HV
M163e
1841

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service
Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service
Washington, D.C.

AN

EXAMINATION

OF THE ESSAYS

BACCHUS AND ANTI-BACCHUS.

PUBLISHED ORIGINALLY IN THE PRINCETON REVIEW.

LIBRARY
SURGEON GENERAL'S OFFICE
DEC.-31-1897
160490.

BY JOHN MACLEAN,
PROFESSOR IN THE COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY.

PRINCETON:
PRINTED BY JOHN BOGART.
1841.

HV
M163e
1841

LIBRARY
SURGEON GENERAL'S OFF
DEC.-31-1897

BACCHUS AND ANTI-BACCHUS.

1. *Bacchus. An Essay on the Nature, Causes, Effects, and Cure of Intemperance.* By Ralph Barnes Grindrod. First American, from the third English edition, edited by Charles A. Lee, A. M., M. D. New York: J. & H. G. Langley. pp. 512.
2. *Anti-Bacchus. An Essay on the Evils connected with the use of Intoxicating Drinks.* By the Rev. B. Parsons, of Stroud, Gloucestershire, England. Revised and amended, with an Introduction, by the Rev. John Marsh, Cor. Secretary of the American Temperance Union. New York: Scofield & Voorhees. pp. 360.

THESE Essays owe their origin to an offer of one hundred sovereigns as a premium "for the best Essay on the Benefits of Total Abstinence from all Intoxicating Drinks."

The premium was awarded to Mr. Grindrod, yet in the opinion of one of the three adjudicators Mr. Parsons was entitled to that distinction.

The comparative merit of the two Essays we shall not undertake to discuss, as our purpose is merely to examine some of the positions assumed, and to show that they are utterly untenable, being contrary to the word of God and the testimony of antiquity. So far as the object of these Essays is to promote temperance, we cordially opprove it; and we only regret that in the prosecution of an object so important, and so benevolent, the authors have not confined themselves to arguments which will stand the most rigid scrutiny.

With them we can rejoice in the triumphs of the temperance cause, in our own and other lands; and according to our ability, we will cheerfully unite in efforts to give an increased impulse to this cause. The intelligence respecting the success of the Rev. T. Mathew, in Ireland, and of our much esteemed friend the Rev. Robt. Baird, on the continent of Europe, gives us unfeigned pleasure. We could indeed wish in the case of the Catholics in Ireland, there had been a total freedom from superstition, as well as total abstinence from intoxicating drinks: and we indulge the hope, that as the people become more temperate, they will also become less superstitious. But, while we make this declaration of our interest in the temperance cause, we must enter our protest against the perversion of scripture and of fact which is found in these and like publications. This perversion constitutes our chief objection to the Essays under review, and it is the only objection which could have induced us to notice them. Had those who favour the views they contain contented themselves with urging *the expediency* of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, they would have met with no opposition from us, although we might differ from them in opinion, on some points pertaining to the question of expediency itself. But when they invade the sanctuary of God, and teach for doctrine the commandments of men; when they wrest the scriptures, and make them speak a language at variance with the truth; when they assume positions opposed to the precepts of Christ, and to the peace of his church; when, in reference to wine, which the Saviour made the symbol of his shed blood, in the most sacred rite of his holy religion, they assert that it is a thing condemned of God and injurious to men, and use the language of the Judaizing teachers in the ancient

church, "touch not, taste not, handle not,"* when Christ has commanded all his disciples to drink of it in remembrance of him, we cannot consent to let such sentiments pass without somewhat of the rebuke which they so richly deserve. That we are fully warranted in making these remarks, we expect to show to the satisfaction of all who do not first determine, what the Saviour ought to have done, and what the scripture must teach, and then seek to confirm their fancies by an examination of the sacred writings, and by an inquiry into the conduct of the Redeemer. On such persons we expect to make no impression. They reverse all the rules that ought to guide us in our inquiries respecting duty, and pursue a course most directly at variance with that of the apostles, who always refer to the example of our Saviour, not as being in conformity to what is proper and right; but as being in itself the standard of true excellence. Did Christ perform any act? This is sufficient evidence that the act is right. We are not at liberty first to decide whether a thing is right or wrong, and then, in accordance with that decision, determine what Christ either did or did not do. And yet this mode of reasoning and judging, a mode to which all heretics invariably have recourse, is the very one employed by the writers of these Essays, and other distinguished advocates of the total abstinence scheme. On what principle is it that the Universalist rejects the doctrine of future punishment? He first decides that it is inconsistent with the goodness of God, and he then infers that the scriptures, which are from God, cannot teach any such doctrine,

* By a strange misconception of the design of the sacred writer in employing these expressions, "touch not," "taste not," "handle not," they are often quoted by advocates of the total abstinence scheme as if they were divine precepts.

and that they are to be understood in a sense different from that usually put upon them. Thus with the Socinian, he decides that the doctrines of the incarnation and of the atonement are inconsistent with reason and justice, and he then infers that the scriptures cannot teach these doctrines.

Thus too with the Encratites, Aquarians, and other heretics in the *second, third, and fifth* centuries, who rejected the use of wine, in celebrating the Lord's Supper: the Aquarians, substituting *water* for *wine* and that too on the pretext of temperance. They appear to have had no knowledge of the wonderful discovery in our day, that our Saviour did not use wine, but merely the unfermented juice of the grape, mixed with water. Following in their steps, our Authors, and some of their worthy co-adjutors having ascertained, as they suppose, that the use of wine, called by them "fermented wine," is always injurious, that it is destructive to the morals, and the lives of men, and that it is impossible for God to approve a drink so vile and worthless, have satisfied themselves, that the Saviour never used it nor provided it for the use of others; and that when the scriptures speak of his making and drinking wine, they must be understood as referring to the unfermented juice of the grape.

That it may be seen, that we do not mis-represent their views, we quote the following passages—*Bacchus*, p. 364; "His (i. e. man's) tendency to estrangement from God would certainly not be lessened by even moderate indulgence in strong drink: and it is INCONSISTENT WITH DIVINE GOODNESS to suppose that he would institute festivals commemorative of his own glorious power and benevolence, which would offer any kind of temptation to his fallible creatures to deviate from the paths of rectitude and sobriety."

Again, p. 390: "Chemical and physiological knowledge,

therefore, sufficiently demonstrates that the nature of fermented wines is such as to render them, as *articles of diet, unwholesome* and *dangerous.* The stronger the alcoholic properties which they possess, the less nutritious matter do they contain. In other words, they become *stimulants,* and not *nutritives.* IN REGARD TO THE SCRIPTURES therefore, reference must be made to wine possessing qualities dissimilar to those under consideration, and such as might be WORTHY OF DIVINE COMMENDATION. Again, p. 417; It CAN SCARCELY BE SUPPOSED that this object (viz. the object of the Saviour's mission,) would be promoted by its great and divine Author, who was the holiest of men, partaking and sanctioning the use of intoxicating wine." "We may indeed rest assured, that so holy a being as the son of God would not partake of any thing improper in itself, or calculated to lead his followers into sin."

Anti-Bacchus, p. 267: "In examining the expressions, 'wine that maketh glad; or that cheereth the heart of man,' we must not forget that they were spoken by the Holy Ghost. Now God the Spirit is distinguished for truth, knowledge, and benevolence. His veracity would not allow him to affirm that a fermented, pernicious drink, which actually poioned and scorched the body, and corrupted the morals, was a drink which 'cheered the heart of man.' And his perfect knowledge of the physiology of our frame, and his benevolent regards for the human family would equally prevent him from commending what is baneful. But WE KNOW that all intoxicating drinks are pernicious, and therefore the wine spoken of in the text in question was not an alcoholic liquor." Other passages of similar import might be quoted from this essay. Would that such sentiments were peculiar to these writers, but they are not: they have been avowed by other advocates of the Total Abstinence Scheme, and by

individuals too, for whom we entertain great personal respect, and among them Edward C. Delavan, Esq., whose zeal in the cause of Temperance deserves the highest commendation. In a letter to the Editors of the New York Observer, Mr. Delavan says: "Previous to my tour abroad, I had imbibed the strong conviction that our Saviour never made or drank intoxicating wine. I am ready to admit that my early conclusions on this point were founded on reasonings drawn from my estimate of the character of the Saviour of the world, as the best and most benevolent of all beings, having at heart the universal interest of the human family. I found it impossible to bring my mind to think that he would make and use a beverage which, since its introduction, has spread such an amount of crime, poverty, and death, through this fair world. He came to save, not to destroy, and could I believe, with my views of alcoholic wine, that he would make or use it?"

The passages above cited fully sustain our assertion, that their authors first decide what it was proper for the Saviour to do, and for the scriptures to teach, in regard to the use of wine, and then go to work to seek for evidence in support of their already formed opinions. First trust to their own unaided reason, to ascertain what is right, and then go to the scriptures to have their opinions confirmed. Are these the persons most likely to ascertain the truth? even if they can say with Mr. Delavan, "so far as I am able to sit in impartial judgment, in what passes on my own mind, the desire that *truth* may be established on this, as on every other subject of Christian morals, is paramount." We give full credit to this declaration, and we believe Mr. Delavan to be perfectly honest, and so with the other gentlemen named, but this does not render their mode of inquiring after the truth less dangerous or less censurable. Would it not have been

more becoming in sincere inquiries after the truth, to seek first what the Saviour did, and from his practice to determine, whether it was proper or not to use fermented drinks of any quality or description, diluted with water or pure? To this mode of investigating scripture truth, we do totally object: it is arrogant and dangerous and a fruitful source of mischievous error.* The result of their investigations is, what might have been expected from the course pursued, a mixture of truth and error.

Our authors searched the scriptures, and other ancient writings, not to discover what the truth was; for this they knew already. The goodness of God, the holiness of the Redeemer, and the nature of man, furnished conclusive evidence to their minds that the scriptures do not sanction even the most moderate use of fermented liquor. All they wanted, therefore, was to find evidence that would satisfy the minds of others; and, by *dint of false criticism*, *misstatement of facts*, and *inconclusive reasoning*, they have accumulated no small amount of testimony in favour of their opinions. Our authors speak freely, and we do the same. Their pretensions to extensive learning, and thorough research, are certainly not slight. This, in the case of the author of Bacchus, is evident from the wide range of subjects he has discussed, and his quotations from the writings of the learned, in ancient and modern times. Criticisms on the use of Greek and Hebrew terms, with occasional reference to the corresponding words in the Arabic and Syriac, abound. The history of intemperance, and of intoxicating liquors, in

* That reason has a proper province for its exercise, in all enquiries respecting duty, we without hesitation admit, but with persons who receive the scriptures as containing the revealed will of God, and as an infallible standard of right and wrong, the office of reason is simply to ascertain what they teach: and when we ascertain this, we know what is right.

savage and civilized lands, is given in more or less detail. The effects of intemperance on the prosperity of nations, and on the welfare of the church, are brought to view. The moral and physical causes of intemperance are discussed; also, the diseases and other evils arising from the free use of intoxicating drinks. The nature and combinations of alcohol, the nature of fermentation, and the adulteration of intoxicating liquors, are examined at large ; also, the customs of the Hebrews, and of the primitive Christians, in regard to the use of wine.

In examining this wide range of subjects, the author of Bacchus has certainly collected a large number of interesting facts, the perusal of which will amply repay one for the time that may be necessary to peruse the work : and yet it might not unfrequently be difficult to suggest any reason why they are classed under one head rather than another. The claims of the author of Anti-Bacchus to attention, are thus set forth by himself: "I examined every text of scripture in which wine is mentioned: I inquired very minutely into the laws of fermentation ; into the character of the grapes and the wines, and the drinking usages of antiquity : the result of these inquiries was, that I came to the firm conclusion that few, if any, of the wines of antiquity were acoholic. I examined Homer, Aristotle, Polybius, Horace, Virgil, Pliny, Columella, Cato, Palladius, Varro, Philo Judaeus, Juvenal, Plutarch, and others. I read each in the original language, and therefore have not been misled by any interpreter ; and in every instance, I have carefully examined the context, that I might not give an unfair representation to any of my authorities." On this passage, we shall at the present simply remark, that Mr. Parsons would probably have made fewer blunders had he not attempted to "read each in the original language."

These Essays have received from various sources the highest commendation, and by many they are considered unanswerable. They are "to produce in our country a new era in the cause of temperance," and one of them at least is regarded by the American Editor of Anti-Bacchus as the production of a "giant mind."

It may therefore be regarded as rather hazardous to encounter giants so fully harnessed for the conflict as are our authors; yet we shall venture on the execution of our purpose. The positions which we intend to examine are the following:

I. That for the most part the ancient wines were not fermented.

II. That a strong wine could not be produced from the grapes of Palestine.

III. That the Hebrew term, translated in our English version of the Bible "strong drink," is inaccurately rendered, and should be "sweet drink."

IV. That wines which could produce intoxication were not allowed to be used at any of the Jewish festivals.

V. That the law, which prohibited the use of leaven at the feast of the Passover, included a prohibition of all fermented drinks.

VI. That, as our Saviour instituted the sacrament of the Lord's Supper at the Passover, he could not have used the fermented juice of the grape.

VII. That our Saviour, on no occasion, used fermented wine, or furnished it for the use of others.

VIII. That it is an offence against God and man to affirm, that the scriptures ever speak with approbation of the use of fermented wine.

After examining these several positions, we shall notice

sundry criticisms on different passages and terms found in the sacred writings.

The proposed examination we shall pursue in the order mentioned, beginning with the position No. 1: *That for the most part the ancient wines were not fermented.*

This position is most distinctly assumed by Mr. Parsons: "We have," says Mr. P. Anti-Bacchus, p. 206, "the most unquestionable evidence, that the *wines of the ancients* were *thick* and *sweet*, or, in other words, were sirups; but you cannot make a sirup out of a *fermented* wine." Again, p. 207: "And hence you have a proof equal to any demonstration of Euclid, that if the ancient wines were *thick* and *sweet*, they were NOT *fermented.*" Again, p. 234: "In a word, from science, philosophy, and history, I have demonstrated, that a large proportion of the wines of old were *not* produced by *vinous fermentation.*" "The popular wine of the ancients, and that of the moderns, are, in their characters, as wide apart as the poles."—p. 234. These extracts clearly indicate the views of the author of Anti-Bacchus.

It is but justice to Mr. Grindrod to remark that his views on this point do not accord entirely with those of Mr. Parsons. On the subject of ancient wines, Mr. G. observes, (Bacchus, p. 200,) "Some of the wines of the ancients were exceedingly strong; indeed, among the sensual part of the community, the celebrity of these wines, in a great measure, depended on their alcoholic strength." As alcohol is the product of fermentation, these exceedingly strong wines must have been fermented. Mr. Grindrod does, indeed, quote, apparently with approbation, the following, as the remarks of Chaptal: "The *celebrated ancient wines*," observes Chaptal, "appear in general to have rather deserved the name of *sirups* or *extracts* than wines. They must have been sweet and little fermented. Indeed it is difficult

to suppose how they could contain any spirit whatever, or possess in consequence any intoxicating properties."—Bacchus, page 196. These are not the words of Chaptal, but of the writer of the article "Wine," in Rees' Cyclopædia, who, in referring to an observation made by M. Chaptal, respecting the accounts given by Aristotle, Pliny, and Galen, of the wonderful consistency of *some* of the ancient wines, applies the observation to "the celebrated ancient wines in general." Of their not possessing any intoxicating properties, Chaptal says not a word; and, in quoting the language of the writer in the Cyclopædia, Mr. Grindrod omits the words "and consequently have contained *a very small proportion of alcohol.*" Mr. Grindrod, too, in copying the words of the writer in the Cyclopædia, has of course made the same mistake; and also another, which is his own, in referring to "Chaptal's Elements of Chemistry" instead of his "Traité sur les Vins," as authority for his statement.—(See Annales de Chimie—T. xxxv. p. 245. M. Chaptal's remark we shall have occasion to notice further in our subsequent discussions. Mr. G. and M. P. both inform us, (Bacchus, p. 194; Anti-Bacchus, p. 237): that "the Egyptians, at an early period, made use of must, or unfermented wine;" and, in proof of it, refer to the dream of Pharaoh's butler, and Mr. G. adds a remark of Dr. Adam Clarke's: "From this we find that wine anciently was the *mere expressed juice* of the grape, without *fermentation.* The saky or cup bearer took the bunches, pressed them into the cup, and instantly delivered it into the hands of the master." A very philosophical mode of reasoning this, to infer a general custom from a particular instance, and that not said to have occurred in real life, but in the visions of the butler while dreaming! We think it perfectly idle to infer any thing in regard to the character of the wine, from the account given by the butler of his dream. Why not in-

fer from Pharaoh's dream that the cows in Egypt were carnivorous, for it is said that "the lean and ill-favoured kine did eat up the first seven fat kine." The only legitimate inferences from the dream of the butler, so far as the customs of the ancient Egyptians are concerned, are: 1. That it was the office of the butler to hand to the king the cup from which he drank his wine, and: 2. That the wine drunk by the king was usually the product of the vine. In confirmation however of his remark, Mr. G. adds "this wine of nature" is called by Herodotus, οἶνος ἀμπέλινος, literally "*wine of the vine*," and he refers to Lowth's Isaiah, vol. ii. ch. v. 2, as authority for the statement. M. P. makes the same reference. It is true that it may be inferred from the words of Bishop Lowth, that the "fresh juice pressed from the grape," was called by Herodotus οἶνος ἀμπέλινος, and if he meant so to say, it is also true that the learned Bishop was mistaken, and that Herodotus employed this phrase, οἶνος ἀμπέλινος, not to designate "the fresh juice of the grape," but to distinguish it from the οἶνος κρίθινος, the wine or beer made from barley, a common drink among the ancient Egyptians, οἴνῳ δ' ἐκ κριθέων πεποιημένῳ διαχρέωνται· οὐ γάρ σφι εἰσὶ ἐν τῇ χώρῃ ἄμπελοι, "they use a wine made from barley, nor have they vines in the country." Herodotus ii. 77. Can any one who recollects the account given by Herodotus, Book ii. 60, of the yearly feast in honour of Diana, at Bubastos, believe that the οἶνος ἀμπέλινος was the fresh juice of the grape and unfermented? For the disorderly and grossly licentious scenes witnessed on these occasions, Herodotus accounts by saying, that at this festival, they use more of the οἶνος ἀμπέλινος than they do in all the rest of the year.

