

THE BIBLE RULE

OF

TEMPERANCE:

TOTAL ABSTINENCE FROM ALL INTOXICATING DRINK.

BY

GEO. DUFFIELD, D.D.,

SENIOR PASTOR OF THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CONGREGATION
OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN.



NEW YORK:

National Temperance Society and Publication House,

172 WILLIAM STREET.

1868.

Rev. Geo. P. Tinsall
Compliments of
W. H. Kelley

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1868, by

J. N. S T E A R N S,

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

ROCKWELL & ROLLINS, STEREOTYPERS AND PRINTERS,
122 Washington Street, Boston.

CONTENTS.



PART I.

	PAGE
<i>What is the Bible Rule of Temperance?</i> Eph. v. 18.	
The Bible Rule explicitly laid down	11
What is Temperance?	14
Total abstinence from intoxicating drink enjoined in the text	18
What is Intoxication?	25
All intoxicating liquors poisonous	29
Fermented liquors alcoholic	36
The apostle's description of wine	39
Fermented wines known as poisonous by ancients	48
Word translated sober signifies total abstinence	55
Effects of alcoholic drink	65
Alcohol not nutritious	75
The Bible consistent on this subject	81
Miracle of Cana	92
Paul's advice to Timothy	100
Other objections	104
Contrasts	109

PART II.

	PAGE
<i>Duty of the Churches in relation to Communion Wine.</i>	
Responsibility of the Churches and their influence	125
The attitude of the Churches	129
Duty of the Churches	130
Wine in the Eucharist the juice of the grape	136
Design of the Lord's Supper	138
Fitness of its Symbol	140
Wines of Commerce alcoholic	143
Adulteration of Wines	144
Use of Enforced Wines morally wrong	146
Fermented Wines Intoxicating	148
Fermented Wines condemned in the Bible	152
Objections of special texts	160
General corroborative considerations	173
Unfermented juice of the grape approved	176
Old Testament Language	180
New Testament Language	183
Paul and Peter's Testimony	188
Positions Established	191
Reasons why the Church should thus act	193
Concluding Remarks	203

P R E F A C E .



THE writer of the following pages, from the earliest period in the history of the Temperance Reformation, has been convinced, that the true and strong ground on which it rests is the immorality of the use, sale, and manufacture of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. His views were presented to his own congregation first, and in February, 1834, to the public through the press. Believing that the will or law of God is the ground of moral obligation, he felt that the pledge of total abstinence was in reality but a solemn recognition of and declaration of assent to the obligation binding to obedience unto God, to be carried out in purpose and practice. As to any other ground, as of interest, convenience, expediency, or conventional compact, he had no confidence, if preferred and adopted, that

the reformation could be successfully placed on it, or permanently prosecuted. The experience of more than forty years has confirmed him in his original convictions. It was on this ground the cause of Temperance Reformation was at first attempted and urged. At a national convention, held in the city of Philadelphia, the moral character of the pledge was questioned and discussed. For the union of all parties, and to meet the scruples of those who objected to pledges of solemn and religious character, the moral obligation, if not ignored, was superseded, and toned down to expediency and conventional compact, of which every one, in view of varying circumstances, might be exclusive judge. It is unnecessary here to relate the phases and fluctuations of the Temperance cause, as thereafter prosecuted. The question was naturally and very early raised, by sober-minded people and professing Christians, does the word of God sanction or require total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks? In other words, is this the Bible rule of Temperance? Those whose careful study of the Scriptures led them to feel themselves under moral obligation

to practise it, whether in or out of the visible fellowship of different religious denominations, have generally stood fast and maintained their opposition to intemperance in every form and degree.

The object of the tract now respectfully offered, is to meet the inquiry as above stated, and to show that the moral obligation to practise total abstinence is as clear as is the expressed will of God upon the subject. Total abstinence from intoxicating drink is not a rule prescribed by mere human authority, but one that rests on a "Thus saith the Lord." The recent attempt of certain Reverend writers to resist the teaching and practice of total abstinence, is but the revival of the effort that once neutralized, to some extent, the power and arrested the progress of the Temperance cause. It was said, in 1835, that to give a moral character and obligation to the Temperance pledge was to trespass on the rights of conscience, and introduce theological and sectarian ideas into a platform which should invite a willing catholic coöperation. But it emasculated the pledge. Now it is said, "The attempt to make it a rule of the Christian life, right in the face of

Scripture we resist, and will resist, as we would resist the beginnings of a new inquisition. If teetotalism (meaning total abstinence) is preached as a matter of expediency, then each Christian is to be the judge in his own case of the expediency; and I have no fault to find with this view: but if mistaken men are going to make it a law, and put non-conformists under a ban, then, in the name of the Lord Jesus and Christian liberty, I protest; and I charge them with preaching a false gospel, and with keeping thousands of perishing souls from the cross by painting that blessed cross in false colors. This grievous error these misguided men never perceive."* But if God, by his Spirit, speaking through his inspired apostle, has required total abstinence, what then? Man's rule may be resisted; but woe betides him that resists God.

This is the question presented to the view of all readers who desire to study and know what saith the Lord.

* Letter of Dr. Crosby to D. R. Thomason.

PART I.



THE BIBLE RULE

OF

TEMPERANCE.

THE

BIBLE RULE OF TEMPERANCE.

"WHAT IS THE BIBLE RULE OF TEMPERANCE?"

THIS question addresses itself to the conscience of every one who receives the Old and New Testament as of divine authority.

The sacred Scriptures contain the only infallible rule of faith and practice. This will not be disputed by the great mass of readers into whose hands the following pages may come. All who acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the word of God, acknowledge, also, their obligation to receive them as law and guide. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for

instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

It is proposed to show, in this tract, that total abstinence from all intoxicating drink is the Bible rule of Temperance.

The Christian's obligation to make this his rule is not general expediency, but the rightful authority of "Thus saith the Lord," if it be the teaching of the sacred Scriptures. The counsel and even what unbelievers may account the "theories and plans" of the Bible have merited the respect of many, who find its testimony verified by human experience, even though they concede not to it the supreme authority of infallible inspiration.

The discussion and argument, herein offered, are addressed to the judgment and conscience, not of the latter, but of those

who admit that "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. i. 21.

THE BIBLE RULE EXPLICITLY LAID DOWN.

The Apostle Paul, who spake, "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth," 1 Cor. ii. 13, lays down the rule of Temperance in drink, in the way of precept: "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit." Eph. v. 18. This the friends and advocates of moderate drinking admit, differing, however, radically from us as to the meaning of the apostle's language. It is therefore essential that its import should be definitely settled.

It will not be denied that the *animus* of the apostle in this text is, in general terms, to say the very least, that Christians

should take their excitement from the Spirit, and not from wine. The one is not auxiliary to the other; but the wine and the Spirit of God — for this, it is assumed, is the Spirit of which he speaks — are contrasted with each other.

The rationale of this contrast, of course, must not be lost sight of, if we would correctly ascertain the meaning of the apostle. It is to be found in the fact that the appetites, which have their seat in our animal nature, and the desires they excite, stimulate "the natural man." These natural animal appetites, becoming the occasions of moral corruption, incentives to crimes of every hateful sort, are at war with those virtues and graces of Christian character, which the Holy Spirit of God produces and excites in the renewed or spiritual man. Hence it follows that the forming and pampering of carnal tastes, appetites, and

desires leading to sin and sinful in their actings, cannot fail to be in contrast with the Spirit's work, and therefore adverse to the cultivation of holiness and true spirituality of mind. For thus has the apostle elsewhere explained himself: "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other." Gal. v. 16, 17. Whatever the apostle may mean by the expression, "be not drunk with wine wherein is excess," he does most undeniably teach, that it is in contrast with and opposed to being "filled with the Spirit;" that is, fully imbued with the excitement He produces. As a matter of duty and obligation, he does, obviously and undeniably, require Christians to be "filled with the Spirit," as

opposed to, and a substitute for, "being drunk with wine wherein is excess."

In this required antagonism, so forcibly presented by the apostle, we have the Christian rule of Temperance; and claim, as we proceed to show, that it is total abstinence from all intoxicating drink.

But here, on the threshold, it is proper to ask, —

WHAT IS TEMPERANCE?

The apostle affirms it to be a fruit of the Spirit, — one of the virtues and graces of Christian character produced by the Holy Spirit, as truly as is "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, or meekness." Gal. v. 22, 23. He puts it, in his catalogue in contrast with "drunkenness. and revellings," — the last named in his enumeration of vices, which exclude from "the kingdom of Heaven." Let it be noticed, that it is Temperance,

especially in the matter of drink, to which he has immediate reference, in both passages already cited. The ordinary definition of the word, and the general idea of Temperance, is moderation in regard to the indulgence of the natural appetites and passions.

These may be indulged, first, in what is lawful and right, as in the use of food for nourishment; or, second, in what is wrong and hurtful, as in the use of poisons. Temperance, in the former case, restrains from excess; in the latter, abstains totally. Each is *sui generis*, of its own kind. They cannot be identified by any process of law or logic. In so far as the means or modes of indulging the appetite are not sinful or hurtful, but lawful and right, Temperance is moderation. The food which is nutritious and conducive to health may be rendered hurtful by excess, inordinate use of

it, gluttony. "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. There may be gluttony of endless variety even in the use of grapes and unfermented wine. Self-denial and Temperance prevent excess in eating. But this is different from drunkenness. Drunkenness can never be produced by excessive use of nutritious diet; it is always by the use of alcoholic, fermented, or drugged liquors. Total abstinence from such is the only preventive.

The Greek word *ἐγκράτεια*, translated Temperance, means abstinence — universal and total — from what is evil. He is temperate, *ὁ τῶν κακῶν ἀπεχθή* who abstains from evil things. For example; chastity, which is total abstinence from unlawful, sinful, sexual indulgence, is denoted by the Greek verb *ἐγκρατεύομαι*, from which *ἐγκράτεια*

is derived. 1 Cor. vii. 9. Total abstinence from that which is evil, unlawful, sinful, is the radical idea of Temperance. It is part and parcel of self-denial, self-control, self-government, by whatever name we choose to call it. The extent to which this abstinence is required, the apostle has decided. All sorts or forms of evil are to be avoided. "Abstain from all appearance of evil." 1 Thess. v. 22. The moderate use or indulgence of anything, morally or physically evil, can lay no claim to be accounted Temperance, according to the meaning *ἐγκράτεια*. Before it can be justly claimed that the moderate use of wine or of any intoxicating liquor is Temperance, it must be shown that such liquors are legitimate means to be used for gratifying appetite. If God has disapproved of intoxicating drink or wine; if he has condemned it as an odious, horrible evil; and espe-

cially, if, by any precept or precedent, he has prohibited its use, — then, according to the Bible, total abstinence is the Temperance appropriate and requisite. That he has done so in relation to fermented intoxicating wine, is shown in detail in the sequel of this treatise. For the present we waive the proof of this point, and confine attention to

THE PRECEPT IN THE TEXT.

It is claimed, by “moderate” drinkers of wine, as they call themselves, to be a clear sanction of their idea and practice of Temperance. On the contrary, we affirm as the main position we propose to establish, that

TOTAL ABSTINENCE FROM INTOXICATING DRINK IS
THE TEMPERANCE ENJOINED BY THE SPIRIT OF
GOD IN THE TEXT.

“Contemptible! absurd!” may be the response made to this assertion, by those

who sympathize with the recent critic of Mr. Ritchie's "Scripture Testimony against Wine." But such attempts at "bluffing" betray either weakness or petulance. The scoffer may flaunt and laugh; but the lover of truth will not mistake antics for argument.

It is not denied that the apostle's language, as rendered in our English, is understood, by readers generally, to imply that there may be a legitimate use of wine as a beverage, provided it be not "in excess." None will deny that it prohibits what is commonly called "drunkenness." But we may here ask, rightfully and pertinently, what is excess? What is it to be drunk with wine? What is the rule of judgment in this matter? And who are to judge? Must every moderate drinker be his own exclusive judge as to his use of intoxicating drink? If not, by what law, usage, or

canon, is it to be decided when a man is drunk? Is every man to be a law unto himself? Or is public opinion to rule?

These questions are put, because there is a wide difference, even among wine-bibbers and toppers themselves, as to what is moderate drinking. No candid, honest casuist will say that they are captious or "Socratic" sophistry. We shall probably be told, "Ask the like questions with regard to food. The same principle or rule of judgment is applicable alike to gluttony as to drunkenness. There is a wide margin for personal liberty in both cases." We reply, if wine and intoxicating liquors are food, then moderate drinking is the rule, as in the case of eating,—that is, what is sufficient, not excessive.

Already it has been said that food necessary for life and health is not and cannot rightfully be placed in the same category

with intoxicating liquors. Water indeed is necessary, entering so largely as it does into the animal frame as one of its essential constituents. But fermented alcoholic mixtures do not.

They are not necessary as food, yea, are hurtful to life and health. It is disingenuous, mere evasive sophistry, to class them with either food or water; for it assumes what cannot be proved, that intoxicating drink of any sort is nutritious. On the contrary, while it supplies no constituent element of our animal frame, it introduces a pernicious and poisonous agent, that furnishes no nourishment, does not assimilate with, or build up and repair, the blood whence the organs and tissues, formed out of it, must derive the materials of which they are composed. Neither warmth, power, nor vitality are supplied by intoxicating drink, as the highest medical authorities have proved.

See the Treatise of Dr. William B. Carpenter, of London, on "The Use and Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors in Health and Disease, and the Tract of Dr. F. R. Lees, of Edinburgh, recently published by the National Temperance Society and Publication House,—to which, and other authorities, we may have occasion again to refer. "It may not be amiss to remark, in conclusion," says the former, "that it is through the medium of the water contained in the animal body that all its vital functions are carried on. No other liquid than water can act as the solvent for the various articles of food which are taken into the stomach. It is water alone which forms all the fluid portion of the blood, and thus serves to convey the nutritive material through the minutest capillary pores into the substance of the solid tissues. It is water, which, when mingled in various proportions with the

solid components of the various textures, gives to them the consistence which they severally require. And it is water which takes up the products of their decay, and conveys them, by a most complicated and wonderful system of sewerage, altogether out of the system. It would seem most improbable, then, that the habitual admixture of any other fluid — especially of one which, like alcohol, proposes so marked a physical, chemical, and vital influence upon the other components of the animal body — can be otherwise than injurious in the great majority of cases; and where a benefit is derivable from it, this will depend upon the fact, that the abnormal condition of the system renders some one or more of the special actions of alcohol remedial instead of noxious, so that the balance becomes on the whole in favor of its use.” — pp. 170, 171.

“If experience, science, and reason,” says Dr. Lees, “all unite, distinctly rejecting the claim of alcohol to be food, there is a *consensus* of authorities testifying to the fact of its being poison.” — p. 20.

With such array of indisputable authority in disproof of the plea for moderate drinking, founded on the false assumption supposed to be involved in the text we are considering, and which is used to interpret the meaning of the spirit in it, we pass to the consideration of

THE WORDS OF THE APOSTLE IN THE ORIGINAL.

In the Greek the text reads, *καὶ μὴ μεθύσεσθε οἴνω, ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἀσωτία*. The word translated “be not drunk,” *μεθύσεσθε*, is evidently used as a reflexive verb, in the middle voice, make not yourselves drunk. It is used in the New Testament, literally, to denote intoxication by drink, drunken-

ness in its current popular meaning, as in Luke xii. 45 ; 1 Thess. v. 7. *Ἡμεθύσθησαν* and *μεθυουσάν* are also used, metaphorically, as in Rev. xvii. 6, and xvii. 2, to denote excitement, illusion, disturbance of mind, a state of mind inconsistent with or different from the exercise of right sense and sound judgment. It is an inquiry altogether pertinent here, does the apostle use it in its literal or metaphorical sense?

WHAT IS INTOXICATION?

We admit that he uses the word in its literal sense. "Do not intoxicate yourselves." We shall have occasion again to notice the expression, when we shall refer to the means of intoxication of which the apostle speaks. At present, it is important and necessary to inquire, what is intoxication? The word, taken in its literal sense, has a wide range of meaning. It will not be denied that intoxication may and does

greatly vary in degrees. It is not to be estimated by the amount of intoxicating liquor drunk; for one will be overpowered and stupefied by what would make another only cross, garrulous, merry, or pugnacious, according to temperament. And the same person, in different states of body, will be differently affected by equal quantities.

It is indispensable, therefore, for the true understanding of this matter, that we should know, or be able to say precisely, what is intoxication. Our judgment of its nature is not to be formed from its degree, be that more or less. It is the radical idea of the word we need here,—by which to determine its real nature,—and not a sliding scale, by which to measure its intensity.

Our English word *intoxicate* is, almost letter for letter, the same with the Italian *intossicare*, which means to poison. It is derived from the Latin word *toxicum*; that

again from the Greek *τοξικον*, both of which denoted the deadly poison in which the ancients dipped the point of their arrows. There is not any other definition of the words intoxicate and intoxication, as we use them. They denote literally a disturbing of the understanding or the senses by imbibing poison. It may require more to overpower, stupefy, or disturb the senses than it does the natural, healthful functions of the understanding or mind. But any and every poison, which especially develops its presence and power in the brain, will and must measurably affect either or both. Increased mental excitement, exhilarated spirits, accelerated circulation of the blood, stimulated nervous energy, sleepiness, torpor, coma, suspended consciousness, disturbed functions of the senses, loss of voluntary power over the thoughts and locomotive organs, are all abnormal

conditions produced by a poison, affecting the brain according as it varies in degree or amount.

