBLE TEMPERANCE.

BEING A

REVIEW OF DR. THOS. LAURIE'S ARTICLE

IN THE

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, OF JANUARY, 1869.

BY REV. WILLIAM M. THAYER.

NEW YORK:
National Temperance Society and Publication House,
172 WILLIAM STREET.
1869.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1869, by

J. N. STEARNS,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

Rockwell & Churchill, Printers and Stereotypers,
122 Washington Street, Boston.

"WHAT WINE SHALL WE USE

AT THE

LORD'S SUPPER?"*

THAT difficulties should attach to the Bible view of temperance is not strange. Difficulties attach to the Bible view of almost every important subject, so that biblical scholars and eminent divines are divided in opinion. Hence, the church visible is divided into denominations, based on different interpretations of the Scriptures. Hence, too, slavery, polygamy, and other evils, have been defended from the Bible by distinguished theologians. Is it strange, then, that biblical scholars and divines differ, to some extent, in their interpretation of the Scriptures on the Wine Question? The sequel will show, however, that they are more harmonious on this subject than they are upon many theological tenets.

Nor is Dr. Laurie's view unusual. He represents a class of Christian temperance men, whose convictions and motives challenge respect. As Dr. L. says, they "agree that the use of intoxicating drinks is danger-

* Article in the January number of the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1869.

ous," but "differ only as to the method of removal." Their object is the same.

HIS POSITION.

He aims to prove that the Saviour used intoxicating wine at the institution of the Supper, and maintains that we *cannot celebrate the Lord's Supper properly without intoxicating wine.* He says that the Bible "never *requires* the use of wine except at the communion table," etc., thus basing its use on a divine command.

He holds that the unfermented juice of the grape *is not wine;* therefore, the Saviour must have used intoxicating wine at the Supper. He endeavors to show that "wine is the fermented juice of the grape," (1) from "the established meaning of the word;" (2) from "the customs of Bible lands;" (3) from "the testimony of holy Scripture." He thus opens for discussion the whole subject of Bible temperance.

CONSEQUENCES OF HIS POSITION.

Before discussing the main question, consider several of the consequences that inevitably follow this view. Often the weakness or falsity of an argument is best exposed by seeing whither it leads us. From his position it follows, then,

1. If Christ commands us to use alcoholic wine at the communion, and we cannot celebrate the Lord's Supper properly without it, then *alcohol* is indispensable to the proper observance of this solemn rite. No matter how much of the Divine Spirit the communicant may possess, unless the table is furnished

with that other *spirit* which intoxicates, he cannot celebrate our Lord's dying love acceptably. The "mocker" (of which Shakespeare said, "I call thee *Devil*") is "*required*" only "at the communion table."

2. If all the wines of Bible times were intoxicating, then the Bible sanctions the moderate use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage, since wine is expressly commended several times in the Scriptures, as Dr. Laurie admits and proves. Of course, there is an end to all pleas and efforts against moderate drinking if the Bible sustains it. It is supported by the highest authority, — the Word of God. All uninspired arguments against a custom are flimsy as tow if the Scriptures support it. The Bible is our "rule of faith and practice." From its sanctions there can be no appeal.

3. It follows, also, that the moderate use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage is not "*morally wrong*," as the distinguished fathers of the temperance reform taught. The committee of the National Temperance Convention, in Philadelphia, May 24, 1833, of which Dr. Justin Edwards was the honored chairman, reported, among others, the following resolution, which was adopted: —

"*Resolved*, That, in the opinion of this Convention, the traffic in ardent spirit as a drink, *and the use of it as such*, are *morally wrong*, and ought to be abandoned throughout the world." (Per. Tem. Doc., p. 333.)

They regarded moderate drinking *sinful*, and total abstinence *virtuous*, — the first, *wrong;* the last, *right*. That this opinion was general in the ministry and churches may be learned from the fact that the Gen-

eral Association of Massachusetts, of that year, reported, "Many of our churches have become temperance churches. They admit none to their fellowship, *who do not avow the principle of total abstinence from both the consumption and the traffic.*" (Per. Tem. Doc., p. 338.) But if Dr. Laurie is right, then Edwards and his coadjutors were wrong. It is not "morally wrong" to do what the Bible sanctions.

4. If Dr. Laurie be correct, then his preaching and practice are in advance of the Bible. He says that he preaches and practises total abstinence, and insists upon requiring it of children. But if the Bible sanctions moderate drinking, directly or indirectly, it is an advance on that book to insist upon total abstinence. It is stepping upon a higher plane of morality than Christianity demands. But Dr. Laurie thinks that the Bible rule of "Expediency" requires it: "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor drink wine," etc. But this rule applies "expediency" only to *good* things. It is *never* expedient to eat or drink *bad* things for food or beverage. Therefore it is never expedient to drink *alcohol* for a beverage, since science and experience both pronounce it *poison*. It is not always expedient to eat and drink *good* things — and here alone we are permitted to apply "expediency." "All things are lawful, but all things are not expedient," — that is, it may not be expedient always to do *lawful* things; but the apostle nowhere intimates that it is ever expedient to do what is *unlawful;* and we affirm that it is always unlawful to disregard the example of Christ or the sanctions of the Bible. Here unyielding right against wrong imposes a duty. Alcohol is an *evil* as a bever-

age, and therefore right, and not expediency, imposes the duty of total abstinence. His view of *necessity* in the case explodes his view of "expediency."

5. Dr. Laurie's view disturbs the harmony between science and revelation. If the Scriptures sanction wine-drinking as a beverage, they must do it as a *good*. Only that which is *good* for men can they endorse. But science declares that all alcoholic beverages are *bad* for men in health, and experience confirms the fact. The strongest man God ever made — Samson — was allowed no alcoholic drink. The fairest and healthiest youth reared in Babylon — Daniel and his friends — were total abstainers. And he whose character was fit to make him the "forerunner" of Christ — John the Baptist — drank "neither wine nor strong drink." STRENGTH, BEAUTY, and GOODNESS, are thus associated with abstinence in the Bible. Modern science and experience are equally emphatic for abstinence from all that can intoxicate. A total abstinence Bible alone can harmonize with science. Dr. F. R. Lees says, "When Christians are half as anxious to harmonize Bible teaching with temperance truth, as with geology or astronomy, they will find ready to their hands a much ampler and far simpler apparatus of conciliation." For this reason, total abstinence in the Bible furnishes additional proof of its inspiration. Professor Stuart said ("Essay on Temperance," 1830), "The use of intoxciating liquors is as evidently forbidden by God in his arrangement of our natures, as in the volume of his revelation."

Such are some of the consequences of Dr. Laurie's position; and they are sufficient to indicate whither

his argument leads, and to prepare the reader for what follows.

We rest the temperance cause on the Bible. With Dr. Laurie we believe that "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." Our chief objection to Dr. Laurie's view is that it compromises Christianity by bringing the Bible to the support of the drinking customs, when all its instructions actually foster the highest and purest virtues.

HIS ARGUMENT.

1. "*Established Usage of the Word.*" — "None deny," he says, "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. What if fermentation be essential to its becoming wine?"

He proceeds to show, from Webster's and Worcester's Dictionaries and Appleton's "American Cyclopædia," that the word "wine" means "the *fermented* juice of the grape." As if the modern and popular use of a term settled its use in *ancient* times! A modern dictionary may define "wine" as "the fermented juice of the grape;" but what of that? The question is, what did it mean in the Saviour's day? What does it mean in the Scriptures? We respectfully submit that Dr. Laurie has thus disregarded a fundamental rule of interpretation. Dr. Murphy says, in his Commentary recently published at Andover: —

"The usage of the time and place of the writer determines the meaning. If a word or phrase had several meanings, the context determines which it bears in a given passage. The more common meaning of the writer's day is to be preferred, provided it suit the passage, *not that more common in our day.*"

We need not cite other biblical scholars, who endorse the same rule of interpretation; for the rule is universally accepted.

Now, Dr. Laurie plainly discards this rule. He maintains that the meaning of the term "wine," now, was its meaning in the Saviour's time. His argument, succinctly stated, is this: "Modern lexicographers define wine to be the 'fermented juice of the grape;' therefore the wine of the Saviour's day must have been intoxicating." Here is not the "*lurking* fallacy," with which he charges a class of temperance advocates, but his fallacy is clear and palpable. Suppose he should try it on other words. Take "villain;" it means now "a vile, wicked person;" but once it meant "a peasant who owned lands." Dr. Laurie's argument would be, "The word 'villain' means a 'vile, wicked person' now; therefore the 'villains' of feudal times must have been 'base, wicked persons,'" not peasants who owned lands. The word "prevent" means to *hinder* now; but once it meant "*to help.*" His argument would make its ancient and modern meaning alike. The same is true of hundreds of words. Their ancient and modern meaning differ widely. Besides, there is scarcely a word in the English language that has not more than one acceptation at the present time.

But this is not all. As we have seen, he

claims that both Webster and Worcester support his view; he overlooks the fact that neither of these lexicographers, in defining the term wine, assert that the *un*fermented juice of the grape *is not* wine. On the other hand, both of them, in another connection, do pronounce the unfermented juice of the grape "wine." Webster defines *must* (Latin, mustum), "wine pressed from the grape, *but not fermented.*" Worcester defines it, "the sweet or unfermented juice of the grape: NEW WINE." So that both of them do say that the unfermented juice of the grape is "wine."

Also, the same is true of Appleton's "American Encyclopædia," from which Dr. Laurie quotes to prove that only the fermented "juice of the grape" is wine. In the same article from which Dr. L. quotes occur such incidental remarks as the following: "that *wine* which has nearly passed through fermentation;" "wines bottled while the process of fermentation is going on," — language which proves that the writer did not wait until the juice of the grape was fermented before he called it "wine." The "Encyclopædia Americana" (Boston, 1855) says, "The juice of the grape, when newly expressed, and before it has begun to ferment, is called *must*, and, in common language, *sweet wine.*"

We know of no lexicon, dictionary, or encyclopædia that pronounces "the fermented juice of the grape" "wine," *to the exclusion of the unfermented juice.* Note the following: —

"Stum, i. e., new wine, close shut up, and not suffered to work." (Littleton's Lat. Dic., Lond., 1678.)

"Virgin wine, which runs of itself out of a tap in the vat;" "pressed wine is that squeezed with a press out of the grapes;" "sweet wine is that which has not yet fermented." (Chambers' Cyclopædia, 6th edition, 1750.)

"That made without boiling is only put up so close that it cannot work; this is called stum *wine*." (London Cyclopædia, 1829.)

"Juice when newly expressed, and *before it has begun to ferment*, is called *must*, and, in common language, *sweet wine*." (Dr. Ure's Dic., 1836.)

"If a flask be filled with grape-juice and made air-tight, and then kept for a few hours in boiling water . . . the *wine* does not now ferment." (Prof. Liebig's Letters on Chemistry, Series 1844.)

Must is "new *wine*, close shut up, and not suffered to work." (Ainsworth's Dictionary.)

"It may at once be conceded that the Hebrew terms translated 'wine' refer occasionally to an unfermented liquor." (Dr. Smith's Bible Dic., Art. Wine.)

"Sweet *wine* is that which has not yet worked or fermented." (Rees' Cyclopædia.)

Gesenius, whom Dr. Laurie ranks with the highest authorities, says that the honey sent by Jacob to Joseph (Gen. xliii. 4), was "WINE boiled down to the consistency of syrup." The boiling must have taken place before fermentation, since fermented wine cannot be boiled down to a syrup. Whatever it was, he calls it "wine."

All the reliable authorities, in all ages, with only here and there an exception, have pronounced the juice of the grape, "wine," whether fermented or unfermented. Dr. Laurie's view is that of only a few men, including the infidel, Dr. Strauss, who maintained that the wine of Cana could not have been wine, since it had not fermented. He used this view against the Bible.

On page 168, Dr. Laurie quotes Pliny, and under-

stands him as saying that only fermented grape-juice is wine. We do not understand Pliny to say this in the passage quoted. And when we know positively that he says the opposite in other parts of his "Natural History," we may learn how to understand him here.—In lib. 14, cap. 2, Pliny speaks of "a *wine* which would not intoxicate." Also, in the same book, cap. 13, he speaks of a very sweet "*wine*," much approved by Roman ladies, and conceded to them "*because it would not inebriate.*" Rev. Albert Barnes, in his Commentary on John ii. 10, speaks on this point, and quotes Pliny as calling the unfermented juice of the grape, "wine," thus: "Pliny expressly says that a 'good *wine*' was one that was destitute of spirit. Lib. 14, cap. 13."

Again, the Bible itself calls the unfermented juice of the grape, "wine." The following texts prove it:—

"As the *new wine* is found in the cluster, and one saith destroy it not, for a blessing is in it." Is. lxv. 18.

"*Gather ye wine,* and summer fruits." Jer. xl. 10.

"Even all the Jews returned. . . . and *gathered wine* and summer fruits." Jer. xl. 12.

"The treaders shall tread out no *wine* in their presses." Is. xvi. 10.

"So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses burst out with *new wine.*" Prov. iii. 10.

"I will give you the rain. . . . that thou mayest gather in thy corn and thy *wine,* and thine oil." Deut. xi. 4.

Other texts speak in like manner; but these are sufficient to show how the Bible regards it. Here the juice of the grape is called "wine," before it is expressed, and when it is gushing from the press.

Besides, in answer to Dr. Laurie's inquiry, "What if fermentation be essential to its becoming wine?"

we answer, the wine which Christ made did not ferment. There was not time for the process of fermentation to take place. The water was suddenly converted into wine. Yet he called it "wine."

May we not, then, in all kindness and Christian courtesy, adopt Dr. Laurie's words against his own views more appropriately than he did in their favor? "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 hindrance 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?" Dr. Laurie overlooks the following facts. The Hebrew word יין, *yain*, is derived from a verb meaning "to *squeeze* or *press*," thus designating simply the expressed juice of the grape without reference to its properties. This Hebrew word is the origin of the Greek *oinos*, the Latin *vinum*, and the English *wine;* so that in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English, *wine* is a generic term, derived from a root signifying *squeeze*, and denoting a liquor obtained from the vine, whether fermented or unfermented. Dr. Adam Clark says, "The Hebrew, Greek, and Latin words which are rendered 'wine,' mean simply the expressed juice of the grape." Hence, we find that different words in the Bible are translated "wine," which proves that wine is a generic term, and covers the "*stores of all*

sorts of wine" spoken of by Nehemiah, v. 18. At the present day, also, the term is used in precisely this manner. It may mean grape, currant, raspberry, whortleberry, elderberry, madeira, port, sherry, and a hundred other wines. It may refer to new, old, sweet, sour, weak, or strong wines. It may refer to enforced or unenforced, fermented or unfermented wine. Pliny says that, in his day (lib. 14, cap. 22), the term covered "one hundred and ninety-five different kinds of wine." Nor is this true of this term alone. It is precisely like many other terms. The word "doctor" embraces all sorts of doctors, — allopathic, hydropathic, homœopathic, and all the pathies; learned doctors, ignorant doctors, quack doctors, good doctors, bad doctors, and others too numerous to mention. If one of our descendants, a few years hence, should undertake to prove that the term "doctor" meant an allopathic "doctor" only in the nineteenth century, he would do with the word "doctor" just what Dr. Laurie has undertaken to do with the word "wine." If a word be generic, it should be treated as such. Dr. Laurie does not treat it thus, but maintains that the wine to which it refers must be "fermented, when we find it in such scriptures as Gen. ix. 24: 'Noah awoke from his wine,' etc." We do not deny that its meaning embraces fermented wine; we say that, as a generic term, it embraces the *un*fermented, also. The late President Nott, of Union College, says: —

"Oil is as distinctly recommended in the Bible as wine, and yet who ever thought of insisting on the use of train-oil, the oil of ambergris, or of tobacco, on that account? And since there are more kinds of wine than of oil, it were at least as reasonable to

defend the use of bad oil as bad wine elsewhere, because good oil and good wine were once used in Palestine. The defence of the use of those kinds of oil known to be offensive to the taste, or injurious to the health and life of man, would be deemed an absurdity. Why, then, entertain a similar absurdity in the defence of similar kinds of wine? Why should the term 'wine' any more than the term 'oil,' consecrate the use of all poisons designated by it?" (Lectures on Bible Temperance, Eng. Ed. p. 67.)