In support of the position that the ancient wines were for the most part not fermented, Mr. P. says, p. 205: "In Greece, Rome and Palestine, it was *customary* to boil down

their wine into a kind of a sirup. Mr. Buckingham tells us that the wines of Helbon, and the wine of Lebanon, mentioned in scripture, and which exist in the Holy Land at this very day, are boiled wines, and consequently are thick, sweet, and sirupy. Columella, Pliny and other Roman writers, tell us, that in Italy and Greece, it was *common* to boil their wines." Again, p. 265: "The chief wines mentioned in scripture are those of Lebanon and Helbon, and these, Mr. Buckingham says, are the principal wines of Palestine at the present day: the former, he adds, are boiled wines made of grapes as large as plums. "The wine of Helbon," mentioned by Ezekiel, Mr. Buckingham observes, is a rich sweet wine: the name of Helbon signifies "sweet or fat;" this wine was made at Damascus, was exported, was a part of the merchandize of Tyre, and in the time of Richard III. was brought to England under the name of the "wine of Tyre."

Mr. Grindrod too observes, Bacchus, p. 375, that "Ezekiel speaks of this wine in his magnificent description of the merchandize of Tyre:" "The *wine* (tirosh) of *Helbon* is classed with other nutritious articles, the produce of Judah and the land of Israel. . . . The "*wine* of Tyre" was exported from Palestine into this country so late as the reign of Richard III." Of wine of Lebanon, Mr. G. thus speaks, p. 374: "The wine of Lebanon is made in the present day, exactly as it was prepared in ancient times. *The juice of the grape immediately after it is expressed*, is boiled down to a greater or less consistence. In this state it could not possess alcoholic qualities. It remained the *healthful juice of the grape*, deprived only of its watery particles.

Keraswân and Mount Libanus, (or Lebanon,) states a modern traveller, produce the best wines in Syria. The wines of Syria are most of them prepared by boiling immediately

after they are expressed from the grape, till they be considerably reduced in quantity, when they are put into jars or large glass bottles, and preserved for use."

From these extracts it is evident that our authors would have us believe respecting wines of Helbon and Lebanon, the only two wines, the names of which are given in the scriptures,

1st. That they were boiled wines.

2d. That they were unfermented.

3d. That they were not intoxicating.

In support of these positions, Mr. Parsons adduces the testimony of Mr. Buckingham. As to the sources of information enjoyed by Mr. B., Mr. Parsons says nothing, and from some information which we have on this subject, we shall have no difficulty in showing that Mr. B. is mistaken. If the extracts given by Mr. Parsons contain all that is said on this subject, it is only of the wines of Lebanon Mr. B. speaks when he says they are boiled. Of the wine of Helbon he says merely that it is a "rich sweet wine." Yet Mr. Parsons says, "hence it is evident that the two wines most esteemed in the Holy Land were boiled wines, were thick and sweet, and consequently were not alcoholic." But granting they were boiled, does this prove that they were not allowed to ferment after boiling. Mr. W. G. Brown, the authority of Mr. Grindrod, for asserting that the wines of Mount Lebanon are prepared by boiling, says, "that this mode of boiling is still retained in some parts of Provence, where it is called *vin-cuit* or *cooked wine*, but there the method is to lodge the wine in a large room, receiving all the smoke arising from several fires on the ground floors, an operation more slow, *but answering the same purpose.* The Spanish Vino Tinto or Tent is prepared in the same way." Bacchus, *Note*, p. 374. Now this very Vino Tinto contains more

than 13 per cent of alcohol, *the product of its fermentation.* See Brande's Table. The phrase *Vin Cuit* ordinarily denotes a wine, "which has had a boiling before fermentation, and which by this means still retains its native sweetness." Rees' Cyclopædia, Article, Wine. We say ordinarily, for we find that Chaptal speaks of the sapa and defrutum and even of the Passum of the ancients as belonging to the class of *Vins-Cuits.* See Traite sur les Vins. Ch: iii. Annales de Chimie, T. 35, p. 290. There is a species of Rhenish must, a very intoxicating drink, which is first boiled and then fermented. See Rees' Cyclo. Article Rhenish must. Henderson, in his treatise on wines, p. 189, tells us that in preparing the *sweet wines* of Spain, the must is often boiled, and that by this operation the saccharine matter becomes concented, and the *proportion of alcohol is increased.* Is alcohol obtained without fermentation?

Chaptal, ch. iv. 4, 2, says: "When the must is very watery, the *fermentation* is slow and difficult, and the wine which comes from it is weak and very susceptible of decomposition. In this case, the *ancients* were acquainted with the advantage of boiling the must. By this means they evaporated the superabundant water, and brought back the liquid to a suitable degree of thickness. This method, constantly advantageous in northern countries, and in general wherever the season has been rainy, is yet followed in our day. Nevertheless, this process is useless in warm countries; at the most, it is not applicable except in cases when the rainy season has not permitted the grape to come to a suitable degree of maturity; or forsooth when the vintage has been gathered in a foggy or rainy season."

Grant, then, that the wines of Lebanon are boiled wines; does it follow that they are not fermented, when it is a fact

not to be denied, that it is customary, in certain cases, to boil the must, in order that it may the better ferment, and that the *strength* and *sweetness* of the wine may be increased? But, further, Mr. Brown does not say that the wines of Keraswân and Lebanon are not fermented, but merely that they are boiled; and he also says, that they are prepared in a way that answers the same purpose as the mode employed in preparing the *vins-cuits*, or *cooked wines* of Provence, and the vino-tinto of Spain.

Of the *vins-cuits* of Provence, M. Jullien, in his "Topographie de tous les Vignobles," p. 273, thus speaks: "These wines, newly made, are luscious, a little clammy, and seize upon the throat; but when they are old, they become delicate and very agreeable, retaining entirely their sweetness. M. *Grimod de la Reynière*, whose judgment is of great weight in this matter, gives to them the preference over the *luscious wines* (vins de liqueur) of Spain, Italy, and Greece." Again, p. 276, speaking of these same *vins cuits* of Provence, he remarks: "Those which are prepared at Aubagnes, Cassis, and Ciotat, when old rank among the *vins de liqueur* of the second class." They are not in general as much esteemed as the *vins de liqueur* of Spain; the mode of preparing which is thus described by Jullien, p. 333: "the must is concentrated by boiling, and acquires the consistency of a sirup. After this, it is put into casks, *where it is fermented enough to acquire the necessary degree of spirituosity;* but having been deprived by the fire of a large portion of its phlegm, the fermentation ceases before the entire dissolution of its sugary parts. These wines remain sweet, and are very clammy during the first years. It is not till they are old that they become delicate, pleasant, and fragrant."

Volney, another of Mr. Grindrod's authorities, says, that "the wines of Lebanon are of three sorts, the red, the white,

and the yellow. The white, which are the most rare, are so bitter as to be disagreeable; the two others, on the contrary, are too sweet and sugary. This arises from their being boiled, which makes them resemble the baked wines of Provence. The general custom of the country is to reduce the must to two-thirds of its quantity. *It is improper for common drink at meals, because it ferments in the stomach.* In some places, however, they do not boil the red, which then acquires a quality almost *equal* to that of Bordeaux. The yellow wine is much esteemed among our merchants, under the name of Golden wine, (vin d'or,) which has been given to it from its colour."

Here observe 1. that the must, when reduced to two-thirds, is *improper for common drink at meals;* therefore, when thus reduced, it must be designed for some other purpose. What that purpose is we shall show presently. 2. The reason assigned for it being an improper drink, viz: "it ferments in the stomach;" and yet Mr. Grindrod tells us, that "it remained in fact the *healthful juice of the grape,* deprived only of its watery particles." 3. That the red and yellow wines reminded Mr. Volney of the baked wines of Provence, which are first boiled and then fermented. 4. That the red wine of Lebanon, when not boiled, acquired a quality almost equal to that of Bordeaux, a fermented liquor, containing about *thirteen* per cent. of alcohol. 5. That the white wines of Lebanon were not boiled.

With respect to the *vin d'or,* mentioned by Mr. Volney, M. Jullien says expressly, that it is not boiled: "Cependant le plus estimé, que l'on nomme *vin d'or,* n' est pas bouilli." p. 474.

Mr. John Carne, in his "Syria, the Holy Land and Asia Minor Illustrated," speaks of the *white wines* of Lebanon

as distinguished for their strength, and the *red wines* as the Champagne of the East. How could he thus describe unfermented liquors?

Mr. Grindrod, in further confirmation of his statement respecting the wines of Lebanon, says: "Two travellers,* of great celebrity, particularly investigated the manners and customs of the modern inhabitants of Judea, and record that the vines of Hermon and Lebanon yield wine of a red colour, very generous and grateful, and so light as *not to affect the head though taken freely.*" Wherein does this account differ from the account of the *red wine* of Lebanon, by Messrs. Volney and Carne, one of whom compares it to the *red wine* of Bordeaux; the other, to the *red wine* of Champagne; *both light wines; both fermented wines;* and although, according to Henderson, p. 183, "the quantity of alcohol which the finer sorts of the Bordeaux wines contain is inconsiderable," yet that quantity has been found by analysis, to be not less than *thirteen* per cent. In the red Champagne it is somewhat less. The phrase "though taken freely" is somewhat ambiguous, and by no means proves the wine is not an intoxicating one.

Mr. Parsons, as if in confirmation of his own and of Mr. Buckingham's statements, says: "M. La Roque, in his Itiner. Syr. and Libanus, remarks, 'It would be difficult to find any other wine so exceedingly choice as that which was presented to us, and which led us to conclude that the reputation of the wine of Lebanon mentioned by the prophet is well founded." Is there any intimation in these words that the wine of Lebanon, "so exceedingly choice," was the "unfermented juice of the grape?" Is it probable that M. La Roque would speak thus of the boiled wine of

* Van Egmont and Prof. Hyman.

Lebanon, which Volney says is too sweet and sugary to be pleasant? Mr. Parsons does not give the name of this wine. M. La Roque says that the best is called *Golden wine, vin d'or*, which we have already shown is not a *boiled wine.*

We have thus far confined our attention almost exclusively to an examination of the authorities cited by the authors of Bacchus and Anti-Bacchus, and have shown from their own witnesses, that the wines of Lebanon were not unfermented wines, whether *boiled or not boiled* before fermentation, and consequently, that they contained more or less alcohol. Let us now examine the authorities adduced in support of the assertion, that the wine of Helbon was unfermented. We have already mentioned the fact, that even Mr. Buckingham, in the passages cited by Mr. Parsons, does not say of this wine, that it was boiled. It is only of the wines of Lebanon he makes this statement. Of the wine of Helbon he says, that "it is a rich sweet wine." And because Nehemiah says, "*eat the fat and drink the sweet*," Mr. P. infers that this wine too must have been a boiled wine, and, consequently, according to his theory respecting wines, not containing any alcohol.

Mr. Henderson, p. 188, speaking of the Spanish wines, says: "The Spaniard, when he drinks wine as an article of luxury, gives the preference to such as is 'rich and sweet,'" employing the very terms that Mr. B. does respecting the wine of Helbon; and he instances, among the favourite wines of the Spaniard, the Malaga. Shall we, therefore, infer that the Malaga is an unfermented wine? With just as much reason as infer that the wine of Helbon is an unfermented wine. The Malaga contains upwards of seventeen per cent. of alcohol, and we have no evidence as yet that the wine of Helbon contains any less.

Mr. Grindrod observes of this wine, that "It is classed

with other nutritious articles, the produce of Judah and the land of Israel." But what has this to do in determining the question whether it was fermented or not; whether it was itself nutritious or otherwise? Judas Iscariot was reckoned among the twelve apostles, but this does not prove that he was either a good man or a true disciple. All such reasoning is idle. Did the sacred writer profess to give a list of nutritious articles of diet, the circumstance mentioned by Mr. G. might be of some importance.

In this very description of the articles of merchandize of Tyre, referred to by Mr. G. the prophet says, "Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, they were thy merchants; they traded in the *persons of men* and vessels of brass in thy market." Why not infer that the *slave trade* is a useful and honourable employment? for this trading *in the persons of men* is just as much classed with the wheat, and the honey, and the oil of the land of Israel, as is the wine of Helbon. But into such extravagance will men run in order to carry out a favourite hypothesis.

Both Mr. Parsons and Mr. Grindrod mention the fact that the wine of Helbon under the name of the "wine of Tyre," was imported into England, as late as the reign of Richard III. but this determines nothing in regard to the character of this wine. If the statement of Sir John Fortescue, a cotemporary of Richard III. that, "they drink no water except when they abstain from other drinks, by way of penance, and from a principal of devotion," given in Bacchus, p. 42, be correct, there is very little reason for believing, that the English at that time would be pleased with wine of such a description as Mr. G. imagines the wine of Helbon was.

Mr. Grindrod also observes, that "Athenaeus, upon the authority of Posidonius, states that the Persians planted vineyards at Damascus, on purpose to prepare this celebrated

article of commerce. The kings of Persia drank no other." Athenaeus, Lib. I. Strabo, Lib. 15. "This fact," says Mr. G. "tends to show that *sweet* and *thick wines* were held in most esteem by the ancients," but in our humble judgment it has somewhat of a different tendency, as we shall at once show. And first compare the statement, that the kings of Persia drank no other wine, with the anecdote related by Mr. G. of Cambyses, king of Persia, and son of Cyrus, by whom Damascus was subjected to the Persian sway. Bacchus, p. 129: According to this anecdote, related originally by Herodotus, Cambyses was a monster of *drunkenness and cruelty*, and as such is referred to by Mr. G. If Cambyses drank no other wine, surely the wine of Helbon must have been a very nutritive article! Again, if the kings of Persia drank no other wine, the wine of Helbon must be the wine called in the book of Esther i. 7. "royal wine," and in the use of which Ahasuerus the Persian monarch became so far intoxicated, that contrary to the customs of the country, he commanded his chamberlains to bring Vashti the queen, that he might exhibit her beauty to the people and princes, who on occasion of a great feast, made for them by the king, were drinking of the royal wine, furnished in abundance for their entertainment. The phrase, "when the *heart of the king was merry* with wine," found in Esther i. 10: is the same as that used in reference to Nabal. 1 Samuel xxv. 36: "and Nabal's heart was merry, for he was very drunken," and also the same with that which occurs 2 Samuel xiii. 28, respecting Ammon, whom Absolom commanded his servants to kill when he should be so far overcome with wine as to be incapable of resisting.

From the statement of Mr. Grindrod, respecting the use of this wine by the kings of Persia, compared with the account in the book of Esther, the reader may perceive how

very harmless this wine of Helbon was, especially when drunk in large quantites. We have now examined at great length all the authorities cited by our authors, that the wines of Helbon and Lebanon were not fermented, and not intoxicating, and have shown that they have failed to make good their assertions in regard to the character of these wines. We shall now produce such testimony as will, we think, set this point at rest. Upon reading the statements of Messrs P. and G., we addressed a note to the Rev. Eli Smith, of the Syrian Mission, who has resided in Syria for a number of years, and who is perfectly familiar with the language and the customs of the country, and enquired of him whether the wines in common use in Palestine, were fermented and produce intoxication, and whether the wines of Lebanon were boiled. Mr. Smith, who was at that time in the city of New York, very kindly furnished the following answer to the inquiries, which were made of him. We give the letter entire, that there may be no doubt as to the views of Mr. Smith.

"*Kinderhook, Nov.* 10, 1840.

"Dear Sir—I was prevented from replying to your note of the 6th immediately, by being called to leave New York the day it was received. You inquire whether the wines in common use in Palestine, and particularly the wines of Lebanon, are fermented, and produced intoxication? and, whether the wines of Lebanon are usually boiled?

"The wines now in common use in Palestine, in Mount Lebanon, and in all the countries around the Mediterranean that I have been in, *are fermented, and do produce intoxication.* They vary in strength, but are on an average, I am confident, (especially the wines of Lebanon,) a good deal stronger than our cider. Of their strength, compared with the wines used in this country, my knowledge of the latter is too

slight to enable me to judge with certainty. The wines of Syria are stronger than those I have tasted farther north, in Georgia and Hungary. Of the inebriating effects of the wines of the Mediterranean, we have often painful evidence. On first going to Malta, at the beginning of the temperance reformation, with the impression I had received here, that there was no danger from the pure wines of those countries, I fell in with what I found to be the prevailing custom, and took a little wine with my dinners. At length I found an intimate friend falling into habits of intoxication, in consequence of habitually using the common Marsala wine of Sicily. I then gave up my wine; and, so far as I know, all my brethren abstain from the habitual use of it, as a temperance measure. In preparing a Tract on Temperance, for circulation in Syria, we have included wine with brandy as one of the causes of intemperance to be avoided.