In the normal condition of the body, the introduction of a poison into the brain is not needed in any, even the least, degree. It must be always hazardous; and often leads to injurious and dangerous results; even though the poison may have been diluted, or be insufficient, in quantity or power to, produce that bewilderment, or stupor, and loss of the power of the will over mind and muscle, which are commonly meant by our English words "drunk" and "drunkenness." But even these words have more or less significance, covering a wide range of phenomena, or effects produced by imbibing intoxicating liquors. In all cases, in whatever stage or degree of effects produced, they are to be traced to a cerebral poison contained in the intoxicating

liquors drunk ; and therefore, as Dr. Carpenter remarks, "If the classical term 'intoxication' be habitually employed as the equivalent of the Saxon 'drunkenness,' we are justified in turning that classical term into English again, and in asserting that the condition of drunkenness, in all its stages, is one of poisoning."

ALL INTOXICATING LIQUORS POISONOUS.

Our argument, taken from the text, requires, at this point, that the poisonous character of intoxicating liquors be brought distinctly and fully into view. They are either distilled, fermented, or enforced mixtures, and in endless variety of combinations now currently manufactured, sold, and used, bearing different names of "spirits," "wine," "beer," etc. We group them all, under the generic name of alcoholic liquors. It is the presence of a poison in them that

gives them intoxicating power. That poison specifically develops itself in the human brain. It has received the name of alcohol from the Arabic word *al kahala*, which was first introduced into Europe by the Moors, in the twelfth century, A. D. 1150. The word originally denoted an impalpable powder, a preparation of antimony used by females in oriental countries, for painting the eyebrows. By accommodation, it was appropriated afterwards to designate distilled spirit. It is now employed, in chemistry, as a generic term, to denote a class of substances, some volatile, and others not even liquid, which kindle and burn at greater or less degrees of temperature. The constituent elements of alcohol are the same with those of sugar, whether of grapes or other vegetable substances. They are carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen. But they are united in very different proportions, so as to render the

two things unlike and antagonistic in their properties. Sugar is healthful and nutritious, forming an important constituent of fruit and vegetable food. Alcohol, or spirits, is a poison, and injurious to the normal health of the body. This poison is found, in greater or less degrees, in every fermented liquor or drink. It is the same specific cerebral poison in kind, though not of equal degree of virulence, with the concentrated spirits obtained by distillation. All fermented liquors are alcoholic, whether beer, ale, porter, cider, wine, and as really as are gin, rum, brandy, whiskey. They contain the poison, alcohol, just in the same degree in which the sugar of fruit, grain, and other vegetable substances is destroyed by the process of fermentation.

The constituent elements of sugar, as they are united by the Creator, and exist, naturally, in proportions to make it a

healthful article of food, are combined, in the new uncreated and unnatural ratios of alcohol or spirits, so as to render it injurious, dangerous, and destructive eventually of health and life. No ingredients introduced into fermented liquors can rid them of the alcoholic poison, or neutralize its power.

It is not necessary to detain the reader here by quotations from admitted and standard authorities, in proof of the above assertions. They will not be denied by any who have carefully studied Chemistry, or examined its different text-books on this subject. It is sufficient to refer in general to English, French, and German chemists and physiologists, Dr. E. Smith, F. R. S; W. B. Carpenter, F. R. S; Dr. Frederick Lees; Prof. James Miller, of Glasgow; Lallemand, Perrin, Duroy, Baron Liebig,

Professors Lehmann and Moleschott, etc., etc.

It is proper here to remark that there are numerous articles, called wines, ale, beer, brandies, whiskey, old Bourbon, etc., extensively manufactured and sold by distillers, "rectifiers," and venders of intoxicating liquors, which are villanous adulterations, produced by vile admixtures combining such dangerous poisons as strychnine, nux vomica, Cocculus indicus, sulphuric acid or oil of vitriol, sugar of lead, and others unnecessary to mention. We may here refer in general to the analyses of Dr. Cox, of Ohio, S. P. Duffield, Ph. D., of Detroit, the publications of Mr. E. C. Delavan, of Albany, and the various laws enacted in different States against adulteration of liquors, in proof of the extent to which this murderous trade is carried on.

It is amazing that the "wines" and liquors of such abominable and poisonous character, and which are by for the most numerous in the market, yea, almost supplanting the unadulterated liquors, should have been ignored by such men as Rev. Dr. Howard Crosby, and Rev. D. R. Thomson; and that, by their advocacy of wine-drinking, without any discrimination whatever as to their known deleterious character, and in their laughing, jocose badinage against "teetotalism," they should have strengthened the hands, and raised the shout of "*Io triumphe*" among the hosts of rum-sellers, saloon-keepers, and murderous liquor-dealers, who are dispensing poison, and inflicting on our country, by their adulterations, a plague more fatal and malignant every year than ever the Asiatic cholera has been in its worst visitations! With grief we exclaim, in relation to such

trifling and sport, *Fænum habet in cornu; longe fuge!*—"He has a tuft of hay on his horn; fly far from him,"—says Horace, comparing those whom he was criticising to a mad bull.

If they know not that the Sherry, Madeira, Port, and other kinds of wine sold under false names, and quaffed by multitudes, are enforced and adulterated mixtures, it is not because the means of knowledge were not within their reach. Their ignorance and indifference, on such a solemn and awful subject, is no excuse for their becoming virtually—indirectly, we say, not designedly—the apologists and patrons of a murderous traffic, in many places factiously opposing law, order, and good government. It is not, however, with this flood of adulterated liquors, bearing the brands of endless falsehood on their face, that our argument is concerned; nor is it

their murderous character, and the guilt and danger of using them, of which we speak; but only of the alcoholic, poisonous intoxicating liquors. Whether distilled, enforced, or simply fermented, the poison of alcohol forms a constituent of them all. Neither the purest unadulterated fermented wines, nor any fermented liquor, can lay claim to exemption from the charge of containing the poison that intoxicates.

FERMENTED LIQUORS ALCOHOLIC.

Alcohol, or spirits, is the product of fermentation. Fermentation is the natural process of decomposition or destruction; by which the elements of a substance, as they naturally exist in a living, healthful state, suffer a series of changes in their relations, separating and resolving them ultimately into putrefaction or death. To understand the pertinency and force of our argument,

it becomes necessary here to bring into view the fermenting process.

It has three stages. The first is called the vinous fermentation; which develops or eliminates the spirits or alcoholic poison from the sugar. The second is the acetic; by which the alcohol is converted into vinegar. And the third and last is the putrefactive; which destroys the substance utterly. From the first to the last, it is a process of dissolution. If the process is not arrested, the juice or mixture cannot be saved. Human skill has contrived to arrest this process of decay, and prevent the death in which it terminates. When arrested in its first stage, the sugar is converted into alcohol, and the liquor becomes an intoxicating drink. When arrested in the second stage, it becomes vinegar, having lost the sugar that remained and was not converted into alcohol. Dr. Carpenter, of the Uni-

versity of London, says, "The alcoholic fermentation is the first of a series of degrading changes, which, if allowed to continue unchecked, terminates in the putrefactive process."* The fact is not to be denied that fermentation is the process of decomposition and decay, and tends, if not arrested, to putrefaction, just as certainly as disease, if not arrested, terminates in death. Hence the fallacy of the objection often made against the condemnation of fermented liquors, because, fermentation being a process in nature, the alcohol eliminated is "a creature of God." Disease and death are natural processes, ordained of God for punishing sin. Who will hence argue that they are therefore to be cherished and enjoyed? Fermentation is not a vitalizing process, like those which produce fruit and food; but, like disease in the human body,

* On Alcoholic Liquors, p. 83.

interfering with the functions of health, and destroying life. It is, in other words, a process of death, developing poison at every stage. In this lies the radical distinction between fermented wine and living water. The water is necessary for health and life. The wine contains a poison, rendering it unsafe and destructive of health and life.

THE APOSTLE'S DESCRIPTION OF WINE.

It is to this poison of alcohol, which forms a radical constituent and is characteristic of fermented wines and liquors, Paul's very peculiar form of expression in the text has direct reference. He prohibits any and every wine "*wherein* is excess," *εν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἀσωτία*. It is the *property* of the wine or liquor of which he speaks, — *its* peculiar characteristic, — the quality which distinguishes the whole class; for he does not use the definite article. It is not *τὸ* *ὄιν*, *the* wine, but *α* wine, any wine, in which is

excess. The excess is not predicated of the drinking, but of the wine, as any Greek scholar may see from the original, or even English scholar from our own translation. The plain, indisputable point and import of the apostle's terms is to interdict the use of any wine, in which wine is excess, *ἀσωτία*. But what does this word mean?

We cannot, according to the use and import of our English word "excess," refer it to the wine as a quality of the liquor; and therefore, many readers take it for granted that it must have reference to an immoderate use of it, — imbibing excessively, — so much as to produce drunkenness. Now, take the word "drunkenness," or the phrase "to be drunk," — according to their current import, as commonly used, — it is certainly pertinent and important for us to ask, whether the apostle, or rather the Spirit of God speaking by the apostle, could have

meant to say, or imply, that the use of intoxicating wine is allowable, provided, only, it be not indulged to *this* degree of excess. Who is to be judge of that degree? And who is to furnish the sliding scale by which to determine where drunkenness begins?

We see abundant and lamentable proof of the injury, misery, and crime incident to the concession, that a man is to be the judge for himself when his drinking becomes excess. We shall return to this point in a few moments when we have examined philologically the meaning of this word of the apostle, *ἀσωτία*, translated *excess*.

This word *ἀσωτία* occurs but three times in the New Testament, Titus i. 6, 1 Pet. iv. 4, — in both which places our English translation renders it riot, — and in the text now under consideration, Eph. v. 18. In Luke xv. 13, the adverb *ἀσώτως*, derived from the

same root, is translated riotously ; literally it means no saving ; or better, insalvableness, that which cannot be saved, *de cujus salute spes nulla est reliqua*. "Of which there remains no hope of safety." — SCHLEUSNER. Whether the apostle used the word in its strict literal sense, or metaphorically, as it occurs in classical writers, is a question of some importance ; yea, necessary to be met, if we would satisfactorily determine its meaning. In Tit. i. 6, it occurs in the description he gives of the moral character or qualifications of a bishop, particularly in his marital relations, — literally, "not in a category, *κατηγορια* (that is, a series, order, or class), of unsalvableness," which here according to the analogical import of the word, means morally unsafe, vicious, corrupting. The Apostle Peter uses the word in reference to the character and habits of a vicious life. "That ye run not with them into the same

excess" (profusion) (*ἀνάχουσι* is the word for excess) "of riot," *της ἀσωτίας*, literally of that unsalvableness. What that was he had fully described in the preceding verse. It was the vices and habits of lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, etc., in which the Gentiles lived, — a state, a character, habits, utterly incompatible with salvation. The word in this verse, 1 Pet. iv. 4, translated "excess of wine," is *δουφλογίαις*, and means, given to, addicted to, fond of, devoted to, wine. This does not necessarily imply what is now commonly called drunkenness; but that use and degree of wine stimulants which the sensual, corrupt world indulged in in their social and sacred banquets and their lascivious idolatry. The metaphorical sense, and classical use of this word *ἀσωτία*, as expressing luxury, prodigality, wickedness, it is easy to see, depends upon the literal meaning of unsalvableness. What

is incompatible with safety, dangerous, injurious, deadly, are analogical meanings not at all questionable; and this use of the word is just as legitimate as when we employ any term, taken from sensible natural objects or acts, to express moral and intellectual ideas, of which analogical character and import, of necessity, is all our language employed for such purposes.

In the apostle's use of the word, in Eph. v. 18, the text under immediate consideration, we see no reason why it should have been translated "excess," and not be understood in its literal meaning. For he is not describing or referring to anything intellectual or moral, but simply to a physical object.

He is describing the drink, in which is unsalvableness, no safety, — any wine in which is a pernicious principle, *άσωτία*, a deadly poison, and uses the word in such connection as

to require a strict literal meaning. One of the rules of rhetoric and of sound exegesis requires that language be taken in its literal meaning, except where this sense is obviously so absurd and false as to render the figurative meaning imperative. No language could so well, so briefly, and so accurately describe the literal alcoholic poison contained in all fermented wines, as does this very peculiar expression, *ἀσωτία*, of the apostle, when taken in the literal sense.

The reader acquainted with Greek knows that it is a noun derived from a compound, which means unsafe (*α*, not, and *σωλο* or *σωζω*, *facere saluum*, to preserve, to keep, to make safe). The obvious design, therefore, of the apostle is to prohibit intoxication by any article of drink that is unsafe, poisonous. The poison of alcohol was not known in its essential chemical character at that day. It therefore could

not be designated, as we now do, by a specific appropriate name, since alcohol has been chemically detected and demonstrated to be a radical constituent of fermented liquors. It could, therefore, only be intelligibly referred to by the Omniscient Spirit that spake through Paul, — the discoveries of science not being embraced intentionally in Revelation, — by a periphrasis describing its nature. It is a matter of surprise and admiration with what accuracy, however, this has been done by the phrase *ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἄσωτία*. Were we to translate it thus "in which is alcohol," a poison now known to be an instrument of death, we would only but legitimately avail ourselves of the light or demonstration afforded by modern science, to give the more point and significance to the apostle's language. "Intoxicate not yourselves with any wine in which is alcohol," is as exact,

as literal, as just, and at this day as perfectly intelligible a rendering, as can be given. This precept of the Spirit by the apostle, therefore, explicitly, fully, — and we will say without any forced exegesis, or improper stress of criticism, — enjoins total abstinence from intoxicating liquors as a beverage. It is the very rule and idea of Temperance, now extensively prevalent, which has been reached, or rather recovered, by the increased light of moral science and chemical analysis.

We wrest this text, therefore, so much perverted and abused by wine-bibbers, — as rendered according to our English translation, — from their grasp, and claim it, according to the original, as the clearest, plainest, and most pointed sanction, yea, requisition, of total abstinence from intoxicating liquors. The rule is positive.

In corroboration of this conclusion we

have two remarks to submit to the candid reader's attention. The first is

FERMENTED WINES WERE KNOWN OF OLD TO BE
POISONOUS.

Long before their constituent of alcohol was analytically, chemically, discovered, they were so spoken of. Every boy that has read Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, when learning Greek at school, will remember the conversation, reported to have taken place between the young Cyrus and his grandfather Astyages, on this very subject.

The noble boy, early trained to Temperance, had essayed to hand to his grandfather the wine-cup more dexterously than Sacas, his cup-bearer. In doing so, he neglected to taste himself the wine, as was the custom of Sacas. When jocosely asked by Astyages why *he* had not done so, he replied, "Because he feared that poison had been mingled in the cup; for, at the enter-

tainment he had given his friends on his birthday, he plainly saw that poison was poured into the cup." When the astonished Astyages asked him how he knew that, he said that they became deceived in mind and body. "For first," said he, "those things which you do not let us boys do, you do yourselves. You all cry out together, and can learn nothing from each other; you sing ridiculously; and although you don't hear him that sings, yet you swear that he sings admirably. Each one, talking of his strength, when he would rise to dance, not only fails to do so according to rule, but cannot even stand erect! You forget yourselves, — you, that you are king, and the rest that you are their ruler. I learned, indeed, then, what is your license of speech, that none of you are silent." *

* Hutchinson's Xenophon, p. 20.

The unsophisticated youth told the truth. He could refer what he saw to nothing but poison in the wine. Xenophon was a philosopher, and put into the mouth of his young hero the very rebuke which inspired wisdom has given to those who exercise authority: "It is not for kings to drink wine, nor for princes strong drink." Prov. xxxi. 4. Wine was known to Greeks and Persians to contain poison. Moses says of wine-bibbers, ages long before Cyrus, "Their wine is the poison of dragons, and the cruel venom of asps." Deut. xxxii. 32. "Look not on the wine," said the Spirit of God by Solomon, "when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright (foams, sparkles). At the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." Prov. xxiii. 31, 32. The poison is well designated by the serpent and adder. We

present the wine-cup to the reader's eye, with its fitting emblem, in a vignette at the close of this tract. Alcohol is the serpent and the adder.

It has not been without meaning, that the Spirit of God has thus used the deadliest animal poison as the fitting representative of this malignant, fatal, cerebral poison in the wine, whose properties and effects, during the last fifty years, have been so fully investigated, and proved to be so pernicious. "Is there not," — asks Dr. John Mair, of Edinburgh, Staff Surgeon to her Britannic Majesty's Army, and now of Toronto, Canada West — "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? Are we not thus forcibly reminded of the seducer of our first parents, — that evil spirit

“ ‘ Who brought death into our world, and all our woe,
With loss of Eden ? ’ —

and who has made more havoc of the human soul, in a physical, moral, and spiritual point of view, probably, by this one poison; alcohol, than by all other poisons of the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms heaped together into one vast putrid mass, rankling with corruption and sending forth noxious exhalations to blast and destroy? Would it not seem by this (one of the earliest notices of alcohol in Scripture, etc., Deut. xxxii. 32) to have had the brand of infamy purposely stamped upon it by the Almighty, when the human race were still in their pupilage; that by its persistent association with the ‘Great Dragon, that old serpent, called the Devil,

and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world,' alcohol might forever retain its place in the memories of all mankind, exciting horror, detestation, and disgust in their breasts, and causing them to shrink from it as a most cruel and treacherous enemy?"*

It is a terrific cerebral poison; and is unquestionably the fitting means and favored element by which the Demon of all evil takes possession of the mind and heart of man. Shakespeare has not expressed himself too extravagantly when he so inimitably describes it in his impassioned apostrophe, "O thou invisible spirit of wine, if thou hast no name to be known by, let us call thee Devil! — Oh, that men

* See Dr. Mair's work entitled "Nephaleia; or, Total Abstinence from Intoxicating Liquors in Man's Normal State of Health, the Doctrine of the Bible," etc., p. 49.

should put an enemy to their mouths to steal away their brains !”