HIS ARGUMENT.

2. "*Customs of Bible Lands.*" — He says there are no "traces in Bible lands to-day of an unfermented wine;" and he continues his fallacy, substantially thus: "There are no traces of unfermented wine in Bible lands to-day, therefore there could not have been unintoxicating wines there four or even two thousand years ago." Is this sound logic? Apply it to other things; take polygamy. "There are no traces of polygamy in Bible lands to-day, therefore polygamy never existed there;" which is not true. Take customs. "There are no traces of stoning offenders to death in Bible lands to-day, therefore that mode of punishment never existed there;" which is false also. Take animals. "There are no lions in Bible lands to-day, therefore lions were never found there;" which is equally untrue. Thus, by this mode of reasoning, we can prove that many things *did not* exist in Bible lands, which we know *did* exist. We can prove, also, that many things *did* exist, which we know *did not* exist; as, for instance, distilled spirits exist in Bible lands to-day, therefore distilled spirits existed there two and four thousand years ago; which is contrary to fact, since distillation was discovered

within eight hundred years. Such reasoning is fallacious.

Dr. Laurie relies upon the testimony of four missionaries and biblical scholars (Messrs. Perkins, Labaree, Smith, and Van Dyck), to prove that there is no unfermented wine in Bible lands now, and therefore there never could have been any such wine. This constitutes his entire proof under this head. He proceeds, however, to his third proposition, which is so intimately connected with the second, that we shall state it here, and then answer the two together, after quoting the following, from Dr. Lees' "WINES, ANCIENT AND MODERN," as a general answer to this testimony of missionaries: —

"Dr. Beard, editor of the 'People's Dictionary of the Bible,' Dr. Eadie, editor of the 'Bibilcal Cyclopædia,' and others, lay great stress on the statements of the modern missionaries, that there is no UNintoxicating substance NOW CALLED 'WINE' in the East. The argument is of no value. (1.) Because the various SUBSTANCES anciently called wine are still plentiful in Syria. (2.) Because NAMES and language are undergoing perpetual modifications, and even transformations and inversions. For instance, *sherap* is now 'wine' in the East, but *syrup* in the West, and by the same trickery of words, can be proved to have no existence in the Orient. Nevertheless, there it is, with its *new* name. In India *toddi* is palm-tree-juice, but in Scotland it has become hot *whiskey-and-water*. Homes records that *krasion*, which means 'mixed' merely, has supplanted the old Scripture word, *oinos*, 'wine.' (4.) Because instead of the primitive language, we have only the testimony, concerning *words*, of the mixed population of the Syrian cities, which in other cases has led to erroneous conclusions, and must in this. The parties appealed to are often no more judges of the matter submitted to them than a Cockney would be of old Saxon phrases to be found in the Yorkshire or Cumberland dialects. As Dr. Beard says (under 'Town'), 'It is among the native Aramæan population that the *old* traditions,

knowledge, and NAMES are to be learnt' — not in towns where the language and habits are corrupted by intercourse with twenty foreign nations. (5.) Because the objection equally applies to our own word '*wine*,' where it *demonstratively* terminates in a *falsity*. Ten years back only a few philologists knew that *wine*, one hundred, two hundred, three hundred, and eighteen hundred years ago, *included* "unfermented wines," but that fact is not the less certain, because modern usage and taste have changed. And (6.) Because the alleged fact is no fact at all. *Peckmez*, *Nebidh*, and *Sakar*, in various parts of the East, are still applied, inclusively, to *un*FERMENTED LIQUORS, as they were, originally, *exclusively*."

HIS ARGUMENT.

3. "*The testimony of Holy Scripture.*" — Proof is abundant that unfermented wine exists now in Bible lands, and other lands, and that it existed there in ancient as really as in modern times.

HISTORICAL PROOF.

Captain C. Stuart, of the Madras Army, for fourteen years a resident in Hindostan, and an extensive traveller in the East, says, "The unfermented juice of the grape, and sap of the palm-tree, are common and delightful beverages in India, Persia, Palestine, and other adjacent districts." (Bacchus, p. 195.)

"The *must, as is customary in the East at the present day*, was preserved in large firkins, which were buried in the earth. Formerly, also, *new wine*, or *must*, was preserved in leathern bottles." (Jahn's Bible Archæology, p. 74.)

Dr. Eli Smith, one of Dr. Laurie's four authorities, speaks of the second method of preparing wine in Syria, thus: "The juice of the grape is boiled down before fermentation." — (Bib. Sacra, v. iii. p. 284.)

It was boiled to *prevent* fermentation. After fermentation, as we have said, wine cannot be boiled down to a syrup. The same was true of burying firkins of *must* in the earth. It was done to prevent fermentation; proof that the unfermented juice of the grape was a beverage.

In his "Bible Dictionary," Dr. Smith says (Art. Wine), "A certain amount of juice exuded from the ripe fruit from its own pressure before the treading commenced. This appears to have been kept separate from the rest of the juice, and to have formed the *gleukos*, or 'sweet WINE,' noticed in Acts xi. 13." . . . "Sometimes it was preserved in its unfermented state, and drank as *must*." . . .

Rev. Henry Homes, missionary to Constantinople, wrote, in the "Bibleotheca Sacra," May, 1848: "Simple grape-juice, without the addition of any earth to neutralize the acidity, is boiled from four to five hours, so as to reduce it to ONE-FOURTH the quantity put in. After the boiling, for preserving it cool, and that it may *be less liable to ferment*, it is put into earthen instead of wooden vessels, closely tied over with skin to exclude the air. . . . It, ordinarily, has not a particle of intoxicating quality, being used freely by both Mohammedans and Christians. Some which I have had on hand for two years has undergone no change." And he adds that, "in the manner of making and preserving it, it seems to correspond with the recipes and descriptions of certain drinks included, by some of the ancients, under the appellation, 'wine.'"

Dr. Gobat (Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem) in his Abyssinian "Journal," speaks of the reception of

"some bottles of *grape wine*," (for the sacrament). "The wine," he adds, "is the juice of dried grapes with water."

The Landers say ("Expedition to Niger," vol. iii. chap. 21, p. 307, 1832), that in Fernando Po, at the colony, as well as on the coast, palm wine, "in an unfermented state, when just fresh from the tree, is the common and favorite drink of the natives."

Brown (in "Travels in Africa, Egypt, and Syria, from 1792 to 1798," published 1799, p. 374), says, "Keraswân and Mount Libanus (or Lebanon) produce the best wines in Syria. The wines of Syria are most of them prepared by boiling, immediately after they are expressed from the grape, till they are considerably reduced in quantity."

In 1845, Capt. Treatt wrote, "When on the South coast of Italy, last Christmas, I inquired particularly about the wines in common use, and found that those esteemed the best were sweet and unintoxicating. The boiled juice of the grape is in common use in Sicily. The Calabrians keep their intoxicating and unintoxicating wines in separate apartments. The bottles were generally marked. From inquiries, I found that unfermented wines were esteemed the most. It was drank mixed with water. Great pains were taken, in the vintage season, to have a good stock of it laid by. The grape-juice was filtered two or three times, and then bottled, and some put in casks and buried in the earth. Some kept it in water (to prevent fermentation)." (Dr. Lees' Works, vol. ii., p. 144.)

In the Commentary of Michaelis, a quotation says "Mohammedans of Arabia press the juice of

the grape into a cup, and drink it as Pharaoh did. Milton represents Eve as doing this: —

"For drink the grape she crushes, unoffensive *must*."

And Gray has a similar allusion: —

"Scent the new fragrance of the breathing rose,
And quaff the pendant vintage as it grows."

So, also, Spencer (Book 2, canto 12): —

"In her left hand a cup of gold she held,
And with her right the riper fruit did reach,
Whose sappy liquor that with fullness swelled
Into her cup she scruz'd (pressed) with dainty breach (crush)
Of her fine fingers, without foul impeach,
That so fair a *wine-press* made the *wine* more sweet."

There are frequent similar references by the poets, ancient and modern.

Mr. E. W. Lane, in his notes on the "Arabian Nights Entertainment," says, that while Mahommedans were forbidden the use of intoxicating wines, "there is a kind of wine which Moslems are permitted to drink. It is frequently called 'nebeedh,' and is generally prepared by putting dry grapes, or dry dates, in water, to extract their sweetness." He says the "*prophet himself was in the habit of drinking wine of this kind.*"

Prof. Newmann, in his work of 1709 (p. 442), speaks of a wine "as being no other than boiled *must. Several of the Italian wines are of this sort*, and are called by the general name of Vino Cotto, or boiled wine."

Russell's "Nat. His. of Aleppo" (i. 83) says; "In Syria, the juice of ripe grapes, inspissated, is us-

great quantities in these diseases," showing the existence of unfermented wine.

Mr. Alsop, a minister of the Society of Friends, wrote to Dr. Lees, in 1861 ("Pre. Dis. of Bible Tem. Com." p. 34), "The syrup of grape-juice is an article of domestic manufacture in almost every house in the vine districts of the South of France. It is simply the juice of the grape boiled down to the consistence of treacle. . . . As to the use of ordinary wine, it is almost entirely confined to the *men*. It is proverbial that if a young woman is known to be in the habit of using it, she is unlikely to receive proposals of marriage."

Professor Moses Stuart says, "Facts show that the ancients not only preserved wine unfermented, but regarded it as of a higher flavor and finer quality than fermented wine."

President Nott says, "That unintoxicating wines existed from remote antiquity, and were held in high estimation by the wise and good, there can be no reasonable doubt. The *evidence is unequivocal and plenary*." (Fourth Lec. on Bible Tem., Eng. Ed., p. 50.)

The late Dr. Duffield says ("Bible Rule of Temperance," p. 180), "The modern Turks, whose religion forbids the use of fermented wine, make use of the inspissated juice of the grape, or 'must,' and carry it along with them in their journeys. In India, Persia, and Palestine, — all over the East, — the unfermented juice of the grape and sap of the palm-tree, according to Charles Stuart, are common and delightful beverages. The Landers testify the same of Africa. There is therefore proof abundant, both from ancient authors and modern travellers, that there is a 'fruit of the

vine," which constitutes a nourishing and refreshing drink, but does not contain the properties of fermented wine."

The foregoing authorities are quite sufficient to offset the four cited by Dr. Laurie respecting unfermented wine in modern times. And these are greatly strengthened by the fact that modern chemists furnish recipes for making unfermented wine, and many persons affirm that they manufacture the article now, and have it in their possession.

Professor Liebig, the distinguished German chemist, furnishes the following recipe: "If a flask be filled with grape-juice, and be made air-tight, and then kept for a few hours in boiling water, or until the contained grape-juice has become throughout heated to the boiling-point, the minute amount of oxygen contained in the air, which entered the flask with the grape-juice, becomes absorbed during the operation, by the constituent of the juice, and thus the cause of further perturbation is removed. The wine does not now ferment, but remains perfectly sweet until the flask is again opened, and its contents brought into contact with the air." (Letters on Chemistry, 2d Series, 1844, p. 198.)

"Gardner's Dictionary" (Art. "Wine," 1798) says, "The way to preserve NEW WINE, in the state of *must*, is to put it up in very strong but small casks, firmly closed on all sides, by which means it will be kept from fermenting. But if it should happen to fall into fermentation, the only way to stop it is *by the fume of sulphur*."

Dr. Ure, in his "Dictionary of the Arts," Art. "Fermentation," refers to the practice of preventing

the fermentation of grape-juice by "filtering," and says, that "if the gluten, or yeast, is removed by filtering, or by any other means caused to subside, *fermentation will not take place.*"

Turner's "Chemistry" (p. 119) says, "By heating *must* to 212 degrees, and then corking it carefully, the juice may be preserved without change."

We know, too, that grape-juice is now preserved unfermented, by the officers of some churches, for the sacrament, "in just the way that fruits are canned and preserved."

Dr. Lees (Preliminary Dis. in "Temperance Commentary," p. 34) says, "Now we have not only preserved such wine imported from Florence, for sixteen years together, but we have induced an able chemist to prepare such wine extensively for both medical and sacramental uses." And he quotes the following from Dr. Hassall's report in that popular English medical work, the "Lancet": "Mr. F. Wright, of Kensington, exhibits what he calls sacramental or passover wine, which consists of the unfermented juice of the grape, and is made to meet the views of those ministers who believe that the wine used at the institution of the Lord's Supper was unfermented, and consisted simply of the expressed juice of the grape. It forms a very palatable beverage."

Mr. Delavan says (Letter to Gen. Coke), "When I was in Italy, I had one hundred gallons of the pure fruit of the vine, — wine boiled down, — and after keeping some of it for years in my cellar, I sent a bottle of it to Professor Silliman, of New Haven, who, after subjecting it to chemical test, informed me that he could

not find a particle of alcohol in it." And he further speaks of the manner in which churches can provide themselves with unfermented wine, as follows: —

"There is scarcely a church whose officers could not secure grapes, in their season, in quantities sufficient to prepare wine for sacramental purposes. All they would have to do would be to press out the wine from the grapes, put it into bottles, cork the same; then plunge the mouth of the bottles thus corked into some melted substance, beeswax and rosin, or other substances used to secure preserves from fermentation, and then keep the bottles in the same position, upside down, and deposit them in a cool place in the cellar, for use when required. Thus the pure blood of the grape — the fruit of the vine — unintoxicating wine — could always be secured. Or the same fruit of the vine could be boiled down to one-third, then bottled in the same way as above stated, and when wanted for use diluted with water; this would also be wine — inspissated wine."

Reynolds & Co., of Ripley, Ohio, manufacture a communion wine, which they have introduced into the market under the name of *tirosh*, — unfermented wine. They make about five thousand gallons annually, — a sufficient quantity to supply a large number of churches. Dr. Duffield, whom we have quoted, says of it, "At this day, an admirably pure article is manufactured and sold by J. Reynolds, Esq., of Ripley, Ohio, which, for many years, has been used for communion purposes by the First Presbyterian Church, of Detroit, of which the writer has been pastor now nearly twenty years."*

Rev. B. Parsons, author of "Anti-Bacchus," speaking of the wine manufactured from raisins, and allowed

* Bible Rule of Temperance, note, p. 198.

Roman ladies for a beverage, says ("Anti-Bacchus," p. 82), "I have unfermented wine in my possession which is now sixteen months old, which I have made according to the receipt of Columella,— a receipt written about the time that our Lord lived in Judea."

We might add to the foregoing authorities respecting the existence of unfermented wine in modern times; but it is not necessary. These authorities prove that "modern science" has secured a "wine free from its present possibilities of evil, and yet retaining all its beneficial effects,"—over which fact Dr. Laurie promises to "rejoice with exceeding great joy." And his joy should be magnified, because these testimonies "relate to what has been and is, and not to what may be." And here we must add, by way of parenthesis, that Dr. Laurie's promise to rejoice over any discovery of "modern science" that will remove the bad quality (alcohol), and leave the good, is plainly inconsistent with his view, that intoxicating wine is indispensable to a proper celebration of the Lord's Supper. If it be wrong now to use unintoxicating wine at the sacrament, we suppose it will continue to be wrong in spite of "modern science." We are not able to see exactly where Dr. Laurie's *rejoicing* can come in.