"In doing this, we make no distinction between brandied wines and those which are not brandied, for no such distinction, so far as I am informed, is thought of among the natives. Nor do we make any exception of unfermented wines. *I have never found any such wines now used in those countries.* I recollect, indeed, that in travelling through Asia Minor, I frequently quenched my thirst with an infusion of raisins. But it was never called sherâb, the name given in Turkish to wine, but üzüm sûyû, "raisin water." Even in the house of the chief rabbi of the Spanish Jews at Hebron, I was once treated with fermented wine during the feast of unleavened bread. I knew it was fermented, not merely from its taste, but because I had a discussion with him on the inconsistency of having it in his house at a time when he had professedly banished every thing that was leavened. The principal word, indeed, in Arabic, for wine, khamr, is derived from the verb khamar, which means to ferment.

From the same root comes also khamireh, the word for leaven.

"As to boiled wines, I have never found them in Mount Lebanon, nor in any of the countries around. The unfermented juice of the grape, is indeed boiled down to a thick sirup, of the consistency of molasses, or thicker. And this, I think, is the principal use made of the juice of the grape, throughout Syria and Palestine. The best of it in Mount Lebanon is even made so thick that the mountaineers boast that they can carry it a day's journey on a piece of bread, without its running off. But this sirup is no more looked upon now as wine, than molasses is regarded by us as the same thing with rum. I am not aware that it is ever diluted for drink.

"You will perceive that I am no apologist for wine drinking, on the ground that the present wines of Palestine are fermented. These wines tend to intoxication, and therefore we banish even them from our tables, though they are the wines of Palestine. Nor do I wish what I have written to be regarded as in any way aimed against the principles of the Am. Temp. Union. Indeed, I am happy to find that any apparent discrepancy between the *testimony* here given, and that of Mr. Delavan in his letter to the editors of the New York Observer, of August 24th, *so far as facts are concerned*, is chiefly if not entirely verbal. He testifies that the unfermented juice of the grape *can* be preserved from fermentation by boiling. My testimony goes farther, and proves not only that it can be, but *is in fact* thus preserved to a great extent. The difference is, that *he calls this sirup wine; I have not found it bearing the name, nor used in the place of wine.* Of his *opinion*, that it was anciently regarded and used as wine, and is the wine approved of in the Bible, but has gone into disuse in consequence of an increased taste for alcoholic drinks, a person who has never

been in Palestine, is perhaps as capable of judging as myself. This point is not included in the questions your letter proposes, and I leave it untouched. You will not therefore consider my letter as containing any opinion respecting the nature of the wines used and approved by our Saviour and the writers of the scriptures. That discussion is one in which I wish not to take any part.

"With much respect, I remain,

"Most truly yours,

"ELI SMITH."

From this letter, it is evident—

1. That the wines now in common use in Palestine and in Mount Lebanon are *fermented, and do produce intoxication.*

2. That the wines of Syria are *stronger* than those farther north, in Georgia and Hungary.

3. That in Asia Minor it is common to use as a drink "an infusion of raisins," but that this is *never* denominated *wine*, but "*raisin water.*"

4. That *boiled* wines, as distinguished from *fermented* wines, are scarcely if at all known in Palestine. Whether the wines were boiled before fermenting was not a matter included in our inquiries, nor is it included in the answers of Mr. Smith.

5. That the unfermented juice of the grape is frequently boiled until it acquires the consistence of molasses, or until it becomes even thicker than molasses; but this sirup is no more looked upon as wine than molasses with us is considered the same thing as rum; and that this sirup is not diluted for drink, but is eaten with bread.

Mr. Volney, as we have seen, says, it is unfit for common drink at meals, but he does not mention for what purpose it is used. From Mr. Smith's letter it appears, that it is used

in Palestine in the same way that in this country we use molasses or honey; and, in fact, it is the very substance called in the English version of the Bible, "*honey*," as in Ezekiel xxvii. 17. In this verse, it is spoken of as a part of the merchandise of Tyre, and as something distinct from the *new wine* (tirosh) of Helbon mentioned in the succeeding verse. It is not improbable, that in rainy seasons, when the grape did not contain its usual quantity of saccharine matter, that they mixed with the juice of the grape, before it was fermented, a small quantity of this *boiled must*, in order to give the wine greater strength and sweetness, as in common in other wine countries. See Henderson and Chaptal.

If it be true, as the author of Bacchus says, and we do not question its truth, that "the wine of Lebanon is made in the present day exactly as it was prepared in ancient times," then it is abundantly evident that the *ancient* wine of Lebanon was a fermented and an intoxicating drink.

There are one or two points in Mr. Smith's letter, which we shall notice under another head. Let us now examine the witnesses of our authors, in relation to the ancient wines of Greece and Italy.

"Columella, Pliny, and other Roman writers," says Mr. Parsons, "tell us that it was common to boil their wines. The sapa and defrutum of the Latins, and the "Εψημα and Σίραιον of the Greeks, which Pliny calls 'siraeum and hepsema,' and adds that they answered to the sapa and defrutum of the Latins, were boiled wines. In making the 'sapa' the juice was boiled to one half, and in defrutum to one third."

But is this all that Pliny says about them? His very next words, indicating for what purpose they were chiefly prepared, are not even noticed by our author, notwithstanding "in every instance he carefully examined the context,

that he might not give an unfair representation to any of his authorities." The words immediately following the above passage are these: "*Omnia in adulterium mellis excogitata,*" showing clearly that for certain purposes at least they were expressly designed to supply the place of honey. Pliny, ch. vi. in treating of the famous Maronean wine, a product of Thrace, had previously mentioned that Aristaeus was the first person in Thrace, who taught the mixing of honey with wine. And how any one who has read Pliny, Columella, Varro and Cato, and that too without being "misled by any translator," should overlook the fact, that the principal use of these preparations was to sweeten and to increase the strength of weak wines, we are utterly at a loss to understand. Mr. Parsons does not give the least intimation that they were used for this purpose. That in some Latin authors we find allusions to the use of *sapa* and *defrutum*, as drinks, by the old women of Rome, we do not deny; but there is no evidence that the sapa and defrutum were ordinary drinks among the Greeks and Romans.

Although Pliny, in treating of the different sorts of wine, makes mention of *sapa* and *defrutum*, also products of the vine, yet he most clearly distinguishes them from *wine properly so called*, and classes them among the *dulcia*. He also distinguishes both classes from the ἀειγλεῦκος of the Greeks. "Intermediate between the *dulcia* and *vinum (wine)* is what the Greeks call *aigleucos*, that is *always must*. It is the result of care, inasmuch as it is not suffered *to ferment:* thus they call the *passage of must* into *wine.**

What words can show more clearly that Pliny understood by *wine* something different from the mere unfermented juice

* "Medium inter dulcia vinumque est, quod Graeci aigleucos vocant, hoc est, semper mustum," and adds, "Id evenit cura, quoniam *fervere* prohibetur, sic appellant *musti in vina transitum.*"

of the grape, whether boiled or not boiled.* Again in book xxiii. c. 30. "Sapa is a thing *allied* to wine, the must having been boiled, until a third part remains."† The same distinction between *dulcia* and *vina* occurs, Book xiv. 15.‡ "From which it appears that murrhina," a drink flavoured with myrrh, "is classed not only with *wines* but also with the *dulcia.*"

In Book, xiv. c. 24, Pliny treats of the different condiments used in the preparation of wine: "And also from *must itself* medicaments are made, it is boiled in order that it may wax sweet by a portion of its strength. In some places they boil the *must* to *sapa*, and having poured it into the wine, they allay its harshness. §

* It is to be presumed that such of our total abstinence friends as object to the use of wine because "it is not eliminated from any living or natural process," but a liquor prepared by "interfering with the operations of nature," see Bacchus, p. 241, or in the words of Mr. Parsons, because, "no where in nature is alcohol produced by the hand of God," Anti-Bacchus, p. 265, will never say another word in favour of drinking "aigleucos," the *always must*, since *must* is first obtained by subjecting the grapes to a very unnatural pressure, and then oh! horrible to mention, to prevent its turning to wine or to vinegar, "the operations of nature are interfered with!" "Id evenit cura, quoniam *fervere* prohibetur," and this is said too by Pliny, a favourite authority with Mr. Parsons. Of *sapa* too Pliny says, "ingenii non naturae est opus." 'It is the work of art not of nature.' Why not object also to the use of *bread?* It may be said of bread as of wine, and with the same propriety, "it is not eliminated from any living or, natural process." "No where in nature is it produced by the hand of God." But does this prove that they are neither of them gifts of God? If the argument is good for any thing, it amounts to this, and proves the same thing of bread, that it does of wine.

† "Vino cognata res sapa est, musto decocto donec tertia pars supersit."

‡ "Quibus apparet non inter modo vina murrhinam, sed inter dulcia quoque nominatum.

§ "Verum et de apparatu *vini* dixisse conveniat," and among other things he says, "*Necnon et ex ipso musto* fiunt medicamina: decoquitur, ut dulcescat portione virium. . . . . Aliquibus in locis decoquunt *ad sapas musta, infusisque his* ferociam *frangunt.*"

"Cato," says Pliny, "directs wines to be prepared with the fortieth part of the lye of ashes boiled with *defrutum*, for a culeus,"* a Roman measure containing about one hundred and forty gallons. The two passages last quoted show what use was made by the ancient Romans of *sapa* and *defrutum* as condiments for their wines.

Columella, another writer mentioned by Mr. Parsons, treats of the preparing of defrutum, and of its uses, more at large than Pliny. See Book xii. cc. 19, 20, 21. "Some boil away a fourth and some a third of the must, nor does it admit of a doubt, that should one reduce it to a half he would make the better *sapa*, and on that account more fit for use, so that must from old vineyards may be cured with *sapa* instead of *defrutum*."† "Although carefully made *defrutum* like *wine* is wont to become sour, we should therefore recollect to season *wine* with *defrutum* of a year old, whose good quality has been ascertained." c. 20.‡

Then, after giving some directions as to the mode of preparing the defrutum, he says, "of this defrutum, thus boiled, a single *sextarius* is sufficient for a single amphora." c. 20.§

Ch. xxi: "Let must of the sweetest taste be reduced by boiling, to the third part, and when boiled, it is called, as I said above, *defrutum*, which, when it has become cool, is

* "Cato jubet vina concinnari, cineris lixivii cum defruto cocti parte quadragesima, in culeum."

† "Quidam partem quartam ejus musti, quod in vasa plumbea conjicerunt, nonnulli tertiam decoquunt, nec dubium, quin ad dimidium si quis excoxerit, meliorem sapam facturus sit, eoque usibus utiliorem, adeo quidem, ut etiam vice defruti sapa mustum, quod est ex veteribus vineis, condire possit." c. 19.

‡ "Quinetiam diligenter factum defrutum, sicut vinum, solet acescere; quod cum ita sit, meminerimus anniculo defruto, cujus jam bonitas explorata est vinum condire."

§ "Ex hoc defruto, quod sic erit coctum, satis est singulos sextarios singulis amphoris immiscere."

transferred into vessels, and set aside, that it may be used at the end of a year. It can, however, in nine days after it has cooled be put into wine, yet it is better not to be used for a year. One sextarius is sufficient for two urnae of must, if the must be from vineyards on a hill, but if from vineyards in the plain, three *heminae* must be added. When the must is taken from the vat, we suffer it to cool for two days, and to become clear; and, on the third day, we add the defrutum."*

These extracts show most clearly that the principal use of *sapa* and *defrutum* was to improve the quality of weak wines. For additional evidence, see Cato, chap. cxiii. and Palladius, chap. xi. 14; also, the Γεωπονικα, edited by Needham, Lib. vii. 13, page 178: "Some, boiling the must and reducing it to a third, mix it with the wine;" τινὲς δὲ γλεῦκος ἑψοῦντες καὶ ἀποτριτοῦντες, μιγνύουσι τῷ οἴνῳ. This mode of improving them is practised at this day. See Chaptal's "Traité sur les Vins," ch. iv. art. 3.—"Annales de Chimie," T. 36, p. 43.† In strong and sound wines, in which the saccharine matter was sufficient to preserve the wines in a perfect state, the sapa and defrutum were not used. "We regard that as the

* "Mustum quam dulcissimi saporis decoquatur ad tertias, et decoctum, sicut supra dixi, *defrutum* vocatur. Quod cum defrixit, transfertur in vasa et reponitur, ut post annum sit in usu. Potest tamen etiam post dies novem, quam refrixerit, adjici in vinum; sed melius est, si anno requieverit. Ejus unus sextarius in duas urnas musti adjicitur, si mustum ex vineis collinis est: sed si ex campestribus, tres *heminae* adjiciuntur. Patimur autem, cum de lacu mustum sublatum est, biduo defervescere, et purgari, tertio die defrutum adjecimus," &c.

† Il est encore possible de corriger la qualité du raisin par d' autres moyens qui sout journellement pratiquiés. On fait bouiller une portion du mout dans une chaudiere, on le rapproche à moitié, et on le verse ensuite dans la cuve: par ce procédé, la partie aqueuse se dissipe en partie, et la portion de sucre se trouvant alors moins délayée, *la fermentation* marche aves plus de régularité, et le produit en est plus généreux.

best wine which will last without any condiment, nor should any thing be mixed with it by which its natural taste may be spoiled. That is the choicest wine which can please by its own quality."* And this passage follows immediately the one first quoted from Columella, in which he tells us how *sapa* is prepared, and that it may be used instead of defrutum to season must obtained from old vines.

In all these quotations from Columella, the distinction between wine and the boiled juice of the grape, whether called *sapa* or *defrutum*, is carefully observed. The object of Columella, in treating of wines, was to point out the various modes employed in his day to preserve and improve them, by increasing their strength, sweetness, and durability, and by imparting to them a more agreeable taste. His object was not to treat of the mode of making unfermented wine, and all the directions which he gives in regard to the preparing of *sapa* and *defrutum* have reference to their being used as condiments for the preservation and improvement of the weaker wines. This is distinctly admitted by the author of Bacchus, and the admission shows, that he understood better than Mr. Parsons the design and import of Columella's observations on wines. "Columella," says Mr. Grindrod, Bacchus. p. 373, "although not writing concerning *unfermented* wine, *the mode of making which he does not describe, except so far as was connected with the preservation of wines of a weak or watery quality*," &c.

We shall now take our leave of Mr. Parsons's *sapa* and *defrutum*, of which he has made so much, and to so little purpose.

* Quaecunque vini nota sine condimento valet perennare, optimam esse eam censemus, nec omnino quidquam permiscendum, quo naturalis sapor ejus infusetur. Id enim praestantissimum est, quod suapte natura placere poterit.

Let us next examine a passage in Columella, Book xii. 27, quoted and translated by Mr. Parsons: "*De vino dulci faciendo:*" "Gather the grapes and expose them for three days to the sun; on the fourth, at mid-day, tread them; take the mustum lixivum (that is, the juice) which flows into the lake before you use the press, and when it HAS SETTLED, add one ounce of pounded iris; strain the wine from its feces, and pour it into a vessel. This wine will be sweet, firm or durable, and healthy to the body."*

But what means the expression, "*has settled?* Does it convey the precise meaning of '*deferbuerit*,' the term used in the original passage? Does not the Latin word imply a previous fermentation; and should it not have been rendered, "has become cool," or, "ceased to ferment?" Is this not the proper and legitimate meaning of the word, which Mr. P. has rendered by the ambiguous phrase "has settled?" Columella says nothing in this passage of boiling, by the the application of external heat, and consequently "*deferbuerit*" can refer only to the cooling consequent on the heat produced by the intestine motion of the must during the time of its passing into the state of wine. Of the propriety of our comment, any one may satisfy himself by consulting any Latin Dictionary that may be at hand. But perhaps Mr. Parsons is as much afraid of being led astray by the Lexicographer as he is by the translator, and therefore deemed it best to define the term to suit himself. It would not have answered his purpose to have rendered "*deferbuerit*"

* "Vinum dulce sic facere oportet. Uvas legito, in sole per triduum expangito, quarto die meriadino tempore calidas uvas proculcato, mustum lixivium, hoc est, antequam prelo pressum sit, quod in lacum musti fluxerit tollito, cum *deferbuerit*, in sextarios quinquaginta irim bene pinsitam nec plus unciae pondere addito, vinum e fecibus eliquatum' diffundito, hoc vinum erit suave, firmum, corpori salubre." Columella, xii: 27.

"has cooled," or, "ceased to ferment;" for his avowed object in quoting the passage was to afford the reader an idea of the ancient way of preserving the juice of the grape from *fermentation.*

So, alas, we see that even in the making of sweet wine among the ancient Romans, the must was fermented. It is true that the strength of this sweet wine was diminished by depriving it of its lees, but this was not done until the first fermentation had ceased, by which in all wines by far the greater part of the alcohol is produced.

"When the fermentation in the vat has ceased," says Henderson, p. 18, "the wine is drawn off into casks, where it undergoes a new elaboration, which renders it again turbid, and produces a repetition, *in a slight degree*, of all the phenomena marked in the former process."