The remark of Coleridge, quoted by Dr. Mair, is so beautifully appropriate to the view of the apostle's meaning, unfolded by our critical examination of his language, in the text we have made our theme, namely, Eph. v. 18, that we cannot withhold it from the ordinary reader or the exegetical scholar : “ A language will often be wiser, not merely than the vulgar, but even than the wisest of those who speak it ; being like amber in its efficacy to circulate the electric spirit of truth, it is also like amber in embalming and preserving the relics of ancient wisdom, although one is not seldom puzzled to decipher its contents. Sometimes it locks up truths which were once well known, but which, in course of ages, have passed out of sight and been forgotten.” In the present case we are filled with wonder and ado-

ration, when we discern in the marvellous aptness of this word, *ἀσωτία*, which the apostle used under the inspiration of the Omniscient Spirit, how accurately has been described the poison, alcohol, then unknown by that name, but through the light of science since proved to be just the very term, of all others, most appropriate, by which to characterize intoxicating liquors and fermented wines.

Our second remark is, that,

THE VERY WORD WE TRANSLATE TO BE SOBER,
SIGNIFIES TOTAL ABSTINENCE.

That word is *νηφω*. It is derived, as lexicographers all agree, from the negative particle *νη*, not, and *πινω*, or *πιω*, the verb that means to drink. Literally, drink not. "Let us who are of the day be sober," — *νήφωμεν*. 1 Thess. v. 8. Peter uses it three times. "Be ye therefore sober, *νηφῶντες*, and hope unto the end." 1 Peter i. 13.

“Be sober, *νήψατε*, and watch unto prayer.”

1 Peter iv. 7, v. 8. Be abstinent. Its metaphorical use and signification, or rather its analogical meaning, when employed to denote mental and moral qualities, as cautious, watchful, prudent, circumspect, can be readily apprehended from the definition of Thom. Magister, *Νήψει τις όταν εκτός μέθης ἐστι* — “Whoever is sober is without wine,” has not drunk it, — totally abstains from it. For, who would ever think, or attempt to develop or promote these virtues by giving him fermented wine to drink? It is the very way to induce rashness, imprudence, recklessness, impropriety of conduct and conversation.

Total abstinence is the only effectual means of keeping men from becoming drunkards, of reclaiming them that are drunkards, and of banishing drunkenness from society. Even the influence of relig-

ion, it is well known, has not been an efficient protection, in many cases where its subject allowed himself to drink intoxicating liquors. Much as we rejoice in the salvation of Christ Jesus, and love to hear and know that he is preached, and much also as we value the power of faith and hope in Him, yet we must bear our testimony, and with a heavy heart, against the rash, inconsiderate way in which Dr. Howard Crosby has allowed himself to speak on this subject, when, in his letter commendatory of the abusive sophistry of Rev. D. B. Thomson's attack on the practice and advocacy of total abstinence, he says, "Our true way to attack drunkenness, as well as every other sin, is to preach *the personal Christ*, and the necessity of an absolute union with him." We have known not a few men of talent, influence, and early reputation for "piety," who have been as zealous, as clo-

quent, as powerful in logic, and mighty in the knowledge of the Scriptures, as Dr. Crosby himself, and more so, who have done just this very thing, and yet have died drunkards, and dragged after them many of their hearers. To preach "Christ and him crucified," "as the end of the law for righteousness," etc., involves more than Dr. Crosby's showing of it. And he will not have done all his duty in this respect, who ignores that self-denial which the Saviour practised and required. "Whosoever," said he, "will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me;" Mark viii. 34; yea, "If thy right hand offend thee cut it off and cast it from thee." Matt. v. 30.

WHAT PAUL MEANS WHEN HE SAYS "BE NOT DRUNK."

It will be objected against what has been said, that, even admitting this interpreta-

tion of the words "wherein is excess," the very fact of the apostle's saying "*be not drunk,*" implies a recognition and allowance of what is called a moderate use of wine. It is the drunkenness only that he condemns or prohibits. In reply, it is pertinent to remark, that the objector has no right to assume that Paul meant, in the word he used, exactly what is commonly now understood by the English words "to be drunk" and "drunken." Ordinarily it is the last and highest degree, or more advanced stage of intoxication, that is denoted by these expressions. Very often men will deny that they are drunk; and it is a difficult thing to prove that another is drunk, though obviously affected by liquor, unless the mind is stupefied, the speech disturbed, and the senses overpowered. We deny that the word Paul used was meant to designate that state, as though there was noth-

ing in the use of wine prohibited, provided only it did not reach that state of excess commonly called drunkenness. We deny, also, that the word used by Paul necessarily means intoxication, in that sense, or in such an extreme degree. The objector must prove it before he can use our English words "to be drunk" as expressing what the apostle meant by the term he used.

The meaning of his word is to be determined by its current use in his day. If the word had a wide range of meaning, from the effect produced by the drinking of any small amount of intoxicating wine down to the stupefaction or bewilderment caused by a larger quantity, then it is unfair and unallowable to restrict the apostle's meaning in the use of it to any one particular phase, or much less to the lowest degree, of intoxication. The original expression is *μεθυσχῆσθεις*, which means, be not excited or affected with

wine; be not in wine. The word is derived from *μεθυ*, which was a name among the Greeks for wine. It was a sweet wine, and sometimes called *γλευκος*, the juice of the grape before it became acidulated by fermentation. It can be called sweet, properly, only before it has begun to ferment, or in the early stage of that process, when but a small portion of the sugar is converted into alcohol, and many are tempted by its sweetness to drink it freely. This, we think, most probably, is the precise idea of the apostle. Do not drink freely, plentifully of *μεθυ*, wine not yet deprived by fermentation of its saccharine matter. He contrasts this drinking with being filled (*πληρωσθε*, but be ye filled) with the Spirit. Seek your excitement and comfort from the Spirit of God, and not from the animal indulgence in *μεθυ*, or sweet wine, or any wine in which is poison, *άσωτία*. This is the

utmost extent of meaning to which the apostle's language can be legitimately pressed. But it by no means involves necessarily the idea of being drunk, or of drinking to stupefaction or drunkenness. Too much or too liberal a use even of *μεθυ*, or sweet unfermented wine, should be avoided, and more especially of that which is intoxicating, alcoholic, in its nature *εν ᾧ εστιν ἄσωτία*.

The word *μεθυσθεσθε* does not, always and necessarily, mean to drink wine to drunkenness, — to be drunk, as the English words are now understood. It is used in the Septuagint translation, Gen. xliii. 34, to express simply the cheerful excitement among Joseph's brethren at the dinner he gave them, at which there was no such thing as modern drunkenness. *Επιον δὲ, καὶ ἐμεθυσθήσαν μετ' αὐτοῦ*. They drank, and wined, or took wine, with him, — certainly they didn't all become drunk together! When Eli saw

Hannah moving her lips and betraying emotion while silently engaged in prayer he "thought she had been drunken," and said "Put away thy wine from thee;" "how long wilt thou be drunken?" Ἔως πότε μεθυσθήσῃ, 1 Sam. i. 14. He had misconstrued her excitement in earnest, agonizing, silent prayer, — no "drunkenness" about it. So did the scoffing crowd misjudge the apostles on the day of Pentecost because they spoke strange tongues. These men are full of γλευκος, new wine, — sweet wine, Acts ii. 13. They could explain the strange mental excitement they witnessed in no other way more gratifying to their coarse wit, than to laugh it off, saying they had been drinking too freely. In 2 Sam. xi. 13, we read of Uriah, that when David called he "did eat and drink before him; and he made him drunk." The Seventy render it Ἐπιε, καὶ ἐμέθυσεν αὐτὸν, — literally, he drunk, and

wined him, — made him take wine with him. There is nothing in the account of this transaction that shows Uriah to have been so much affected by liquor as to unfit him for orderly withdrawing from David's presence to his place, the servants' quarters, and for keeping the resolution he had formed, to be in wakeful attendance on his majesty through the night. The word covers the whole range or scale of excitement from wine or intoxicating drink, from the first imbibing that exhilarates, to the repletion that makes drunk. There is a brain poison in fermented wine that tends directly to impair the exercise of sound judgment. And hence the word *μεθυσ* is metaphorically employed, as the Latin word *ebrius*, to denote one who is for the time *mentis inops*, — whose mind is so excited and disturbed that he cannot use it with right sense and sound judgment. In this metaphorical sense the

word is used in Rev. xvii. 2. It is of little comparative importance to say whether Paul uses it literally or metaphorically. Yet the description being of a *literal thing* — the wine that contains alcohol — we think restricts us to the former. For such a state of mind alcoholic drinks literally produce, in different degrees, according to the amount imbibed.

THE EFFECTS OF ALCOHOLIC DRINK.

Here it becomes necessary, for the truth's and our argument's sake, to trace the effects which the alcohol contained in fermented wines and liquors produces. We condense them from the very full and accurate account given of the phenomena of alcoholic intoxication, by W. B. Carpenter, M. D., of the University of London. Alcohol enters quickly and unchanged into the blood; does not assimilate as food; and is carried

as a liquid fire to the brain. There it operates as a poison, disturbing its normal healthful action, degenerating its component or radical elements, and injuring both the blood and tissues. Its direct and appropriate effect, as chemists and pathologists have shown, is to corrugate or shrivel the tissues, and to coagulate whatever soluble albumen — which is a nutritive substance — they contain. Thus deranging their chemical relations, it disturbs the normal series of changes involved in the process of nutrition. It excites directly, or stimulates the nervous power; and, by exalting for a time the vital activity of the tissues, is always measurably followed with a corresponding depression. It possesses no tonic properties, even in small doses, whether taken in the form of wine or malt liquor. What is called, and mistaken for, its tonic virtue is but a manifestation of its

stimulant effects. It is as a diffusive stimulant only that it is prescribed by any well-informed and safe physician. The use and design of a stimulant is to prevent the diminution or sinking of the vital force. It is valuable as such, just as it may keep the vital energy from being exhausted, till the force of disease abates, and the system can be toned up and brought back by nutriment to its normal healthful state. The introduction of alcoholic stimulus into the human body is never needed in a normal healthy condition. It is simply the introduction of a poison, and is therefore, in any and every stage and degree, well and truly called intoxication, as its effects demonstrate.

INTOXICATION DESCRIBED.

As in fermentation, so in intoxication, there are three stages. The first is that of stimulation, producing in most persons an

increased force and rapidity of the heart's contractions, evidenced by a full, frequent, and strong pulse. With this, there seems to be a general exaltation of the organic functions; the appetite and the digestive power being increased, and the secretions augmented, especially those of the skin and kidneys. The appetite and digestion, in normal health, are best regulated by wholesome diet, air, and exercise; and the substitution of alcoholic stimulants for them is, and always must be, unsafe. Alcoholic stimulus acts on the encephalic centres of the nervous system; and, hence, in the first stage of intoxication, the excited action, produced by the poison, shows itself in the talkativeness, rapidity, and variety of thought, exhilaration of the spirits, animation of the features and gestures, flushing of the countenance, and suffusion of the eyes. This mental excitement is very simi-

lar to the incipient stage of phrenitis or mania. It is not a uniform *exaltation* of the mental powers, but in some degree a *perversion* of them; for the voluntary control, the self-governing power of the will over the current of thought, — which is the distinguishing characteristic of the sane mind of man, — is considerably weakened, so that the heightened imagination and enlivened fancy have more unrestricted exercise; and, whilst ideas and images in the mind succeed each other with marvellous readiness, no single train of thought can be carried out with the same continuity as in the normal state of perfect sobriety. This weakening of the voluntary control over the mental operations must be regarded, then, as an incipient stage of insanity.

SECOND STAGE OF INTOXICATION.

In the second stage of intoxication, not merely the mental state, but the *sensorial*

apparatus is disturbed. The voluntary control of the thoughts is completely lost; the excitement becomes delirious, the ideas confused, the reasoning powers disordered, and hallucinations sometimes present themselves. Vertigo, or swimming of the head, double vision, ringing in the ears, and other sensory illusions occur. The muscular movements become tremulous and unsteady, the voice thick, the eyes vacant, the face commonly pale; symptoms which, if not cut short by vomiting, end in heavy sleep, from which the miserable inebriate awakes to feel horribly the consequences of his transgression. These effects differ in some degree with the previous habits. But when the poisoning, in this stage of intoxication, is not carried so far, those unaccustomed to such excesses usually suffer from headache, feverishness, with dry and parched and furred tongue, loss of appetite, depression

of spirits, loathing of alcoholic drinks, inability for mental or bodily exertion, and only recover from this condition after prolonged repose and abstinence. Where, however, such excess has become habitual, while the general condition, as above described, remains the same nearly, yet the poor creature craves a farther dose of his stimulant, which being obtained, he is able to take food and proceed with his ordinary avocations.

LAST STAGE OF INTOXICATION.

The third and last stage of intoxication is a state of *coma*, or deep sleep supervening on extreme diminution, or entire suspension of cerebral and sensorial power, varying in degree from capability of being aroused to some manifestations of sensibility, to a torpor as profound as that of apoplexy.

The above is but a condensed view of the effects produced by alcoholic poison. Dr. Carpenter has given a much more extended detail, and shown how, when the use of it has become habitual, various acute and chronic diseases are produced, such as inflammation of the brain, apoplexy, paralysis, epilepsy, delirium ebriosum, delirium tremens, insanity, oinomania, not to mention those of the alimentary canal, and of the different organs of the stomach, liver, kidneys, etc. The pathological phenomena of alcoholic intoxication and the *modus operandi* of the poison, have been fully made out from experiments and observations carefully made. What he says of that form of insanity called OINOMANIA, or wine madness, deserves particular attention. "This is an inordinate and uncontrollable thirst for excessive quantities of intoxicating drinks. In all its phases or forms, acute, periodic, and chronic,

it is God's own awful beacon, and comment on the danger and evil of those habits of drinking which the moderate wine-bibber is forming." "It must be remarked," he says, "that in these forms of the disease the patient is perfectly incapable of self-control; that he is impelled by an irresistible impulse to gratify his propensity; that while the paroxysm is on him he is regardless of his health, his life, and all that can make life dear to him; that he is prone to dissipate his property, and easily becomes the prey of the designing; and that in many cases he exhibits a propensity to commit homicide or suicide." *

The writer of this tract knew a man of learning and eminence as a teacher and theologian, who, full sixty years ago, made the confession, then indelibly imprinted on his youthful memory, that, "such was his thirst

* *Effects of Alcohol*, p. 47.

for strong drink, when he saw a bottle filled with brandy on the table before him, although a pistol loaded, primed, cocked, and pointed at his heart, were between him and it, and he knew it would explode if he approached it, yet would he run all risk of life to seize it and gratify his insatiable appetite !”

Enough has been adduced to show, that, from the very first drink for stimulus, or excitement, by alcoholic or fermented liquor, to the last stage, the use of such beverage is a poisoning process, incompatible with a safe and sane condition of body and of mind. It is poison first, and poison last, — INTOXICATION in any and every degree of imbibition.

It is unnecessary to extend our extracts from the valuable author just named, who has brought to his investigation of the whole subject all the light which science can shed upon it, as well as the accumulation of facts

derived from experience and observation as a physiologist of acknowledged familiarity with the functions of the human system in a state of health, and as an able and skilful practitioner of medicine, thoroughly acquainted with the different agencies by which those functions are disturbed or impeded, and with the normal condition of the living organism replaced by one of disease. The reader is referred to the work itself, republished in the United States by Lea & Blanchard, of Philadelphia, in 1853, — a work which stands as an impregnable defence of the position that “total and universal abstinence from alcoholic beverages of *all sorts* would greatly contribute to the health, the morality, and the happiness of the human race.”

ALCOHOL NOT NUTRITIOUS.

To the above we add the testimony of the highest chemical authority on the continent

of Europe, in proof of the fact that alcohol furnishes no nutriment in any fermented drinks. It is the conclusion at which JUSTUS VON LIEBIG arrived more than twenty years ago.

"Beer, wine, spirits, etc., furnish," says this learned chemist, "no element *capable* of entering into the composition of blood, muscular fibre, or any part which is the seat of the vital principle." *

"The circulation will appear accelerated *at the expense of the force available for voluntary motion*, but without the production of a greater amount of mechanical force." †

See also Dr. F. R. Lees' tract, "Is Alcohol Food?" and his "Inquiry into the Reasons and Results of the Prescription of Intoxicating Liquors in the Practice of Medicine," p. 81. "Alcohol is neither food

* "Letters on Chemistry," 1844, p. 57

† See "Animal Chemistry," 1843.

nor physic, but poison possessing the power of death.”

It is therefore wise, well, and wonderfully gracious, that the apostle, as in the text we have exegetically considered, was led by the Spirit of God wholly to interdict, as poisonous, as being *άσωτια*, the use of alcoholic, that is, fermented or intoxicating drinks. There can be no safety in the use, however diluted, of a cerebral poison that generates disease and death. We need no other, no higher, no more specific, sanction of total abstinence from the use of intoxicating drink of every variety and grade,—any wine in which is *άσωτια*, ALCOHOL. Total abstinence is the Bible rule and idea of Temperance. Revelation and Science unite their testimony.

THE EXEGESIS CORROBORATED.