The foregoing view is confirmed by the proof of the existence of unfermented wine in *ancient times*. Columella furnishes the following recipe (b. 12, ch. 29): "That *must* may continue always sweet, as if it were new, manage it thus: before the husks of the grape are put under the press, take the very freshest out of the wine-vat, and put it into a new *amphora*, and daub it and pitch it carefully, that no water at all may en-

ter into it; then sink the whole amphora into a pond of cold and sweet water, so that no part of it may stand out of it; then, after forty days, take it out of the pond; thus it will continue sweet for a whole year."

He gives another, in the same book, p. 27, thus: "Gather the grapes, and expose them for three days to the sun; on the fourth, at mid-day, tread them; take the mustum lixivum, that is, the juice which flows into the lake before you use the press, and when it has settled, add one ounce of pounded iris, strain the wine fæces, and pour it into a vessel. This wine will be sweet, firm, and durable, and healthful to the body."

Cato gives the following recipe for making "*family wine*," — a phrase which denotes a common beverage: "Put eighty gallons of must into a vessel, and sixteen gallons of sharp vinegar; pour into the vessel at the same time sixteen gallons of sapa (wine boiled down to one-third) and four hundred gallons of pure water; let these be well mixed for five days successively; to these ingredients add eight gallons of old sea-water; put the cover on the vessel, and close it up firmly for ten days. This wine will keep until the solstice of the following year, and if any of it remain after that period, it will be very acid and very beautiful." (Cato, de re rustica.)

Pliny speaks of the manufacture of sweet or unfermented wine (lib. 14, cap. 9), and says that it is "*always sweet*," and "*is produced by care*." He says that, in making it, "they plunge the casks, immediately after they are filled from the lake, into water, until winter has passed away, and the wine has acquired the habit of being cold."

Other ancient writers, living about the time of Christ, furnish similar recipes. And the fact that these recipes were furnished to the public is very good evidence of itself that unfermented wine was used as a beverage.

The numerous authorities already cited to show that unfermented grape-juice has always been called "wine," may be recalled here as proof upon this branch of the subject. They prove that unfermented wine existed. But still other testimonies are abundant.

Homer, the Greek poet, lived about one thousand years before Christ; so that his testimony is valuable as covering the times of Old Testament history. And, as the manners and customs of those ages were well-nigh permanent, what he says may be true of hundreds of years before and after he lived. In the ninth book of the "Odyssey," he makes Ulysses say that he took into the boat with him, "a goat-skin of sweet, black wine, — a divine drink, which Muron, the priest of Apollo, had given him." Of the beverage he says, "It was sweet as honey; that it was imperishable, and would keep forever; that when it was drunk, it was diluted with twenty parts water." Its *sweetness*, *thickness*, and the necessity of reducing it with *twenty parts water*, in order to drink it, prove that it was *must*, or unfermented wine.

Aristotle, in his "Meteor" (lib. 4, cap. 9), speaking of "sweet wine," says, "It would not intoxicate." The same writer says that the "wine of Arcadia was so thick, that it was necessary to scrape it from the skin bottles in which it was contained, and to dissolve

the scrapings in water," — a fact which proves that it had not fermented; for, we repeat, fermented wine cannot be thickened by boiling.

Polybius says (sixth book), "Among the Romans, women were forbidden to drink wine; they drank a wine that was called passon (Latin, passum), and this was made from dried grapes or raisins. As a drink it very much resembled Ægosthenian and Cretan (gleukos) sweet wine, and which is used for the purpose of allaying thirst." Ælian makes a similar statement in Var. His., lib. 2, cap. 38. So, also, Athæneus, in lib. 10, cap. 7. Also, Valerius Maximus in lib. 2, cap. 1. Also, Pliny, Nat. His., lib. 14, cap. 13.

Here is positive proof that unfermented wine existed, since Roman ladies, who were forbidden to drink intoxicating wine, could drink this.

In the Delphian edition of Horace, we are told that "Lesbian wine could injure no one; that, as it could neither affect the head, nor inflame the passions, there was no fear that those who drank it would become quarrelsome." It is added, "It is harmless, and would not produce intoxication."

Pliny speaks (lib. 14, cap. 2) of "a *wine* which would not intoxicate." Columella, also (lib. 3, cap. 2), speaks of "a wine which would not intoxicate." Pliny says further of "*murrina*," that "it was a *wine* not mixed with myrrh, but a very sweet, aromatic drink, much approved of by Roman ladies, and conceded to them because *it would not inebriate*."

Mr. Buckingham says that *gleukos*, or *mustum*, is called, in Smyrna, "the droppings of the wine-press," or "virgin wine," and adds that he has drank it, and

found it delicious. Of course, the "droppings of the wine-press" are unfermented.

Plutarch, in his "Sympos," réfers to the method of preventing the fermentation of wine by filtering, as explained by Dr. Ure, whom we have quoted. Plutarch says, "Wine is rendered old, or *feeble in strength*, when it is frequently filtered; this percolation makes it more pleasant to the palate; the *strength* of the wine is thus *taken away* without any injury to its pleasing flavor. The *strength*, or *spirit*, being thus *withdrawn* or *excluded*, the wine *neither inflames the head*, nor *infests the minds and the passions*, but is much more pleasant to drink. Doubtless defecation takes away the *spirit*, or *potency*, that torments the head of the drinker; and, this being removed, the wine is reduced to a state both *mild*, *salubrious*, and *wholesome*." Here is a writer on conviviality, — one who associated with drinkers, — who asserts that these unintoxicating wines were most esteemed.

In "Horace" ("Delphin Notes," lib. 1, ode 2), there is reference to the same mode of preventing fermentation. "Be careful to prepare for yourself wine percolated and defecated *by the filter*, and thus rendered sweet, and more in accordance to nature, *and a female taste*." Females, as we have seen, were not allowed to drink intoxicating wine. It was this kind of wine which Theophrastus so appropriately called "*moral wine*." The mischief wrought by fermented wine ought, long since, to have earned for it the title of "immoral wine."

Pliny, also, speaks of this method. "The juice was frequently filtered before it could have fermented."

And he adds, "All the power of the wine was broken by the filter."

Donovan's "Domestic Economy" (p. 24) says, "Many of the *wines* described by the ancients seem to have been rather the *stock* from which wine was to be made than the wine itself. They were often so *thick* as to require solution in hot water, and filtration, before they were fit for drinking, as appears from the statements of Pliny and Aristotle."

Herodotus says (lib. 3, i. 6) that the Egyptian priests were allowed to drink "oinos ampelinos," "wine from the vine," which Bishop Lowth says ("Notes on Isaiah," chap. 5) means a wine similar to that drunk by Pharaoh, and was unfermented; for it was "only the fresh juice pressed from the grape, and was called *oinos ampelinos.*"

Xenophon says that when in Anatola, "the wine froze in their vessels," — clear proof of their weakness, since alcohol will not freeze.

Calmet says, "The ancients had the secret of preserving wine sweet throughout the year."

Henderson, in his "History of Wines," commenting on the "boiled wine" used by Roman ladies, and referred to by Virgil ("Georgics," I., 293, 295) says, "The use of this inspissated juice became general." Cobbold versifies the passage of Virgil, to which Henderson refers, thus: —

> "The industrious dame anon
> Sings to the whizzing wheel she urges on;
> *Boils the sweet must,* slow simmering by her side,
> And skims with leaves the cauldron's bubbling tide."

Sir Edward Barry says of the ancients, "Grapes

became at first a usual article of their aliment, and the recently expressed juice a cooling drink." Mohammed, whose followers are prohibited the use of intoxicating wine, says, in the Koran, "Of grapes ye obtain an inebriating liquor, and also a good nourishment," — evidently condemning the bad use (inebriating wine), and approving the good use (either the grape as food, or the juice unfermented).

We have thus quoted from many writers of different ages and countries, and might quote from many more, were it necessary, to prove that unfermented wine has existed from remote antiquity. All the authorities cited, prove, also, how generally the unfermented juice of the grape has been called "wine."

We may add, also, that nearly all the authorities cited speak of a wine that cursed mankind, demoralizing their characters and spreading desolation, woe, and death. They could not express themselves more emphatically in describing the evils of such wine, were they tectotalers living at the present time. And this fact alone is positive proof that they recognized two kinds of wine, — good and bad, fermented and unfermented. Their approbation is of wine *before* fermentation; their condemnation of it *after* fermentation.

BIBLICAL PROOF, — OLD TESTAMENT.

Dr. Laurie consumes much space to prove that certain words, in the original text of the Bible, translated "wine," mean that which intoxicates. We agree with him in respect to nearly every word he considers. We take issue with him chiefly upon the meaning of TIROSH alone.

That the Bible speaks of two kinds of wine, there can be no doubt. It pronounces one of them a *blessing*, and the other a *curse*. It teaches us to *touch* one of them, but *not to touch* the other. It employs one as the symbol of divine *mercy*, and the other as the symbol of divine *wrath*. In short, it speaks of one as *good*, and the other as *bad*. Now, it cannot be that the same beverage is meant by these opposite appellations. The *good wine* cannot be the same beverage as the *bad wine;* that which man is *allowed to drink* cannot be the same as that which he is *forbidden* to drink, in the same circumstances; that which *cheers the heart*, and symbolizes prosperity and peace, must differ from that which is a "*mocker*," and which "biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." The two things are as different as light and darkness, right and wrong. When black and white can mean the same thing, then the aforesaid Bible wines, approved and condemned, may mean the same beverage, and not till then. And what quality can there be in the wine that is condemned to deserve condemnation, except the *intoxicating* quality? Is there anything in wine to make it a "mocker" except the *alcohol?* These inquiries answer themselves. Here is the chemical analysis of the two: —

TIROSH, — WINE "IN THE CLUSTER." *Isaiah* lxv. 8.	YAIN, — THE "MOCKER." *Prov.* xx. 1.
Gluten — plentiful, and forms blood.	Alcohol — powerful narcotic.
Sugar — large amount.	Œnanthic Acid.
Gum.	Œnanthic Ether.
Aromas.	Essential or Volatile Oils.
Malic Acid and Citric Acids — small quantities.	Acetic Acid.
Phosphorus and Sulphur.	Sulphate of Potash.
Bitrate of Potash.	Aroma.
Tartrate of Lime.	Chlorides of Potassium and Sodium.
Water.	Tannin and coloring matter.
	Undecomposed sugar, gum, and extractive matter, in *small quantities.*

In TIROSH — unfermented wine — there is not a deleterious element. *Gluten* makes blood, and *sugar* is "nutritive." But after fermentation, the elements, as the analysis shows, are changed. Both gluten and *sugar* are destroyed, and *alcohol* and other constituents take their place. The first six constituents of fermented wine are not found in the unfermented. Among them is *alcohol*, — a poison, and highly intoxicating, made from the sugar.

Here is positive proof that wine is a different article after fermentation. How appropriate for the Bible to say of Tirosh — new wine — "As the wine (tirosh) is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not, for a *blessing* is in it"! It is equally appropriate for the Bible to say of the other: "Wine (yain) is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and whoso is deceived thereby is not wise." Would it be appropriate to apply the latter to the former, and say of *tirosh*, "Wine is a mocker," etc.? Of course it would not; it would array the Bible against science. The foregoing analysis shows that the Bible harmonizes with science, by approving unfermented wine and condemning fermented wine. It sets the Bible against science to make it approve intoxicating wine, whose *nutritive* element is destroyed by fermentation; and it exposes it to the charge of *inconsistency* also, by making it both *approve* and *condemn* the same wine; teach its readers both to *use it* and *let it alone;* assert that the same wine is both *good* and *bad*. Now, Dr. Laurie himself says that "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," which is true; and for this reason we object to his argument.

How beautifully, too, the foregoing analysis harmonizes with the counsel in Proverbs xxiii. 31: "Look not thou upon the wine *when* it is red, *when* it giveth his color in the cup, *when* it showeth itself aright;" — referring to the time of fermentation. That is, look not upon the wine *when it has fermented. Before* it ferments ["showeth itself aright"] you may look upon it.

Professor Moses Stuart says: —

"Wine and strong drink are a good, a blessing, a token of divine favor, and to be ranked with corn and oil. The same substances are also an evil. Their use is prohibited; and woe is denounced to all who seek for them. Is there a contradiction here,— a paradox incapable of any satisfactory solution? Not at all. We have seen that these substances were employed by the Hebrews in two different states; the one was a fermented state, the other an unfermented one. . . . Is there any serious difficulty now in acquitting the Scriptures of contradiction in respect to this subject? I do not find any. . . . I can only say, that to me it seems plain, — so plain that no wayfaring man need to mistake it. My final conclusion is this: namely, that whenever the Scriptures speak of wine as a comfort, a blessing, or a libation to God, and rank it with such articles as corn and oil, they mean — they can mean — only such wine as contained no alcohol, that could have a mischievous tendency; that wherever they denounce it, prohibit it, and connect it with drunkenness and revelling, they can mean only alcoholic or intoxicating wine. If I take the position that God's word and works entirely harmonize, *I must take the position that the Bible before us is such as I have represented it to be.* . . . I cannot refuse to take this position, without virtually impeaching the Scriptures of contradiction, or inconsistency."

President Nott says (Third Lec. on Bible Tem. Eng. Ed., p. 30): —

"Can the same thing in the same state be good and bad; a symbol of wrath, a symbol of mercy; a thing to be sought after, and a thing to be avoided? Certainly not. And is the Bible, then, inconsistent with itself? No, it is not."

He proceeds to show how this "seeming inconsistency will vanish," by explaining the matter precisely as Professor Stuart does. He adds: —

"There is a wine of some sort, spoken of very frequently in the Bible with express disapprobation, or in connection with drunken feasts, as an emblem of temporal and eternal judgment. And there is also a wine, spoken of with express approbation, or in connection with religious festivals, or as an emblem of temporal and eternal blessings. That wines of such different qualities, and presented in such different aspects, and even in such fearful and frightful contrast, were one and the same article, in one and the same state, would seem, even though history, both sacred and profane, had been silent, *quite incredible*. How much more so now that in place of silence, history, both sacred and profane, hath spoken, and spoken not of their identity, but known and marked dissimilarity."

Professor Taylor Lewis, of Union College, Dr. F. R. Lees, and Dr. Dawson Burns, of England, and other distinguished biblical scholars of our times, take a similar view.

It is not necessary to dwell on single texts of Scripture. The texts already quoted to prove that the Bible itself calls the unfermented juice of the grape "wine," are proof that, in Bible times and lands, there was an unintoxicating wine.