To this two-fold fermentation, Columella alludes in c. 24, in which he treats of the mode of preparing the condiment, called "Pix Nemeturica," "et vina cum jam *bis deferbuerint.*" Perhaps Mr. Parsons would render this passage, "and wines, when they have now *twice settled.*" That Columella understood the difference between settling and ceasing to ferment, is evident from the sentence immediately preceding, in which the following words occur: "deinde patiemur picem *considere*, et cum *sederit* aquam eliquabimus."

In Book xii. c. 25, treating of the *flavouring* of wine after the Grecian mode, with salt or sea water, Columella thus says, near the close of his remarks, "Before you take the must from the vat, fumigate the vessels with rosemary, laurel, or myrtle, and fill the vessels full, that *in fermenting*, he wine may purge itself well."*

* "Mustum antequam de lacu tollas, vasa rore marino vel lauro vel myrto suffimigato, et large repleto, ut *in effervescendo* vinum se bene purgat."

The distinction between *wine* and *must* is most distinctly marked in this passage, and the difference is shown to consist in the *fermenting of the wine.* We have already noticed the fact, that in its application to wines, Pliny mentions, as the definition of *fervere* (*to ferment*) "*transitus musti in vina,*" *the passing of must into wine.*

Varro is another writer on Rural Economy mentioned by Mr. Parsons, among those authors he had read in the original. Could he ever have read the following passage? "Quod mustum conditur in dolium, ut habeamus vinum, non promendum *dum fervet, neque etiamdum processit ita, ut sit vinum factum.*" "The must that is put into a *dolium,* in order that we may have wine, should not be drawn *while it is fermenting, and has not yet advanced so far as to be converted into wine.*"

Can it admit of a doubt that by the term *wine,* Pliny, Columella, and Varro meant *the fermented* juice of the grape? We presume that not even Mr. Parsons himself will venture to affirm that his favourite authorities, Pliny and Columella, used the term *vinum* (*wine*) in a sense different from its common acceptation among the Romans. That in treating of wines, these writers have mentioned modes of preserving the juice of the grape other than by fermenting it, we without the least hesitation admit; and that this unfermented juice, whether inspissated or not, was some times used as a drink, we do not question; but we do maintain that the *common* and *almost universal* acceptation of *vinum,* the Latin term for *wine,* is the *fermented juice* of the grape, and that when the term is applied to any other preparation of grape juice it is connected with some word qualifying the import of *vinum.* Whether the above quotations sustain us in making this statement, let the reader judge.

The same remark may be made of the Greek term οἶνος, corresponding to the Latin *vinum*, and the English wine; and there is not a particle more of ambiguity in the use of the Greek οἶνος, than there is in the use of the Latin *vinum*, or of the English term *wine*.

The following passage from the Poet Alexis indicates the true import of οἶνος. "Poetae Graeci Minores," by Winterton, p. 527:

Ὁμοιότατος ἄνθρωπος οἴνῳ τὴν φύσιν
Τρόπον τιν' ἐστί· τὸν γὰρ οἶνον τὸν νέον
Πολλή γ' ἀνάγκη καὶ τὸν ἄνδρ' ἀποζέσαι.

'In a certain respect *man* much resembles *wine*, for both new wine and man must needs ferment.' The verb αποζέω signifies rather to *give over fermenting* than *to ferment;* but in this acceptation it includes the idea of fermentation.

In further confirmation of our remark on the import of οἶνος, we quote the following passage from Diophanes, a Greek writer, who is mentioned with commendation by Columella and Varro, and who is referred to by Pliny as one of his authorities. Diophanes was cotemporary with Julius Cæsar. "Before the must is put into the πιθοι (vessels made of clay) they should be sponged with pure brine, and fumigated with frankincense. They ought not to be filled completely, nor should there be a deficiency, but we must conjecture what increase the *fermenting* must will probably make, so that it may not overflow, and that the foam being elevated to the edges, it may cast out only that which is impure." . . ἀλλ' εἰκάζειν ὅσον εἰκὸς το γλεῦκος ὑποζέον ἄυξησιν ποιεῖν, ὥστε μὴ υπερχεῖσθαι, καὶ ὥστε τοῦ ἀφροῦ ἕως τῶν χειλῶν μετεωρισθέντος, τὸ μὴ καθαρὸν μόνον ἀποπτυειν. *Geoponics*, p. 160.

This direction is not given concerning any wine in particular, but of the management of wine in general.

Democritus, another writer, also much commended by Columella, and quoted by Varro, Pliny, and Palladius, and who was born 460 years B. C., gives the following directions respecting the management of wines in cases where the grapes have been much exposed to rain, and where the must is ascertained to be watery. "When the wine, ὁ οἶνος, has been lodged in the dolium, and has undergone the first fermentation, τὴν πρώτην ζέσιν ζέσῃ, let us immediately transfer it to other vessels (for all the feculence on account of its weight remains at the bottom) and add to the *wine* three cotylae of salt for ten metretrae."

This passage, with some variation, is cited by Palladius Lib. xi. 9 and 14, who says: "The Greeks direct, when the grape has been too much exposed to the rain, that the *must* (*mustum*) be transferred to other vessels, after it has undergone its first fermentation, *primo ardore fervebit.* On account of its weight the remaining water will sink to the bottom, and the removed wine (*vinum*) will be preserved pure. Observe here that before the fermentation the juice of the grape is called *must;* after the fermentation, *wine.* That the terms ζέω and *ferveo* refer here to the *vinous fermentation,* and not to boiling, is evident from the passage in Democritus immediately following, in which he says: "Some, pursuing a better course, *boil,* ἑψοῦσι, the must till the twentieth part is consumed," a method used also at the present day, as before shown, to increase the fermentation and the strength of the wine.

These directions, it is perceived, are general, not having reference to any particular kind of wine; and they show that among the Greeks, as well as among the Romans, the terms corresponding to our term *wine* were employed to denote

the fermented juice of the grape, just to the same extent that the word *wine* does with us. And it would be as rational to argue, that the term *wine* in English and *vin* in French denote in general an unfermented liquor, as to maintain that οἶνος and *vinum* do.

Do not the French boil their must? Do they not reduce it by boiling to even the consistence of the ancient *defrutum?* Do they not preserve must from the external air, and thus keep it sweet and unfermented? Have they not wines so light "that a person may drink three or four bottles in the course of the day, without intoxication being produced?" (See Bacchus, p. 391.) And, consequently, as innocent as any ancient wine? Why not argue from the *vin cuit*, the *raisine'*, the *vin muet*, &c. of the French, that the term *vin* for the most part denotes an unfermented liquor, as Mr. Parsons does in reference to the word *vinum?* which, according to Mr. P.'s understanding of Pliny, does only in one instance denote a fermented liquor, containing sufficient alcohol to emit a flame. It would not be a particle more absurd than the reasoning of Mr. P., and not very much more so than that of Mr. Grindrod, as to the general character of the ancient wines.

Before concluding our remarks on this subject we must give a few more specimens of the critical acumen, accurate statements, and logical inferences of our authors, and especially of Mr. Parsons.

"Pliny, Columella, Cato, and others," says Mr. P., "give us receipts for making almost every variety of wine then in use; such as wine from hore-hound, wine from worm-wood, hyssop, southern wood, myrtle, &c. Myrtle appears to have been a great favourite." But what of all that? Does the mere mention of them by these writers prove that they were not fermented? Were they not all made by fermenting the juice of the grape, with some one of these articles thrown in

before the fermentation began? Columella alludes to their fermentation; and in the case of the myrtle wine, the only one of these of which Cato speaks, he expressly mentions its fermentation. His words are: "Vinum murteum sic facito. . . . . Ubi desierit *fervere* mustum, murtam eximito." "Myrtle wine make thus: . . . . when the must has ceased to *ferment* take out the myrtle." Cato, ch. cxxv.

Mr. Parsons quotes from Pliny the following words: "Utilissimum vinum omnibus sacco viribus fractis;" and thus translate them, "The most useful wine is that which has *all its strength* broken or destroyed by the filter." That the reader may see how carefully Mr. P. examined the context, as he says he did in every instance, we will quote the passage, L. xxiii. 24: "Nunc circa aegritudines sermo de vinis erit, saluberrimum *liberaliter genitis*, Campaniae quodcunque tenuissimum: *vulgo* vero, quod quemque maxime juverit validum. Utilissimum *omnibus* sacco viribus fractis. Meminerimus succum esse, qui fervendo vires e musto sibi fecerit. Misceri plura genera, omnibus inutile."

A bare inspection of this passage will satisfy the reader who has any knowledge of Latin, that Mr. Parsons has mistaken the meaning of Pliny, and that the word *omnibus all*, has no reference to the strength of the wine, but to the persons drinking it, and the reader will perceive the same from the following translation: "Our discourse will now be of the use of wines in maladies. For *gentlemen*, the thinnest Campanian wine is the most wholesome; but for the *commonalty*, the wines which please each when in firm health. The most useful for *all persons*, is that whose strength is diminished by the filter. We should remember the juice to be that which by fermenting acquires for itself strength from the must. The mingling of different wines is useless to all."

The reason, doubtless, for directing invalids of the higher ranks in society to use wines of Campania in preference to others was, that the choicest Italian wines, and those most esteemed by the Roman nobility and gentry, were from Compania, as it is witnessed by Strabo, Lib. v. 14: Καὶ μὴν τὸν οἶνον τον κρὰτιστον ἐντεῦθεν ἔχουσι Ῥωμαῖοι, κ. τ. λ. "From hence also they have the best wine," and among them he enumerates the Falernian, Statan, Calenum, and Surrentine. He mentions also the fact that the Surrentine had of late become the rival of the others. Pliny says of it, that it does not affect the head. "Surrentina vina caput non tentant." Not, however, for the reason assigned by Mr. Grindrod, p. 392, who translates *tenuitatem*, applied by Pliny to this kind of wine, by *weakness;* whereas *tenuitas* has reference to the *perfect fluidity* of the wine, and is perfectly consistent with a considerable degree of strength. The *vinum tenue* of the Romans is the opposite of the *vinum crassum* or *pingue*, which we presume neither of our authors would be willing to render by the phrase "*strong wine.*" Mr. Grindrod has himself translated *tenuis, thin,* and correctly so. Bacchus, p. 371:

——————"*tenuisque lageos*
Tentatura pedes olim, vincturaque linguam."—*Virgil's Georg.*

——————"and the *thin* lageos
Will try the feet at length, and bind the tongue."

Dioscorides, too, speaks of *very old thin white* wines as producing headache: Καὶ κεφαλαλγεῖς οἱ σφρόδρα παλαιοὶ, καὶ λεπτοὶ καὶ λευκοί. Liber v. c. 785. The *tenuity*, therefore, of the Companian wine recommended by Pliny, is no proof of its weakness. That the Surrentine wines were of a very durable quality, is evident from the testimony of Virgil, who styles them "firmissima vina;" and Athenaeus, on the

authority of Galen, says of the Surrentine wine, that "it begins to be fit for use as a drink after it is twenty-five years old, for wanting fatness and being very harsh, it ripens with difficulty." That it was inferior in strength to the Falernian is doubtless true, but it was not on account of its *weakness* that it is recommended to invalids, or that it was compared by Tiberius Cæsar to vinegar, but for its thinness in the one case, and its rough taste in the other. In the opinion of the ancient physicians, the thin and harsh were more agreeable to the stomach, and more easy of digestion, than the thick wines:" Οι δὲ παχεῖς καὶ μελάνες κακοστόμαχοι, φυσώδεις; . . . Οι μέντοι λεπτοὶ καὶ ἀυστηροὶ ευστόμαχοι. Dioscorides, Lib. v. c. 785. This writer had previously mentioned, as characteristics of the white wines, that they were *thin, easy of digestion, and suited to the stomach.* Ετι μὲν ὁ λευκὸς λεπτός τε καὶ ἐυαναδότος και ἐυστόμαχος ὑπάρχει. Lib. v. 782. And among the austere and white wines, he enumerates the Falernian, Surrentine, the Cecuban, the Signinum, the produce of Campania. Also, the Chian and Lesbian.

The object of filtering was to render it free from its lees, which were regarded by the ancients as the source of strength in wine, and the removal of which rendered the wine at the same time better fitted to the stomach, and less affecting the head. See Plutarch's Symposiacs, Liber vi. 7, in which the question is discussed, "Whether wine should be filtered." This filtering of wines, for the purpose mentioned, is practised by the modern Persians, as appears from Thevenot's Travels. Part ii. p. 126. "The wine of Schiraz is an excellent stomach wine, but very strong. . . . They have both red and white, but the red is the best; it is full of lees, and therefore very heady; to remedy which they filtrate it through a cloth, and then it is very clear and free from fumes." The very filtering of the wine, for the purpose of

diminishing its strength, shows that the wine was fermented; and it is expressly said by Pliny, and that too immediately after the words quoted by Mr. Parsons, that this strength, *vires*, is acquired by the fermenting of the must. As the direction respecting filtering is not given in reference merely to the thin wines of Campania, but to *any* wine which might be used, "quod quemque maxime juverit," it furnishes additional evidence, if it were wanted, that the ancient wines were fermented, and that it was from their fermentation they derived their strength.

On the subject of filtering wines, Mr. Parsons farther quotes from Pliny the following words: "Ut plus capiamus sacco franguntur vires;" which he thus renders: "That we may be able to drink a greater quantity of wine, we break or deprive it of *all* its strength or spirit." What word in the original corresponds to the very unimportant word *all* in this translation? Why not insert *omnes* in the original, and thus make both agree?

"It seems," says Mr. P., "that the filtering mentioned in the passages quoted above, was generally performed before the wine was allowed to ferment." But from what does it thus seem? From Pliny's own statement of the case? No; for Pliny most plainly shows, that the contrary was the fact. It appears to be a conclusion from the laws of fermentation, into which Mr. P., according to his account of the matter, "inquired very minutely." "Chemistry informs us," says Mr. P., "that gluten is as essential to fermentation as sugar. But gluten is a most insoluble body, and therefore the frequent filtering of the must would deprive it of this principle so essential to fermentation." Pliny says nothing of *frequent* filterings; nor do Horace and Plutarch, to whom reference is made by Mr. Parsons. *They* had not inquired so very minutely into the laws of fermentation; and had they

filtered the *must* instead of the wine, they would have found from actual experiment, that their object would not have been attained. If the ancients were acquainted with so very simple a method of preventing the fermentation of the must, would it not be surprising that they adopted the very troublesome methods they did with this end in view? On this subject, we presume, the authority of Berzelius, confessedly at the head of the chemists of the present day, will be regarded as more conclusive than any reasonings of our author. Berzelius informs us, that if the fermenting liquor be filtered after the fermentation has advanced to a certain point, say to a fourth part, the fermentation will be checked; but after some time it will be renewed, and will be more gentle than before; but if the liquor be filtered when the operation is more advanced, then the fermentation will be completely arrested. It is not until the fermentation is considerably advanced, that the gluten is precipitated in such quantity, that it can be so separated by the filter as to prevent entirely the further fermentation of the liquor, and of course before fermentation it cannot thus be separated.*

These words of Pliny, respecting the Falernian wine, "solo vinorum flamma accenditur," Mr. Parsons understands as asserting that the "Falernian wine was the only

* Si l'on filtre la liqueur qui fermente, quand elle est arrivée á un certain point, par example, au quart de l'époque de la fermentation, le liquide transparent, qui passe au travers du filtre, ne fermente pas; mais au bout de quelque temps, il recommence à se troubler et à fermenter, quoique plus lentement qu'auparavant. Si l'on filtre la liqueur quand l'operation est plus avancée, la fermentation s'arrête completement."

. . . . "En outre, il résulte de l' experience, dont je viens de parler, que la portion précipitée du gluten est seule propre a developper la fermentation, et que si tout ce qui pouvait être précipité l'a été avant filtration, le sucre que reste dans la liqueur n'est plus detruit." See Traite de Chimie, par Berzelius, Vol. vi. pp. 405, 406.

one which, in the time of Pliny, would emit a flame. "Here then," says our author, "we have the most remarkable evilence, that the Latin wines were not alcoholic, or at least, contained so little that only one out of three hundred and ninety would *emit a flame:*" A very extraordinary fact this, if it be one; but we are somewhat distrustful of Mr. Parsons's inference from the statement of Pliny. The exact rendering of Pliny's language is: "It is the only wine by which a flame is kindled;" and the obvious import of which is, that it is the only wine which will of itself support a flame, which circumstance shows it to have been a wine of extraordinary strength. This Mr. Grindrod also regards as the meaning of Pliny. His words are: "Faustian wine," remarks Pliny, "*will take fire and burn.*" Bacchus, p. 200. The Faustian was a species of the Falernian wine. Dr. Henderson, in his "History of Ancient and Modern Wines," refers to this same passage in Pliny, (c. xiv. 6,) and thus expresses the meaning: "They continue, however, in the greatest estimation; and are, perhaps, the strongest of all wines, as they burn when approached by a flame." In giving this translation of the passage, Dr. Henderson, though he does not quote the Latin, appears to have adopted as the true reading of the original, and one that is given in the margin of the Delphin Classics, as found in some copies, and most probably the correct one: "Solum vinorum accenditur flamma;" the obvious meaning of which is, that is the only wine of sufficient strength to take fire by being brought in contact with a flame; and in this respect it must have resembled the brandies and other spirituous liquors of modern times. If the true reading be the one usually found in the copies of Pliny, its meaning must be that which we have assigned to it. And the Falernian must, in this case, have been a very strong wine, to support a flame, or to continue

burning when once ignited. To satisfy himself of this, let any one take some common Madeira wine and make the attempt to set it on fire. Let him bring into contact with it any ignited combustible he pleases, and it will be found that as soon as the burning substance is removed there will be no flame visible on the surface of the wine, as there will be in the case of brandy that is pure or but little diluted. It will probably be found, that no wine will take fire, and continue to burn, if it contain less than 30 per cent. of alcohol. Whereas any liquor containing alcohol, however weak, if thrown upon a hot flame will emit a flash, and that this was the case with the *ancient wines in general*, we shall establish by authority that Mr. Parsons himself will not venture to impugn, as he quoted parts of the passage; omitting such parts as are most directly at variance with his view of the passage in Pliny, on which we have just been commenting.

Διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἔλαιον οὐχ ἕψεται, οὐδὲ παχύνεται, ὅτι θυμιατόν ἐστιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀτμιστόν· ὕδωρ δ' οὐ θυμιατὸν αλλ' ἀτμιστόν. Οἶνός θ', ὁμὲν γλυκὺς θυμιᾶται· πίων γάρ· καὶ γὰρ ταὐτα ποιεῖ τῷ ἐλαίῳ· οὔτε γὰρ ὑπὸ ψύχους πήγνυται, καίεταί τε. Ἔστι δὲ ὀνόματι οἶνος, ἔργῳ δ' οὐκ ἔστιν· οὐ γὰρ οἰνώδης ὁ χυμός. Διὸ καὶ οὐ μεθύσκει. Ὁ τυχὼν δ' οἶνος μικρὰν ἔχει ἀναθυμίασιν. Διὸ καὶ ἀνίησι φλόγα. *Aristotle's Meteor.* iv. 9.

"Therefore oil is not boiled and it is not congealed, because it turns to smoke and not to vapour, but water turns to vapour not to smoke. And wine, the *sweet* is reduced to smoke, for it is fat, and possesses the qualities of oil, for it is not congealed by cold, and it is consumed by fire. It is a wine *in name* but *not in fact*, for the liquor is *not vinous*, (possesses not the qualities of wine), *therefore also it does not intoxicate*, but *wine in common*, contains little that escapes in smoke, and therefore *emits a flash.*" The English term flash is derived from the word used in the Greek, and expresses the precise result of throwing wine or any ferment-

ed liquor into a fire sufficiently hot to disengage its alcohol; a flash or transient flame is produced. And this Aristotle says is a common property of wine. Is it not strange that Mr. Parsons, in culling from this passage the words which signify, "sweet wine does not intoxicate," should overlook the fact that Aristotle says, that this sweet wine, οἶνος γλυκύς though called a wine is not a wine, and the other no less important fact, that wine, properly so called, and in common use, when cast into the fire, does not consume away in smoke, but vanishes with a flash? Which fact is of itself sufficient to show the fermented and intoxicating character of the ancient wines in general, and their similarity to the wines of our own times, We wish not to impugn the honesty of Mr. Parsons in making his quotations, yet his mode of making them, viewed in the most favourable light, argues the grossest carelessness.

Mr. Parsons tells us from Polybius, (and it is but little that he says on the subject), that the ancient Romans did not allow their women to drink wine, though they permitted them to use *Passum*, a drink which was so slightly fermented, that there was no danger of its intoxicating. And why did they not permit them? Dionysius Halicarnassensis says it was from fear lest becoming intemperate, they should prove unfaithful? But what danger could there be of their becoming intemperate, if the Roman wines were not intoxicating? Ah! but, says Mr. Parsons, the ancients drugged their wines, and thus made them intoxicating. How does this meet the case? Was it not just as easy to drug the *lora* and the *Passum*, which were allowed to the women as any of the wines? And again was it not as easy to drug fermented as unfermented liquors? Has not the greatest clamour been raised, of late, and very justly so too, against the vile practices of many venders of wine, for mixing deleterious drugs with their wines? The fact therefore,

that the ancients drugged their wines, proves nothing in regard to the question whether or not they were fermented. Had it been proved, that the ancient wines were not fermented, then the fact of their being drugged would be important, as showing the manner in which they were rendered intoxicating. But as this has not been proved, cannot be proved, and is contrary to the fact, as we have already shown, we pass this point without further remark.

The famous Maronean wine also attracts the attention of Mr. P. and he seems to regard the poetic description given of it by Homer as if it were more worthy of credit, than the other fables respecting the one eyed Cyclops, to whom this wine was given by Ulysses, and upon whom it produced such marvellous effects.

We might speak farther of the *lora* and the *passum* and Cato's *family wine*, all of which were indeed very weak drinks, but all of them to some extent fermented, but it must be unnecessary after what has already been said on the character of the ancient wines, concerning which Mr. Parsons speaks with so much confidence and yet manifests so little knowledge. It was our purpose before we closed our remarks on the point under consideration, to examine at large Mr. Grindrod's quotations from the Latin Poets, but we must content ourselves with a brief notice of two or three of them, and before doing this, we ought perhaps to make our acknowledgments for the information he gives us respecting Horace, who according to Mr. G., lived in the latter part of the 1st. Century. This statement follows a quotation from this poet, and from the translation given by Mr. G., we learn that *mulsum* and *mustum*, or in English *mulse* and *must* are the same thing, the one being

made from honey mixed with wine or water, and the other being the fresh juice of the grape.

> "Aufidius forti miscebat mella Falerno
> Mendose; quoniam vacuis committere venis
> Nil nisi lene decet, leni praecordia *mulso*
> Prolueris melius."

> "Aufidius first, most injudicious, quaffed
> Strong wine and honey for his morning draught
> With lenient beverage fill your empty *veins*
> For lenient *must* will better cleanse the reins."

After this quotation and translation, Mr. Grindrod adds. "In the above striking passage, *must* is evidently considered as a nutritious article of diet, and proper on that account to be taken in the morning."

And in this connexion he says, that "Juvenal also sufficiently testifies, that *must* was viewed by the ancients not only as a nutritious substance, but as peculiarly favourable to longevity. This writer flourished in the latter half of the second century." A little nearer the mark than in the case of Horace, yet not much.

> "Rex Pylius (magno si quicquam credis Homero)
> Exemplum vitae fuit a cornice secundae:
> Felix nimirum, qui tot per secula mortem
> Distulit, atque suos jam dextra computit annos,
> Quive novum toties mustum bibit."
>
> Juvenal x. 246—250.

These lines Mr. G. thus translates: "The Pylian king, if you at all believe great Homer, was an example of life, second from a raven. Happy, no doubt, who through so many ages deferred death, and now computes his years with the

right hand, *and who* so often *drank new must.*" How *quive* comes, in this passage, to signify "and who," we know not, and we presume that almost any Latin scholar would render it "*or who,*" thus showing that he understands the words of Juvenal, "Quive novum toties mustum bibit," as merely expressing, in poetic style, the fact that Juvenal regarded Nestor as peculiarly happy in so often reckoning a new year added to his life: the treading of grapes marking as distinctly as any thing can do it, the revolution of the year.

> "A frugal man that with sufficient *must*
> His casks replenished *yearly.*"—Philips.

That *must* was not always regarded so wholesome a drink as Mr. G. supposes, is evident from the remarks respecting it made by Hippocrates, who says of it, "that it produces flatulence, purges, and causes commotion, by fermenting in the stomach, Γλεῦκος φυσᾶ, καὶ ὑπάγει, καὶ ἐκταράσσεται ζέον ἐν τῇ κοιλίῃ. *Hippocrates, Sect.* iv. p. 26.

Again after giving two lines from Virgil's Georgics he adds, "It is absurd to suppose that Virgil would reccommend fermented wine to bees as a means of restoring their health." Yes surely, and Virgil says nothing about giving them wine fermented or unfermented, new or old; but ***must boiled to the consistence of honey.***

> "Arentesque rosas, aut igni pinguia multo
> *Defruta*, vel Psythiâ passos de vite racemos."
> *Virgil's Georg.* iv. 269, 270.

We shall advert once more to the remarks of our authors on the thick and sirupy character of the ancient wines. They seem to regard it as an almost universal characteristic of the ancient wines, and we have seen that Mr. Grindrod has re-

presented Chaptal as describing the celebrated ancient wines as being in general little else than sirups or extracts. It is only, however, of the wines of Arcadia, mentioned by Aristotle; of the Opimian wines, mentioned by Pliny, and of some wines of Asia, mentioned by Galen, that Chaptal speaks, when he says, of the statements made respecting them, "But all these facts can pertain to none other than wines sweet, thick, and *little fermented*, or to juices not changed and concentrated; they are rather extracts than liquors, and were perhaps no other than *raisiné*, very analagous to that which we make at the present day, by the thickening and concentration of the juice of the grape."* Now, admitting that the remarks of Chaptal concerning these wines are in all respects correct, would they prove any thing more than that among the hundreds in the varieties of the ancient wines, there were a few preparations of the grape-juice, so concentrated by boiling, or by being lodged in *fumaria*, and so little fermented that they deserved the name of *extracts* rather than of *liquors*, and that though classed with wines, (from the circumstance of their being made from the juice of the grape,) they were not in fact wines, as Aristotle says respecting the οἶνος γλυκύς.

Are not these wines mentioned by Aristotle, Pliny, and Galen, on account of their wonderful consistency? And does not this very circumstance show that they were different from the wines in common use? Nothing is said by these writers in regard to the mode of preparing them, though, with respect to some, the mode of preserving them is mentioned. The wines of Arcadia, Aristotle says, were

* "Mais tous ces faits ne peuvent appartenir qu' á des vins doux, épais, peu fermentés, ou á des sucs non altérés et rapprochés; ce sont des extraits plutôt que des liqueurs; et peut-être n'étoit-ce qu'un raisiné très analogue á celui que nous formons aujourd' hui par l'épaississement et la concentration du suc du raisin." Annales de Chimie. xxxv. p. 245.

placed, while new, in skins, and dried by smoke;* and those mentioned by Galen were treated in the same way. Were the original juices very rich in saccharine matter, they may have been fermented, and yet there would have remained after the fermentation, a considerable portion of the sugar unchanged. Then by exposing them, when deposited in skins, to the action of hot smoke, the watery parts would have been evaporated through the pores of the skins, and the sugar and other more solid ingredients would have remained. And farther, this result might have taken place without any diminution of the alcohol. For it is a well established fact, that there are some substances which permit the aqueous parts to pass through them more freely than they do the alcohol, and there are others through which alcohol escapes, while the water remains. Henderson, p. 325, mentions this experiment: "Dr. Soemmering filled a common Bohemian wine-glass with Ausmanshäuser, covered it with ox-bladder, and allowed it to remain for eighty-one days undisturbed, in a warm and dry room. During this time, one half the quantity enclosed had evaporated; and the residue had acquired a more spirituous, and at the same time more mellow and agreeable flavour and aroma than the wine originally possessed. The colour was considerably heightened; a *crystalline coat*, or *film*, had formed on the

* As a specimen of Mr. Grindrod's accuracy in quoting his authorities, we give the following sentence from Bacchus, p. 197: "Aristotle states, that either by their *natural consistence* or by *boiling*, or by *adulteration*, the wines of Arcadia were so *thick* that they dried up in the goat skins." Now Aristotle says not one word about natural consistence, boiling, or adulteration, (as the reader may see by examining the original;) and on the subject of their consistence, he says merely, that new wine possesses more of the nature of earth than of water, and refers to the wines of Arcadia as furnishing a striking example of the fact.—(Meteor: iv. 10.) Mr. G. appears to have fallen into this error from a misapprehension of some remarks in Rees' Cyclopædia.

surface; a *deposite of crystals* had also taken place, at the bottom of the glass, and the proportion of alcohol was exactly doubled—the areometer showing an increase from 4.00 to 8.00."

The crystals which were thus formed were crystals of sugar, which had been held in solution by the evaporated water, and they would doubtless have been increased in number, if the remaining water had also been dissipated, and the result would have been in entire accordance, we think, with the result of the evaporation mentioned by Galen, viz. that the wines acquired, in consequence of it, the hardness of salt.* Having no knowledge of sugar as it exists at this day, he could not well have made a more apt comparison with respect to the crystals of sugar which were formed in consequence of the evaporation. This process is well known to the Chemists, under the name of *exosmose.*

The fact mentioned by Aristotle, that the wines of Arcadia were scraped from the skins, shows that the bulk of the dried product must have been exceedingly small in comparison with the original bulk of the wine, and such as might well be the product of a very sweet wine, and one but little fermented; at the same time the strength of the wine must doubtless have been increased by the process employed.

The fact that the quantity was diminished, and that the *strength* of the wine increased with its age, did not escape the attention of the ancients, it being distinctly mentioned by Plutarch, in his Symposiacs, L. III. c. vii. καὶ γίνεται μέτρῳ μὲν ἐλάττων ὁ οἶνος, δυνάμει δὲ σφοδρότερος.

In the year that Opimius was Consul of Rome, the vintage was remarkable for its excellence; the grapes were per-

* See Chaptal's Traite sur les Vins, Annales de Chimie, xxxv. p. 245.

fectly ripened, and the juice exceedingly rich. The quantity of saccharine matter in it must have been large, and hence the generous quality of the wine, its durability, and its great reputation. It was preserved in the Amphora, an unglazed earthern vessel, and consequently more or less porous, and through the pores it may well be supposed that no inconsiderable portion of the aqueous particles would escape, in the course of almost two hundred years intervening between the consulship of Opimius and the age of Pliny; also, that the wine would have the consistence of honey, and that at the same time have lost its original sweetness, and acquired a bitter taste. That the wines most esteemed by the ancient Greeks and Romans were thin wines, and yet thoroughly fermented, we have evidence the most indubitable. Dioscorides, as we have already shown, gives it as a characteristic difference between the *white* and *red* wines, that the former are *thin*, and the latter *thick*.

The dark and thick wines as a class were considered by the ancients, as more intoxicating than those which were white and thin, yet some of the latter, when old, became very troublesome to the head. Among the white wines, Dioscorides mentions as before stated the Falernian, the Surrentine, the Cecuban, the Chian, and the Lesbian; than which there were no wines held in higher repute. That the Falernian was a *fermented* and intoxicating wine is admitted even by Mr. Parsons, and if we are not mistaken, we have furnished conclusive evidence, that this was the general character of the ancient wines; or in other words, that among the ancient Greeks and Romans, the words corresponding to our term *wine* denoted a *fermented* and intoxicating liquor, just as much as the word *wine* does with us.

Near the conclusion of his letter respecting the modern

wines of Palestine, the Rev. Mr. Smith remarks, that he is "happy to find that any apparent discrepancy between him and Mr. Delavan, *so far as facts are concerned*, is chiefly if not entirely verbal." But when the matter in question has respect to the signification of a word, a verbal distinction is everything. Mr. Smith says distinctly, that he never found the boiled and *unfermented juice* of the grape *bearing the name, or used in the place of wine.*

We have now finished our examination of the statements made by the authors of Bacchus and Anti-Bacchus, in support of their opinions respecting the *ancient wines;* and we feel bound to apologize for occupying so much time and space with comments upon statements so inaccurate, and arguments so idle. We should have confined ourselves to much narrower limits, had not these Essays been highly commended by individuals whose standing and character have served to impart, to the productions of Messrs Grindrod and Parsons, an importance which their intrinsic worth could never have given them. Persons who ought to have known better, and among them instructers in some of our Colleges, have given their countenance to these productions, and have spoken of them as containing views which merit the most serious consideration.

The discussion of the other matters proposed to be examined, we must defer to a subsequent number.

II. In the examination of the essays Bacchus and Anti-Bacchus, begun in our No. for April, the second position proposed to be considered had respect to the strength of the wines in Palestine. "It is impossible," says Mr. Parsons, "to obtain strong alcoholic cider from sweet apples, and for the same reason *it is impossible to obtain strong wines*

from very sweet grapes, but *the grapes* of *Palestine*, Asia Minor, Egypt, &c. were *exceedingly sweet.*" Anti-Bacchus, p. 203. And why is it impossible? Let Mr. Parsons answer. "Thus the sweetness of the fruits and of the juices, together with the high temperature of the climate, must have been fatal to the existence of strong alcoholic wines." p. 204.