The apostle's antithesis gives point and force to it. “But be ye filled with the

Spirit." There is, as if he had added, a much better way for excitement, a stimulus safe and salutary for the Christian. It is to partake freely, even to repletion, of the Holy Spirit of God. For it is to his agency he refers, whose office and function it is to give life. "Walk in the Spirit and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh" — *ἐπιθυμίαν* — that is, ye will deny yourselves in what your carnal nature craves or desires. Among the works of the flesh he enumerates, Gal. v. 21, "drunkenness," as we have it in our English version; in the Greek *μέθαι*, which Schleusner interprets, a *μέθο*, *vinum et omnis potus inebrians*,—wine and every inebriating (or intoxicating) drink. This word occurs but three times in the New Testament. Luke xxi. 34, "Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged, made heavy, βαρηθώσιν, "with surfeiting," ἐν κραυπάλῃ. The word means literally headache

produced by intoxicating drink or over-eating, — call it surfeiting, as our translators metonymically render it, — *nimia cibi, potus que inebriantis ingurgitatio, qua crapula contrahitur*, — “drunkenness, and cares of this life.” The word is *μέθην*, wine-drinking. It occurs again, Rom. xiii. 13, “Not in riotings,” *κώμοις*, hilarious, festive conviviality and dancing, and drunkenness, *μέθαις*, wine-drinkings; and last in this verse, Gal. v. 21 — *μεθη* differs from *κραιπαλη* and *κωμοις*; and the distinction ought to be observed. Wine-drinking may not be carried to the extent of *κραιπαλη* or *κωμοις*, yet it is, according to the apostle, a work of the flesh which they who walk in the Spirit must and will avoid.

On the other hand, he enumerates among the fruits of the Spirit, “love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, *temperance*,” *εγκρατεια*, abstinence,

Gal. v. 22. The contrast is marked, and what the apostle teaches plainly by it is, that to be imbued with the Spirit is the only safe life-giving stimulus or excitement the Christian should seek, as well as the best and sure defence against wine-drinking. This accords with universal Christian experience. Wine-drinking is the bane of spirituality. To "be filled with the Spirit," and to be in wine or excited by wine, are so antithetical as to be irreconcilable and simultaneously impossible. They cannot coexist. To affirm they do, or can morally, is absurd, as were the pretexts of the old pagans, who claimed to have a divine afflatus, and to be actuated by their Deity, when inebriated. Thus correlate evidence supports the exegesis and views above advanced.

THE WHOLE BIBLE CONSISTENT IN ITS TEACHINGS
ON THE SUBJECT.

Having, as we think, confirmed our first and main position, that the apostle, in the text we have exegetically examined, enjoins total abstinence from intoxicating drink, as the idea and rule of Christian Temperance, we advance a second and corroborative proposition for the reader's careful and candid consideration. It is this: that nothing, in the entire, authoritative teaching of the Bible conflicts, or is inconsistent, with this apostolic idea and rule of Temperance. Whatever has been claimed to the contrary, by the advocates of moderate drinking, will not abide the test of thorough investigation.

Never has there been a book more abused, by wine-bibbers and drunkards, for their justification or excuse, than our English version of the Bible. No candid reader

will deny, that the use of isolated texts, irrespective of their connection, is inadmissible, on any and every correct principle of exegesis. There must be a due regard to the person speaking, writing, or reporting, — to the occasion, circumstances, and purpose, when, in connection with, and for which, the language was used, — to the current import of the words, — and to the animus and meaning of the one that uttered them. Thus, a text will necessarily possess a different import and authority, if it be the utterance of God himself, as an expression of His thought, from what it does, if it be the reported utterance of Satan or any historic personage. A reference or allusion to any existing custom or state of society, in the way of historic statement or description, although made by the Spirit of God, through the mouth or pen of an inspired prophet, does not neces-

sarily involve censure or approval; but, whether the one or the other, must be determined by the design of the speaker, and by related circumstances. Thus the habits of society, in respect of articles of food and drink, when alluded to, or stated incidentally by inspiration, as simply existing facts, may or may not have been improper and disapproved; but, whether the one or the other, when a mere reference is made without judgment expressed, must be determined on other grounds than the bald notice, historically, of the fact. Thus, when it is stated that Jacob had two wives, and "David took to him more concubines and wives," although the historical facts be certified to us by the authority of Inspiration, there is no implied approval, or admission of the propriety, of the procedure. The common sense of readers, generally, needs no instruction in such cases; so, even though it

could be shown that God himself refers to, and has reported to us, certain drinking usages in the olden time without his judgment expressed, it is illegitimate to infer, from that circumstance alone, the morality or immorality of the custom. Other general and unquestionable teachings of God's mind are sufficient, when given in the sacred Scriptures, without a specific judgment expressed in every reported historic allusion or statement as to usages and customs. Not a little of the disputes, by wine-bibbers, as to the propriety of wine-drinking, and God's alleged implied sanction or approval of it, has grown out of a contempt or neglect of the above plain dictate of sober common sense.

Of late years the ancient usages of society in relation to the various articles⁴ for beverage purposes among the Hebrews, and known by different names, have been made

the subject of careful and extended investigation. The looseness of our English translation, in relation to them, and therefore its liability to mislead, or to be abused by inconsiderate readers and disputants, have been fully and demonstratively exposed by learned critics and scholars. For a minister of the gospel and religious teacher to ignore the discoveries made of late, as to the *norma loquendi* of the Hebrew Bible on this subject; and, especially, as some are now doing, to treat it with contempt and scorn, is as disreputable to their scholarship as to their fidelity in the exposition of the word of God. When examined in the original, the Scriptures will be found divested of the alleged inconsistency and self-contradiction, sometimes apparent in our English version. Much is said of the wine that intoxicates, in rebuke and warning, in condemnation and prohibi-

tion ; but nothing in commendation or sanction of its use. Let all the passages in which wine, according to our English translation, is spoken of, be examined in the original, and due respect be paid to the import of their terms, and there will not be found any approval, direct or indirect, of drink that intoxicates.

The writer of this tract was led, in the providence of God, to do this thing some thirty-two years ago, before ever any one had turned their own or public attention to the subject. The result was a thorough conviction that the Scriptures nowhere approve of fermented or alcoholic liquors as a beverage, and that the wine spoken of as a blessing and with favor was unintoxicating. The results of his examination were published in 1835, and led to much discussion. They are given to the reader in the sequel or second part of this publication, with little

or no variation of importance, and are now, as they were then, more especially designed to urge upon the churches their obligation to exclude from the sacramental cup of holy communion all fermented, intoxicating wine.

It is unnecessary, therefore, in this first part of our tract to enter into a minute examination of the entire language of the original Scriptures as to wine and wine-drinking. The author has had for years *in retentis* the results of such investigation, every passage having been quoted and carefully examined, critically and hermeneutically. They are substantially in accord with those of Dr. F. R. Lees, Dr. Mair, Mr. Ritchie, and others, in their publications, with which earnest advocates of Temperance have of late years been familiar. It is sufficient here to state, for the satisfaction of the reader not acquainted with the original languages of the Old and New Testaments, or the history of

discussions on the subject, that there is a broad, unmistakable, and radical distinction, recognized in the Hebrew text between fermented wines and drinks that intoxicate, and the "new wine" and unfermented juice of the grape that does not, but is nutritious. The latter is not condemned, but called a blessing, as in Isaiah lxxv. 8. The former is disallowed and denounced when a judgment of them is expressed. The Scriptures never confound them, or use the names designating them as synonymous.

In our English version the word wine is employed to express no less than nine different things, designated in the Hebrew by as many different words; how accurately the reader may judge, when he is informed that three of these Hebrew words "indicate solids, not liquids; while of the remaining six, one is a generic term for wine made of grapes, another denotes the simple 'must,'

or unfermented juice ; the third, a wine prepared by art ; two others refer to the modes of use, as in the pure or the mingled state ; and the last is a generic term for a drink made of the palm, and other sweet drinks not made from grapes." *

This simple statement is enough to satisfy every candid mind that the word "wine," used in our English translation, possesses no value or authority whatever for settling the question as to the lawful use of fermented or alcoholic drink. Much less does the use of the Greek word *οινος*, a generic term occurring in the New Testament, settle the question as to the specific character of the article so called, whether it be fermented or unfermented. Both Greeks and Romans, as well as the Jews, knew the difference between the wines that intoxicate and the *mustum*, or pure unfermented juice of the grape, that

* See Dr. F. R. Lees' "Tirosh Lo Yayin," p. 7.

does not. They had their *γλευκος*, *gleucus*, or sweet wine, and *μεθο*, *methu*, of like character. And although our recent opposers of total abstinence object to the use of the word wine, to designate any other drink than fermented juice of the grape, and all the other vile preparations and adulterations current in the market under that name, yet were not the ancients of like mind and sensitiveness. They had, as we use the word wine, their generic word *οινος*, which did not of itself designate the specific character of this or other variety, whether *must*, unfermented, fermented, or enforced mixtures. The reader will find it, in Matt. ix. 17, and Mark ii. 22, and Luke i. 15, v. 37, 38, where it especially designates the juice of the grape before fermentation, and described as *οἶνον νέον*, *new wine*.

This generic import of the word requires that reference be had to the circumstances,

to determine accurately the nature or character of the article, or specific wine, spoken of. It is begging the question for the advocates of moderate drinking to assume that, because the word does sometimes denote intoxicating wine, it does so always!

Thus, various objections are obviated at once, and their force destroyed, in the mind of every candid person who seeks to know the truth, and who can appreciate logical reasoning. One very common one is taken from the miracle of the Saviour in Cana of Galilee, when, at the marriage feast, he turned water into wine. We have just as full and valid a right to assume and say it was an unintoxicating wine, as the moderate drinker has the contrary. The generic term *οινος* will admit either, and therefore there must be a reference to the circumstances, the usages of the times, the articles used for drink, and especially those preferred or

in best repute, as well as the character of Christ himself, and the religious proprieties of the occasion of His presence who ever was "holy, harmless, undefiled," and "knew no sin."

THE OBJECTION AGAINST TOTAL ABSTINENCE TAKEN FROM THE MIRACLE OF TURNING WATER INTO WINE BY THE SAVIOUR.

The ruler of the feast expressed his surprise to the bridegroom; whether publicly or privately it is not stated. "Every man, at the beginning, doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine till now!" John ii. 10. Why, it is asked, did the Saviour miraculously furnish wine to those already, partially at least, intoxicated—"well drunk"? How does it comport with the principles of total abstinence that He should have provided an intoxicating wine at all?

The objection derives all its force from false assumptions. It assumes, first, that the guests were, partially, at least, if not fully, intoxicated, toward the close of the feast. In reply it is enough to say, of this there is no proof. Even Mr. Thomason does not dare to intimate it. Only he argues against and pours contempt on the distinction between fermented and unfermented wine, assuming that the wine on the occasion, furnished by the bridegroom, was like the French "*vin ordinaire*," a weak country wine, that might be used in large quantity without producing intoxication. Let him prove it if he can. His denial of the distinction between fermented and unfermented wine will not do it. For it only proves either his ignorance or disingenuousness. The historic evidence of this subject is so overwhelming as to make his denial simply weak and ridiculous. But suppose we should

admit that the bridegroom's wine furnished for his guests was fermented. That does not prove the wine the Saviour supplied to have been such also. If he affirms it, the onus of proof rests with him.

The fact is not to be denied that the wine miraculously produced by the Saviour was so entirely different as to produce great surprise, and to attract particular attention on the part of the ruler of the feast. The Saviour was by no means implicated by, nor had he anything to do with, the wine, furnished by the bridegroom for his guests. If fermented and intoxicating, his sanction cannot be claimed for it. All that we know accurately about the matter is, that there was not enough for the guests. Mary discovered this fact and being concerned about it, told Jesus — *υστερήσαντος οίνου* — there was a want of wine. The most natural and appropriate supposition is, that the number of

guests attending, among whom were the Saviour and the whole company of his disciples, was greater than the supply. There is not a word said about the quantity previously provided, except that it failed.

As to the remark made by the ruler of the feast, "when men have well drunk," John ii. 10, the objector has no right thence to assume that there had been even a free use of the wine provided by the bridegroom. The word is *μηθυσθωσι*—when men have wine— that is all. And that phrase will cover as well only once serving the cup to the guests as oftener. But the remark of "the ruler of the feast" in this case will not prove that actually it had gone even that far on this occasion. For it has no reference directly to the then actual state of the guests; but only to a general usage of presenting first the good wine, and afterward following it with an inferior. All that we

may legitimately infer is, that the wine the Saviour made was "good" — preferable to that of the host. In what that quality of excellence consisted, Mr. Thomason has no right to assume, or to infer it, from the taste and judgment of modern wine-drinkers, whose tastes have been vitiated by the use of intoxicating drinks. It is the vitiated taste of modern wine-bibbers and inebriates that pronounces old, heady, enforced, "mellow" intoxicating wines, "the good." The wines of Palestine were not the wines of this day. The wine of Helbon and the wine of Lebanon were boiled juice of the grape, thick, sweet, and syrupy. The wine of Cyprus is at this day sweet and thick as oil. The wines of Greece and Rome, like those of Palestine, were of both kinds, fermented and unfermented; and, according to Pliny, were of almost endless variety.* The

* See the 14th book of his "Natural History."

providence of God has preserved ample information on this subject. The elder Cato, Varro, Columella, and Palladius, with Pliny, form a "succession of authors, extending from 150 years before, until about 130 years after, Christ, who have not merely described varieties of wines, but detailed the particular recipes for making them."* The sweet and weak wines were accounted the "good" wines. The famous Lesbian wine of Horace was not intoxicating, and was extolled on that account. The quality that entitled a wine to be called a "good" wine was, that it would not intoxicate. In this respect the ancients differed from modern sots and toppers, whose taste and judgment would have outraged the philosophy of Aristotle, Pliny, Plutarch, and even Horace.

Every legitimate consideration here suggested from the usages of antiquity goes to

* Dr. F. R. Lees' "Tirosh Lo Yayin," p. 6.

show that the wine the Saviour miraculously made had nothing in it in common with modern intoxicating liquors but the generic name. We therefore have much greater ground of presumption to infer that the Saviour's wine was an unintoxicating one, than Mr. Thomason and the sots have the contrary. Assuredly a God of mercy, a Saviour of infinite goodness, could not be supposed, for one moment, without its casting on him the reproach of the wise and the good of his day, to have furnished a beverage for abundant use, at all allied to, or of kindred character with, the wines they accounted the worse, because intoxicating; much less identical or similar with those current in our day, of poisonous character, prepared and enforced to inebriate. It is beyond all reason to assume or think that He should make a wine which God his Father had cursed, — which drunk but

moderately proves pernicious, — which wages war against the very vitals of the human frame, — which, drugged with hellebore and freighted with death, disorders the mind, depraves the morals, debauches the conscience, and destroys the soul, — which mocks and maddens, and is the fruitful cause of woe and sorrow, of contention and babblings, of “wounds without cause,” of wretchedness and disease, of torment and damnation, — the wine that “biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder,” — the wine that kindles the fires of Lucifer, and immolates his 60,000 wretched victims annually on the altars of human lust, — and which is, in fact, the pestilential breath of hell, worse than any sirocco’s blast to desolate and destroy. Far, far be it for any one by implication to attribute to the gracious and merciful Redeemer a procedure

so inconsistent with all the glories of his character.

PAUL'S PRESCRIPTION TO TIMOTHY.

The views already unfolded, it will be seen, at once obviate another objection against total abstinence as the rule of Temperance. It is that taken from the Apostle Paul's advice to Timothy, 1 Tim. v. 22: "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities." The generic import of the word, *οινος*, wine, forbids the assumption, that what Paul prescribed was the fermented, intoxicating wine. The notorious existence and use of the unfermented juice of the grape in his day, and its established reputation as the "good wine," render the presumption stronger in favor of *its* being the article prescribed than fermented and intoxicating drink. The unfermented wine is

nutritious, of easy digestion, sets light upon a weak stomach when taken in small quantity, quickly and readily assimilates, and, as a means of distributing nutriment, is, by skilful physicians who know its virtue, often prescribed to persons in feeble, delicate state of health. The writer of this article has seen, in many cases, its virtue, and knows it to be with happy results prescribed, as it is by skilful physicians with whom he is personally acquainted. If Mr. Thomason, Dr. Crosby, and others, who use intoxicating wine in the sacramental cup, know not that there is such an article prepared and in the market, furnished at this day to apothecaries and for communion purposes, it is proper that they should extend their information on the subject, and not reason, as they do, *ab ignorantia*. We have nothing now to say as to Mr. Thomason's remark about "the inconsistency of our

Temperance clergy in drinking wine, and offering it to the communicants, at the Lord's table."* There are those not liable to this merited reproach. But both Paul and consistent Temperance clergy, with numerous churches, are free from the charge of glaring inconsistency in this respect. Paul's prescription corroborates, rather than militates against, the position of total abstinence being the idea and rule of Bible Temperance. The undeniable distinction between fermented and unfermented wines in the apostle's times; the usages of antiquity, and the unmistakable judgment left on record of that day as to the excellence and hygienic properties of the unfermented juice of the grape, its medicinal virtue in cases like that of Timothy, and the general analogy of

* "Teetotalism," p. 60. The reader is referred to the second part of this tract for a full discussion as to the duties of ministers and churches concerning the wine to be used in the communion cup.

scriptural teachings approving it and condemning that which intoxicates, — forbid the supposition, much more the assumption, that Paul prescribed an article containing alcoholic poison, — a wine that has neither nutritive nor tonic value. “Chemical experiments have demonstrated,” says Prof. Youmans, of New York, “that the action of alcohol on the digestive fluid is to destroy its active principle, the pepsin, thus confirming the observations of physiologists, that its use gives rise to the most serious disorders of the stomach and the most malignant aberrations of the entire economy. It is evident that, so far from being a conservator of health, alcohol is an active and powerful cause of disease, interfering with the respiration, the circulation, and the nutrition; nor is any other result possible.”

OTHER OBJECTIONS DISPOSED OF.