But all the direct indorsements of wine in the Bible are connected with the word *tirosh*, which is found, as Dr. Laurie says, *thirty-eight* times in the Scriptures. Without delaying to speak of its reference to vine-fruit in such passages as tell of "gathering" tirosh (Deut.

xi. 14), "eating" tirosh (Deut. vii. 17), etc., we affirm that in every passage claimed to refer to the *liquid* product of the vine, it is spoken of as a blessing. There is no denunciation of this beverage, no warning against its use. This is not true of one of the eight other Hebrew words translated "wine" in the Old Testament. So that the fact that there is not found a single condemnation of the wine which the Hebrews called *tirosh* in the Bible is of itself remarkable. It should raise the inquiry, What sort of wine was it? It was NEW WINE, the unfermented juice of the grape. Dr. Laurie claims that Gesenius, the eminent Hebrew scholar, is right, when he says of tirosh, "*to seize, to take possession*," "so called, because it gets possession of the brain, inebriates." But it must be admitted that other Hebrew scholars controvert Gesenius' etymology. Dr. Smith, in his "Bible Dictionary" (and Dr. Laurie quotes him as high authority), refers to this opinion of Gesenius, and adds that Bythner supposed it to refer to "the wine as a possession in the eyes of the Hebrews." And Professor Taylor Lewis, in a letter to Dr. F. R. Lees, of England, says, "I regard Gesenius' derivation of (תִּירוֹשׁ) tirosh, from יָרַשׁ 'to possess,' because 'it *possesses* the brain of the one who drinks,' and must therefore be intoxicating, as one of the most absurd etymologies ever offered. Had it come originally from some English or American scholar, instead of our 'learned German,' it would have been *hooted* as utterly unworthy of notice." Still more: Gesenius himself, in Isaiah xxiv. 17, gives to "*tirosh*" the sense of "clusters," thus denying his own etymology, "to inebriate," while it is perfectly consist-

ent with Bythner's view, "a possession in the eyes of the Hebrews."

That Bythner's view of the term is far more natural than that of Gesenius, appears from its harmony with facts. Among the Hebrews, corn, oil, and wine represented field-fruit, orchard-fruit, and vine-fruit. They were coveted possessions. A vineyard was a treasure to its owner, chiefly for food. Of Gaal and his brethren it is said (Judges ix. 27), that "they went out into the field and gathered in their grapes, and did eat and drink." They ate grapes, and expressed the juice of grapes and drank it, as Pharaoh's cup-bearer expressed the juice of grapes for immediate use (Gen. xl. 4). President Nott, alluding to another text says, "In connection with the blessings conferred on Jacob (honey, oil, butter, milk, etc.), it is said (Deut. xxxii. 14) that he drank (dham ænabh hhamer) *the pure blood of the grape.* In the Septuagint this is translated, 'of the blood of the grape thou didst drink (oinon) wine.' The allusion probably was to the simple must of red grapes, the most-approved grapes. Among the principal things enumerated as needful to man are 'water, flour, honey, milk, and *the blood of the grape*,' meaning with the ancients *grape-juice.*" ("Bible Temperance," Eng. Ed., p. 34.)

Rev. Henry Homes, missionary at Constantinople, says ("Bibliotheca Sacra," May, 1848), "The fabrication of an intoxicating liquor *was never the chief object* for which the grape was cultivated among the Jews. Joined with bread, fruits, and the olive-tree, the three might well be representatives of the

productions most essential to them, at the same time that they were those most abundantly provided for the support of life. He mentions sixteen uses of the grape, wine-making being *the least important*, and their use as food *the most important*. He adds, "I have asked Christians from Diarbekir, Aintab, and other places in the interior of Asia Minor, and all concur in the same statement." Dr. Eli Smith writes of Syria, "*Wine is not the most important, but the least so*, of all the objects for which the vine is cultivated." ("Bib. Sacra," Nov., 1846.) Dr. Robinson says, "No wine is made from the very extensive vineyards of Hebron, except a little by the Jews." ("Bible Researches," ii., p. 442.) Rev. S. Robson, missionary at Damascus, wrote to the "Missionary Herald," 1845, "From August to December, bread and grapes are substantially the food of the people." Dr. Duff ("Missionary Record," 1840) describes his journey through France to India, and says, "Look at the peasant at his meals in vine-bearing districts! Instead of milk, he has a basin of pure, unadulterated blood of the grape. In this, its native original state, it is a plain, simple, and wholesome liquid, which, at every repast, becomes to the husbandman what milk is to the shepherd,—not a luxury, but a necessary; not an intoxicating, but a nutritive, beverage."

Thus, reliable authorities maintain that grapes were raised in Bible lands for *food;* so that a vineyard was valuable, in the same sense as a grain-field or orchard was valuable. And Gesenius' etymology of *tirosh* is so inconsistent with these facts as to justify Prof. Lewis in saying that if it had come from some Ameri-

can or English author, it would have been "*hooted* as utterly unworthy of notice." But the view of Bythner, Drusius,* Dr. Lees, and others, namely, "*to possess*" refers to "the wine as a *possession* in the eyes of the Hebrews," is in complete harmony with these facts, as well as with all such passages as "Inheritance of fields and vineyards." (Num. xvi. 14.) "Thou shalt gather in thy corn, thy wine (tirosh), and thy oil." (Deut. xi. 14.) "Thou shalt eat within thy gates the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine (tirosh), of thy oil." (Deut. vii. 17.)

We have said that *tirosh* is always associated with *blessing* in the Bible. One passage is claimed by Dr. Laurie as proving the intoxicating nature of *tirosh*, and disconnected with *blessing*. It is Hos. iv. 11. "Whoredom, wine (yain), and new wine (tirosh), take away the heart." If both *yain* and *tirosh* mean intoxicating wine, what sense is there in using both? Read it, "whoredom, intoxicating wine, and intoxicating wine take away the heart." What sense is there in this use of terms? On the other hand, give to each term its true meaning, just as the passage stands, understanding *new wine* to be the unfermented juice of the grape, and there is both force and propriety in the text. "The three nouns symbolize," says Dr. Lees, "idolatry, drunkenness, and luxury." That is, they represent different things.

Dr. Laurie appears to think that a *good thing* cannot "take away the heart." He concludes that *tirosh*

* Drusius, in 1617, commenting on Gen. xxvii. 28, observes that "the idea of 'possession' is implied in tirosh, because amongst those *things which a man possessed* by *inheritance*, vintage-produce was the chief, and received the name by way of distinction."

must certainly mean intoxicating wine here, because it "takes away the heart." This is not a correct conclusion, since the Bible is continually representing the heart as being captivated, or *taken away*, by legitimate things. Men are warned against such absorption in their honest pursuits as to forget God, — have their hearts turned from him. Martha's heart was *taken away* from Christ by household cares. We are not to infer, however, that domestic duties are an evil because they sometimes take away the heart. One of the prominent evils in the church is that members allow their hearts to be turned away from Christ by necessary business, in which the support of their families is concerned. The term "*heart*," in this passage, is not synonymous with "reason," as Dr. Laurie says. It refers to the seat of the *affections* in distinction from the seat of the "*reason*," and means *turning away* the soul from God. Now, a vineyard, which, at that day, as we have seen, was the owner's wealth and business, as really as a merchant's store is now, might "*take away the heart*" as effectually as a man's business does take away his heart at the present day. The Saviour put this strongly when he showed that a man's heart might be turned away from Christ by buying a "piece of ground," "five yoke of oxen," and even by "marrying a wife." (Luke xiv. 18–21.)

This is the only passage in which *tirosh* is found that Dr. Laurie cites to prove that tirosh means *intoxicating* wine. Were there other passages, of course he would quote them. Were it true that this passage teaches apparently just what Dr. Laurie would have it teach, should we allow a single passage to offset

the other thirty-seven passages in which *tirosh* is found? Rather would wisdom decide that this must harmonize, in its teaching, with the other passages, even though we might be wholly unable to show the harmony.

It is a singular fact that Gesenius, whom Dr. Laurie represents as the prince of Hebrew lexicographers, and who does not agree with Dr. Lees in his view of *tirosh*, generally, nevertheless renders *tirosh*, in this passage, "*vine-fruit*," precisely as Dr. Lees does; thus contributing his learning and research to support our view of the subject. He recognizes the fact that *tirosh*, as a "possession," may "take away the heart."

At this point, Dr. Laurie indulges another fallacy. Explaining the passage that speaks of "wine in the cluster," he remarks, "Job says (xxvii. 5) that, 'as for the earth out of it cometh bread;' that is, that which makes bread; just as Isaiah says that new wine is in the cluster; that is, that which yields new wine."

Here is a flat contradiction of science. The earth yields the very materials out of which bread is made, — the corn, rye, wheat, — and these materials are nutritive, healthful, life-supporting in the bread just as they are in the kernel. On the other hand, the vine does not furnish *alcohol* that makes wine intoxicating, as we have seen. That is the product of *decay*, *putrefaction*. The nutritive, life-supporting principle of the cluster is destroyed before intoxicating wine can be furnished. Professor Liebig says, "Fermentation is nothing else but the *putrefaction* of a substance containing no nitrogen. *Ferment*, or

yeast, is a substance in a state of *putrefaction.*" The product of the vine must *putrefy* before it can intoxicate. But this is not true of the materials which the earth yields for bread. Hence, Dr. Laurie's view that the cluster yields intoxicating wine just as the earth yields bread, has no foundation in truth; it is scientifically *false.*

We come now to the word יין, *yain*, which is found one hundred and forty-one times in the Bible. Dr. Laurie says, "The idea is advanced by some that תירש is the word uniformly used when the Bible makes favorable mention of wine, and יין when it is mentioned unfavorably." This is not so. We say that all the clear *indorsements* of "wine" are found in connection with *tirosh.* But we admit that there is an *implied* permission of the use of wine in twenty-four passages in which *yain* is found, — a generic term, as we have seen, embracing both fermented and unfermented wine. We maintain, however, that not one of these twenty-four texts speaks of fermented wine. The connection of each passage is such as to force the conclusion that *un*fermented wine was intended.

First, Dr. Laurie is in error when he says that "much less than half the passages in which יין (*yain*) occurs indicate a reprehensible use." For "actual count" shows that of the one hundred and forty-one texts, *seventy-one* (which is full half) sound notes of warning against the use of wine. Surely, in those passages which he cites, — "Noah awoke from his wine" (Gen. ix. 24); "When the wine was gone out of Nabal" (1 Sam. xxv. 27); "How long wilt thou be drunken? Put away thy wine from thee" (1 Sam. i.

14), — no sanction for the use of wine can be discovered. These and kindred passages warn the reader against the "mocker." Of the one hundred and forty-one texts named, *thirty-three* are neutral; that is, they do not indicate a good or bad wine. This leaves only twenty-four passages (about *one-sixth* of the whole instead of *one-half*, as he indicates) which contain an *implied* sanction. We need not speak of all these passages; it is necessary to speak only of those to which Dr. Laurie calls attention to show that none of them can sanction intoxicating wine.

In Gen. xiv. 18, we read, "And Melchizedec, King of Salem, *brought forth bread and wine*. And he was the priest of the most high God." Dr. L. claims that these two godly men drank intoxicating wine. Where is the proof that it was intoxicating? From the text no proof can be gathered that it was either intoxicating or unintoxicating. But the *circumstances* indicate that it was the harmless, unfermented juice of the grape. Here was pious Abraham, returning from a warlike expedition, and Melchizedec, "the priest of the most high God," recognizing before God, with grateful hearts, the deliverance of their country from foreign invaders — and these men celebrate the triumph with the intoxicating cup! The thought dishonors religion. When "priests of the most high God," and prominent members of the church, do that now, the public feel that Christ is reproached. We said that the text itself furnishes no proof on either side. We think, however, when the fact that "bread and grapes," in all lands and ages of vineyards, have been staple articles of food, is considered, that the connection of "wine"

with "bread" in the passage, does intimate that it was the pure, unfermented "fruit of the vine" that was used.

Again, in Numbers vi. 20, it is said that the Nazarite may drink wine at the expiration of his vow. What proof is there that he might drink *intoxicating* wine? During his "separation," he could not drink either fermented or unfermented wine, nor even eat the grapes which the vine yielded. At the expiration of his vow, he could drink wine; was it necessarily intoxicating wine? Why must we conclude that it was the worst sort of wine? Rather do the circumstances teach that it must have been the harmless fruit of the vine. For the Nazarite's vow bound him to more complete consecration to the service of God; would intoxicating wine help him? How much more consistent is the view of Prof. Moses Stuart, who says, "Everything which might have even a *tendency* to inspire them with a taste for inebriating liquor was to be most carefully avoided!" And of Matthew Henry, the commentator, "They were to eat nothing that came of the vine, to teach us with the utmost care and caution to avoid sin and everything that borders on it, and leads to it, or may be a temptation to us." And Ainsworth remarks, "By this prohibition God taught the Nazarites sanctification in mortifying the lusts of the flesh, for the drinking of these endangereth men to forget the love of God, to mock and to rage." There is nothing about the expiration of the Nazarite's vow to indicate that intoxicating wine was used; but the opposite.

Again Daniel speaks of his fasting thus (Dan. x. 3): "I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor *wine*

(יין) into my mouth, till three whole weeks were fulfilled." Dr. Laurie thinks that Daniel drank wine *before;* but what proof that it was intoxicating? None at all. Besides, Dr. L. thinks that all the Daniels are under solemn obligation to practise total abstinence now; why was not the original Daniel under the same obligation? Why conclude that the good man drank the worst kind of wine? He *ate no flesh*; shall we conclude that he ate *pork*, and all other flesh, after his temporary abstinence? Dr. Lees (B. T. C., p. 216) has the following note on this passage: "That somebody consumed these innocent vinous preparations is certain. Is it probable that the prophets and saints were the *sole* persons who refused to do so? Is it likely that while moral pagans preferred good wines, the prophets and religious Jews invariably selected the drugged and intoxicating? But the associated element of Daniel's abstinence will refute the whole principle of the argument. He abstained from flesh. Does this imply, because the term is generic, that before and after his temporary abstinence from *all* animal food he consumed *pork*, and every other ordinary form of flesh? If there was discrimination in the case of the meat, why not in the case of the wine?"

In like manner, other passages which Dr. Laurie cites, as, "The children say to their mothers, where is corn and wine?" and 1 Sam. xvi. 20, and xxv. 18, etc., etc., furnish no evidence at all of an intoxicating wine. On the other hand, the connection in which wine is often used, as "corn and wine," and "wheat, barley, bottles of wine and oil," indicates that it was the nutritious and healthful fruit of the wine, like wheat

or barley, before its nutriment was destroyed by fermentation or "putrefaction."

Dr. Laurie refers to two passages in connection, and they deserve attention. He says, "Isaiah lxv. 1, sets forth the blessing of the gospel under the symbols of wine (יַיִן) and milk. Zephaniah denounces it as a judgment from God (i. 13): 'Ye shall plant vineyards, but shall not drink the wine thereof.'" In one of these passages, wine is used as a symbol of divine *mercy*, and in the other a symbol of divine *wrath*, — the same generic word, *yain*, used in both texts. We have seen that *yain*, as a generic term, includes both fermented and unfermented wine. Is it reasonable that the inspired penman employs the same kind of wine both as a symbol of *wrath* and *mercy?* Is there anything else of which this is true? "*Bread*" is used as a symbol of mercy, and so are "*milk*" and "*oil*." Are they ever employed as a symbol of *wrath?* Never. Neither is the unfermented fruit of the vine used as a symbol of *wrath*. It is the *changed*, *innutritious*, *alcoholic*, *dangerous* wine that is an appropriate symbol of divine wrath. This view alone renders the Bible consistent, and in harmony with science and experience.

The foregoing must suffice for an examination of *yain*. Not one of the twenty-four texts in which *yain* indicates a *permitted* use of wine refers to an intoxicating beverage. Understanding them to mean the unfermented juice of the grape is alone consistent with the circumstances.