It is true, indeed, that the expressed juice of the grape may be so rich in saccharine matter, as to interfere with its undergoing a thorough fermentation; and it is also true that, in this case, the wine will not be so strong as when the juice is less sweet. But before we conclude that a strong wine cannot be produced from "grapes exceedingly sweet," let us inquire whether there is no method of diminishing the sweetness of the must, and of so increasing the fermentation, that all the saccharine matter shall be converted into alcohol? When this point is settled, we can then determine what is possible. Is there any difficulty in the way of mixing sufficient water with the must to reduce it to the state most favourable to fermentation? "It sometimes happens," says Chaptal, "that the must is altogether too thick and too sugary; in this case the fermentation is gentle and imperfect, and the wines are sweet, luscious, and clammy. . . . . *It will be easy in all these cases to promote the fermentation;* it may be done by diluting the must with water: also by agitating the vintage as it ferments: but all this must be subordinate to the end proposed to be attained, and the intelligent agriculturist will vary the process according to the effect which he proposes to produce."*

* Il arrive quelquefois, que le moût est a la fois trop épais et trop sucré: dans ce cas, la fermentation est tonjours lente et imparfaite, les vins sont doux, liquoreux, et páteux. . . . Il seroit aisé, dans tous les cas, de provoquer la fermentation, soit en délayant, à l'aide l'eau, un moût trop épais, soit en agitant la vendage a mesure qu'elle fermente: mais tout cela doit être suborn-

The high temperature of the climate is mentioned by Mr. Parsons as another reason, why a strong wine cannot be produced in Palestine. That this reason has no foundation in fact, must be evident from the following quotation:

"Syria has three distinct climates. The summits of Libanus covered with snow diffuse a salubrious coolness through the interior, while the maritime low situations are constantly subjected to heat accompanied with humidity. . . . . In the mountains, the order of the seasons very nearly resembles that of the middle of France: the winter lasting from November to March is sharp. No year passes without falls of snow, which often cover the surface to the depth of several feet during entire months. The spring and autumn are very agreeable, and the summer not oppressive." Malte Brun's Geography. Book xxviii.

This statement given on the authority of Volney, is confirmed by recent travellers and residents in Syria. Carne, p. 14, speaks of "the high central chain of Lebanon covered with snow." And on page 40, he says of the villages inhabited by the Druze mountaineers, that they "are situated on one of the wildest positions of Lebanon: in *winter*, a cold and storm beat, in *summer* a welcome residence on account of its pure and bracing air." The Rev. Mr. Hebard, of the Syrian mission, speaking of Mount Lebanon says, "What an excellent retreat from the sultry atmosphere of the plain is Mount Lebanon. I hardly know what we should do without it, as it would be dangerous to pass the summer in Beyroot. I doubt whether a more salubrious climate can be found in the world, than is enjoyed by the

donné au but qu' on se propose d'obtenir, et l'agriculteur intelligent variera ses procedés selon l'effet qu' il se proposera d'obtenir." Chaptal, Traité sur les Vins, chap. IV.

inhabitants of this goodly mount. Its cool and limpid waters gushing out of the rocks—its gentle and refreshing breezes and pure and healthful atmosphere, brace up the system and invigorate its impaired energies." Missionary Herald for February, 1840.

Whatever may be the heat of the low lands of Syria, the temperature of Mount Lebanon, where the best wine in Palestine was made, must be sufficiently cool for the most perfect fermentation. And if any farther testimony is desired, in regard to the seasons of Lebanon, it can be found in the letters addressed to the New York Observer, by Mr. Buckingham, and by the Rev. Messrs. Bird and Smith, of the Syrian mission. See also the Biblical Researches of Prof. Robinson, vol. iii, p. 344, and note 1, p. 440.

If then as stated by Dr. Henderson, p. 6, the temperature most favourable to fermentation is about the *sixty-fifth* degree of Fahrenheit, it must be abundantly evident, that the temperature of Mount Lebanon is not so high as to render it impossible to produce a strong wine from its rich grapes. The assertion of Mr. Parsons is not supported by a single authority, and it is moreover directly at variance with the testimony of the most credible witnesses. The Rev. Eli Smith says of the wines of Lebanon, that they are stronger than the wines of Georgia and Hungary, further north,* and yet even the Tokay of Hungary contains nearly ten per cent. of alcohol.†

Mr. Carne, in one of his descriptions of Mount Lebanon, makes mention of "the strong white wines of Lebanon," and adds that "the *vin d'or* is the champaigne of the East."

And now let us ask what countries produce the strongest

* See Mr. Smith's letter in the No. for April, p. 283.

† See Anti-Bacchus, p. 164.

wines? Are they not the very countries in which the grapes arrive at the most perfect maturity, and in which they abound in saccharine matter? What modern wines are stronger than those of Madeira, Sicily, Spain and Portugal, and from what other than grapes of the richest juice do they obtain these strong wines, containing in general from sixteen to twenty-three per cent. of alcohol?

"If in France," says Mr. Parsons, "where the saccharine qualities of the grape are most favourable to perfect fermentation, the wines when unmixed with alcohol are weak; if the strongest wine, that the pure juice of the grape yields, does not contain more than eight per cent. of spirit, then how weak the wines must have been in those climates, whose high temperature gave to the fruits an excess of saccharine matter; and consequently the wines of Palestine, and other hot climates, if allowed to ferment previous to the invention of stills and distillation, must have had in them a *a very small portion of alcohol*, and for want of more spirit would have turned sour." Anti-Bacchus, p. 203.

So then we see, that if Mr. Parsons is right, in his facts and arguments, it was not only impossible in ancient times to obtain a strong wine from the grapes of Palestine, but it was also impossible to keep a fermented liquor obtained from these grapes from turning sour. Upon whose authority but his own does Mr. Parsons make the statement, that "the strongest wine which the pure juice of the grape yields, does not contain more than *eight per cent.* of spirit"? The choicest wines of France contain from ten to twelve per cent., and the wines from which, in the southern departments of France, brandy is made, afford not less than seventeen per cent. of alcohol, as appears from the statements of Chaptal and others, who tell us that from three gallons of wine, one gallon of brandy is obtained, and brandy contains

upwards of fifty per cent. of alcohol.* This fact alone is sufficient proof, that the pure juice of the grape can of itself, and without any foreign admixture, produce a wine containing more than double the quantity of alcohol assigned to it by Mr. Parsons. It would be ridiculous to suppose that they add brandy to the wines which they design to convert at once into brandy; and if so, each of the three gallons that produce a gallon of brandy must contain at least seventeen per cent. of alcohol.

Granting then that the grapes of Palestine contain a greater abundance of saccharine matter than the grapes of France, this very circumstance would enable one more readily to obtain a strong wine from the grapes of Palestine than he could from the grapes of France, and yet from these a pure wine is obtained, containing from twelve to seventeen per cent. of alcohol. Add to this, that the wines of Palestine were often preserved in skins, through the pores of which, the watery portions escape in greater or less quantity, while the alcohol is retained, and it will be apparent that, in ancient times, they may have had in Palestine strong wines, and wines rendered strong solely from the quantity of alcohol, produced in the course of fermentation.

III. The third position to be examined is, that the Hebrew term translated in our English version of the Bible, "strong drink" is inaccurately rendered, and should be "sweet drink."

The following passages indicate the views of Mr. Parsons: "I have made these remarks to show, that our trans-

* The quantity of alcohol in brandy, in the table given by Mr. Parsons, p. 164, is 53.39 *per cent.*

lators had no warrant for rendering the word 'shacar'* in every instance by the terms 'strong drink.' Had they used the words 'sweet drink,' they would have approached much nearer to the truth; for there is not a particle of doubt, that shacar meant a sweet, luscious, satisfying liquor. Theodoret and Chrysostom, both Syrians, and therefore good witnesses, assert that shacar was palm wine, and Dr. Shaw says, that 'this liquor is of a more luscious sweetness than honey.' " Anti-Bacchus, p. 255.

"In making the preceding remarks, I do not deny that shacar might be rendered inebriating by the addition of drugs; or that those, who sought inebriation, hesitated to produce such a mixture; and wines thus drugged may constitute the sicera of which Jerome speaks; but still I maintain that when shacar is used in scripture, we are to understand a weak, sweet palm wine, unless the context shall intimate the reverse," p. 257.

Our first remark on these passages is, that we presume Mr. Parsons has consulted neither Theodoret or Chrysostom, to ascertain the meaning of שֵׁכָר (shekhar), but has copied the observation of Lowth, on the import of this term, and that too without any acknowledgment. Lowth's words are, "Theodoret and Chrysostom on this place, (Isaiah v. 11), both Syrians, and unexceptionable witnesses, to what belongs to their own country, inform us, that שכר (σικερα in the Greek of both Testaments, rendered by us by the general term *strong drink*,) meant properly palm wine or date wine." In this comment, Lowth seems to have overlooked a limitation to this definition of שֵׁכָר given by Chrysostom; who says, that "sicera *in this place* (ἐνταῦθα) is the juice of

* In all quotations we give the Hebrew terms as they are spelled by the authors from whom we quote.

dates, which by bruising and crushing the fruit, they labour to convert into wine." What the character of this wine was is stated in the next member of the sentence. "This kind of sicera is stupefactive and efficacious in producing drunkenness."* These properties of this kind of strong drink, Lowth also most distinctly mentions. Referring to the name *cariotae*, given by Pliny, xiv. 19, to the palm or date trees, and to the remarks of this author, that the name is derived from the circumstance that the wines obtained from them are hurtful to the head, Lowth adds—"Καρος signifies *stupefaction*, and in Hebrew likewise, the wine has its name from its remarkable inebriating qualities." Our second remark on the passages cited from Anti-Bacchus, on the import of שֵׁכָר is, that there is no contradiction between the significations assigned to this term by Jerome and Chrysostom, the former of whom says of sicera, the Greek term for שֵׁכָר, "omnem significat potionem, quæ inebriare potest," "sicera denotes every drink which can intoxicate." Of course it includes the palm or date wine, which Chrysostom says is the import of the term in the particular passage, on which he is commenting, and the wine he describes as remarkable for its stupefying and intoxicating qualities. The comments of Theodoret on Isaiah we have not at hand, and therefore cannot give his language, but as his work is said to be an abridgment of that of Chrysostom,† and as Lowth makes no mention of any discrepancy in their statements, but on the contrary refers to them both as giving the same testimony, we may safely infer, that between Theodoret

* Σίκερα δὲ ἐνταῦθά φησι τῶν φοινίκων τὸν ὀπὸν, ὃν ἐπετήδευον, συντρίβοντες τὸν καρπὸν καὶ καταβλῶντες, εἰς οἴνου μεταschηματίζειν φύσιν, καρωτικόν δέ 'στι τὸ τοιοῦτο; καὶ μέθης ἐργαστικόν.

† See Gregory's Church History, Vol. I. p. 293.

also and Jerome there is no disagreement respecting the import of *shekhar*, and that whether this term denotes palm wine, or some other drink, it always denotes a drink which can produce intoxication.

Our next remark is, that Dr. Shaw does not say that this palm or date wine is of a more luscious sweetness than honey, as is asserted by Mr. Parsons, but that the *fresh juice* of the palm tree, which Dr. S. informs us, the natives of the Sahara in Africa, call "*honey*," not wine, is "of a more luscious sweetness than honey," and that "it is of the consistence of a thin sirup, but quickly groweth tart and ropy, acquiring an intoxicating quality, and giving by distillation an agreeable spirit, steam or arâky, according to the general name of these people for all hot and strong liquors extracted by the alembic." See Shaw's Travels, p. 225.

Mr. Parsons says, "I do not deny that shacar might be rendered inebriating by the addition of drugs." Of course he would have us believe, that *shekhar* is not intoxicating, unless rendered so by the addition of drugs. But what evidence does he give us that this is so? Does Chrysostom say that it was drugs which made the date wine stupefactive and inebriating? No. Does Dr. Shaw say so? On the contrary, he says that it acquires an intoxicating quality by becoming tart and ropy. Does Bishop Lowth say so? Not at all. His words are, "In Hebrew, also, the wine has its name (shekhar) from its remarkable inebriating quality." showing that the very name itself implies that the liquor denoted by it is inebriating. Does Mr. Parsons produce a single instance in which שֵׁכָר (shekhar) denotes a liquor that is not intoxicating?

He does indeed cite two passages from scripture, in which he maintains that the term *shekhar* denotes a sweet or palm

wine. Grant it. Does this prove that it is not intoxicating? Do not his own authorities for rendering שֵׁכָר (shekhar) palm wine, inform us that this sweet palm wine was powerfully inebriating? But let us examine the texts referred to by Mr. Parsons, and his comments on them. The first is in Isaiah—"They shall not drink wine with a song, strong drink shall be bitter to them that drink it." "That shacar in scripture is sweet," says Mr. P., "is evident from the contrast expressed in Isaiah xxiv. 9, 'strong drink shall become bitter.' Lowth translates the verse, 'The palm wine shall be bitter,' and paraphrases it, 'all enjoyment shall cease, the sweetest wine shall become bitter;' the contrast between shacar 'sweet' and the term 'bitter' is here placed in striking opposition." It is true, that the paraphrase places the contrast between *shekhar* and the term 'bitter' in striking opposition; but it is equally true that the use of the Hebrew word יַמַר rendered by Lowth 'shall be bitter,' does not determine any thing in regard to the luscious nature of *shekhar*, for we find in Exodus xv. 23, that the children of Israel could not drink of the waters of Marah, for they were *bitter*, in Hebrew, מָרִים (marim,) both words יַמַר and מָרִים being derived from מָרַר. Are we to infer from the use of מָרִים in Exodus xv. 23, that water "is a sweet, luscious, satisfying drink"? The truth is that the word יַמַר used by the prophet Isaiah would apply not only to palm wine, but with equal propriety to any other drink capable of producing exhilaration of spirits; the obvious meaning of the whole passage being, that during the terrible judgments of God denounced by the prophet, those who were subjected to them would be in such bitterness of soul, that they would have no inclination to indulge in merriment and drinking, even could they command the wine and other strong drinks, that

are wont to accompany the song. And this view of the text accords with the comment of Lowth, whose words are, "Those who can command wine under this scarcity will have no heart to drink it, nor will it be able to cheer their souls under such afflictions." The bitterness therefore spoken of by the prophet has reference not to a change in the taste of the liquor, but to the sorrow of heart, which even the use of their ordinary stimulating drinks would not be able to remove but would serve rather to increase. The Hebrew verb מָרַר and its derivatives, are not unfrequently used to express sorrow of heart, as in Job vii. 11, xxvii. 2, Isaiah xxxviii. 15, 17, Ezekiel xxvii. 31, &c. But admitting that in Isaiah xxiv. 9, the term is opposed to and suggested by the sweetness of the drink denoted by שֵׁכָר (shekhar,) does it follow that this drink is not intoxicating? And if it be intoxicating, it is with the strictest propriety called "strong drink."

The other text to which Mr. P. refers, in support of his opinion respecting the import of שֵׁכָר (shekhar), is Numbers xxviii. 7, compared with Exodus xxix. 40: שֵׁכָר (shekhar) in the one passage being used for יַיִן (yayin) in the other. From this circumstance, and also from the fact that *shekhar* does sometimes denote palm wine, Mr. Parsons would infer that it always has this meaning.

The use of יַיִן (yayin) in Exodus xxix. 40, is beyond doubt conclusive as to the point, that in Numbers xxviii 7, שֵׁכָר (shekhar) denotes *wine;* and if it determines any thing in regard to the kind of wine, it proves that the wine denoted by *shekhar* in this passage was made from the juice of the grape; as beyond all dispute *yayin* denotes this description of wine. That *shekhar*, in the instance before us, signifies wine, is no proof that it never meant any thing but wine;

but on the contrary, when taken in connexion with the meaning of this term in other passages of scriptures, serves to confirm the definition of *shekhar* given by Jerome, viz. that it "signifies every drink that can intoxicate." According to this author, however, and others, when used in connexion with *yayin* (wine), *shekhar* signifies any intoxicating liquor other than wine;* and thus the term is explained by Onkelos, and Philo-Judæus, the latter known to be a cotemporary of our Saviour, the former probably so.

The words יַיִן וְשֵׁכָר *wine and strong drink*, in Leviticus x. 9, Onkelos renders by the phrase חֲמַר וּמְרַוֵּי wine and whatever can intoxicate. See Targum of Onkelos, in Walton's Polyglot. Philo refers several times to the command given to Aaron, "Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation," and for שֵׁכָר (shekhar), *strong drink*, he commonly uses the Greek term derived from it, viz. σίκερα, but in his treatise on Monarchy he gives as the meaning of the phrase יַיִן וְשֵׁכָר "wine and *any other* intoxicating drink," μη οἶνον μήτέ τι ἄλλο πίνειν μέθυσμα. Thus again in his treatise on Drunkenness, in quoting the answer of Hannah to Eli, in 1 Samuel i. 15, he expresses the import of *shekhar* by the Greek term μέθυσμα, which beyond all cavil denotes an intoxicating liquor. This explanation of *shekhar*, given by Philo, is confirmed by Origen, who, in his comment on Lev. x. 9, says, that "in the vernacular appellation of the divine scripture it is usual to name every

* Saepe diximus esse vinum quod de vineis fit: syceram autem omnem poionem quae inebriare potest et statum mentis evertere, quam proprie Aquila ebrietatem transtulit sive illa frumento sive ordeo, sive mileo pomorumque suce, et palmarum fructu, et alio quolibet genere conficitur. Jerome. Isaiah xxviii. 7.

drink which can intoxicate, *shekhar.*" See *seventh* homily on Leviticus.*

The translators of the Septuagint, and also Clemens Alexandrinus, in the passage, "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging," Proverbs xx. 1, use for שֵׁכָר (shekhar) the Greek term μέθη, drunkenness; and to express the import of *shekhar*, Jerome frequently uses the Latin word *ebrietas*, drunkenness: and we make bold to assert, that in no one passage of scripture, can it be shown, that the term *shekhar* is used to denote any other drink than one that can intoxicate; and that not one single authority can be adduced in support of the assertion of Mr. Parsons, "that undrugged shacar was not a fermented drink." pp. 255-6 of Anti-Bacchus.