Other objections, taken from the language of the New Testament, require but little attention. The scoffing jest of those who mocked the apostles on the day of Pentecost, saying, "These men are full of new wine," — *γλεύχους μεμευτω μένοι-εισι*, — have been drinking sweet wine, — deserves notice only in so far as it is alleged in proof that *γλεύχους*, or sweet wine, would intoxicate, and that the profane jesters explained their use of strange tongues by intimating that the apostles were thus affected. It is not denied, that while *γλεύχους* denoted sweet, unfermented juice of the grape, it also, as a generic term, denoted any *sweet* wine, whether in the early stages of fermentation, or by various processes adopted to concentrate it. It is a false inference, an assumption altogether unwarranted, that, therefore,

γλεύκος, even when the unfermented juice of the grape, would intoxicate. The Apostle Peter repelled the charge of their having imbibed any wine at all. Before the objector can make this jest available for his purpose, he must prove that γλεύκος was invariably unfermented. This he cannot do; and this is not claimed by the friends of total abstinence. Nor does the admission of its generic import, as the word for any sweet wine, disprove the distinction, so radical between wine unfermented and wine intoxicating, or give force or point to the objection attempted by opponents of total abstinence to be taken from the coarse wit of these profane mockers.

When the apostle says to Timothy that the deacons "must not be given to much wine," there is no implication in favor of its moderate use. 1 Tim. iii. 8. The words are μή οὖν ᾧ πολλῶν προσέκοντας — *mee oino*

pollo prosechontas — literally, *not to wine* — *much looking*, or *giving heed*. The wine may be either fermented or unfermented, or both. The meaning is, to have no looking after or desire for it. For the generic import of the word authorizes us to claim that the reference is, or may be, as well to unfermented as to fermented wine. This explanation is in exact accordance with the import of another word used to express the like idea, in Tit. i. 7, where Paul says to Titus, a bishop must be “not given to wine” — *μη παροινον* — *mee paroinon* — literally, not by wine — not with wine — not near wine; that is, a bishop must not be where it is. Or, as he has stated the same qualification of a bishop in his letter to Timothy, 1 Tim. iii. 2, “sober” — *νηφελιον* — *neephalion* — literally, no drinker; as this word, we have shown from Schleusner, signifies “abstaining from the use of all intoxicating drink,” — the very

idea and almost the phraseology of the temperance pledge. This is required also of the women, 1 Tim. iii. 11 : " Even so must their wives be — sober," — *νηφαιλιους* — *neephalious* — abstainers. Nothing can be clearer than that Paul intended to teach, by the words he has used, that bishops must not attend, or by their presence countenance, feasts where wine is furnished to the guests.

The aged women were to be required, by Titus, ii. 3, to be " not given to much wine " — *μη οινω πολλω δεδουλουμενας*. " Enslaved is the meaning of the Greek word," says Mr. Thomason. True ; but he must prove that the word *οινω* here, which is generic, is used in the specific meaning of fermented, intoxicating wine. The spirit of Paul's injunction is that even the aged women, for whom the juice of the grape may be beneficial, whether as a medicine or as a tonic, must see to it that they do not become enslaved to the use

of it, or to any great amount of it, not even in its unfermented state. They must exercise such self-control and self-denial, that they indulge not an appetite for much wine. The generic import of the term neutralizes the force of the objection ; and the special class of persons spoken of affords no ground for an argument in favor of general use.

What the apostle states, relative to the love-feasts in the church of Corinth, affords no ground of objection to the position maintained in this tract. When he says, "One is hungry, and another is drunken" — *μεθύει* — *methuei* — drinks wine, or "*wines*," there is no pretext whatever furnished, even by implication, for the use of intoxicating drink. For, should we admit the word "drunken," here used, to have all the significance commonly given to it, — which, however, we do not, — all that can be said, is, that Paul refers to a corrupt state of things which he

reproves and prohibits. The sensuality and love of social pleasure, that began to infect the church in the rich, licentious, and luxurious city of Corinth, can be no apology, sanction, or rule, for Christians at this day.

THE CONTRAST.

The contrast given in the Sacred Scriptures between the wine that intoxicates, and that which contains not alcoholic poison, is too strong and clear to admit of appeal to them, with any hope of success, by the advocates of moderate drinking. The language of Isaiah (lxv. 8) explains itself sufficiently. "Thus saith the Lord, As the new wine is found in the cluster; and one saith destroy it not, for a blessing is in it, so will I do for my servants' sakes." It is the juice of the grape and unfermented, that he has blessed. The strongest epithets of condemnation and abhorrence are bestowed upon the wine that

intoxicates. Fermentation destroys that of which God approves, by converting it into poison. Speaking of those who are "void of counsel," and in whom is "no understanding," He says: "Their wine is the poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps." Deut. xxxii. 33. He brands it with infamy, calling it "a mocker." Prov. xx. 1. He denounces those that give it to their friends: "Woe to him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken." Hab. ii. 15. He prohibits the use of it at all, not even to look at it with favor: "Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." Prov. xxiii. 31, 32. He has pronounced a woe against them that drink it. Isa. xxviii. 1-7. He prohibits keeping company with those that use it:

“Be not among wine-bibbers.” Prov. xxiii. 20. He makes it the symbol of his wrath, calls it the “wine-cup of his fury,” Jer. xxv. 15, li. 7; the “cup of astonishment and desolation.” Ezek. xxiii. 33. He speaks of it as an instrument he uses for accomplishing his wrath upon the wicked and unbelieving: “There is a cup in the hand of Jehovah, and the wine is foaming and full of mixture, and he poureth out this; but all the wicked of the earth shall wring and seek out the dregs of it.” Psalm lxxv. 8, 9. Intemperance annually in our own land destroys from 60,000 to 100,000. No more graphic description can be given of the manner in which God abhors the intoxicating cup, as a thing to be poured out and thrown away with detestation; and yet, how the miserable sot prefers to lick and suck the poison that kills both body and soul! Verily it is the cup of God’s wrath, — the very poison

of the curse, and worse ; for it is more extensively fatal, as an instrument of death and Almighty vengeance, than small-pox, yellow fever, cholera, war, or any other form of plague, which, in his providence, he sends upon the earth. Who, but one smitten with blindness, would ever think of searching the Scriptures for a sanction of his use of intoxicating drink?

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, we urge the practice of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks on every one that reads these pages. In this day of light, the Christian minister or professor who adopts, and practises upon, any other idea or rule of Temperance, does it to the injury of his reputation and usefulness ; and, by that very fact, forfeits the respect and confidence appropriate to the teacher or expounder of God's word, who should be an

example and illustration of the temperance or sobriety it requires. "Ye are the children of light and the children of the day; we are not of the night, nor of darkness. Therefore let us not sleep as do others; but let us watch and be *sober*." The word, as we have seen, is *abstinent*. "Therefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober," — abstinent from intoxicating wine or drink, as one essential item at least, — "because your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." 1 Thess. v. 7, 8; 1 Pet. i. 13. It is by the intoxicating cup that the old serpent, the horrible boa-constrictor that has been preying upon our race, lubricates his victims and swallows them down alive. You owe it to your family, to the church, to your country, to the youth, to the multitudes around you, to do all you can, by example and coöperation, to denounce and war against the drink-

ing usages of society, and the vending of intoxicating liquors, as you would against the devouring Molochs and murderers of your fellows.

Beloved youth, take warning and escape from the snares surrounding you. Stray not into the saloons and beer-gardens, those dens of rattlesnakes, where are ever ready some to spring upon you and inflict their deadly poisonous sting. Total abstinence will be to you a coat of mail if you put it on, and wear it. "Touch not, taste not, handle not, the accursed thing," should be your motto, if you would escape the dangers in which myriads have fallen. Let not the young lady ever present the wine-cup, nor the young man ever accept it, any more than they would poison. Renounce the dominion of your appetites; make them your servants, and let them never be your masters. Form no danger-

ous habits. Vitiate not your taste by the use of tobacco, which is a poison that prepares for, and often leads to, the use of stimulating drink. Make no friendships with the corrupt. Enter not the path of the wicked and sensual. Avoid it, pass not by it, turn from it, and pass away. And in so doing seek and look to the Lord Jesus Christ, our blessed Redeemer, for guidance and salvation. He is "a shield for us;" and will be "a buckler to all them that trust him." Ps. xviii. 30. Trust not in your own strength. The first sinful indulgence, in quaffing the intoxicating cup, invites to the second. Soon habits will forge chains upon you, which you can never break. Heed not those who tell you "there is no danger; it cannot be wrong to take a social glass." Believe them not. But hearken to the warning voice of experience and age. Your entrance on habits

of sinful indulgence and dissipation will begin with moderate drinking, as it is called; your exit may be into the bottomless pit. At first your days and hopes may be bright; but at last they will be clouded with gloom and despair. In the heyday of youthful hilarity you may have a full flow of fine spirits; at last you will sink in despondency and horrors. At first it may be but a cup of exhilaration in the hand of a thoughtless youth; at last it will be a cup of fearful trembling from the hand of an offended God. At first a joyous anticipation of good times to come; at last "a fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation." At first the wine of cheerful and pleasant fellowship; at last the wine of the wrath of Almighty God poured out without mixture. At first the agreeable excitement of an evening; at last the long-drawn agony of an endless per-

dition. At first the sweet relish of an hour; at last the worm that never dies. At first the warm glow of healthful blood; at last the fire that never can be quenched. At first a courteous response to the pleasant invitation, "Drink wine with me;" at last the terrible wail, "Send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame." Luke xvi. 24.*

* See tract of Dr. E. L. Cleveland on Wine-Drinking.

PART II.



THE DUTY OF THE CHURCHES

IN RELATION TO

COMMUNION WINE.

P R E F A C E .



THE writer of the following tract thinks it proper to state that he has reproduced it, he hopes, under circumstances more propitious than when it was first given to the public. In no essential or important point, or thought, does it vary from the original. He has endeavored to give it, as it was first offered, for the calm and conscientious consideration of all, and especially of the churches of Christ, desiring to do good to their fellow-men. "He that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Under a sense of this obligation and admonition, he bespeaks for it a careful examination, and prays that the Lord may grant it his blessing.

He also judges it proper to relate the historic facts connected with its first publication. It was the result of a debate and discussions that occurred at meetings of a Temperance Society in Carlisle, Pa., when the question was first agitated, whether the spirit and intent of the Temperance pledge did not embrace, and ought not to be regarded as including, fermented wine with all other intoxicating drinks, as well as distilled spirits. It was prepared for and forwarded to the "Revival Tract Society"

in New York, who, in 1834-5, had advertised for tracts on the subject, offering a premium for that which should be judged best. The committee, appointed to judge and make the award, gave their preference for a tract of Dr. Chapin, of Connecticut, which advocated the substitution of water for wine in the communion cup. This led to much and angry controversy, in various religious papers of the day. The writer of this tract became, unjustly, involved in the general censure and condemnation bestowed on the preferred tract. The "New York Observer" and the "Presbyterian" denounced the agitation of the subject as almost sacrilegious and fanatical, and deprecated any unhallowed innovation. The subject also was introduced into the pulpits, and a very learned clergyman of Albany preached, in opposition to it, a sermon "*On the danger of being over-wise.*" "Many good men were for a time distressed and offended, and walked no more with those so universally denounced as fanatics." Under these circumstances the author of this tract first published it in the "Philadelphia Observer," in May, 1835, and in the "Evangelist," June, 1835. It called forth severe criticism and condemnation from Prof. M'Lean, of Princeton, in the columns of the "New York Observer." They were responded to in defence of the positions advanced; but the "New York Observer" closed its columns against the response and dismissed the subject. But the subject never was allowed to rest neglected and forgotten. Prof. M. Stewart, and other learned critics examined it and published their views. The author reproduces the tract as an illustration, he believes, of the remark, *Magna est veritas et prevalebit.*

PART II.

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCHES IN RELATION TO THE WINE FOR THE COMMUNION CUP.

HAVING, in the former part of this treatise, shown the Bible idea and rule of Temperance to be *total abstinence from all intoxicating drink*, it becomes the duty of every church member to practise it. Whether he or she belong to a Temperance society, and have signed the pledge, is not so important a question, as whether their influence or example accord with the teachings of God's word. "Ye are my friends," says the Saviour, "if ye do whatsoever I command you." John x. 14. Nothing can be plainer than the terms of discipleship and test of friendship, He has prescribed: "If any man will

come after me, let him deny himself." Matt. xvi. 24. Total abstinence from intoxicating drink is self-denial consistently practised in this particular. There is no proof, nor can any be adduced, to show that the blessed Redeemer or any of his apostles ever used fermented wine or intoxicating drinks. To this it will be replied, Did he not put the wine-cup into the hands of his disciples when he instituted the sacrament of his Supper, and said, "Drink ye all of it"? But it is an important question in reply, Was that wine intoxicating? Undoubtedly the practice of many churches, that have taken this for granted, has sanctioned the use of fermented wine. We ask, however, as we did more than thirty years ago, shall there not be a reformation in this respect? Shall the churches, by their practice, make no distinction between the "the cup of the Lord," and "the cup of devils"?

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHURCHES.

The responsibility of the churches in this matter cannot be well denied, if it be true that the Lord has never sanctioned the use of fermented wine. "Ye are my witnesses," said the Master to his followers. He looks to his people as the channel and means through which to operate upon the surrounding world, for the preservation of his truth, and the progress of his work of salvation.

We bespeak the reader's favorable and serious consideration for the remarks we submit in this appeal to Christian people and to churches of every denomination. It cannot be without guilt for any to remain inactive, unconcerned spectators of the great moral movements destined to "prepare the way of the Lord."

INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH ON THE WORLD.

Corruption in the churches is a calamity to the world. A high standard of piety in

them, fully up to the Bible mark, is essential for the personal purity of their members, and for the power of their testimony against the vices of society. It is by the purification of the church God seeks to purge the world. Vices will remain, and be consecrated in the habits of social life, as long as they are indirectly countenanced by the forbearance and example, the forms and usages, the concessions and apologies of the members of the church. If tolerated in the church, they will triumph in the world.

No reformation in the world has ever advanced beyond the purity that obtained among professing Christians. Polygamy in the church countenanced the uncleanness of the world. Slavery in the churches strengthened the hands of rulers and States that framed iniquity by law. Intemperance in the churches encouraged it in the world.

THE TEMPERANCE REFORMATION.

A great reformation has, within the present century, been in progress, in this last respect particularly. By the practice of self-denial, in total abstinence from all intoxicating drink by many, an efficient influence, unknown in the previous history of the world for centuries, has been exerted. Formidable, and to a great extent, has been the opposition made to the wide-spreading and desolating vice of intemperance and its companions.

However great has been the success of philanthropic efforts thus far in this cause, the ultimate triumph and universal prevalence of the Temperance reformation depend, mainly, on the consistent example and persevering action of the churches. As long as those who drink intoxicating liquors can find a lodgment in them, and be accounted

pure and respectable members of the same, there will be serious obstacles in the way. Venders and manufacturers of the price of blood will have an open door of retreat; and Christian churches, like the idolatrous temples of the heathen, be the sanctuaries where the pests and murderers in society will find a place of refuge.

THE MORAL WRONG.

It is no longer possible to resist the evidence, by any honest, candid searcher after truth, that the use, sale, and manufacture of alcoholic beverages is *morally wrong*. No church can deliberately shut her eyes to the light diffused on this subject, and afford a resting-place to the lovers of wine and beer and strong drink, without incurring guilt before God and disgrace before men. If a man's heart is deeply interested in the cause of Temperance; if his earnest desire

and importunate prayer to God are, to be instrumental in arresting the march of intemperance, that giant vice, and in rescuing his fellow-men from its grasp, — he will feel that he cannot himself stop short of total abstinence from *all* that can intoxicate. This is the purity and self-denial, or rather *the* Temperance, which it is essential to maintain in order to be owned of God and used for efficient influence in opposing intemperance.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCHES.

Such being the fact, the zealous and consistent friend of Temperance becomes very sensitive, and wakeful to everything that might interfere with and frustrate the great design at which he aims. He casts his imploring eye on the churches, and expects their aid. But while he secures the coöperation of many of their members, he is met with one of the solemn rites of religion, be-

hind which the lovers of wine retreat, and whence they hurl their missile objections. The eucharistical cup, and the language of the English version of the Old and New Testaments, apparently approving of and sanctioning the use of alcoholic mixtures called wine, are appealed to as a license of their indulgence in the use of intoxicating drinks. Who has not heard even the drunkard quote the example of Christ, and refer to the Lord's Supper, in justification of his wine-bibbing? Can this thing be prevented?

WHAT THE CHURCHES CAN DO.

The inquiry suggests another of deep importance, and from which no church of our Lord Jesus Christ should shrink, namely: What is the duty of the churches in relation to the wine used in the communion cup, or in celebrating the Lord's Supper? In reply we remark, —

1. It is taken for granted that whatever is proper and practicable in aid of Temperance, the churches are under obligations to undertake. They can require all their members—or refuse to admit as such those who will not—to adopt and act upon the Bible rule of Temperance, which is total abstinence from intoxicating drink. It is indicative of very doubtful piety, to say the least, where, after all the light that has been shed on this subject, the use, sale, and manufacture of intoxicating drink will not be relinquished by a member, minister, or officer of the church. To purge themselves from such members as speedily as possible, and in the kindest and most efficient manner, — whether by instruction, counsel, and exhortation, or by the exercise of discipline, — is the duty of all the churches of Christ. To neglect or delay to do so, in the increase of light, and progress of moral sentiment

upon the subject, will deservedly degrade any, whatever may be their influence, their pretensions, their self-applause, or their name.

THEY MUST AVOID INCONSISTENCY.