The same is true of the word *sheechar*. We need not stop to show that good authorities agree that the translation of it, "*strong drink*," is not happy, since

there is nothing equivalent to the word "strong" in the Hebrew. It is not necessary to our purpose to consider that point, since in every case we are warned against its use *as a beverage*, as in the first passage in which it is found in the Bible (Lev. x. 9): "Do not drink wine nor strong drink (shechar,)" etc. Dr. L. admits, with Gesenius and Prof. Stuart, that the term is *generic;* and we have shown that a generic term may cover both fermented and unfermented wine. The word presents a striking contrast with *tirosh*, which approves of "wine" in every instance, while this condemns its use, as a beverage, in every instance. The passage in Deut. xiv. 26, relates to a religious ordinance: "And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen or for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth; and *thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God;* and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy household," — the tithes of the Israelite's increase to be partaken in the tabernacle "*before the Lord.*" Is it probable that God would appoint a *fermented* beverage to be used in that solemn service, when (1.) according to second chapter of Leviticus, all *fermented* things were excluded from sacrifices to God; and (2.) he destroyed the sons of Aaron for intoxication in the tabernacle, and, in consequence, prohibited priests thereafter from drinking wine in his courts? Still more, even the use of intoxicating wine in a religious service cannot be a sanction of its use as a beverage. Dr. Laurie admits this. For while he maintains that the Saviour used intoxicating wine at the institution

of the Supper, he affirms the duty of totally abstaining from the use of wine as a beverage.

So, also, the passage in Prov. xxxi. 6: "Give strong drink to him that is ready to perish, and wine to those that be of heavy hearts. Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more." The editor of the "Christian at Work" recently published the card of a Chicago rumseller, on which this passage was printed as an indorsement of his business. We commend the fact to those persons who cite this passage to sanction the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. If the passage teaches the use of inebriating liquors, then it teaches drinkers *to get drunk*, — drown their sorrows in drink, — which we know to be false, since drunkenness is elsewhere forbidden. Nor is this God's way to "remember misery no more;" but "cast thy burden on the Lord [not the bottle], and he will sustain thee." "Call upon ME in the day of trouble, and I will deliver thee." If the passage speaks of intoxicating wine, it must teach the use of it as Paul did Timothy (1 Tim. v. 23), *as a medicine*. If it speaks of unfermented wine, then it cannot be an indorsement of that which intoxicates.

The term *asis* is found five times only in the Scriptures. In three passages (Cant. viii. 2; Joel iii. 18; and Amos ix. 13) there is an *implied* legitimate use of wine; but in each instance the unfermented juice is clearly meant. In the other two (Is. xlix. 6 and Joel i. 5) God warns against its use.

The term *sobhe* is found but three times (Is. i. 22; Hos. iv. 18, and Na. i. 10). It refers to the harmless, "inspissated wine," or boiled juice of the grape. The

latter passage warns against drinking it to excess, being derived from *sabha*, "to drink to satiety."

Chemer is found eight times, and refers to intoxicating wine. In neither instance is it sanctioned.

Shemarim occurs four times, in words of warning, except in Is. xxv. 6: "And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, *a feast of wines on the lees*, of fat things full of marrow, *of wine on the lees well refined.*" It is claimed by some that old fermented wine is here referred to. Nothing can be clearer, however, than that the wine in this text must be different from the wine in Ps. lxxv. 8, where the same word is used: "For in the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red; it is full of mixture," etc. Heavenly blessings are represented by the first, and divine wrath by the latter. Hence, Rev. Wm. Ritchie says of Isaiah xxv. 6, "We are led to think of the rich, refreshing, unfermented juice of the grape, the pure wine which makes glad man's heart. This alone is a fit emblem of the heavenly blessings of salvation, which are here promised by God to our ruined world." And he speaks of the *filtering process* mentioned by Dr. Ure to prevent fermentation as what is meant by "well refined." "The term thus becomes a brief name for the richest and best wines. But such wine needed to be strained ere it could be used, and hence the words added by the prophet, 'well refined.' Here, however, the whole tone of thought and expression forbids the idea of supposing the inspired penman to speak, in his promise, of intoxicating wine." Dr. F. R. Lees says, (Works, vol. ii. p. 152), "*shemarim*, 'pre-

serves,' or jellies, derived from the verb *shamar*, 'to preserve.' It is translated 'wines on the lees' in Is. xxv. 6; in the three other passages in which it occurs by 'dregs' or 'lees' alone. This may be a secondary sense indeed, but dregs of wine can form no part of a delicious feast; while in the East various species of '*preserves*' are highly esteemed. Our older translators so understood the word. Coverdale in Is. xxv. 6, renders it 'sweet things;' the 'Bishop's Bible' (1568), 'delicate things,' and 'most pleasant dishes.' Forerius and Grotius, '*a feast of vine-fruit*' (vindemiæ)."

Rev. Benjamin Parsons ("Anti-Bacchus," pp. 47–8) says of this text, "This passage receives a striking illustration from Pliny. Speaking of the tipplers of his time he says, 'That we may take the more wine we break its strength by the filter.' The most useful wine is that which has had *all* its strength broken by the filter. In the notes on the Delphin edition of 'Horace,' Car. Lib. xi. 6, it is said, 'The ancients filtered their wines repeatedly before they could have fermented, and thus the fæces which nourish the strength of the wine being taken away, they rendered the wine itself more liquid, weaker, lighter, sweeter, and more pleasant to drink.' The fæces which were here taken away were no doubt the gluten which, though not known at that time by its scientific name, was the active principle of fermentation; and Dr. Ure, in his late 'Dictionary of the Arts,' on the word 'Fermentation,' tells us, that if the 'gluten or yeast' is removed by filtering, or by any other means is caused to subside, fermentation will not take place. See, then, how exactly the words of the prophet and of these naturalists agree,

Isaiah speaks of 'preserved wines well refined,' or 'well filtered.' Pliny tells us that wines were thus filtered to destroy their strength or spirit, and that the wines which had *all* their strength broken by the filter were the best wines. The Delphin commentator adds that this filtering took place before they could have fermented; and Dr. Ure informs us that when this is done grape-juice will not ferment. Hence, then, we learn that the *shemarim*, the 'wines on the lees,' or 'preserved wines well refined,' mentioned by Isaiah, were unfermented wines, were wines without any strength or spirit, and on that account were most esteemed in ancient days, and called the best and most useful wines. The harmless, nutritious drink, therefore, is the beverage to which God compares the blessings of the gospel feast."

The term *mesech* is found in three texts (Ps. lxxv. 8, Prov. xxiii. 30, and Is. lxv. 11), and condemned in all of them.

The term *eshishah* is found four times (2 Sam. vi. 19; 1 Chron. xvi. 3; Cant. ii. 5; Hos. iii. 1); in all of which, as Dr. Laurie admits, there is no reference to wine, but to "cakes."

Thus in the Old Testament we find no indorsement of intoxicating wine. Where the word itself, in texts of approval, does not indicate the unfermented juice of the grape, the *circumstances* warrant no other conclusion.

Dr. Laurie admits that in Num. vi. 3, "Neither shall he drink any liquor of grapes," refers to "a drink made in that way [steeping], *and drank before it ferments.*" We think that Gen. xl. 30, is even

more decisive. "And Pharaoh's cup was in my hand; and I took the grapes and pressed it into Pharaoh's cup, and I gave the cup into Pharaoh's hand." Baxter's "Comprehensive Bible" has the following note on this passage. "From this we find that wine anciently was the mere expressed juice of the grape [still another instance of calling the unfermented juice 'wine'], without fermentation. The saca or cup-bearer took the bunch, pressed the juice into the cup, and instantly delivered it to the master." The "Comprehensive Commentary" remarks: "Probably it had been usual with him to press the full, ripe grapes immediately into Pharaoh's cup." "This," remarks Rosenmüller upon the passage, "is conformable to the Egyptian customs. The Egyptians drank no wine from the age of Psammetichus, nor offered it to their gods, being taught by their priests that there was something pestiferous in wine." And *Michaelis*, "Thus the chief butler, in this passage, does not pour out wine for Pharaoh; but only mixes the juice of ripe grapes with water."

Thus far we have taken only a negative view of the subject, — that the Old Testament does not sanction the use of intoxicating wine as a beverage. Much strength is added to this view by turning to the *positive* side, and observing the strong denunciations of fermented wine as a beverage.

"Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging; and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise." (Prov. xx. 1.) "Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? who hath babbling? who hath wounds without cause? who hath redness of eyes? They that

tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine. . . Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, etc. . . At the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder." (Prov. xxiii. 29–32.) "They also have erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way; the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine; they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment. For all places are full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place clean." (Is. xxviii. 7, 8.) "Thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Drink ye and be drunken, and spue, and fall, and rise no more, because of the sword which I will send among you." (Jer. xxv. i. 27.) "Be not among wine-bibbers; among riotous eaters of flesh." (Prov. xxiii. 20.) "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink; that continue until night, till wine inflame them. . . . Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink. . . Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim, whose glorious beauty is a fading flower, which are on the head of the fat valleys of them that are overcome with wine." (Is. v. 11, 22, and 28.) "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that puttest thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken also." (Hab. ii. 15.) Consider, too, that the bitter woes experienced by God's chosen people, including their captivity, are ascribed to intoxicating drinks. (Is. v. 11, 22; Amos vi. 1, 6; Hab. ii. 15, 16.) It is predicted as one of the great curses that God would inflict on Israel, calling it the poison of

dragons, and the cruel venom of asps" (Deut. xxxii. 31–34), the "wine-cup of his fury" (Jer. xxv. 15), and the "cup of astonishment and desolation" (Ezek. xxiii. 33), and much more of kindred character.

It is worthy of note that the Bible supports the view that alcohol is *poison*. The Hebrew word for "poison" is *khamah*. This word is found in the two following passages with others: "Adder's *poison* is under their lips." (Ps. cxl. 3.) "Their *wine* is the *poison* of dragons." (Deut. xxxii. 33.) If the idea of "poison" is found in the first passage, so it is in the second. Hence, some commentators translate the passage in Habakkuk ii. 15, thus: "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy *khamah* (poison) to him!" Instead of "*bottle*," St. Jerome's version has it "poison," "gall." Montanus has it, "thy *poison*." Dr. John Gill says, "The word is by some translated, 'thy gall,' 'thy poison.'" Parkhurst defines *khamah*, "inflammatory poison." Archbishop Newcomb has "gall," "poison." The Bible declares that wine "biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder;" in which text there is no sense, unless we have in view the fatal *poison* which these reptiles eject with their bite. Dr. John Mair, of Edinburgh, staff-surgeon to her Britannic Majesty's army, remarks upon this passage: "Is there not something to be gathered from this singular fact? Does it not tend to show that alcohol is no ordinary poison; but that it possesses qualities assimilating it to the poison of serpents, which render it peculiarly the enemy of man, to be shunned by him as venomous reptiles are, almost instinctively?"

("Nephaleia," p. 49.) Again science and revelation harmonize.

In contrast with the denunciations of wine, place the approvals of total abstinence in the Old Testament. There were the Nazarites, — a sect that totally abstained from the use of all intoxicating beverages (Num. vi. 3),— and the Rechabites (Jer. xxxv. 14, 18, 19), also; all of whom were highly approved of God, and their total abstinence spoken of as a means of spiritual growth. There was Daniel, also, and his associates, who refused even the *royal* cup of wine, and maintained their total abstinence principles, in consequence of which God signally blessed them. There was Samson raised up to deliver Israel. God demanded total abstinence of him and his mother also (Judges xiii. 4–24), thereby indicating that the possession of this virtue was indispensable to the successful accomplishment of his mission. There were Nadab and Abihu, guilty of intemperance at the very altar of God, for which they ignobly perished; as a remedy for the evil, and that it might never occur again, total abstinence was enjoined upon priests "*forever*." (Lev. x. 8–11.) There was Israel in the wilderness *forty years*, wholly dependent upon God for food and drink; yet as a necessary part of their discipline, they "drank neither wine nor strong drink." They were God's *chosen* people, and he led them "in a way they knew not," that they might honor him the more; "Know that I am the Lord your God;" and that was the way of total abstinence. (Deut. xxix. 6.) Add to these eminent examples such explicit declarations as we have already quoted, as "Look not thou upon the

wine, etc.," — and who can doubt that, even in the ages before Christ, God approved and required total abstinence?

BIBICAL PROOF, — NEW TESTAMENT.

There is not a single indorsement of intoxicating wine as a beverage in the New Testament. The Saviour did not even use the term *oinos*, wine, when he instituted the Lord's Supper, as we shall see in the sequel.

The miracle at the marriage of Cana furnishes no proof that the Saviour sanctioned the use of fermented wine; nothing but the circumstances of the incident indicate whether the wine was intoxicating or unintoxicating, and the circumstances wholly favor the idea that it was unintoxicating. (1.) Did Christ make such a beverage as Almighty God declared to be a "*mocker*," and said we must not "look upon"? The supposition creates such a conflict between God the Father and Christ as mortals cannot settle. (2.) Christ might have made an intoxicating or an unintoxicating wine: which would he do, judging from his character, — make that which would injure, or that which would not? There is but one answer. A good man now would sacrifice some of his reputation by furnishing intoxicating wine to guests, when he might just as readily furnish the unintoxicating. (3.) The Saviour performed the miracle when they were "well drunk," or well "filled;" that is, when they had drank as much as they ought to drink. Now, on the supposition that they had been drinking intoxicating wine, which was the case, probably, how it reflects upon the Saviour's

character, to furnish them with just as much more of the same sort. A member of a church who should do so now would sacrifice his influence as a Christian man. (4.) It was done to magnify his glory. How much more would it magnify his glory to make that which would not injure them, instead of that which would! And if they had been drinking intoxicating wine until the company was excited, as some commentators suppose, what a telling rebuke would the production of unintoxicating wine by a miracle be to them! (5.) The governor pronounced it the "best" wine, from which some writers have very erroneously inferred that it must have been intoxicating; as if the presence of the inebriating element were necessary to make it good wine. Nothing could be further from the truth. Any person who will quaff the *tirosh* manufactured by Reynolds, and to which we have referred, will find no difficulty in understanding the governor of the feast, since it is far more delicious than any alcoholic wine of the market which money can purchase. Besides, we have cited authorities to prove that unfermented wine was always regarded *best.*

President Nott says, "That the wine declared by the master of the feast to be 'good wine,' *was good wine* — in the sense that Pliny, Columella, or Theophrastus would have used the term 'good,' when applied to wine; good, because nutritious and unintoxicating; and of which the guests even at such an hour might drink freely and without apprehension, because it was wine which, though it would refresh and cheer,

would not derange, demoralize, or intoxicate." ("Bible Tem.," Eng. Ed., p. 53.)

Thus, all the circumstances of the miracle of Cana favor the view that Christ made an unintoxicating wine.

Barnes says, in his "Commentary," "As wine was a common article of beverage among the people, he drank it. It was the pure juice of the grape, and, for anything that can be proved, it was without fermentation."

Besides, this view alone harmonizes Christ with the great apostle. Paul, who followed Christ immediately in his teachings, taught entire abstinence. He wrote to the Romans, "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine," etc., — a thorough total abstinence text, without sense or reason, unless it means, it is not good to touch these things at all. Then he wrote to the Corinthians, announcing his own practice to be, "If meat cause my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth," — a principle which applies equally to whatever causes our fellow-men to offend. Afterwards he wrote to Timothy, who was a young minister in feeble health, and who was not taking wine even as a medicine, "Drink no longer water, but take a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and for thine oft infirmities." That is, take a little as a medicine. Thus Paul taught precisely what the temperance societies of to-day require, — entire abstinence from all that can intoxicate, except as a medicine. And only the view we have taken of the miracle of Cana establishes harmony between Christ and Paul.