To strengthen his assertion with respect to the meaning of *shekhar*, Mr. Parsons adverts to the fact that this term, and the Arabic, Greek, Latin, French and English words for sugar, have all sprung from the same root, and that in the Arabic language, the same word denotes "both honey and palm wine," p. 254. But may not all this be accounted for, from the circumstance, that the various intoxicating drinks, and different kinds of honey and sugar made from the juices of fruits, trees, and sugar cane, are obtained from the same sources, the sirupy or solid products by concentratrating the saccharine properties of these juices, and the liquors by converting them into alcohol, the very process in

* The homilies of this celebrated writer, who flourished in the first half of the third century, were translated into Latin by Rufinus, a distinguished father in the Latin Church, and who died A.D. 410. As the original is lost, we quote from the Latin the following passage, which it will be seen at once is free from all ambiguity. "Lex evidens datur, et sacerdotibus et principi sacerdotum, ut cum accedunt ad altare, vino abstineant, *et omni potu quod inebriare potest*, quid scripturae divinae appellatione vernacula, *siceram* (shekhar) moris est nominare."

the latter case greatly diminishing if not altogether destroying the sugary portions of the juices. How idle therefore to infer that *shekhar* denotes "a sweet, luscious satisfying liquor," and one that will not intoxicate, because a cognate Arabic term denotes both honey or sugar and palm wine;* especially when the Hebrew term occurs more than twenty times in the scriptures, and in not one single instance, is there the least evidence that it denotes any other than an intoxicating liquor, unless the express permission to drink it found in the scriptures, is to be taken as evidence that it was not intoxicating; as is done by Mr. Parsons. On the other hand, there are numerous passages which prove incontestably that *shekhar*, whether it is palm wine or barley wine, or some other drink, is an intoxicating liquor. See Leviticus x. 9, Numbers vi. 3, 1 Samuel i. 15.

In the passages just mentioned, *yayin* and *shekhar* are both used, and together they denote every species of intoxicating drink. If further evidence is wanted in regard to the import of *shekhar*, it may be found by consulting Wetstein's Greek Testament, who quotes the Greek scholiast as saying, Σίκερα δε ἐστι πᾶν τὸ μέθην μὲν ποιεῖν δυνᾶμενον, οὐκ ὂν δὲ ἐξ ἀμπέλου, "*Sicera* is every drink capable of producing intoxication, that is not made from the vine." Hesychius defines Σίκερα to be οἶνος συμμιγεὶς ἡδύσμασι ἢ πᾶν πόμα ἐμποιοῦν μέθην, μὴ ἐξ ἀμπέλου

* *Sukkar* is the Arabic term for sugar, and it also signifies date wine: and so do *sukr* and *sakar*: but Mr. Parsons seems to have overlooked the fact, that these terms denote inebriating liquor in general, and that the palm wine denoted by them is itself inebriating. From the same root, with these terms come *sakrat*, drunkenness, *sikkir*, always drunk, *miskir*, apt to be drunk, *musakkar*, overcome of drunkenness, &c. See the Lexicons of Golius and Richardson. And from this statement the reader may learn what aid in establishing his position Mr. Parsons is likely to receive, from an examination of the Arabic cognate terms of *shekhar*.

δὲ, σκευαστὸν, σύνθετον: "Sicera is wine mingled with sweet spices, or every drink causing drunkenness, but not made from the vine; prepared, compound." Suidas explains the term σίκερα in the same manner. His words are, σκευαστὸν πόμα, και παρ' Ἑβραίοις οὕτω λεγόμενον μέθυσμα, οἶνος συμμιγὴς ἡδύσμασιν: "a prepared drink; and with the Hebrews this name is given to an intoxicating liquor, viz. wine intermingled with sweet spices." He does not say mixed with intoxicating drugs, but sweet spices or perfumes; and he employs the very term ἥδυσμα that is used by the Seventy in their version of Exodus xxx, 34, respecting the materials from which the ointment for the service of the sanctuary was made according to the command of God.

The explanation of the word sicera, given by Suidas and Hesychius is in our apprehension confirmed by a comparison of Prov. xxiii. 29, 30: "Who hath wo . . . they that tarry long at the *wine*, they that go to seek *mixed wine*," with Is. v. 22: "Wo to them that are mighty to drink *wine*, and men of strength to mingle *strong drink*." The "mixed wine,' in the one passage corresponding to *shekhar* "strong drink," in the other. The use too of the phrases οἶνος συμμιγὴς ἡδύσμασι, and οἶνος συμμιγεὶς ἡδύσμασι to express the import of σίκερα shows that neither Suidas nor Hesychius understood this term to denote merely palm wine; for it is not to be denied, that οἶνος is the Greek term for wine in general, and denotes in the first place wine made from grapes, and secondly, any fermented liquor made in imitation of it, whether from fruits or grain. That שֵׁכָר denotes a liquor made from grain, as well as from the juice of the grape and the date and other fruits, appears from the use of this term in the Mishna or Oral Law of the Jews, in which it is employed to denote an intoxicating drink made by the Medes from grain: and

Maimonides and Bartenora,* inform us that it was for the most part made from wheat or barley.

Defining the import of שֵׁכָר, Maimonides says that "it is an inebriating drink, made from many varieties, from macerated wheat, barley and other things." Bartenora explains the phrase שכר המדי, the shekhar of Medes, to be a beer which they made from wheat or barley steeped in water. See the Mishna by Surrenhusius, Book II. 142.

From the form of expression "*shekhar* of the Medes," used in the Mishna, and from the comments of Maimonides and Barteonra, it is probable that this *shekhar* differed from that in common use among the Jews, in being made from grain and not from the juices of fruits; yet this application of the term *shekhar* to the different varieties of intoxicating drink, made both from fruits and grain, shows that the primitive and essential meaning of *shekhar* is that of a liquor which can intoxicate. None of the numerous authorities which we have cited give the most distant intimation that it ever denotes any thing else than an intoxicating drink, although in other respects there is some difference of opinion as to the kind of drink intended. It does, however, by no means follow, that because it is intoxicating, it must necessarily intoxicate the persons who use it. When drunk in small quantity, and especially when diluted with water, it may exhilirate the spirits, and yet no unnatural excitement be produced.

To show that the verb *shakhar* does not always imply the

* Maimonides flourished in the twelfth century, and of all their Rabbins he is held in the highest estimation by the Jews. Obadiah de Bartenora is also distinguished for his commentary on the entire Mishna, which he commenced in Italy, and completed in Palestine, where he died in the year 1520 of the Christian era. See Wolfii Bibliotheca, 1 vol.

use of an intoxicating drink, Mr. Parsons refers to the expression made use of in Genesis, in reference to Joseph and his brethren, "they drank and were merry." Mr. P. argues, and correctly so, that the Hebrew term does not necessarily imply that they were drunk; and from this circumstance, and from the character of Joseph, he comes to the very logical inference, that they could not have used an intoxicating liquor. But is there really any greater difficulty in being made merry by an intoxicating drink than by one that will not intoxicate? And if not, it is all idle to argue that they did not use an inebriating liquor, unless the use of it in any quantity, however small, must of necessity produce intoxication.

"But I must maintain," says Mr. P. "that undrugged *shacar* denotes a weak sweet palm wine." Doubtless he must do so, or else his whole scheme falls to the ground. Shall we however trust to the reasoning of Mr. Parsons with respect to the import of a Hebrew term, rather than to the authority of the translators of the Septuagint, of Aquila, of Philo Judaeus, of the Chaldee Paraphrase, of the early Christian writers, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Chrysostom and Jerome, of the Greek lexicographers, Hesychius and Suidas, of the Greek Scholiast, and of the learned annotators on the Oral Law of the Jews, Maimonides and Bartenora, and of the Mishna itself? Add to all these authorities the fact, not denied by Mr. Parsons, that *shekhar* does in repeated instances in the scripture denote an intoxicating liquor, and also another fact of no less importance, that in not a single instance is there the least intimation that the term *shekhar* is to be understood in a sense different from its acknowledged import in sundry passages, as denoting an inebriating drink of one description or another; and then let the reader, if he

can, believe with Mr. Parsons that *shekhar* is a weak sweet palm wine incapable of producing intoxication. Could it be shown, what is far from the fact, that *shekhar* always meant *palm wine*, of what avail would it be? The palm wine mentioned by Chrysostom and Pliny, and made from the fruit of the palm or date tree, is represented by them as exceedingly intoxicating.* And equally so is palm wine obtained at the present day in India from the *sap* of the palm tree. Speaking of the tála, one species of the palm, Sir William Jones says, "the liquor extracted from the tree is the most *seductive* and *pernicious* of *intoxicating* vegetable juices; when just drawn it is as pleasant as Pouhon water fresh from the spring, and almost equal to the best mild champaigne." vol. ii. p. 117. None of these writers speak of the admixture of intoxicating drugs, by which alone Mr. Parsons imagines, that palm wine can be rendered inebriating; and yet they describe it as causing stupor and inebriation, and as being most pernicious and seductive. Can there be any impropriety in calling such a drink "strong drink?"

If it be a fact, as stated by Mr. Parsons, on the authority of Mr. Beaumont, in his Essay on Alcohol, that palm wine contains only four per cent. of spirit," Anti-Bacchus, p. 256, it may still with propriety be called "strong drink." We presume that Mr. Parsons, and all who agree with him, will be unwilling to admit that the best wines of France, unless diluted with two or three times their bulk of water, are not intoxicating; or that ale and porter, with equal quantities of water, are not intoxicating; and that unless they are mixed with drugs it is improper to call them strong drinks: and yet, according to the table of the respective strengths of

* See page 476 of this vol.

different liquors given by Mr. P. p. 164, porter contains less alcohol than palm wine: the quantity in palm wine being 4.79, and that in porter 4.00. Mr. Parsons must take back this admission that palm wine contains even four per cent. of alcohol, or his cause is ruined, for porter contains but four per cent., and yet it is condemned by Mr. P. as a vile and pernicious drink. Yes, he must maintain, as is done on pp. 255-6, that the palm wine denoted by *shekhar* was the unfermented juice of the palm tree,* "and the fact that it

* In his account of inebriating drinks, Bacchus p. 193, Mr. Grindrod remarks that "the unfermented juice of the palm tree is described by a celebrated oriental scholar as the 'palm wine' of the poets." This statement is founded upon a passage in Forbes' Oriental Memoirs, p. 24, in which, speaking of the cocoanut tree (a species of the palm), he says, "A small incision being made, there oozes in gentle drops a cool pleasant liquor called tarce or *toddy*, the palm wine of the poets. This, when first drawn, is cooling and salutary, but when fermented and distilled produces an intoxicating spirit." That Mr. Forbes intended to say that this liquor was thus called before fermentation, we are very much disposed to question: and we think that nothing farther can be inferred from his words than that the palm wine of the poets is obtained from the juice of the cocoanut tree, a choice species of the palm. In this opinion we are confirmed by the definitions given of the words tálí and tálkí by H. H. Wilson, of the University of Oxford, in his Dictionary of the Sanscrit Language, published at Calcutta in 1832, under the patronage of the then President of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Tálí he defines to be "the *spirituous* juice of the palm, the common *toddy:*" and Tálkí, "toddy or the fermented exudation of the palm trees." Not the most distant intimation is given that the term *toddy* ever denotes the *unfermented* juice of the palm. This explanation of the word toddy is farther confirmed by the statements of Dr. Scudder, American missionary at Ceylon, in his Description of the Value and Uses of the Palmyra Tree, pp. 24—25 of the Missionary Herald for 1839. "I do not recollect that I ever was in so vile a place, so far as drunkenness was concerned, and among so many drunkards. . . . . The principal cause of drunkenness among them is *toddy*, the *fermented* juice of the palmyra tree. . . . . The tree yields a sweet and very pleasant juice, which in its unfermented state is called *kudupperney*." Let it be recollected that it is *toddy* which Forbes says is the palm wine of the poets: of course this wine must be

was undrugged shacar or sweet wine demonstrates that it was not a fermented alcoholic drink." A demonstration indeed! But let it pass, and let us direct our attention to what Mr. Grindrod has to say respecting the import of *shekhar*.

Mr. Grindrod does not limit the signification of *shekhar* to palm wine as is done by Mr. Parsons, yet he maintains that it does not always denote an intoxicating liquor. His words are, "The term shekar, in some of its variations at least, does not uniformly or necessarily refer to a state of intoxication, or even to an inebriating beverage. Parkhurst however concludes *shekar* to refer to intoxicating or inebriating liquor in general." p. 381. And who that has any knowledge of its import does not do the same? Mr. G. again says, that the learned Edward Leigh, in his Critica Sacra, thus remarks: "This word (*shekar**) is not always taken in the worst part, but is used for large drinking unto mirth, but with sobriety." Who questions the truth of this remark? And yet how does it prove that *shekhar* could not intoxicate if used freely?

Again Mr. Grindrod observes, "The words *shekhar* and *methuo*, in some of their significations, may be applied in reference to that state of mind and body produced by such lawful indulgence in unfermented wine, or nutritious food of any kind, as imparts a pleasing and satisfied state both of body and mind." p. 381. For this statement he cites no authority, and the verbs *shakhar* and *methuo* are not and can-

fermented. Could it be shown that among some of the tribes of Asia or of Africa, the same term was sometimes used to express both the fermented and unfermented juice of the palm, what evidence would this be that the term *shekhar* was used in the same way, even granting that it always denoted palm wine?

* We give this word as "we find it in" Bacchus p. 381, on which page, and elsewhere, the noun *shekhar* and the verb *shakhar* occur one for the other.

not be thus employed: for unless used figuratively, they imply the use of an intoxicating liquor, although they do not of necessity imply any excess in the use of it, but merely, as Leigh expresses it, "large drinking unto mirth, but with sobriety."

Again Mr. G. says, "The ancients had numerous methods by which they made *strong* yet *unintoxicating* drinks. . . Of this nature probably was the strong drink which the children of the Lord were allowed to partake of in the house appointed by God, Deut. xiv. 26." p. 381. From this passage it appears that Mr. Grindrod does not make objection, as does Mr. Parsons, to rendering *shekhar* by the phrase "strong drink," though he agrees with Mr. P. in maintaining that the liquor denoted by *shekhar*, in Deut. xiv. 26, was not intoxicating. The reason for this is given in the passage immediately following the one last cited, and is in these words. "Whatever was its composition, it could not have possessed the power of exciting unholy feelings and practices, otherwise the God of holiness would not have sanctioned its use." Conclusive reasoning this! When the very subject of inquiry is, whether God has sanctioned the moderate use of drinks, which, when taken immoderately, produce intoxication, it is assumed as a self-evident truth, that he would not have sanctioned its use, if it had been possessed of any intoxicating quality. If this be so, how perfectly idle was it to write a whole volume, as Mr. Grindrod has done, to establish a self-evident proposition.

Whether *shekhar* does or does not *always* denote a liquor that can intoxicate, we submit without further remark to the judgment of our readers.

IV. The fourth subject of inquiry has respect to the position, "*That wines which could produce intoxication were not allowed to be used at any of the Jewish festivals.*"

On this subject Mr. Grindrod observes, "The temperance observed at these festivals may be inferred not only from the nature of the occasion, but from the character of the professed people of God, as distinguished from that of the surrounding heathens. . . . The use of fermented drink, doubtless, would have been a dangerous source of temptation, &c. . . . and it is inconsistent with divine goodness to suppose that he would institute festivals commemorative of his own glorious power and benevolence, which would offer any kind of temptation to his fallible creatures to deviate from the paths of rectitude and sobriety." pp. 362–5. On this subject also Mr. Parsons says, "It may be objected, that as the Jews were allowed the use of wine at some of their feasts, it is evident that the Supreme did not expect all his worshippers to abstain. To this we reply that there were two sorts of wine and sweet drinks: the one unfermented and innocuous, the other drugged and inebriating. When, therefore, wine was permitted, the Jews knew, from the benevolent character of the Deity who gave the permission, that the drink allowed was 'the pure blood of the grape;' and when wine or sweet drink was prohibited, they also knew, from the purity, and pity, and kindness of their divine Legislator, that the beverage was that which was inebriating." Anti-Bacchus, p. 288.

With the mode pursued, by both these authors, of arguing from the goodness and benevolence of God, in opposition to the plain and palpable statements of his holy word, we frankly confess we have no patience. It argues so much self-confidence, and so much disrespect for the revealed will

of God, that we find it difficult to discuss with cool and becoming temper their hasty conclusions and reckless assertions. Their aim would seem to be not so much to prove from the scripture that the use of fermented drinks is wrong, as to vindicate the scriptures from the charge of countenancing, in the least, the use of drinks which they fancy they have ascertained to be always injurious to man and offensive to God. Hence when we find in the scriptures such a passage as that contained in Deut. xiv. 26: "And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for *wine*, or for *strong drink*, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth; thou shalt eat these before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy household:" we are told that there are two kinds of wine and strong drink, and that the kind spoken of in this "so doubtful a passage," as it is styled by Mr. Grindrod, p. 381, could not have been intoxicating, for "whatever was its composition, it could not have possessed the power of exciting unholy feelings and practices, otherwise the God of holiness would not have sanctioned its use." p. 381. That is to say, it is so undeniably self-evident, that all use of intoxicating liquor as a drink, is so utterly inconsistent with sobriety, and with the exercise of holy and devout feelings, that God could not sanction its use, and therefore, although the text in Deut. xiv. 26, does not give any intimation that the phrase "wine and strong drink" is to be understood in a sense different from that in which these words are used in Lev. x. 9, "Do not drink wine and strong drink, thou nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; it shall be a statute forever throughout your generations;" yet the mere fact that they were allowed to be used in the one case, and forbidden in the other, is to

be regarded as evidence that entirely different kinds of drinks are spoken of in the two passages; as if drunkenness, so severely condemned in the scriptures, consisted in the kind of drink made use of, and not in the excessive or immoderate use of one that can intoxicate. In his comments on the passage in Deut., Mr. Grindrod remarks, "The strong drink allowed on this occasion . . . COULD NOT, *in any degree*, interfere with the *spiritual worship*, with which it was more or less accompanied." This remark, if correct, is equally applicable to the oxen and the sheep, and whatever else might be purchased for the feast.