It is important to set a consistent example. In attempting to promote the cause of Temperance by the practice of total abstinence, it is manifestly inconsistent to put into the hands of church members, when commemorating His death, "the cup of the Lord" filled with intoxicating wine. Shall a visible testimony continue to be thus publicly given, in favor of such beverage, by the church to the world? Shall the reformed drunkard, when seeking the confirmation of his faith, and of his purpose of amendment, in his approach to the table of the Lord, have his crucified, dying appetite for intoxicating drink stimulated into

fresh life by the contents of the sacred chalice? The Lord seeks, by the sacrament of his Supper, to strengthen his followers, by assisting the faith of the communicant, in deriving from his death invigorating motives and force to mortify the lusts of the flesh. Shall the communion cup, through thoughtlessness, indifference, and neglect, contain a mixture, which, through the medium of a counter-acting sense of taste, will introduce distracting thoughts into the mind, stimulate into convulsive paroxysms an animal appetite whose cravings are terrible as death, obviate the devotional and sanctifying influence of the ordinance, and challenge the feeble convert to a fresh contest with sore, and perhaps successful, temptation?

SOME FACTS STATED.

It is well known that reformed drunk-

ards, whose appetite for intoxicating drink had been long indulged, find total abstinence from all such liquors to be the only effectual means of security. One mouthful of fermented wine — the deep, long swallow sometimes witnessed by the officers of the church, when the communion cup is presented, and which is suggested by the cravings of appetite at the moment excited — may afterwards lead to a more copious draught, to the violation of pledges and vows, to the injury of conscience, to the crime of intoxication, to the disgrace of character, and to the ruin of body and soul. 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; — of a father of a family also, — who had been recovered to sobriety and respectability after great degra-

dation, — utterly ruined, and thrown out as a common beastly street-drunkard, by one dram he was persuaded to take by the man who employed him to work ; — and of one who had entered the sacred desk as a minister of Christ, and for ten years had tasted nothing stronger than water, save the wine in the communion cup, which he was in the habit of putting only to his lips through fear, thrown back into his ruinous habits by one mouthful of intoxicating drink taken when drenched with rain, but which was followed by others till he “ returned like the dog to his vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.” Facts of this nature are innumerable. Can it be right, then, for the church, in view of such things, to put to the lips of her members the wine that intoxicates? Shall “ the cup of salvation ” become the cup of damnation? Shall

“the cup of the Lord” be made identical with “the cup of devils”? Assuredly the churches are bound to look into this matter, and to have a care that the guilt and apostasy of some of their members be not induced by the “liquid damnation” administered in the consecrated chalice! The danger is so obvious, and the evil so great, that every candid and benevolent mind must see and feel the obligation to purify that cup. Let not “the poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps” be any longer mingled in the eucharistic cup. To fill it with intoxicating wine is to sanction the wicked man’s love of it, and the unhal- lowed indulgence of ruinous appetite. It is jeoparding immortal souls.

THE WINE IN THE EUCHARIST THE JUICE OF THE
GRAPE.

2. The second remark we submit is, that *both the design of the Lord’s Supper, and*

his own example at its institution, authorize the use of a liquor obtained from the grape. The philosophy of the thing forbids the substitution of water. From the remark he made at the origination of the ordinance, there can be little or no doubt as to the contents of the cup he gave to his disciples. "Take this and divide it among yourselves." "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God is come." Luke xxii. 18. The reason why he used the juice of the grape was neither accidental nor arbitrary. The ordinance was to be commemorative, and the symbol he used, it was fitting should be significant, suggestive of the facts to be remembered.

The signs or symbols, which divine wisdom has appointed for the exhibition of the great truths or facts of religion, possess always a natural fitness. Water aptly

symbolizes the purifying agency of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, and therefore has been appropriately adopted in baptism to exhibit the same to the senses. The slaying and burning of animals as sacrifices also spake to the senses and sympathies of the worshipper, teaching the solemn facts, that his life was forfeited, and that "without the shedding of blood there was no remission." To use wine in baptism would be incongruous; to use water in the Lord's Supper would be as much so.

THE DESIGN OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The Lord's Supper is designed to "show forth His death till He come." That death was effected by the shedding of His blood. He was "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His

own blood, He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. ix. 12. It was His offering up of Himself a sacrifice for our sins by the shedding of His blood, that He intended should be set forth in the sacrament of His Supper. This is its public historical use in the world. It has also a private personal use in aiding the Christian's faith, by leading to the solemn remembrance of that death by which he is reconciled to God. This it does, not by any superstitious influence, or talismanic power, or carnal participation, but by arresting the senses, and setting forth, in a more lively and impressive manner, the fact that Jesus died for our sins, and so, by the Spirit's aid, suggesting and holding in contemplation before our minds, confirmed in faith, the wonderful reality. "For," says the apostle, "if the blood

of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb. ix. 13, 14.

THE FITNESS OF ITS SYMBOL.

The blood-like color of "the fruit of the vine," in the juice of the grape, rendered it a fit symbol of the blood of Christ. When presented in the sacramental cup, as a memorial, it speaks, through the senses, the affecting fact that his precious blood was shed for our sins. Of the fitness of the symbol there can be no doubt. The juice of the grape was called by Jacob "the blood of grapes." Genesis xlix. 11. Androcydes called it "the blood of the earth."* No

*See Pliny's "Natural History," xiv. 5.

other liquid so well symbolizes the blood of Christ. Its rubicund color, by the laws of suggestion, readily leads the mind, viewing it in the sacramental cup, to the scenes of Calvary, which, apprehended by faith, awaken emotions of penitence and love.

“ With cold affections who can see
The thorns, the scourge, the nails, the tree,
The flowing tears and purple sweat,
The bleeding hands, and head, and feet,”

which the sacramental cup marshals in the memory? If a colorless liquid or water were used, there would be no suggestive aid derived to faith through the medium of sense. The Saviour's design, by this sacrament, would not be so fitly obvious, nor his words at its institution so significant and forcible, namely: “ This cup is the New Testament in my blood.” 1 Cor. xi. 25. “ This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many.” Mark xiv. 24. As already re-

marked, it cannot be denied that the cup he gave contained the juice of the grape. Thus he sanctioned and predicted its use ever afterward. "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.

There seems to have been peculiar wisdom in the selection of "the fruit of the vine," apart from its symbolical fitness. None other is so widely diffused over the earth, or capable of being cultivated in such varieties of latitude and climate. The difficulty of procuring the juice of the grape in some countries, compared with others, can afford no valid argument in favor of substituting water. The vine was once unknown in Italy, France, and Germany, where now its fruit is a staple commodity. Water, in some regions of the earth, is as rare as "the fruit of the vine" in Greenland. As Chris-

tianity advances through the world it opens new channels of commerce ; and the demand for any article will regulate the supply. The facilities of intercourse and trade, that obtain with increasing civilization, obviate all objections against the juice of the grape, and the futile, preposterous arguments for the use of water in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, urged by some, from the fact that the gospel and its rites are designed for universal diffusion in the world.

THE CURRENT WINES OF COMMERCE ALCOHOLIC.

3. While the positions above stated will generally be admitted, it is nevertheless undeniable that the current wines of this country and those of commerce abroad possess so large a share of alcohol as to be intoxicating. Brande's analyses — which proved brandy, gin, rum, and whiskey, to contain a little more than one-half of alcohol — detected

about one-fourth of this poison in Lissa, Marsala, Port, and Madeira wines; one-fifth in Currant, Sherry, Teneriffe, Lisbon, and Malaga; one-sixth in Claret and Burgundy; one-eighth in Champagne and Frontignac; and, according to Liebig, from ten to twelve per cent. in the German wines, Steinberger, Rudesheimer, Marcobrunner, Geisenbrunner, etc.* The man who drinks his quart of Madeira or Port, drinks in so doing a pint of brandy.

ADULTERATIONS OF WINES.

It is notorious that before our imported wines leave Europe they are enforced by admixtures of brandy. Pure, unadulterated juice of the grape, in a fermented state, is very rarely to be procured. The must is enforced by alcoholic mixtures; or "body,"

*Dr. L. C. Beck's analyses of several wines in the United States accord with Brande's.

as it is said, must be given to the fermented liquor, by the introduction of alcohol, to prevent the acetic fermentation during its passage. Immense quantities of factitious wines are manufactured in our cities out of sour beer, cider, whiskey, etc., compounded with various poisonous drugs, and sold to country dealers, in imported casks, for imported wines answering to the brands they bear. The same fountain of poison is made to send forth Madeira, Port, Sherry, etc., according to order. Much of the whiskey forwarded to our cities is returned to the country sold as imported wine!* The writer of this treatise has been frequently grieved and annoyed at the communion seasons, in country places, by the polluted liquor in the sac cup, — the whiskey, of which it wa

*See Mr. Delavan's statement at the Utica Convention in the "N. Y. Evangelist," No. 192.

largely composed, being offensive both to taste and smell. *

TO DRINK ENFORCED WINES MORALLY WRONG.

4. The Temperance pledge and the arguments that prove the use, sale, and manufacture of ardent spirit as a drink to be morally wrong, are as valid against all enforced wines. Their essential character is the same. All intoxicate. The difference, in the degrees of dilution and in the manner of uniting their constituent ingredients, does not disprove their substantial identity. They all contribute to promote habits of intemperance. The argument in favor of fer-

* Since the above was first published, this subject has attracted much attention by medical and other authorities. The reader is referred to "Anti-Bacchus," pp. 51, 52; the tract of E. C. Delavan, Esq., on "The Adulterations of Liquors," published from the "National Temperance Offering;" 1st and 2d vols. of Dr. F. R. Lees' Works; Dr. Hiram Cox's Letter to James Black, Esq.; S. P. Duffield's Ph. D. Analysis in the "Pharmaceutical Magazine," and the very learned work of Arthur Hill Hassall, M. D., analyst of "The Lancet Sanitary Commission," entitled "Adulterations Detected," published in London, 1857.

mented wines, drawn from the alleged temperance of France and other wine countries, is fallacious. Recent travellers deny the fact on which it is made to rest, and represent France, especially, to be more disgraced with the crime of intemperance than the United States. The number of commitments for intoxication in Paris during one year, on an average, was seventy per day! The amount of intemperance which does not reach drunkenness is vastly greater. According to Dr. Hewett's statements, made at the anniversary of the American Temperance Society in Boston, in 1832, sensuality is a science in France. Care is taken by the *bon-vivants* not to stimulate beyond that point in which the moral sense is completely stupefied, but the animal sense brought to the highest sustainable degree of pleasurable excitement. The lower orders are rendered irritable by the copious use of low wines.

The use of wine is not necessary to health.* When taken habitually it is injurious to the constitution. The stimulus and excitement it gives are inconsistent with Temperance. Whoso is conscientious in abstaining from ardent spirits, must, for the same reasons, give up the use of enforced wines. If he is a disinterested and zealous friend of Temperance he will feel the necessity of total abstinence from both, in order to exert an efficient moral influence. To condemn the use of ardent spirits as morally wrong, and drink enforced wine, is grossly inconsistent. †

ALL FERMENTED WINES INTOXICATING.

5. Fermented wines when unenforced are capable of producing intoxication. They

*This subject has of late years been thoroughly investigated. See Dr. F. R. Lees' "Inquiry into the Reasons and Results of the Prescription of Intoxicating Liquors in the Practice of Medicine."

†See the writer's discourse delivered in Carlisle, Pa., on the

were employed for this purpose long before distillation was known. The drunkenness of Noah, also that in Palestine and in the ancient world, is mainly attributable to them. Pliny, in his "Natural History," has given as graphic a description of the deleterious and corrupting effects of wine as have ever since been given of those of ardent spirits. Androcydes, whose advice to Alexander he quotes, admonished that prince, "when about to drink wine : O king, remember that you drink the blood of the earth. Hemlock is the poison of man, and wine, of hemlock." Pontianus, quoted by Athenæus, calls it "the metropolis of all evils." Solomon's description is as true as it is condemnatory of its use : "Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath conten-

25th of February, 1834, on "The Immorality of the Traffic in Ardent Spirit;" the first sermon preached specifically and published on this subject, in which the immorality of the use, sale, and manufacture of ardent spirit was affirmed and maintained.

tions? who hath babbling? who hath wounds without cause? who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine." Prov. xxiii. 29, 30.

Except in Egypt and in Greece, wine was seldom allowed either to virgins or matrons or young men. Pliny states that it was prohibited from females in Rome. For the first two hundred years in the history of that celebrated city, heavy restrictions were laid on it. The Koran interdicts its use among the followers of Mahomet. Assuredly Christians ought not to be less temperate than Turks.

If it be urged, as sometimes it is done, that vinous liquors are produced by a natural process in a natural juice, and, therefore differ from ardent spirits obtained by distillation, a process wholly artificial, it may be replied, that this natural process of fermentation proves nothing in favor of wine. If

suffered to advance, fermentation would soon pass from the vinous to the acetic, and thence to the putrefactive stage, through the whole course by which the juice of the grape returns to its original elements and is destroyed.* The art of man is required to resist or retard the process of nature in dissolution. In doing so, very often, wines, which have been "pricked," or soured, are disguised by alkaline substances, rendering them poisonous, otherwise than by their alcohol. †

* See the first part of this Tract.

† See "Adulterations Detected," etc., by Arthur Hill Hassall, M. D., London, pp. 547-560. Caustic potash, lead, and copper are common, to say nothing of the poison alcohol itself, of which Dr. Lees says: "Alcohol is an agent utterly foreign to the human body and its normal wants, — one that never gives power like food, nor aids circulation like water, nor helps elimination like exercise, nor produces heat like oil, nor purifies like fresh air, — an agent the sole, perpetual, and inevitable effects of which are, to arrest blood development, to retain waste matter, to irritate mucous and other tissue, to thicken normal juices, to impede digestion, to lower animal heat, to deaden nervous filament, to kill molecular life, and to waste, through the excitement it creates in the heart and head, the grand controlling forces of the nerves

If wine is less intoxicating than diluted sweetened ardent spirits, that is not owing to any essential difference, but, according to Dr. Beck, to its more complete union. The same union, he says, would take place, in the latter case as in the former, if sufficient time were given, and then its effects would be similar.

FERMENTED WINE CONDEMNED IN THE BIBLE.

6. The Sacred Scriptures, so far from countenancing the use of fermented wine, are very solemn and pointed in its condemnation and prohibition. In the original Hebrew there is a distinction carefully maintained between fermented wine which is intoxicating, and another product of the vine which is not. To the English reader this is not apparent in our translation, but

and brain." See his "Inquiry into the Reasons and Results of the Prescription of Intoxicating Liquors in the Practice of Medicine," p. 79.

the following facts can be substantiated by abundant philological details.

Fermented wine was known to the Jews, and often used to inebriating excess. The Hebrew word *yayin*, used to designate it, expresses, as any one can perceive, the elementary sounds of our English term WINE.* A learned lexicographer has traced the Hebrew word to another for its origin, which signifies mud, or turbid liquid clay, like the lees or dregs which the juice of the grape expels from itself by fermentation,—the process by which it is converted into intoxicating wine. To this liquor various properties and effects are attributed.

THE BIBLE'S DESCRIPTION OF YAYIN, OR FERMENTED WINE.

It excites and exhilarates. Zech. ix. 15, x. 7; Psalm lxxviii. 65. It inflames the

* Robertson, in his "Thesaurus Linguae Sacrae." Gesenius says, "*fortasse ab æstuando et effervescendo dictum.*"

blood. Isa. v. 11. It stimulates and rouses the passions. Isa. xxii. 13. It intoxicates. 1 Sam. i. 14, 15; Isa. xxix. 9. It overcomes those that use it. Isa. xxviii. 1. It exerts a demoralizing influence. Prov. xx. 1; Isa. xxviii. 7. It renders men pugnacious and violent. Isa. iv. 17. It facilitates corrupt designs. Gen. xix. 32-34. It makes hell enlarge herself and open her mouth without measure. Isa. v. 11 and 14. It destroys men's moral perceptions, so that they take no cognizance of the Lord's doings, by stimulating them to sensual, hilarious social amusement. Isa. v. 12. It promotes disorder, riot, quarrels, and blood-shedding. Prov. xxiii. 29, 30.

The most holy and devoted persons in the world, whom the Lord signally honored, totally abstained from it. Dan. i. 8; xii. 16. The Nazarites would not touch it. Num. vi. 3. The Rechabites were so highly approved

of God for their abstinence from it, that he has preserved the tribe in existence to the present day, as reported by Niebuhr and Wolf, furnishing an example to the world of a Temperance society organized on the principle of total abstinence from all intoxicating drink. Jer. xxxv. 14, 18, 19. John the Baptist would not touch it. Luke i. 15. There is no proof that ever the Saviour partook of it. The Jews' slander, "Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber!" is no proof. It referred to him in contrast with John, who kept himself aloof from city life. He mingled with men in their social repasts, and partook of "the fruit of the vine;" John the Baptist did not. It was manifestly an intended opprobrious witticism, — a distorted, ill-natured comment on the Saviour's benevolent intercourse with "publicans and sinners." Luke vii. 34; Matt. xi. 19. Neither his miracle at Cana, nor his

appointment of the ordinance of his Supper, as reported by the Evangelists, furnish ground for the inference that the wine he used was fermented. John ii. 1-11; Luke xxii. 17. When it was offered to him in a medicated state, — “wine mingled with myrrh,” — for the purpose of stupefying and allaying pain, as was customary among the Jews preparatory to the execution of criminals, he would not taste it. Mark xv. 23. Timothy did not use it till an inspired apostle prescribed it as a medicine; and that it was fermented wine cannot be established, either from the language or the customs of the day. 1 Tim. v. 23.