This view, too, is alone consistent with the general

teachings of the New Testament respecting Christian example. "*Abstain from all appearance of evil,*" binds us not to drink beverages that may entice others to ruin. "*Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,*" suggests that it is not a *loving* act to set the dangerous example of drinking intoxicating liquors to our neighbor, or his children. "*Do thyself no harm.*" Abstinence is the only sure way to prevent harm to one's self. "*Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation.*" There is no more emphatic way of disregarding this lesson, than by tampering with the intoxicating cup. So, also, the exhortations to "*lay your bodies a living sacrifice on the altar of God,*" to "*crucify the lusts of the flesh;*" and many others are wholly inconsistent with defiling the body by using that which inflames the passions (Is. xxii. 13), excites to violence (Is. iv. 17), and overcomes and demoralizes many who drink it. (Is. xxviii. 1; Prov. xx. 1; Is. xxviii. 7.)

Add to this the fact that John the Baptist, who heralded the Saviour to earth, was a total abstainer. He came neither "eating nor drinking wine." (Luke vii. 33.) And it was declared of him, "He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost." Abstinence is best suited to growth in holiness, as every one knows. It is told of John as something in his favor, — a proof of his excellence.

But it is said, did not the Saviour say, "New wine must be put into new bottles"? (Luke v. 38.) Very true; but (1.) the allusion to a custom of the times by way of illustration does not prove the lawfulness of the thing; otherwise the allusion of the in-

spired penman to the Roman games and cruel sports sanctions them. (2.) Was new wine put into new bottles that it might, or *might not*, ferment? The latter, of course. The bottles were closed tightly; what for? To prevent fermentation. Had they wished the new wine to ferment, they would not have closed the bottles tightly; they would have given them vent, as the farmer does a barrel of new cider. Besides, if the newly expressed juice had commenced to ferment before bottling, it would not only burst the newest bottles, but even iron-bound casks. "Chamber's Cyclopædia" says that "a fermenting wine will burst the strongest casks, if tightly closed." If bottled before fermentation commenced, and made air-tight, fermentation would be prevented, especially if the bottles were buried in the earth, as we have seen was a custom. "*Old* wine," preserved in this way, was regarded best, as we have seen; hence the words, "No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new, for he saith, the old is better."

But was not the Saviour called a "wine-bibber"? He was called a "glutton" also, and a *disturber* of the peace, and an *impostor*. It was simply a blasphemous accusation of wicked men; just as wicked men now say of a temperance advocate, "He drinks liquor on the sly." It is the Saviour himself who relates this incident, and he does not admit that he drank wine. On the other hand, he uses language which implies the opposite. "But wisdom is justified of all her children." My life speaks for itself. Besides, the charge of "wine-bibber," which means simply *wine-drinker*, by his enemies, implies that then a good man could not

drink intoxicating wine without bringing a stigma upon his character. When a temperance advocate is now charged with drinking wine, the object is to injure his character and reputation; to show that he dishonors his profession. If men believe it, he loses caste with them. Such were the enemies of Christ, who charged him with being a "wine-bibber." But, as "gluttonous" implies that he eat something, does not "wine-bibber" imply that he drank a little? By no means; any more than the charge against a temperance advocate man implies that he drinks wine. The charge was calumnious.

It is said that the counsel, "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess" (Eph. v. 18), permits the use of wine in moderation. By no means. The passage warns against using it at all. The term *asotia*, here translated "excess," is translated *riot* in other places. "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is riot," — a good translation. The "excess" is not in the drinking, but in the wine itself, "*wherein* is excess." It stimulates the passions; hence Clement renders *asotia* "*shameful licentiousness.*" It creates insubordination; hence, the Rheims version renders it "*riotousness.*" Calvin renders it "*impurities and dissipations.*" No word could more plainly denote the pernicious principle of wine, known as *alcohol.* Dr. Duffield says, "Intoxicate not yourselves with any wine in which is alcohol," is as exact, as literal, as just, and at this day as perfectly intelligible rendering, as can be given. This precept of the spirit of the apostle, therefore, explicitly, fully, and we will say without any forced exegesis, or improper stress of criticism, enjoins total abstinence from in-

toxicating liquors as a beverage." ("Bible Tem.," p. 46.) The closing part of the passage, too, confirms the foregoing, —"But be filled with the SPIRIT;" as if the *Spirit* was the opposite of wine, as we know it is.

It is said that the counsel to bishops, "not given to wine" (1 Tim. iii. 8 and Titus i. 7), and to deacons, "not given to much wine" (1 Tim. iii. 8), implies that the moderate use is allowable. By no means. The command in Eccl. vii. 17, "Be not overmuch wicked," does not imply that we may be *moderately* wicked." "Excess of riot" is denounced in the Scriptures; but we are not to infer that a *little* riot is innocent. So, "superfluity of naughtiness" does not encourage *moderate* naughtiness. No; the counsel about "much wine," properly rendered, and especially when taken in connection with such total abstinence instructions as we have considered, is an injunction to "touch not, taste not, handle not," or, as commentators generally admit, to "come not near wine."

It is plain that the prohibition of drunkenness prohibits all indulgence which leads to drunkenness; as Dr. Duff says, "In condemning murder, the Bible of necessity condemns the use of any and all of those means which naturally and inevitably lead to it." Reference may be made to the unfermented juice of the grape, and the word *much* used to guard them against over-indulgence, since Pliny, Columella, and others say with Dr. Rule, that many Romans were so fond of it that "they would first fill their stomachs with it, then throw it off by emetics, and repeat the draught." Thus it was with "honey." "Hast thou found honey"? asks Solomon; "eat so much as is sufficient for thee,

lest thou be filled therewith, and vomit it," (Prov. xxv. 16.) Bible temperance is "moderation" in the use of *good* things, and abstinence from *injurious* things.

"Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand." (Phil. iv. 5.) Appetite has strangely perverted this passage to defend the *moderate* use of intoxicating drinks. The closing words of the verse are quite sufficient to expose the absurdity of such a view. "*The Lord is at hand*," — the reason why "*moderation*" should be practised. Men must drink liquors moderately, because the Lord is coming. Does it mean that? Women and children need to drink them for that reason as much as men. This interpretation is absurd. Nearly all commentators agree with Barnes, who says, "The word *moderation* properly means that which is *fit* or *suitable*, and then propriety, gentleness, mildness." He adds, "He that has a lively expectation that heaven will soon be his, will form very moderate expectations of what this world can furnish." And the next verse shows that such must be the meaning of the verse in question. "Be careful for nothing [not anxious]; but in everything, by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God." Thus, "Let your moderation," etc., actually enjoins *abstinence* from the use of intoxicating drinks, while men pervert it to favor *indulgence*. Cowper rebukes the perversion, thus: —

> "The self-same word that bids our lusts obey,
> Is misapplied to sanctify their sway."

Again, it is objected that the apostles were charged with being "*full of new wine*" (gleukos), Acts ii. 13;

and this implies that they used intoxicating drinks. Not so. If these haters of religion were honest in their charge, it proves that it was considered wrong for good men like the apostles to use intoxicating wine. But their language was *ironical.* We are told, "Others, *mocking*, said, 'These men are full of new wine.'" "New wine," or, *gleukos*, is admitted, as we have seen, to be "sweet wine," that is, not intoxicating, which good men could drink. It was the climax of *irony*, therefore, to charge them with being "full of new wine." These men, who profess not to use intoxicating wine, are drunk on "new wine." If a professed teetotaler should get drunk, it would be the greatest *irony* for his foes to say, "See your teetotaler, intoxicated on cold water." A French writer accused Proudhomme of being a "water-drinker," when he was a "brandy-drinker." So here, Christ's enemies meant that the apostles were drunk on something stronger than "new wine," meaning thereby to reprove their zeal for Christ. Active, earnest Christians have often been called "mad," as Paul was, or "crazy," or monomaniacs. Peter's reply — "These are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day" — is the same as saying, "By your own admission, these men are not drunk. It is but nine o'clock in the morning, and you know that even drunkards are not usually intoxicated so early!" If they had said, "We do not drink intoxicating wine at all," their enemies, continuing their "*mocking*," would have replied, "Only in secret." If they had appealed to their *personal* character, they would have answered, "We have already called that in question by our charge." Hence the reply of Peter was the only one suited to silence

their "mocking." Barnes says, on this passage, "It was a regular practice with the Jews, not to eat or drink *any*thing until after the third hour of the day, especially on the Sabbath, and on all festival occasions. Sometimes this abstinence was maintained until noon. So universal was this custom, that the apostle could appeal to it with confidence, *as a full refutation* of the charge of drunkenness before that hour."

Again, "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused," etc. (1 Tim. iv. 4.) This text is sometimes perverted to defend the use of alcoholic stimulants as a beverage. "Alcohol is a good creature of God." Everybody knows better. It is not a creature of God at all. Alcohol does not exist in nature. Prof. Turner says, "It does not exist ready formed in plants, but is a product of the vinous fermentation." ("Elements of Chem.," 2d Ed., p. 664.) Sir Humphrey Davy says of alcohol, "It has never been found ready formed in plants." ("Agricul. Chem.," 6th Ed., p. 126.) Chaptal says, "Nature never forms spirituous liquors; she rots the grape upon the branch, but it is *art* which converts the juice into wine." ("L'Art de Faire le Vin," p. 2, Paris, 1819.) Prof. Liebig and other eminent chemists concur in the foregoing view. Alcohol is not a creature of God in any other sense than arsenic is. Rev. Dr. Guthrie, of Edinburgh, says, "I have heard a man with a bottle of whiskey before him, have the impudence to say, 'Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving;' and he would persuade me that what was made in the still-pot was a creature of God. In

one sense it is so; but in the same sense so is arsenic, so is oil of vitriol, so is prussic acid. Think of a fellow tossing off a glass of vitriol, and excusing himself by saying that it is a creature of God. Whiskey is good in its own place. There is nothing like whiskey in this world for preserving a man when he is dead. But it is one of the worst things in the world for preserving a man when he is living. If you want to keep a dead man, put him in whiskey. If you want to kill a living man, put the whiskey into him."

Nor is it true that every *good* creature should be used for food or drink. The blood of animals is good and indispensable, in its place; but who would drink it for a beverage? Toads and lizards are "good creatures of God;" but who would eat them? The meaning of the passage, according to "Barnes' Commentary" is, "good in its place; good for the purpose for which He made it." And Barnes exposes this perversion by saying, "This passage should not be adduced to vindicate the use of intoxicating drinks. As employed by the apostle, it had no such reference, nor does it contain any *principle* which can properly receive any such application."

The fallacy of the plea, "It is the *abuse* and not the *use* of intoxicating liquors which the Bible prohibits," is apparent from the foregoing remarks. As Bible temperance is "the moderate use of *good* things and abstinence from *evil* things," *any use* of that which is injurious must be an *abuse* of it. Besides, it is not the *abuse* of wine that is called "a mocker," but wine itself. Solomon does not teach us to avoid the *abuse* of wine, or not to drink it to excess, but not to "*look*

upon" it. After Nadab and Abihu were slain for impious ministrations through drunkenness, the counsel was not that ministers at the altar should not abuse the use of wine, but that they should not touch it, — entire prohibition. The Nazarites and Rechabites were not commended for not *abusing* wine, but for not using it at all. Nor was John the Baptist approved for not abusing, but for not *using*, "wine or strong drink." The "abuse" theory is the merest twaddle. Were it correct, a multitude of moderate sins might be defended.

Equally fallacious is the plea that good men, like Noah and David, used wine. So good men practised polygamy, and upheld slavery; but their example does not make those sins virtues. Good men now do some naughty things, and so long as human nature is imperfect, we shall not be surprised at the fact, though we must not be led into sin by their example. The Bible nowhere commends a good man for drinking intoxicating wine as a beverage, or for doing any other wrong act.

A class of the biblical interpretations which we have considered are such a perversion of the Scriptures as to warrant the ridicule of Robinson's "Notes to Claude," quoted by Dr. Lees in "Tem. Com.," Pre. Dis., p. 33, as follows: —

"Reverend brethren! Let me advise you to get drunk. You will perhaps think me doubly drunk in giving you such advice. But good men *have* got drunk. Noah was a good man; Lot was a good man; yet they both got drunk. You tell me our Lord said, 'Be not *overcharged* with drunkenness.' Mind, he did not say, Do not *get* drunk, but be not *overcharged* with it. Now, can't you get drunk without being *dead* drunk? But you reply,

St. Paul says, 'Be not drunk with wine wherein is *excess*.' Observe here, again, he does not say, 'Be not *drunk*,' but, 'Be not *excessively* drunk.' Observe, too, he says, 'Be not drunk with *wine*,'—he does not prohibit spirits. So you may get drunk on beer, or brandy, even to excess, without violating this injunction."

Having considered the Bible argument for total abstinence, we are prepared to answer directly the question,

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

Shall we use at this *sacred* feast what was not fit to be used at a *secular* feast? Dr. Laurie maintains that we should not use intoxicating wine as a beverage; it is wrong to do it. Shall we use it as a symbol of Christ's "shed blood"? Can a "dangerous" element become harmless by consecrating it to a sacred purpose? The idea is in conflict with all the dedications and sacrifices to God of which we read in the Scriptures; they must be without "spot or blemish," pure, sound, good. Though impure, unsound, blemished things were used elsewhere, they must not be used before the Lord.

Is it duty to teach children total abstinence everywhere except at the Lord's Supper? He says that children "should be trained to avoid" wine and other intoxicating drinks. "We are to see," he continues, "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'"—that is, not until they join the church and come to the Lord's Supper. Then, they can both "look

upon" and *taste* this "mocker," which "biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder."

Recently, the Presbyterian Church, Prospect Street, Hull, England, substituted unfermented for fermented wine at the Lord's table. The change was brought about by a father whose children were about to unite with the church. He had taught them not to taste of intoxicating drink, and he could not conscientiously take them to the Lord's table to taste intoxicating wine for the first time. The church saw the inconsistency, and voted to use unfermented wine.

Is it *right* to tempt drunkards at the Lord's Supper, when it is *wrong* to tempt them elsewhere? Speaking of drunkards, Dr. Laurie holds that the "least indulgence may involve such in the guilt of self-destruction," and for this reason, among others, he would regard total abstinence a duty. Yet his position not only compels the church to place this temptation before reformed inebriates who join it, but also compels the drunkard himself to risk the danger, since he cannot commemorate his Saviour's dying love acceptably without intoxicating wine. May not the sacred sip prove that "least indulgence" which will "involve such in the guilt of self-destruction"? Such has been the sad result in many instances. There are many reformed drunkards in the church now, who allow the cup of intoxicating wine to pass, at the Lord's Supper, without tasting it, for fear of "self-destruction." According to Dr. Laurie, they do not celebrate the Lord's Supper acceptably, — they mock their Lord. We know of one instance, where a reformed drunkard in the church returned, like a dog to his vomit, in con-

sequence of partaking of fermented wine at the Lord's Supper. Dr. Duffield says, "The writer has unhappily had cognizance of the intoxication of a reformed drunkard, who went directly from the communion table to the tavern to satisfy his stimulated appetite." ("Bible Rule of Tem.," p. 134.) There have been many such cases. Is it right to tempt "weak brothers" thus? In the language of Dr. Duffield, "Shall the 'cup of salvation' become the cup of damnation? Shall 'the cup of the Lord' be made identical with 'the cup of devils'?"

Dr. Laurie's position is all the more complicated at this point, by another admission in the same paragraph, namely, "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." Ought not "the spirit of Christ" to "induce us to abstain" from the use of intoxicating wine at the communion table, since such wine has been "the occasion of stumbling to a weak brother for whom Christ died"? Is it duty not to cause a weak brother to stumble, everywhere, except at the Lord's Supper?