God has solemnly and frequently discountenanced the use of it by reproaching and punishing Israel on account of it. Isa. xxii. 12-14. He regarded it as one of the crimes of the people, for which he denounced his woes against them. Isa. v. 11, 22;

Amos vi. 1, 6; Hab. ii. 15, 16. He prohibited, by a special statute, the priests, while officiating in the tabernacle, from drinking it. Lev. x. 9. The avowed design of this statute was to put a difference between holy and unholy, clean and unclean, and thus to teach the children of Israel how inconsistent the use of it was with a devotional spirit. Odium was thus thrown upon it; and it was pronounced unfit to be used by those who draw nigh to God. The excitement and exhilaration it produces are placed by the Apostle Paul in marked contrast with the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.* Eph. v. 18. Pious Jews, like Daniel, were taught to regard it as unclean, in the same light in which they did swine's flesh. Dan. i. 8. Such prophets as would prophesy

* It is a fact attested by the observation of many ministers of Christ, who make themselves acquainted with the spiritual exercises of men, that persons given to wine more easily extinguish their convictions, and, persevering in their use of intoxicating drinks, are seldom, if ever, apt to be converted.

of wine, that is, speak in apology and commendation of its use, were denounced as "lying prophets," just fit for an intemperate and wicked people given up of God. Jer. xiii. 11-14; Amos ii. 12; Micah ii. 11. The Lord, by requiring it to be poured out on the ground as a libation when a sacrifice was offered, taught the children of Israel that the way in which he was to be honored by it was, not by drinking it, but by returning it to the earth. Num. xxviii. 7. To use it as drink, therefore, in ordinary life, would not have been regarded as venial. Priests, prophets, and kings were not to use it. Prov. xxxi. 4. The men of influence in society, whose example is there felt, were thus interdicted from its use. And all classes of persons promiscuously were required not to look upon it with favor or desire, nor even to associate with them that indulged in its use. Prov. xxxiii. 20, 31.

The use of it is not necessary to life or health. The children of Israel for the space of forty years did not drink it. Deut. xxix. 6. Solomon spoke of indulgence in it as vanity, Eccl. ii. 4, etc., and itself to be mean and worthless in comparison with the love of Christ. Song i. 2, 4; iv. 10. It is predicted as one of the great curses that God would inflict on Israel in their degeneracy, calling it by odious and frightful names, "the poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps." Deut. xxxii. 31-35. And he has made it the symbol of his sore and terrible judgments, which he would inflict on guilty nations, making them drink from "the wine-cup of his fury," Jer. xxv. 15, and calling it the "cup of astonishment and desolation." Ezek. xxiii. 33. This description is frightful! Such epithets used, as to fermented, intoxicating wine, in the Sacred Scriptures, are sufficient to show what is God's mind

concerning it. Nothing more can be needed to prove that he does not allow, but abhors and denounces, the use of fermented wine.

OBJECTIONS NOTICED TAKEN FROM SPECIAL TEXTS.

The above is sufficient, we should think, to satisfy every reasonable person. Yet it is denied by some to be conclusive; and objections are sought from passages, in which it is alleged there is either an implied approval, or at least no condemnation expressed by the sacred writer.

It has been objected, that when the Lord alludes to fermented wine, and takes a metaphor thence to represent the blessings of the gospel, there can be nothing in the thing itself worthy of condemnation. It is assumed that this is done in Isa. lv. 1. But we remark, it must be shown that the word *yayin*, here used, did designedly in this place refer to the fermented juice of the grape. For, while it is admitted that it is

often so used, it is nevertheless a word of generic import, and sometimes expresses "the fruit of the vine" itself, the grape in bunches and clusters before the juice has been expressed, — an article of food. It is evidently with such intent that it is used in this passage; for the Lord speaks of it as an article to be eaten, — "Come ye, buy and eat." The only articles of drink named are water and milk. The inference or assumption, therefore, is illegitimate that it means here intoxicating wine, any more than it does in Lam. ii. 12, where it means grapes, an article of food desired by famished children to satisfy their hunger; or in Jer. xl. 10, 12, where it is classed with "summer fruits" and called "gathered wine," — evidently grapes.

But let the objector take it in its more frequent specific sense of liquid, fermented wine, his inference, even then, that God, by

using the word in this sense, approves the use of intoxicating drink, is altogether invalid. For, when allusion is made to it as metaphorically expressing the blessings of salvation, it must not be assumed to involve an absolute approval either of the thing or of the use made of it by a sensual people. The utmost that is legitimate here in interpreting the language is, that the Spirit of inspiration adopted illustrations suited to impress a sensual people. He employed a lively metaphor to attract their attention, and awaken their interest in relation to the blessings of the gospel. The wicked, who were spending their "money for that which is not bread," and their "labor for that which satisfieth not (v. 2)," are exhorted to come to Christ, and "buy wine and milk without money and without price;" receive him as a free gift. The idea undeniably is, to give up the thought and effort to find happiness

in sensual enjoyment, but to seek and find it in the free salvation of God. Admitting, therefore, — which we do not, and are by no means required to do as an exegetical expositor, — that the word *yayin*, wine, here denotes the fermented juice of the grape, and is metaphorically employed to exhibit the blessings of the gospel, this will no more prove God's approbation of it as an article of drink, than the Saviour's parable of the unjust steward does, that he approved of his unfaithful and selfish conduct, or than Paul's allusion to the Olympic games (Heb. xii. 1), etc., proves that he approved of the races, pugilism, and gladiatorial exhibitions of the heathen.

OBJECTION FROM ISAIAH XXV. 6.

Another passage, used for purposes of objection to the view advocated in this treatise, is in Isaiah xxv. 6, where the glo-

rious blessings attendant on the triumphant conquest of Christ are spoken of as a feast, to be celebrated at his coming, — and called “a feast of fat things; a feast of wines on the lees — of wines well refined.” All that claim this text as a sanction for the use of fermented wine or *yayin*, have neglected to consult the original. No such word is used by the prophet. His terms are *shemārim mezikkākim*. Gesenius renders them *vinum vetus et mobilissimum, dein a fœcibus purgatum*, — an old and most excellent wine purged or strained from the lees or dregs. The words and the description apply, as accurately, and even more so, to the well-preserved unfermented juice of the grape, strained from all feculent matter, of which we shall presently take more particular notice.

OBJECTION FROM DEUT. XIV. 26.

A third passage, sometimes referred to as

conclusive proof that the Lord did not disapprove of fermented wine, but licensed the sale of it, is the ordinance recorded Deut. xiv. 6, which permitted pilgrims to Jerusalem, on occasion of the sacred feasts, to convert their tithe-offerings into money, and on their repairing, for the worship of God, to the place which the Lord should choose, reconvert it by purchase into their tithe-offerings according to their choice. This is the limitation which the connection and manifest design of the ordinance put upon the spirit and intent of the statute. It cannot legitimately be construed into a license-law for the sale of intoxicating drinks, nor for their use. For it was a religious ordinance, — not a general political or civil regulation; and it simply gave the benefit of exchange, — should it be judged by the possessors cheaper and easier to sell the bulky articles at home, — and, avoiding the expense

and trouble of transportation, procure afterwards the several articles they desired to present as their tithe-offerings. In the 23d verse, where the articles are enumerated, of which the tithe-offerings might — because of their bulk or inconvenience of transportation — be converted into money, namely, “thy corn, thy wine, and of thine oil, and of the firstlings of thy herds and of thy flocks,” they are all spoken of as things to be eaten. “Thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God in the place where he shall choose to place his name there, the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine,” etc. Not a word is said about any article of drink here. For the word here translated wine is *tirosh*, a generic term, denoting “the fruit of the vine,” whether growing on the stock, in the cluster, or containing juice, or that juice expressed; but never a fermented, intoxicating drink. Associated here directly with

corn and the firstlings of the flock, — bulky articles of food, — there can be no question that it means grapes. In the 26th verse, where the same articles are again referred to and enumerated, the words are different, but express the same things also as articles of food. “Thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after (desireth) for oxen, or for sheep, or for wine!” — *yayin*, — or for “strong drink” — *shechor*, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth; and thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household.” The idea unquestionably is, food for purposes of family repast; both the *yayin*, and the *shechor*, here, were articles that might be eaten, not drunk. We have already said that *yayin* is also a generic word, but of more extensive import than *tirosh*, denoting grapes, and their juice in every variety and state,

fermented or unfermented. The connection, by every rule of exegesis, requires, that its significance here be understood as the same with *tirosh*, just before named, that is, *grapes*, an article of food, — something that might be eaten, not drunk. And as to *shechor*, translated “strong drink,” the word cannot here be correctly so rendered ; for it, also, is referred to as something that might be eaten, used as food. This word, — whence is derived the Greek word *σιξερα*, the Latin word *saccharum* and our English word *sugar*, — properly expresses the idea of something sweet, that might be used as food. It was variously made, from the juice of the palm, from grapes, and from sweet fruits. By boiling, it was converted into an inspissated syrup, that, when rid of its liquidity, and put away, would granulate, or become candied and solid, in cakes ; just as in the case of maple-juice,

cane-juice, sorghum-juice, grape-juice, beet-juice, and all sweet liquids, whence sugar by evaporation and granulation is now obtained.* That the word *shechor*, here used, must be received in this meaning is evident, not only from the fact recognized that it was to be eaten in the temple "before the Lord, as a religious observance; but, also, from its answering in the second enumeration in verse 26 to the word translated "oil," *yitzhor*, which denotes, not so much the olive-fruit, as figs, dates, — fruits capable of being kept for winter use, and prized as food for their saccharine properties.

That the juice of all sweet fruits will, if not prevented by boiling or otherwise, undergo

* Messrs. C. Cory & Sons, of Lima, Indiana, "have patented a method of converting the juice of apples into a jam, or jelly, which is perfectly delightful: there is a tartness about it which was a perfect god-send to our suffering soldiers, to whom they sent 9,000 lbs." The juice of the grape, also, is by the same method converted into a jelly, which will keep for years, and will make a pleasant drink when dissolved in water.

the process of fermentation at a proper temperature, there is no dispute ; nor that, according to the degree or amount of saccharine matter contained in it, will depend its potency, when the sugar is converted into alcohol ; nor that, from such sweet juices, a drink might be and was obtained, possessed of greater intoxicating power than even ordinary fermented wine from grapes ; nor that thence the word *shechor*, was used to denote such a drink, or, as our translators render it in this passage, "strong drink." Yet it will by no means, after all such admissions, be a correct legitimate rendering of the word used in the original here,— which is one of generic character. For the whole design and spirit of the religious ordinance, the occasions and place of its use, the solid eatable property of the whole tithe-offerings enumerated, forbid the false, perverted, unjust, and injurious use which

has been made of it by those who claim thence the sanction of God himself for the license of the sale and use of intoxicating drink.*

OBJECTIONS FROM JUDGES IX. 13.

In the fable of Jotham, the vine is made to say to the trees, "Should I leave my wine, which cheereth God and man," etc. Hence an argument has been taken in favor of God's approval, as well as man's, of intoxicating drink. To say nothing of Jotham's opinion being questionable authority, it is enough to remark that the word here translated "wine" is not *yayin*, which is often used to denote intoxicating drink, but *tirosh*, which is never so employed, the import of which we shall presently have

* The views here presented have been fully and forcibly confirmed and carried out in pointed rebuke of such impiety, by Dr. F. R. Lees, Dr. J. Mair, and Rev. William Ritchie, in late publications.

occasion, in the progress of our argument, to unfold.

In noticing another objection, taken from the example of good men, it may be remarked, that even should we admit the use of intoxicating wine on "special occasions," by eminent ancient worthies, as by Noah, Melchisedec, Abraham, Isaac, David, Solomon and others, that fact would not prove it to be right, nor that God approved of their use of it. Noah got drunk by it, and occasioned a temptation which brought a curse on his son, — a frequent result in the history of families where its use is sanctioned by the parent. Gen. ix. 21-25. Melchisedec gave wine, *yayin*, with bread to refresh Abraham and his troops, when returning from battle. Gen. xiv. 18. The generic import of the word, however, may allow us to deny that it was intoxicating wine, and challenge proof that it was

anything else than bunches of grapes. Isaac took it as a medicine, to give him strength, when, in great feebleness, he wished to bless his sons before his death. Gen. xxvii. 7-25. David and Solomon were not infallible. Both did things not to be regarded with approbation. The argument is in itself good for nothing. If it proves anything, it proves too much, for there is scarcely a crime which may not be apologized for in this way. The recommendation of it for medicinal purposes, should it be admitted, as in the case of Paul's advice to Timothy, 1st Epistle, v. 23, and Solomon's, Prov. xxxi. 6, no more proves the lawfulness of its ordinary use as a drink, than the physician's prescription of opium, or of any other drug, would their ordinary use.

GENERAL CORROBORATIVE CONSIDERATIONS.

The Scriptures are plain enough on this

point. There is not a single passage to prove that God has approved of fermented wine as a drink. He has, indeed, by the mouth of his prophets, sometimes spoken of it without expressing positive disapprobation; but that does not imply approbation, — the occasion and design in view not requiring a judgment in the case. It was spoken of indifferently. Good men's use of it in former days no more proves it lawful and right than "good men's" use of it now. The Bible states historical facts very often, without one word of comment on the subject of their moral character. The descriptions which it contains, on the one hand, of agricultural prosperity predicted and promised, or, on the other hand, of depression and adversity in Israel, involving allusions to it, or setting forth abundance at one time and scarcity at another, do not affect the merits of the question, or prove

God's approval of it as a drink. An historian or traveller might, very naturally, describe the state of political or agricultural prosperity in France, and other vine-growing countries, by referring to abundance or scarcity of *yayin*, wine, a staple article, without ever committing himself or intimating his judgment about the lawfulness of converting the grape into, or using it as, an intoxicating drink. The same holds true of the whiskey and rum distilled in the United States. If we would understand the light in which the Bible regards it, we must consult its plain, explicit declarations on the subject. These have been shown to be strong, pointed, varied, and frequent, in disapprobation and condemnation of the same; so that no man can continue to use fermented wine as a drink, with the Bible before him, without running counter to its counsel, and disregarding the judgment of

God. Will Christian men and ministers do so?

THE UNFERMENTED JUICE OF THE GRAPE APPROVED.

We advance to our last and important position in its bearing on our subject.* However novel it may appear, we nevertheless affirm, that, while the Scriptures are so clear and decided in their disapprobation of fermented wine, there was another article known and in use, the product of the vine, too, of which they as uniformly speak with approbation, when a judgment is expressed or implied. In the original Hebrew it is expressed by a very different word from *yayin*, denoting fermented wine. It was called, as already noticed, *tirosh*. In our English Bibles the word is sometimes

* This position was first advanced by the author early in 1834, and published in 1835 in "The Philadelphian," in May,—a religious paper edited by Dr. Ezra Stiles Ely.

translated wine, and thus the ordinary reader finds it impossible to distinguish or know when it, or the fermented juice of the grape, is referred to. Hence, too, the Bible is so often claimed by the intemperate and lovers of intoxicating wines, as sanctioning their indulgence of an appetite degrading and destructive. The Hebrew scholar may see that a marked distinction is observed. Our English translators seem to have had some difficulty in rendering the word, and in understanding precisely what it means, — sometimes calling it "new wine," Neh. x. 29; xiii. 5, 12; at others, "sweet wine," Micah vi. 15, and very often "wine," as synonymous with the word *yayin*, denoting the fermented intoxicating juice of grapes. Isa. xxxvi. 17; lxii. 8; Joel ii. 24.

DESCRIPTION OF IT.

The etymology of the Hebrew word

tirosh, has been differently given by lexicographers, who have derived it from the same root. It is of no importance to notice their conjectures. They agree that the word is used to denote the expressed juice of the grape in an unfermented state, — what is called “must,” and essentially different from fermented wine. Such was Pharaoh’s drink. Gen. xl. 11, 13. The simple juice of the grape expressed, — as it flows from the bunch in the hand or the press, or when inspissated by boiling, and thus prevented from fermentation, — possesses no intoxicating properties, but is a cooling and nourishing drink, either when taken by itself or diluted with water. Reduced to the consistency of a syrup or a jelly, and by other means, it could be preserved for a long time. Both Columella* and Cato† have given directions

* See Jun. Columel. L. xxix. De re rustica.

† M. Cato, De re rustica, p. 16, sec. 121.

how to preserve "must" sweet without fermentation, and without boiling it, the one always, the other during the whole year, and as sweet as when new. Commonly this was done by boiling it down one-third or one-half, as is done in this country with cider to prevent fermentation. When one-half evaporated, Pliny* states that it was called *defrutum*, — an article well known and much prized. The Arcadian wines, of which Aristotle speaks, in consequence of their jelly-like character and still greater consistency, had to be dissolved in water before they were used. Syrups of this description were preserved for many years. It is not necessary for our purpose or argument to be very particular here. If it were so, many different preparations of the "must," or "fruit of the vine," with honey and other ingredients, possessing none of the properties of fer-

* Pliny's Nat. Hist Lib. xii. vol. 1, tom. 1.

mented wine, might be shown, from Columella, Cato, and Pliny, to have been known to the ancients. 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 pain-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 possess the properties of fermented wine. It contains no alcohol.

SCRIPTURAL NOTICES OF IT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

It is unnecessary to enter into a minute,

detailed examination of the different places in which the word *tirosh* occurs and of the different shades of its meaning when used in its generic or specific import.* The "must," or *defrutum*, or new wine, or *tirosh*, is what the Saviour calls "the fruit of the vine," in a state fit for drinking. Luke xxii. 18. 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.