The Orthodox Church, in Norton, Mass., discontinued the use of fermented wine several years ago, for the following reason: A drunkard in the place was reformed, and subsequently he was converted and joined the church. At the Lord's Supper, however, he did not dare to taste the intoxicating wine, for fear of "self-destruction." He partook of the bread, but not of the wine. According to Dr. Laurie, he did not celebrate the Lord's Supper, because he did not taste

of *alcohol*. The church looked at the matter. Members said, "It is wrong to tempt our 'weak brother for whom Christ died.'" They voted to put away the temptation; and that church has used no fermented wine since. Did that church do wrong? Did they not rather act agreeably to Dr. L.'s counsel, "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'"?

The foregoing interrogatives and facts expose the difficulties involved in Dr. Laurie's position. They prepare the reader, also, to appreciate the direct argument for the use of unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper.

1. The unfermented juice of the grape was used at the Jewish Passover. The Jews were clearly forbidden to use anything that had fermented at that time. The prohibition is so explicit that commentators are agreed upon it. See Exodus xii. 8, 15, 17, 19, 20. It was forbidden, because *leaven* is the symbol of corruption. (1 Cor. v. 6–8.) It applied to liquids as much as to solids, because "*ferment*" is the same in one as the other. Even Gesenius, Dr. L.'s infallible authority, says that *leaven* applied to the wine as really as to the bread. It was just as inconsistent and improper to use "the symbol of corruption" in drink as food. Prof. Liebig says, "Fermentation is nothing else but the *putrefaction* of a substance containing no nitrogen; *ferment*, or yeast, is a substance in a state of putrefaction." ("Turner's Chem.," edited by Liebig, p. 991. 1842.) For this reason all *ferment* was ex-

cluded from their houses for "seven days." The practice of the Jews proves that such was their understanding of the prohibition. Even Maimonides Bartenora, and other mediæval Rabbins, who allowed the use of intoxicating wine, defended themselves in their departure from general custom by the strange hypothesis that "the water of fruits does not ferment; hence the prohibition does not apply to pure water and to wine." ("Tem. Com.," p. 280.)

Rabbi Manasseh Ben Israel ("Vindiciæ Judæorum," printed in 1656) says, "Here, at this feast [Passover], every confection ought to be so pure as not to admit of any FERMENT, or anything that *may fermentate.*" Judge Noah, a leading Jew of New York, informed Mr. Delavan that the use of wine, prepared from steeped raisins, in order to avoid fermented wine, was general among American Jews at the Passover. Mr. A. C. Isaacs, a teacher of the Jews, having lived among them twenty-six years before his conversion, wrote, in 1844, "All the Jews with whom I have ever been acquainted use *un*intoxicating wine at the Passover, — a wine made in this country expressly for the occasion, and generally by themselves. Some raisins (dried grapes) are steeped in water for a few days previous to the Passover, the vessel being placed near the fire. This liquor is bottled off, and used at the feast of unleavened bread as 'the fruit of the vine.' Sometimes, when time does not permit of steeping, the raisins are boiled on the same day on which the feast is to be celebrated at night; and when the whole of the saccharine matter is thought to be extracted, the decoction is bottled off and corked; and this is the

Passover wine." Dr. Cunningham, the learned Hebraist, says, "What is now chiefly used by the Jews at the Passover for wine is a drink made of an infusion of raisins in water, which is either boiled at once or simmered during several days. . . . No Jew with whom I have conversed, of whatever class or nation, ever used any other kind." Horne ("Intro. to Scrip.," vol. iii., p. 322, foot note, edit. 1846) says, "The modern Jews, being forbidden to drink any fermented liquor at the Passover, drink either pure water or a wine prepared by themselves from raisins. It is not known when the Jewish custom began of excluding fermented wine from the Passover feast. It is, however, very ancient, and is now almost universal among the modern Jews." Professor Moses Stuart wrote in the first volume of the "Bibliotheca Sacra," "I cannot doubt that *khahmatz* (any fermented substance), in its widest sense, was excluded from the Jewish Passover when the Lord's Supper was first instituted. . . . . That this custom is very ancient; that it is even now almost universal; and that it has been so from time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, I take to be facts that cannot be fairly controverted." The "Encyclopædia Britannica" observes that "considerable dispute has been raised as to whether the wine used on the occasion was fermented or unfermented, — was the ordinary wine, in short, or the pure juice of the grape. Those who hold that it was unfermented appeal mainly to the expression 'unfermented things,' which *is* the true rendering of the word translated 'unleavened bread.' The Rabbins would seem to have interpreted the command respect-

ing ferment as extending to the wine as well as to the bread of the Passover. The modern Jews, accordingly, generally use raisin wine, after the injunction of the Rabbins." (Art. "Passover," 8th edit.) Dr. Duffield says, "For the Jews, in observing the Passover, — which feast he was celebrating when he instituted the sacrament of his Supper, — were prohibited from the use of anything whatever, whether food or drink, that was fermented, Exod. xii. 13; and to this day they rigidly observe the original regulation. ("Bible Rule of Tem.," p. 181.)

That some of the Jews, ancient and modern, have departed from the aforesaid custom, does not militate against our view of the general practice among them *as a sect.* The Baptists, as a sect, observe close communion, though some of their number oppose the practice. The Congregationlists, as a sect, believe and practise infant baptism, though many of their number neglect it. So ancient and modern Jews, as a sect, use unfermented wine at the Passover.

2. The Lord's Supper was substituted for the Passover. When the Saviour made the substitution, did he disregard this law of Moses? There is no proof of it. Would he abrogate a prohibition so absolute as this, without speaking of it? Never; especially when we consider the reason of the prohibition, that "*ferment*" *symbolized corruption.* He had instructed his disciples to "beware of the *leaven* of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (Matt. xvi. 6), thus making the term symbolize hypocrisy, malice, and wickedness, thereby implying that he accepted Moses' law respecting "fermented things." Then, he was about to seal the

new covenant with his blood, which would cleanse the soul from all sin; why would not the presence of "ferment" (*khahmatz*) be as unsuitable a symbol at the Supper as at the Passover? Could his precious, purifying blood be properly symbolized by that which God declared to be a "mocker," and which the Scriptures employ as a figure of human depravity and an emblem of divine wrath? In the absence of any intimation of a change so important as the use of fermented for "unfermented things," we are bound to believe that there was no such change.

3. The Saviour's language implies that he continued the practice of using the unfermented juice of the grape. At the institution of the Supper, he did not use the word "wine" (oinos), — the word in general use among the people; but he employed a phrase which is translated "*fruit of the vine.*" We have his language recorded three times (Matt. xxvi. 27–29; Mark xiv. 23–25; Luke xxii. 19, 20), and in each instance it is "*fruit of the vine.*" As if he would distinguish the wine which was used on that occasion from that which the people were taught not to "look upon," and which would "bite like a serpent and sting like an adder"! As if he meant that no man should ever point to his example on that sacred occasion to defend the use of intoxicating wine on a secular occasion. It has the appearance of a studied, consistent, Christian arrangement to discard the "mocker." If the Saviour used *oinos* at the Supper, it is singular, at least, that he avoided the name by which it was known, and called it "fruit of the vine."

We submit, too, that the grape itself, or the newly

expressed juice, is "the fruit of the vine" in a truer sense than fermented wine can be. For all chemists say that fermentation destroys the nutritive element of grape-juice, while the unfermented juice is highly nutritious. The latter is innocent and healthful, while the former is "dangerous" and harmful to persons in health.

Dr. Laurie overlooks, entirely, Christ's language. He consults Webster's and Worcester's Dictionaries, the opinions of missionaries and writers, but never so much as alludes to the language of Him who instituted the Supper. The words of Him, who, above all others, should be regarded, are treated as if foreign to the subject.

4. The unfermented juice of the grape more fitly represents the blood of Jesus than fermented wine does; we mean in its appearance. Jacob called the juice of the grape, "the blood of grapes." (Gen. xlix. 11.) And again, in Deut. xxxii. 14, we read of "the pure blood of the grape." There is here a foreshadowing, in a sense, of that blood of which Christ spoke when he instituted the Supper. "This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many." (Mark xiv. 24.) Also, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." (1 Cor. xi. 25.) Now, the unfermented juice of the grape resembles blood, in its consistency, more than the fermented juice. It is thicker, and hence more like blood. Fermentation not only destroys the nutritive element, but it *thins* "the blood of the grape." So we maintain that they who rely upon the fitness of the symbol should insist upon the unfermented juice.

5. Dr. Laurie's argument, that makes intoxicating wine indispensable to the proper celebration of the Lord's Supper, must also make *barley bread* indispensable, since that was the kind of bread used. If it be necessary to conform to one part of the original method, then why not to the other? The inquiry indicates the difficulties involved in Dr. Laurie's view. It is not consistent to be so particular to use intoxicating wine, and wholly indifferent to the nature of the bread used, whether barley bread or not, or whether "*ferment*," the scriptural symbol of corruption, has taken place in it. He defends the use of one element, which he declares is "dangerous" as a beverage, while he is wholly indifferent to the use of the other element, the daily use of which he regards both safe and necessary.

6. The foregoing argument is strengthened by the consideration, that if Christ used intoxicating wine at the Supper, he used what God declared to be a "mocker," and said we must not "look upon when it is red." Here is an inconsistency, — a conflict even between God and Christ, which commentators cannot settle. It was not *excess* of wine that God declared a mocker, but wine itself. And what but the *alcohol*, or intoxicating element, was in the wine, to deserve that brand? Yet, according to Dr. Laurie, Christ used the "mocker," the use of which God had forbidden.

7. It is objected that Christ said, "Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day I drink it new in the kingdom of God." (Mark xiv. 25.) And these words are supposed to imply the use of alcoholic wine. The remarks of

Professor Stuart upon this passage furnish a good reply: —

"Is there not a sanction here of drinking ordinary wine? Far from it. It is beyond all reasonable doubt that orthodox Judaism has ever and always rejected alcoholic or fermented wine at sacred feasts. Even now, as I have abundantly satisfied myself by investigation, the Passover is celebrated with wine newly made from raisins, where unfermented wine cannot be had. This would seem to explain that difficult passage in Matt. xxvi. 29: 'I will not drink of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.' 'New' alludes to the wine then employed on that occasion. The meaning seems plainly to be this: 'I shall no more celebrate with you a holy communion service on earth; in heaven we shall meet again around our Father's table, and there we will keep a feast with wine appropriate to the occasion, — that is, new wine.' Of course, we are to understand the language in a spiritual, and not in a literal, sense. But the imagery is borrowed from the wine then before them. Scarcely a greater mistake can be made, than to rest the use of alcoholic wine at the sacramental table on the example of our Saviour and his disciples."

7. It is objected that Paul said of the Corinthians at the Lord's Supper, "And one is hungry, and another is drunken" (1 Cor. xi. 21), — that this proved they used intoxicating wine, since they became "drunken." Were this the meaning of the passage, it would not prove that the use of fermented wine is allowable; for *Paul severely rebuked them.* But such is not its meaning. "Drunken" has the meaning of *fulness.* Dr. A. Clarke says, "filled to the full;" Dr. Macknight, "is plentifully fed." Without citing authorities, we may add the words of Dr. Lees: "The great majority of expositors join in ascribing to the apostle's words a charge of selfish repletion, but not of intoxication." ("Tem. Com.," p. 341.)

8. The practice of Christians furnishes additional proof. On this point, Dr. Lees has the following: —

"As subsidiary evidence, we may cite the long-established practice of nearly all the Christian communities of the East, though widely separated from each other. Baron Tavenier, in his 'Persian Travels' (1652), says of the Christians of St. John, whom he found very numerous at 'Balsara' (Bassorah), 'In the eucharist they make use of meal or flour, kneaded up with wine and oil; for, say they, the body of Christ being composed of two principal parts, flesh and blood, the flour and the wine do perfectly represent them. To make their wine they take grapes dried in the sun, which they call in their language *zebibes*, and, casting water upon them, let them steep for so long a time. *The same wine* they use in the consecration of the cup. The Christians of St. Thomas, who were found on the coast of Malabar, and claimed to have derived the gospel from St. Thomas, the apostle, celebrated the Lord's Supper in the juice expressed from raisins 'softened one night in water,' says Odoard Barbosa. 'They use in their sacrifices *wine* prepared from dried grapes,' states Osorius, ('De Rebus,' 1586). Ainsworth, in his 'Travels in Asia Minor' (London, 1842) notes the administration of the sacrament among the Nestorians, and adds, 'Raisin water supplied the place of wine.' Tischendorf, in his narrative of visits to the Coptic monasteries of Egypt, remarks that at the eucharist the priest took the thick juice of the grape from a glass with a spoon;' and Dr. Gobat (the Protestant bishop of Jerusalem), in his Abyssinian 'Journal,' records the reception of 'some bottles of grape wine [for the Lord's Supper]. The wine is the juice of dried grapes with water.' It is morally certain that the eucharistical notices of some of the ancient Christian sects, who are represented as denouncing wine and rejecting it from the Lord's Supper, are colored and perverted statements, — pointing simply to a refusal to use *fermented* wine in the sacrament." (Tem. Com., p. 282.)

Speaking of the emblems used at the Lord's Supper, Mr. Basil (A. D. 328), writing to Cesarius, said, "The hermits brought the consecrated bread into the desert with them for a year's supply, but could not

preserve the wine so long." This is positive evidence that the wine was unfermented, since fermented wine will keep any length of time. This argument is strengthened by the considerations suggested by the following inquiries: —

Admitting that the Saviour used intoxicating wine at the Lord's Supper, does that prove it to be wrong for *us* to use *un*intoxicating wine? Though the former be right, it does not follow that the latter is wrong. If the Bible taught moderate drinking, *that* would not prove that total abstinence is sinful. Though the Master might favor the moderate use of intoxicating drinks, he surely would not frown upon that act of self-denial involved in the practice of total abstinence for the sake of our fellow-men.

Again: Dr. Laurie says that Christ used intoxicating wine, as there was no other kind for him to use. Suppose there had been *un*fermented wine, would he have used the fermented?

Yet again: Does not Dr. Laurie's view reject the generally accepted opinion that it *is the spirit of the act*, and not the letter, which constitutes a proper celebration of the eucharist? Professors of religion have celebrated the Lord's Supper with water instead of wine, because wine could not be obtained. Once admit that they did right, and Dr. Laurie's position is wrong. It is generally believed that a church could celebrate the Lord's Supper acceptably *without wine* (were it impossible to obtain it); but Dr. L.'s view denies it.

Once more: Does not Dr. Laurie show a conscious weakness in his argument by stopping to assure his

readers that he is a total abstainer? As if conscious that his views might be used by anti-temperance men as "an aid and comfort," he says, "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." And, in quoting from a foreign letter to support his views, he assures his readers that the author "maintains the principle of total abstinence." Here is apparent a consciousness of holding views that may be used to strengthen the anti-temperance side. We do not refer to what *temperance* men may say, but to what *anti-temperance* men say. The latter *do* appropriate such views to sustain their own. J. C. Lovejoy, noted in Massachusetts for having abandoned the ministry and temperance party, quotes quite liberally from Dr. Laurie's article to defend himself, in his recent pamphlet, "PROHIBITION GROUND TO POWDER." And he not only quotes Dr. L., but he also quotes Dr. Smith and Dr. Van Dyck, whom Dr. L. quotes. Anti-temperance papers, too, have done the same. This is common. When the friends of the liquor traffic in Massachusetts made their great effort before the Legislature for license, in 1867, they summoned as witnesses all the prominent clergymen and Christian laymen who had the reputation of holding such views on the temperance question as they might use to advantage in opposing prohibitory legislation. Now, we affirm that Dr. Laurie, and others who maintain similar views, betray a consciousness of holding a position which the foes of temperance take

advantage of, when they stop to prove or affirm that they are teetotalers.