The juice expressed from the grape before fermentation, being devoid of alcohol, cannot intoxicate. The use of it as a drink is not condemned in the Bible. On the con-

* This has been done, since this treatise was first published, by Dr. F. R. Lees, Dr. John Mair, and Rev. Wm. Ritchie, whose treatises the reader may consult.

trary, it is spoken of with approbation. Like the grape itself it is called the "wine that checreth God and man." Judges ix. 13. Isaac prayed for it as a blessing to be bestowed on Jacob. Gen. xxvii. 28, 37. It is enumerated among the blessings and first fruits God allowed the priests to receive from the people and use. Num. xviii. 12. The consumption of it by a foreign foe was one of the curses denounced against Israel in case they should rebel. Deut. xxviii. 5. It was one of the clean things allowed. Deut. xiv. 23. It was allowed to females. Zech. ix. 17. It was the reward promised to Israel for the observance of the statutes of the Lord. Deut. vii. 13; xi. 14; xxxiii. 28; Prov. iii. 10; Hos. ii. 9, 22. Assuredly it has not been an accidental thing, that such marked distinction has been made in the Old Testament between fermented wine, decidedly condemned, and the must or unfermented juice of the grape,

as decidedly approved. God would have us know that the former should not be indulged in by us, while the latter may.

NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE.

The New Testament conflicts not with the above positions. The Greek language, however, does not discriminate so accurately on this subject as does the Hebrew. The same word *οίνος* denotes both fermented wine and the must or expressed juice of the grape, being a generic term. Pliny states expressly that the unfermented juice of the grape was preserved and used by the Greeks, being distinguished from the fermented intoxicating wines by the term *αιγλευκος*, *aigleukos*, which means "always sweet," and he has given the mode of preserving it.* It was called *γλευκος*, *gleukos*, also, or sweet wine. As we have already said, the Saviour drank the must or unfermented wine when he in-

* Plin. Nat. Hist., p. 12, tom. 1.

stituted his Supper, it being contrary to law and Jewish usage at the Passover to have any leaven, or fermented substance even, in the house, whether of food or drink. The wine he used, he styled "the fruit of the vine." And nothing is related throughout his history, or can be cited from the entire New Testament, that favors or sanctions the use of fermented wine. His allusion to the custom of putting new wine — that is, the fresh expressed juice of the grape — into new bottles or skins, to prevent bursting by the process of fermentation, does not settle the question of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of using fermented wine. Nor does his remark in the least degree touch the merits of this question, when he says, "No man, having drunk old wine, straightway desireth new, for he saith the old is better." Luke v. 39. The remark was as applicable, according to the tastes of his day, to

the unfermented juice of the grape, as it is regarded by modern wine-bibbers to be to the fermented old wines. He is referring merely to customs and habits in society at that time, for the purpose of illustrating certain moral truths, without any reference to the propriety or impropriety of using fermented wine. The generic import of the Greek terms neutralizes the drunkard's argument. Old, well preserved, and clarified syrup of the grape is much superior to the newly expressed must. The use which the good Samaritan made of wine, Luke x. 34, whether fermented or unfermented, was for cleansing and healing wounds. Nothing, therefore, can be inferred, from the Saviour's commendation of this man, in favor of using intoxicating drink.

The miracle of Christ's converting water into wine does not sanction the use of the fermented liquor. There is no proof that

the wine he made was fermented and intoxicating. The word wine, *αῖνος* or *γλευκος*, as used by the Greeks, cannot settle this point, being of generic import. The question, as to what it was, must be determined by other considerations. If suppositions or assumptions are to be admitted, it is just as allowable for us to say, that it does not absolutely appear that more was produced than what was contained in the servant's pitcher. He drew water from the vessel, John ii. 7, 8, and when he poured it into the cup it was "wine," and superior in quality to what had been previously used, just as old, well-preserved, clarified must or syrup would be preferable to the new. The phrase "when they had well drunk" does not imply intoxication; and there is no conclusive evidence, that there was any fermented wine at all at the feast. Such Christ himself did not use. Not a passage

in the New Testament can be cited in proof of it. The slander of his being "a wine-bibber," Matt. xi. 19, had just as much foundation in truth, as had his being called "a gluttonous man." John, as a Nazarite, abstained from both the flesh and juice of the grape in every form. Christ, however, did drink must, or use "the fruit of the vine;" and therefore, being no Nazarite, was contrasted with the Baptist, by the malicious wits and slanderers of the day. It was the Saviour himself, whose language is reported by the evangelists Matthew and Luke, that has made us acquainted with this slander. But it is worthy of our notice, that in neither place does he admit that he drank wine. All he says is "The Son of man came eating and drinking." There is no proof that what he drank was fermented wine. It is begging the question when the ellipsis is thus supplied. We have equal

right to supply it with the other idea, and better; for the pretext for the slander was that his habits were not those of the Nazarene John.

PAUL AND PETER'S TESTIMONY.

The Apostle Paul says, very explicitly, "It is good not to eat meat, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby a brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." Rom. xiv. 21. He has also forbidden Christians to be "drunk with wine, wherein is excess;" or, as certain learned writers render it, "use not the wine wherein is excess," * Eph. v. 18; it being unsafe and excess to use it at all,—that being its character. Seek not exhilaration and excitement by wine, but from the Spirit. The two are utterly inconsistent with each other.

* See the first part of this volume.

Both bishops and deacons are particularly prohibited from the use of it as a drink. "Aged women," whose feebleness might require either a nutritious drink, such as unfermented wine, or stimulant, such as fermented wine, were particularly required carefully to guard against any enslaving appetite or desire for much of either, that might thence arise. It was only as a medicine it was allowed to Timothy, and that but "a little." The word translated "excess of wine" in the first epistle of Peter, iv. 3, denotes the love, and thirst of, or excitement produced by, wine, from which Christians are represented to have been reformed. The remark of Paul, in relation to the abuse of the sacrament of the Lord's supper by the Corinthians, when he said, "one is hungry and another is drunken," if it proves that they made use of an intoxicating wine in the observance of the ordinance, does by

no means furnish an argument for the propriety of the use of such wine on such an occasion; for their example he condemned. His rebuke rather intimates the obligation to use nothing that can intoxicate. His object in that rebuke, was not to state the kind of wine to be used, but to rescue the ordinance from being perverted into a festive rite for the gratification of appetite. This Corinthian example should never be quoted as authority. Paul's reproof of their free use of an intoxicating drink, when another liquor not intoxicating could have been procured, is rather confirmatory of our argument than otherwise. The above are all the passages in which the subject is spoken of in the New Testament. None of them sanction the use of fermented wine as a drink.

POSITIONS ESTABLISHED.

The following positions, therefore, in conclusion, we think have been successfully established, namely:—

1. That the churches are bound, in every proper practicable way, to abet and advance the Temperance reformation.

2. That there is a great inconsistency in their presenting to their members alcoholic poison in "the cup of the Lord."

3. That the current wines of this country are so enforced and adulterated, by the admixture of ardent spirits, as to agree essentially with brandy, rum, gin, or whiskey.

4. That the arguments, which prove the use of the latter to be morally wrong, prove the same of the former.

5. That fermented wines, even when

unenforced, possess substantially the same intoxicating properties.

6. That the Sacred Scriptures express no approbation whatever of fermented wine; and, so far from sanctioning its use as a drink, condemn it in the strongest terms.

7. And that there was another article, prepared from the grape, — the must or “fruit of the vine,” — which possessed no intoxicating properties, contained no alcohol, the use of which was allowed and approved of God, and sanctioned by the example of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Wherefore we conclude that the duty of the churches, in relation to alcoholic fermented wine, in the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, is, clearly, to cast out the intoxicating liquor, which assimilates it to “the cup of devils,” and substitute “the pure blood of the grape,”

the must or "fruit of the vine," in its unfermented state. Why should they not do so? It is only thus that they will or can bear testimony full and clear, consistent and strong, in favor of Temperance, and against the wine and all that intoxicates.

• REASONS WHY THIS SHOULD BE DONE.

Many considerations urge the importance of purging from the communion cup, symbolically "the cup of salvation," the alcoholic poison, contained in enforced and fermented wines, by adopting the juice or syrup of grapes, the new wine or "must," which the Saviour used and called "the fruit of the vine." We urge it, 1. Because the use of fermented wine in the Lord's Supper is inconsistent with the principle and rule of conduct laid down by the Apostle Paul, "not to eat meat, nor drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother

stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." Rom. xiv. 21. The church's use of it is plead by the intemperate as sanctioning their indulgence in that which causes many to stumble, which renders many weak, and which destroys both body and soul forever.

SECOND REASON.

2. Because it is of great moment that the churches should give a public, visible, standing testimony against the use of intoxicating wine. Their testimony, by the use of such wine so generally in this most sacred duty of ritual worship, is in favor of "the cup of devils." The Temperance societies give their testimony against it, and the power of that testimony is felt. The churches of our Lord Jesus Christ, which are "a city set on a hill," as such, are bound to go as far, if not beyond them, and do something peculiar to themselves in opposition to intemperance,

by following the example of our Lord. How would the symbolic "cup of salvation" speak to the eye and to the conscience of the drunkard and lover of wine, and to all who witness the celebration of the Lord's Supper, should they see and know that it contains no alcohol, no fermented wine, but the pure and wholesome juice of the grape in an unfermented state! — that "the cup of the Lord" is thus made to differ essentially from "the cup of devils"! Knowing that the churches, walking after the example of their Lord and Master, accounted it poison, and morally wrong to drink from the intoxicating cup, every drunkard and wine-bibber would be and feel rebuked by every celebration of the Lord's Supper they might witness. The force of such a silent testimony as this would, doubtless, often wake the slumbering conscience, and might be the means of reformation, repentance, and the

saving of the soul. At any rate, what a salutary influence might thus be exerted on the children of the church trained up under it! Its conservative tendency would, doubtless, prevent many from tasting fermented wine, and forming destructive appetites.

THIRD REASON.

3. Because the churches are now actually reproached,* by many men of the world of temperate habits, for their guilty inconsistency and indifference in this matter, and for the mischievous influence of their example. Here and there a church is found, openly and avowedly, on Temperance ground, but

* Hear the Rev. D. B. Thomason: "And here the inconsistency of our Temperance clergy in drinking wine (he means intoxicating wine, for, like the infidel Strauss, he recognizes nothing else as entitled to the name of 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 which 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!" — "Teetotalism," p. 60.

what multitudes of rumsellers, and manufacturers and drinkers of alcoholic poison, are yet allowed a name and a place in Christian churches, even those especially claiming to be "*the church*"! It is high time they should come out and be separate and "touch not the unclean thing."

FOURTH REASON.

4. Because there is a substitute for fermented wine, which can easily be procured, in the "must," or unfermented "fruit of the vine." In proof of this it may not be improper here to introduce Cato's recipe for preparing it, which we translate: "If you wish to have must through the whole year, put it into a firkin and smear over the staves and bung with pitch. Let it down into a fish-pool. After the thirtieth day, take it out. It will be must through the whole year." (P. 16, sec. cxxi.) Columella's recipe

is substantially the same, differing only in the time the vessel should be left under water. Other processes, such as boiling, mixing with honey, etc., have been recommended. When must was inspissated by being boiled down to one-half it was called *defrutum*, when to two-thirds, *carenum*, and to one-third, *ἐψήμα*, *hepsēma*, by the Greeks. The last species of inspissated must, or syrup, was in great repute for beverage purposes.* This unfermented wine will answer

* When this treatise was first published, no such article was to be found in the American or English markets. Professor Stewart's "Views of the Wine Question," the investigations and publications of E. C. Delavan, Esq., in "The Enquirer," commenced at Albany, 1841, and Rev. Dr. E. Nott's Lectures, led to extended researches. The testimony of respectable, reliable travellers and others has been adduced in proof abundantly of the existence and use of the unfermented juice of the grape in Italy and other vine-growing countries. At this day an admirably pure article is manufactured and sold by J. Reynolds, Esq., of Ripley, Ohio, which for many years past has been used for communion purposes by the First Presbyterian Church of Detroit, of which the writer has been pastor now nearly thirty years. At the International Exhibition in London, 1862, honorable mention for its good quality was made of an article advertised by F. Wright, manufacturing chemist, Kensington, W., as "unfer-

much better, as a sensible sign and memorial of the blood of Christ, than any alcoholic wine.* It will prevent all those unpleasant consequences that result to some persons of delicate health and to others of dangerous dormant appetites, from even a mouthful of intoxicating liquor,† and were the ordinary

mented wine for medical and sacramental use, free from alcohol, prepared from the best continental grapes, and preserved in vacuo." Dr. F. R. Lees, Henry Mudge, Esq., M. R. C. S., Rev. H. Gale, D. C. L., Treborough Rectory, and N S. Kerr, Esq., M. D., have publicly given it their decided approbation, and it is sold by agents extensively in England, Scotland, and Ireland.

The valuable essays entitled "Bacchus" and "Anti-Bacchus," republished in this country during the excitement existing on this subject, set the whole question of the difference between fermented and unfermented wine in due season to rest.

* See "Letters of Dr. John Mair," published in New York, 1861.

† The writer of this article, years before its first publication, when but a youth, and before the Temperance reformation had commenced in this country, was told by a valuable and excellent physician, his kinsman and an elder in one of the Presbyterian churches in Philadelphia, Dr. W. B. Duffield, that having in early life become addicted to the use of intoxicating liquors, to the injury of his practice and his health, he made the resolution that he would never thereafter drink wine or anything that would intoxicate, believing total abstinence to be his only security. His words were, that, although for more than twenty years he

use of it to take the place of fermented wines, would render the grape and its juice still a valuable staple in all vine-growing countries.

FIFTH REASON.

5. Because the example of the blessed Redeemer and the prediction of Isaiah xxv. 6, both sanction the use, not of fermented wine, but of the unfermented or expressed juice or syrup of grapes. The liquid contained in "the cup of the Lord," when he instituted the sacrament of the Supper, and which he gave to his disciples to drink, as has already been noticed, is not called wine, as the word is now currently used, but "the fruit of the vine." There must have been

had been abstemious and never tasted intoxicating liquor, except to put the communion cup to his lips, yet, were he then to drink one glassful of wine, he would have no control of himself, He lived ever thereafter a total abstainer, and died after having passed his threescore years and ten, honored and lamented by his friends and all who knew him.

some good reason for this periphrasis. Immediately after he observes, "I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." Matt. xxvi. 29. There is no room for a question, or shadow of doubt, here as to the contents of his cup. "This," "new," are his words. New wine was the common term to denote the must, or unfermented juice of the grape, as new cider is that of apples before fermentation.

The "feast of fat things" predicted by Isaiah xxv. 6 — which, it is supposed by some, has reference to the Lord's Supper — is metaphorically described in terms corroborative of this position. As has been shown, the sensible emblem noticed by the prophet was not fermented wine, the word wine not being used in the original. The words are,

“a feast of fat things,”—of oily lees, that is, inspissated lees, — aptly descriptive of the syrup of grapes. The word oily speaks for itself to the English reader. Why our translators rendered it “wine,” it is of no consequence to inquire. Such an article as the syrup of grapes was unknown to them. The word rendered “well refined” is never used in reference to the racking of wine. Its most frequent use is to denote the smelting or fluxing of silver and gold, — a process produced by heat, and a fluid of greater consistency than fermented wine. In two places only is it applied to other than metallic substances: one is in this text now under consideration, and the other in Job xxxvi. 27, where it is said “they pour down rain according to the vapor thereof.” The idea is that of turning vapor into rain, — a process in which water passes from its most fluid

or gaseous condition to a more inspissated state, and totally unlike to that of defecation or throwing down and separating the sediment from wine. Beside, it is "the lees" the prophet says will be used, not the liquor separated from them. In no other state than as "must," or syrup, is the extractive matter of the grape potable. It is for those who quote this passage in support of their wine-drinking, to prove that the prophet really refers to the Lord's Supper, or to anything to be used in the shape of drink, at all. As to its prophetic reference, it looks forward to the scenes of the glorious resurrection yet to take place, and not to that primarily, or only, of the Lord Christ.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

The passages of Scripture in general above referred to and quoted, are all of any importance in their bearing on our ar-

gument. There are others, in which *yayin* and *tirosh* occur, which do not, in the least, impair but rather corroborate our positions, and therefore not necessary to be noticed.* The distinction is clearly made, and carefully maintained, in the Sacred Scriptures, between fermented wine — an unlawful drink, and characterized by odious epithets — and one that is lawful and approved of God, the unfermented must, or “fruit of the vine.” Can any church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, therefore, doubt about the obligation or even expediency of adopting, in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, what he himself used, the must, or unfermented juice of the grape, an unintoxicating drink, and rejecting the fermented alcoholic wine? Let the churches, then, resolve to purge their sacred cup, and use nothing but

* The reader will find every such passage in the Bible critically noticed in Dr. Lee’s Tract “*Tirosh Lo Yayin*,” and Rev. Mr. W. Ritchie’s late publication.

the "pure blood of the grape," and it will soon become an article of commerce,* and of easy procurement. Is it not worthy of being attempted? yea, is it not imperatively demanded? Let not the drunkard and lover of intoxicating wine, any longer find occasion — from the solemn memorials of our blessed and immutable Redeemer, as used in the churches—to glory in their use of alcoholic poison, and justify themselves in the gratification of an appetite that is jeoparding their souls' salvation!

The credit of the churches, their reputation, the efficiency of their influence in promoting temperance, their work in seeking the salvation of the souls of their fellow-men, and the consistency and purity of the example they are bound to exhibit to the world, require their action on the subject.

* The prediction has already been verified; and those who are ignorant of the fact may attribute it to culpable indifference.

Let them, promptly and zealously, banish from the temple and table of the Lord the deadly poison, as they would the idols that are an abomination to him. It is of essential moment that they do so,—for a public testimony against prevailing intemperance; for the rebuke of the drinking usages of society; for the reformation of the lovers of wine; for the preservation of the purity of their own members; for the guardianship of the young; for the rescue of the erring; for the arrest and frustration of increasing vice and immorality; for the good of society; for the salvation of the souls and bodies of men and women and youth; for the honor of Jesus,—by wresting his example, institutions, and word, from the hands, and profane use of the wicked, who pervert them; and for the glory of our God.