Then, is it entirely consistent for Dr. Laurie and others to preach and practise total abstinence, and, at the same time, advocate the use of intoxicating wine at the Lord's Supper? The foes of temperance make use of this position to support moderate drinking. Even Rev. D. D. Thomason, well-known as the author of a pamphlet which attacks "TEETOTALISM," says (p. 60), "And here the inconsistency of our temperance clergy in drinking wine, and offering it to the communicants at the Lord's table, is glaring. Why do they themselves violate, and lead their Christian flocks to violate, a law of Christ, under circumstances that give peculiar aggravation to the offence, commemorate the death of Christ with the wine-cup in their hands, which they believe to be a curse, and which they have vowed elsewhere not to touch?"

This is a fair criticism. If converted people will use intoxicating drink on the most solemn and sacred occasion, unconverted people may be expected to use their example to support moderate drinking. Most caution and the safest example should be observed on the most sacred occasions. On the phrase "drink wine" (Ezek. xliv. 21), the Assembly of Westminster divines of 1651, in their "Annotations," say, "Occasions of evil to be avoided, *especially in sacred things*, —Lev. x. 9; Psa. xciii. 5, —and by sacred ministers. They of all men must not be given to wine." Here is the principle; worldly men say, "If intoxicating wine

is fit to be used on sacred occasions, it surely is not unfit for secular occasions."

The National Temperance Convention that met at Saratoga, in August, 1865, having many conservative temperance men for members, adopted the following resolution: —

"*Whereas*, There is no longer, in the estimation of many eminent ministers and Christians, a plea for the use of intoxicating wines in Christian ordinances, *as the fruit of the vine, unfermented, can so easily be obtained*, giving full satisfaction; therefore,

"*Resolved*, That should all Christian churches confine themselves to that at the table of the Lord, it would remove one of the strongest pleas for the necessity and morality of the intoxicating wine traffic, and one of the chief supports of the pretended innocence and divine sanction of intoxicating drinks."

Were they not right? Are not reason, piety, and Scripture on their side?

Said President Nott: —

"On the whole, since the bread of the Passover must be unfermented; since the use, nay, even the possession of ferment, was prohibited during this festival; since many of the Jews refuse even now the use of fermented wine in 'the cup of blessing which they bless,' — it is not improbable that unfermented wine, as well as unfermented bread, was made use of at the paschal supper by the pious Jews, and if at the paschal supper, then probably at the supper of our Lord. . . It was the 'CUP' that Jesus Christ gave to his disciples; *and neither fermented nor unfermented wine*, but the 'fruit of the vine,' are the terms by which the contents of that cup are designated. And surely the pure blood of the grape, expressed from the cluster, is quite as intelligible and striking an emblem of the blood of Christ, and as truly 'the fruit of the vine,' as that blood of the grape will be after fermentation shall have converted a nutritive into an intoxicating, deleterious beverage. (Bible Temperance, Eng. ed., p. 52.)

We have quoted the words of Professor Moses Stuart, as an advocate of unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper. E. C. Delavan, Esq., recently said, speaking of the period of his famous discussion of the "communion wine" question, "Professor Stuart made me an especial visit from his seminary at Andover, Mass. After much counsel respecting the communion wine, he said, on taking leave, I suppose to encourage me, 'Mr. Delavan, *I will die in the ditch with you, if necessary, in defence of the stand you have taken.*'" ("Enquirer," Aug., 1869.)

Also, when Mr. Delavan was reading the proof of his first number of the "Enquirer," Bishop Alonzo Potter called upon him, and their conversation was upon the subject of "communion wine." "If you will remain with me long enough to read my proofs," said Mr. Delavan, "and will then advise me to abandon the whole undertaking, I will do so." Dr. Potter promised to stay and read the work; and he did. When he had finished the reading of it, he said to Mr. D., "*You have the whole ground.*" Mr. Delavan says, "I think he added, 'Go ahead.'" ("Enquirer," Aug. 1869.)

Mr. Delavan says, further: —

"About thirty years since, I called at the American Bible Society, New York, to see the managers. I wished them to direct me to some learned biblical scholar, from whom I might gain correct information as to '*Bible temperance.*' I was directed to Professor Bush, as the organ of that society. I visited him in his library, the shelves of which appeared to be loaded with Bibles in all languages. I stated, in brief, my views on the wine question, and he received them with a prompt condemnation, took up his English Bible, and read from it a single verse, saying, 'This verse upsets

your theory.' I replied, 'Perhaps if you refer to the *original*, you will find it does not.' He at once did so, and started back in amazement. 'No *permission to drink intoxicating wine here.* I do not *care about wine, and it is very seldom that I taste it, but I have felt until now at liberty to drink* in moderation, *from* this verse.' I made a strong appeal to the professor to enter thoroughly into the examination; he said he would; and he *did.* On calling upon him, when I next visited New York, I was greeted thus: '*Mr. Delavan, you have the whole ground, and, in time, the whole Christian world will be obliged to adopt your views.*' I asked him if he would not prepare an essay on the subject for publication. He said he would; *and he did.*" [This essay was published in the New York "Observer."] — (Enquirer, Aug., 1869.)

Suppose now, after their examination, there should be passages of Scripture, one or more, that we cannot reasonably or clearly interpret upon our side of the question, shall we array them against the general current of scriptural instruction? Surely not. Rather should we conclude that human research does not comprehend divine wisdom in the matter. We are bound to accept the clear, manifest spirit and teaching of the Bible, though single texts may perplex us. Men often cite a single text to overthrow the whole Bible argument for total abstinence and unfermented communion wine. The general drift of biblical instruction must stand, in spite of single texts.

It is said that the early biblical scholars and commentators did not interpret the Scriptures in the interests of total abstinence; and this fact militates against the view of teetotalers. By no means. There are what scholars and commentators call "Epochs of Exegesis." For many generations the Bible was interpreted by men who believed that slavery was a divine

institution, and their convictions caused them to interpret the Bible accordingly. It was not until the anti-slavery cause claimed special attention that the Bible was specially examined and explained with reference to the sin of slavery and the blessing of liberty. So of other subjects, as the missionary enterprise. The same is true of temperance. Our English Bible was translated, and for ages it was interpreted, under the influence of drinking customs. No one claimed that the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage was wrong. Every person believed that drinking customs were right. They were so settled in their views that they did not stop to ask, does the Bible actually support these customs? They took for granted that it did. But when the temperance cause arose, they began to read the Bible with other eyes. They studied it with reference to this particular subject; and another "Epoch of Exegesis" was ushered in. The Bible taught liberty just as much while slaves were held in bondage as since they were emancipated; but men did not see it. It taught the church to "preach the gospel to every creature" just as much before the missionary enterprise was inaugurated as since; yet Christians did not see it until within the present century. So the Bible taught total abstinence before the year 1800 as clearly as it does now; but men, blinded by customs and habits, did not see it until since that period.

Dr. Laurie remarks (p. 176) upon Gesenius' interpretation, "This derivation has also been controverted by Dr. Lees. But when a thorough Hebrew scholar, with no special theory to maintain, gives the result 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.*" This remark deserves attention, since it is precisely the sentiment of anti-temperance men, who say, "No one expects a sound opinion as to drink from a teetotaler." It would be just as sensible to say, "No one expects a sound opinion as to theatre-going from one who never attends the theatre." Or, "No one expects a sound opinion as to slavery from one who renounces slaveholding." Or, "No one expects a sound opinion as to profanity from one who will not swear." This is precisely the style of Dr. L.'s reasoning, "No one expects a sound opinion as to drinking from a teetotaler." Hence, he prefers the opinion of Gesenius. Now, moderate drinking was "the favorite theory" of Gesenius as really as total abstinence is "the favorite theory" of Dr. Lees. All he wrote was written under the influence of the drinking customs and habits of the times in which he lived; just as Dr. Lees wrote under the influence of the temperance cause of his land and times. Hence, so far one is just as likely to be prejudiced as the other. But, over and above this fact, we maintain, that a man who never attends the theatre can give a more reliable opinion about the theatre than a man who is in favor of theatre-going; he who never swears bears more reliable testimony than he who does not regard the act a sin; he who will not hold slaves, because it is wrong, can give an opinion more sound than he who does not scruple to buy and

sell them. So he who practises total abstinence can give a sounder opinion as to drinking than he who discards such practice. In the one case appetites and passions sway the mind; in the other they are held in abeyance. Even physically, he is better prepared to give a sound opinion. Dr. Hitchcock, of Amherst College, once said that one of the results of his abstaining from wine was "the power of determining with greater accuracy the nature of the religious emotions." And we appeal to Dr. Laurie if he is not a teetotaler for this reason, among others. He has a clearer head and a better conscience, with which to labor and pray. He would scarcely accept the argument of a Baptist opponent, who should say, "Dr. Laurie is not qualified to give a sound opinion on baptism, because he has 'his favorite theory' to defend;" or, of the Unitarian opponent, who should say, "He is not competent to give an unbiased opinion respecting the Trinity, because he has 'his favorite theory' to support." Dr. Laurie would say, "That is not argument, it is *cant*, unworthy of a place in dignified controversy." We say the same of his allusion to Dr. Lees.

Dr. Laurie admits that science and history declare against the use of intoxicants by men in health, and for this reason he discountenances their use. Now, if science and history prove them *bad* as beverages, can the Bible prove them *good* for beverages? Do not science and revelation harmonize? If "history is providence," do not providence and revelation harmonize?

The wine which David commended caused "joy and gladness," and it was associated with "oil that caused

the face to shine" and "bread that strengtheneth man's heart;" while the wine condemned by Solomon caused "woe" and "sorrow," "redness of eyes," and "wounds without cause." Did *alcohol*, or the intoxicating element, constitute the difference between the two, or was it something else? If it was something else, what was it?

The changes are often rung upon the "sin *per se* argument." "It is not a sin *per se* to drink a glass of wine." Suppose it is not; what then? A young trout was looking wistfully at a fly dancing upon the water above. "Don't go near it," said his mother. "What harm is there in a fly *per se?*" responded the little trout. "It is dangerous," replied the mother. "I will at all events examine it for myself," said young trout; and he shot up to the surface, and the next moment he was swinging on the fisherman's hook. The fly was not an evil *per se;* nevertheless it was death to the trout. So of the glass of wine. If it be dangerous, of what use is the plea, "not a sin *per se*" ? A few years since, an English clergyman, who had been intemperate, reformed. At a public meeting in Manchester, he said, confessing his guilt, "My greatest sin is not found where I brought the most disgrace upon my Master's cause in the public view; my greatest sin, in the sight of God, was when I *entered* upon the course which led to drunkenness." Was he not right? The intemperate man has incurred guilt somewhere. Was it when he first staggered under the influence of strong drink? Nay, it was before that. Was it when he had been a moderate drinker one year, two years, or more? Was it when he drank his tenth, hundredth, or

five hundredth glass? Was it not rather when he quaffed the first glass which lured him to all that followed? "It is the first step that ruins." "Enter not into the path of the wicked." (Prov. iv. 14.) "Watch and pray, that ye *enter not* into temptation." (Matt. xxvi. 41.) The divine prohibition is laid upon the first step to ruin.

In concluding this essay, we ask the reader to compare the evidence upon which we rest our view of the Temperance Cause, with that on which the cause of liberty rests. Is the proof that the Bible denounces American slavery more direct and explicit than the proof that it denounces American drinking customs? Does not the Bible support slavery as clearly as it does the use of inebriating beverages? And more, do we not discard certain customs and habits as *sinful* on less evidence than we ask men to discard intoxicating wine? Do we not accept many theological tenets as scriptural on less evidence than we adduce for Total Abstinence and unfermented Communion Wine? Let reason and conscience answer. Especially let the church be true. No virtue will rise higher in the world than it is in the church. If there be a place of safety on this subject, let the church occupy it. "Lead us not into temptation," is the prayer; let God's people live as they pray. Tempt no man with the intoxicating cup, at any time, or in any place. Let the standard be as high at the Lord's table as it is at man's table. A vicious thing in a holy place is out of place. The church is bound to set a pure and safe example on Temperance as really as on Religion.

The National Temperance Advocate.

THE NATIONAL TEMPERANCE SOCIETY AND PUBLICATION HOUSE publish a new Monthly Temperance Paper, the object of which is to promote the interests of the Cause of Temperance, by disseminating light from every quarter upon its moral, social, financial, and scientific bearing. It is the intention of the Society to make it such a source of information and such an advocate of the cause as shall render it not only a welcome visitor in the family, but indispensably necessary to every true friend of Temperance.

TERMS, IN ADVANCE.

Single copy, for one year, in advance,	$1 00
Ten copies, to one address "	9 00
Twenty " "	16 00

All over Twenty copies, at the rate of 80 cents per copy.

The Youth's Temperance Banner.

THE NATIONAL TEMPERANCE SOCIETY AND PUBLICATION HOUSE publish a beautifully illustrated Monthly Paper, especially adapted to children and youth, Sunday-School and Juvenile Temperance Organizations. Each number contains several choice engravings, a piece of music, and a great variety of articles from the pens of the best writers for children in America. It should be placed in the hands of every child in the land.

TERMS, IN ADVANCE.

Single copy, one year,	$ 25
Ten copies, to one address,	2 00
Fifty " " "	7 50
One hundred " "	12 00

Temperance Chimes.

THE NATIONAL TEMPERANCE SOCIETY have just published a new Temperance Hymn and Tune Book, of 128 pages, comprising a great variety of New Music, Glees, Songs, and Hymns, designed for the use of Temperance Meetings and Organizations, Bands of Hope, Glee Clubs, and the Home Circle. Many of the hymns have been written expressly for this book, by some of the best writers in the country. The Odes of the Sons of Temperance and Good Templars are given in full, and set to appropriate music. The book is edited by WM. B. BRADBURY and J. N. STEARNS, and contains over 150 Hymns and Tunes, which will be found worthy of the great and noble cause they are intended to advance.

Price, in paper covers, 30 cents, single copies; $25 per hundred. Price, in board covers, 35 cents, single copies; $30 per hundred.

Temperance Hymn and Song Book.

THE NATIONAL TEMPERANCE SOCIETY have just published a new Temperance Hymn and Song Book, 32mo, 128 pages, consisting of hymns and songs set to old and familiar tunes.

The aim has been to select hymns and songs adapted to old familiar tunes, giving the first line of music of each, so that any one can "start the tune," and when started, every one can sing without notes.

A large number of hymns and tunes are given, especially adapted to Temperance Prayer-Meetings, which are now being held with so much interest and benefit in very many places.

The Odes of the Sons of Temperance, Good Templars, and Templars of Honor are also given, making the book a valuable "pocket companion" for all occasions.

Price, paper covers, single copies, 12 cents; $10 per hundred. Price, board covers, single copies, 15 cents; $13 per hundred.

The Temperance Speaker.

This book contains 288 pages of declamations and dialogues, suitable for Sunday and day schools, Bands of Hope and other Temperance Organizations. It consists of choice selections of prose and poetry, both new and old, from the Temperance orators and writers of the country, many of which have been written expressly for this work. It should be in the hands of every friend of temperance.

J. N. STEARNS, Publishing Agent,

172 William Street, New York.