These articles of diet therefore could have presented no temptation to excess; and if those who partook of them would confine themselves to the use of oxen and sheep, and whatever their souls lusted after, there could be no possible danger of their falling into the sin of gluttony; for, to use the words of Mr. Grindrod, "it is inconsistent with the divine goodness to suppose that he would institute festivals commemorative of his own glorious power and benevolence, which would afford *any kind* of temptation to his fallible creatures to deviate from the paths of rectitude and sobriety." But, says Mr. G. "the temperate and of course moderate use is understood." What call is there for this remark, if "the strong drink allowed on this occasion *could not in any degree* interfere with the spiritual worship," &c.? Is not the very limitation an admission that the immoderate use of even unintoxicating drinks can and will interfere with spiritual worship, and with the exercise of holy feelings? And if eating the flesh of oxen and of sheep, and drinking palm juice and grape juice, may be carried so far as to produce surfeiting, and thus render the worshippers of God incompetent to the proper discharge of their religious duties, what

becomes of the argument of Mr. G. against the "wine and strong drink" mentioned in Deut. xiv. 26, being intoxicating drinks, derived from the circumstance, that if they were intoxicating they might interfere with the spiritual worship usual at this festival? Does not the use of rich and various viands present a temptation to gluttony similar to the temptation to drunkenness presented by the use of intoxicating drinks? If the temperate use of the flesh of oxen and of sheep and of unfermented drinks is understood, where is the difficulty of supposing that "the temperate and moderate use" of wine and strong drink is also understood, even should they be drinks which, if taken to excess, will produce intoxication? With respect to "the wine and strong drink" mentioned in Deut. xiv. 26, Mr. Grindrod farther says, "In conclusion it appears improbable that the strong drink used on that occasion was the same as that spoken of by the inspired writer. 'Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise.'" Prov. xx. 1. And why improbable? Because the "wine and strong drink" mentioned in the latter text are undeniably intoxicating, and if there is no difference between them and the wine and strong drink mentioned in Deut.; these also must be intoxicating, and then his whole scheme is ruined: for in that case God, in express terms, authorized the Jews to use intoxicating drinks on one of their religious festivals.

If the wine and strong drink spoken of in Deut. xiv. 26, are different from the wine and strong drink mentioned in Prov. xx. 1, why may we not conclude that the oxen, and also the sheep, are of a different species from those mentioned in Isaiah xxii. 13, 14? "And behold joy and gladness, slaying oxen and killing sheep, eating flesh and drinking wine, let us eat and drink for to-morrow we shall die. And

it was revealed in my ears by the Lord of Hosts, Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die, saith the Lord God of Hosts."

By the help of Mr. Parsons' logic respecting the different kinds of wine spoken of in scripture, we may argue that when the flesh of sheep and oxen were permitted to be used, the Jews knew, from the benevolence of God, that it was of that kind of flesh which could not surfeit the persons who partook of it: and that when the use was prohibited, they knew it was that kind of flesh on which riotous eaters were wont to glut their appetites.

But Mr. G., apparently somewhat apprehensive that his readers will not be altogether satisfied with his account of the meaning of the phrase "wine and strong drink" in this "so doubtful a passage," as he is pleased to style it, remarks farther, that "the permission to drink it occurred only once in the year, and for a special purpose." But did Jehovah really give his people permission to indulge once a year, and that too at a religious feast, in drinks, the use of which is always injurious, and is most strictly prohibited on all other occasions, and which cannot fail, according to our author, to excite unholy feelings? If our memory serves us, this conceit respecting the permission referred to in this passage originated with a distinguished writer on this side of the Atlantic, and has been as inconsiderately adopted by Mr. Grindrod as it was at first formed.* The permission consisted simply in

* This solution of the matter reminds us of the directions respecting the use of wine given in the Koran. Among the precepts of the Moslem prophet is one strictly enjoining total abstinence from wine as the invention of the devil, ch. v.; and among the blessings vouchsafed to his followers, it is promised that they shall drink wine in Paradise, ch. xlvii. Doubtless the sanctity of the place and of the employment, both at the Jewish feast and in the paradise of the faithful,

this, that those Jews, who resided so far from the tabernacle, that they could not carry their tithes to the place where it was reared, were permitted to sell them, and with the money to purchase whatever things they preferred, in order to keep the feast at the appointed place, where they were required to eat before the Lord, and to rejoice with their households. To make this a permission to drink "wine and strong drink" once a year, involves also the absurdity of making it a permission to feast upon sheep and oxen once a year. On this passage, Deut. xiv. 26, Mr. Parsons contents himself with referring to his attempts to prove that the wines among the Hebrews were unfermented, and that the term rendered "strong drink" in our version was "weak, sweet

would counteract the natural tendency of the wine, and render it perfectly harmless. It is not thus, however, the Mohammedan doctors endeavour to account for the discrepancy between the commands and promises of their prophet: they do it by saying that the wine of Paradise is different from the wine drunk by men on earth, and will not produce intoxication. It appears, therefore, that they were not ignorant of the distinction of wines into intoxicating and those not intoxicating; but they were so ignorant as to suppose that unintoxicating wines were confined to Paradise. How much wiser answers would they have been able to give to cavilling infidels, had they only been acquainted with the distinctions made by our authors and other recent writers in regard to wines made from the vines of earth. And on the other hand, we think that those who adopt the views of our authors, would find more explicit authority for their opinions in the Koran, than they can possibly do in the Bible, especially if we compare the precepts in the Koran with the traditionary sayings of Mohammed recorded by Thalebiensis, and given by Marracci, in his most valuable Edition and Refutation of the Koran, published at Padua in 1698. "Moreover, whatever inebriates shall be esteemed wine, and all wine is prohibited. God has cursed wine, and the persons drinking it, tasting and presenting it to others, buying it, selling it, treading grapes and expressing it; and also the persons receiving it, or eating any thing bought with the money for which it was sold. Shun wine, for it is the key to all evils." See Refutatio Alcorani, p. 237.

palm wine" utterly incapable of producing intoxication. As we have already examined his views on these points, we shall take no farther notice of his remarks, but proceed at once to adduce some direct and positive evidence, that the "wine and strong drink" used on this occasion were intoxicating liquors. With perfect safety to those views of truth which we entertain, we might follow the example of Mr. P., and rest the decision of this question upon what has been advanced respecting the nature of the ancient wines, and the import of *skekhar*, which, in the passage now under consideration, is in our English version rendered by the phrase strong drink. But we prefer to establish our positions separately and independently of each other; and we shall therefore, as briefly as we can, show that the Jews were permitted to use intoxicating drinks at their feasts.

In the execution of this purpose, we shall begin with citing several different passages in which the words "wine and strong drink," when used together, do beyond all possibility of cavil denote intoxicating liquors. 1 Samuel i. 14, 15, "And Eli said unto her, how long wilt thou be drunken? put away thy wine from thee. And Hannah answered and said, No, my lord, I am a woman of a sorrowful heart, I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink." This passage shows that the words "wine and strong drink" not only denote intoxicating liquors, but they denote all drinks capable of producing intoxication; otherwise her having abstained from these would not be conclusive as to the point whether she were drunken or not. Proverbs xxxi. 4, 5, "It is not for kings, O Lemuel, to drink wine, nor for princes strong drink. Lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of any of the afflicted." Isaiah xxviii. 7, 8, "But they have also erred through wine, and through strong drink

are out of the way, the priest and the prophet have erred through drink, they are swallowed up through wine, they are out of the way through strong drink, they err in vision, they stumble in judgment. For all tables are full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place for them."

No one can doubt that in these passages the words "wine and strong drink" denote intoxicating drinks, and none other, and if in Deut. xiv. 26, these words do not denote intoxicating drinks, then this text forms an exception not only to those just cited, but also to every other in the scriptures, in which these words occur in like connexion; as any one may satisfy himself by examining the following passages. Leviticus x. 9; Numbers vi. 3; Deut. xxix. 6; Judges xiii. 4, 7, 14; 1 Samuel i. 15; Prov. xx. 1; xxxi. 4, 6; Isaiah v. 11, 22; xxiv. 9; xxviii. 7; xxix. 9; lvi. 12; Micah ii. 11. These, with Deut. xiv. 26, are all passages in which the words *yayin* and *shekhar*, wine and strong drink, occur together.

Under a former head, we showed what Philo Judaeus regarded as the import of the term שֵׁכָר (shekhar), viz. that it included every intoxicating liquor but wine, and the very form of expression used by this writer, μὴ οἶνον μήτέ τι ἄλλο πίνειν μέθυσμα, "to drink neither wine nor any other intoxicating drink," shows that he had no other idea of the term οἶνος (wine), than that of a word denoting an intoxicating drink. And surely it must be admitted that he understood the true import of the Greek term οἶνος (oinos), and of the corresponding Hebrew one, יַיִן (yayin), and it is more clearly evident, from his remarks at the very beginning of his treatise "on drunkenness," that he had never heard of the distinction of wines into fermented and unfermented, or into intoxicating and those not intoxicating. He begins with

observing, "The sayings of other philosophers respecting drunkenness, we have, as far as in our power, mentioned in the foregoing treatise, and let us now consider what were the opinions entertained in regard to it by the in all things great and wise lawgiver; for frequently in his laws he makes mention of wine and of the plant producing the wine, viz. the vine, and some he permits to use it, to others he does not give this indulgence, and to the same persons it is sometimes allowed and sometimes not allowed;* and he then mentions, as persons belonging to this last named class, the priests, and those who take upon themselves the great vow. And again, speaking of the command given to Aaron and his sons respecting the use of wine and strong drink, he expressly says that the prohibition was limited to the time during which the priests were engaged in the discharge of their sacred functions." Ἐν ᾧ χρονῳ τέτακται τὰς ἱερὰς λειτουργίας επιτελεῖν. ΠΕΡΙ ΜΟΝΑΡΧΙΑΣ.

In all this there is no intimation of two kinds of wine and two kinds of strong drink; the one allowed to be used, and the other not; it is the same wine and the same kind of strong drink. And he further tells us that the ancient Greeks "called the art of making wine μαινομένη, *the art of producing madness*, since wine, to those swallowing it immoderately, is the cause of insaneness and folly," p. 183, and yet we perceive that Moses the great lawgiver of the Jews permitted some to use and others not, and yet none to excess.

* Τὰ μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις εἰρημένα περὶ μέθης, ὡς οἷόντε ἦν ἐν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης ὑπεμνήσαμεν βίβλῳ· νυνὶ δὲ ἐπισκεψώμεθα τίνα τῳ παντα μεγάλῳ καὶ σοφῷ νομοθέτῃ περὶ αὐτῆς δοκεῖ, πολλαχοῦ γὰρ τῆς νομοθεσίας οἴνου καὶ του γεννῶντος φυτοῦ τον οἶνον ἀμπέλου διαμέμνηται· καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἐμπίνειν ἐπιτρέπει, τοῖς δ' οὐκ εφίησι, καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐστι καὶ μή. κ. τ. λ. ΠΕΡΙ ΜΣΘΗΣ.

But we have another witness, also a Jew, and who flourished not less than two hundred years before the Christian era: the author of Ecclesiasticus, whose testimony is explicit and to the point as to the character of the wines in common use among the Jews.

"Show not thy valiantness in wine; for wine hath destroyed many. The furnace proveth the edge by dipping; so doth wine the hearts of the proud by drunkenness. Wine is as good as life to a man, if it be drunk moderately; what life is there to a man that is without wine? for it was made to make men glad. Wine measurably drunk, and in season, bringeth gladness of the heart, and cheerfulness of the mind: but wine drunken with excess maketh bitterness of the mind, with brawling and quarrelling. Drunkenness increaseth the rage of a fool till he offend, it diminisheth strength and maketh wounds." Ecclesiasticus xxxi. 25, 30. This passage shows most clearly that the Jews knew nothing of this fanciful distinction of wines into intoxicating and unintoxicating, and that when in the Jewish scriptures wine is mentioned, we are to understand by the term, a liquor that can intoxicate if drunk to excess, and which will not intoxicate if used with prudence and moderation. And although we do not regard the book of Ecclesiasticus as canonical, we have no hesitation in saying that the views expressed in the above passage are the views contained in the canonical books in reference to the nature, effects and use of wine. Next to the inspired writers on the subject under discussion, no better authority could possibly be produced.

We had before shown that the assertions of our authors respecting the character of the ancient wines, and especially those of Greece and Rome, were without foundation, and

the views we then presented are most fully sustained by the extracts we have given from Philo Judaeus, and the son of Sirach, and, taken together, they afford an irrefragable argument, that both in the Old and the New Testaments the words rendered in our English version by the terms "wine and strong drink," always denote liquors that can intoxicate, and consequently the passage in Deut., so often already cited, furnishes conclusive evidence that at a Jewish festival, observed in connexion with the payment of their tithes, they used fermented wines, or, in other words, wines capable of producing intoxication if drunk immoderately. "And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen or for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth, and thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy household." And we have also shown that the explanations given by Messrs Grindrod and Parsons involve the grossest absurdity. Should we compare Deut. xiv. 26 with 1 Samuel i. 1—18, we shall have additional evidence that at the Jewish feasts they were permitted to use intoxicating drinks. That they were permitted to use wine and strong drink of some description is not disputed, the question has reference simply to the kind of wine and strong drink. In 1. Samuel i. 1—18, we are informed that Elkanah and his family went yearly to worship and sacrifice unto the Lord of Hosts in Shiloh; and that on one of these occasions Hannah, the wife of Elkanah, wept and did not eat, and that after *they had eaten and drunk* (doubtless the things mentioned in Deut. xiv. 26), Hannah rose up, and, being in bitterness of soul, prayed unto the Lord and wept sore. Eli the priest, observing her, and not knowing the state of her mind, said to her, "How long wilt thou be drunken, put away thy *wine*

from thee; and she answered and said, No, my lord, I am a woman of a sorrowful spirit, I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink, but have poured out my soul before the Lord." It is evident from the whole account, that Eli thought Hannah, having indulged, as was usual on this festival occasion, in the drinking of wine, had drunk to excess, and he therefore asks her, not why she had drunk wine which it was unlawful to use, but why she continued to drink until she had become drunken. Of Elkanah, and of the rest of the family, it is testified that they ate and drank, but of Hannah, that she did not eat, but spent the time in weeping; and when Eli charged her with being drunk, she assured him that her conduct was not owing to her being overcome with wine, for she had drunk none of the "wine and the strong drink," which it was customary to use on these occasions. We have no allusion whatever, in all this account, of the yearly feast kept at Shiloh, of any distinction into wines intoxicating and those which could not intoxicate.

Let us now examine what the Jewish Rabinical writers say respecting the nature of the wine in use among the Jews. In the Tract on Tithes, Part I. of the Mishna, it is said, "that wine" is subject to tithe "from the time it is purged," משיקפה היין, and this phrase is explained by Bartenora to signify "from the time that the wine shall have cast off the kernels *during its effervescence.*" Maimonides gives a similar explanation. Surenhusius, I. p. 248. It was of this tithe of the wine that the Jews were to drink at the feast mentioned in Deut. xiv. 26, unless the distance was so great that they could not conveniently carry it with them to the place where the tabernacle was reared; in which case they were permitted to sell it, and buy other wine. If then, as is asserted in the Mishna, wine was not subject to tithe until it was fer-

mented, then it is evident, that at the feast of which we speak, the Jews used the fermented juice of the grape, or, in other words, a drink which, if used too freely, would intoxicate.

On the subject we are now discussing, we have shown, 1. That the reasonings of our authors are absurd. 2. That in several passages of scripture the words "wine and strong drink" do undeniably signify intoxicating liquor of all kinds. 3. That a comparison of Deut. xiv. 26, with 1 Samuel i. 1—15, furnishes at the very least a strong presumption, that the "wine and strong drink" mentioned in the former passage were intoxicating. 4. That it is evident from the passages cited from the writings of Philo Judaeus, and from the book of Ecclesiasticus, that the Jews had no knowledge of any other wines than such as could intoxicate. 5. That wines were not tithed till they were fermented, and 6. That it appears from Deut. xiv. 26 and the context, that it was of the tithes of their wine they were wont to drink, when they eat before the Lord, and rejoiced with all their house. We have also referred to all the passages in which the words wine and strong drink both occur, that the reader may the more readily examine them and satisfy himself, whether in a single instance there is any thing in the context to warrant the assertion that "wine and strong drink" do ever denote liquors that cannot intoxicate; and if there be nothing of this kind in the context of any one of the passages cited, then our position is firmly established, and that of our authors overthrown. Let the reader judge.

V. The next subject of inquiry is, whether *the law, which prohibits the use of leaven at the feast of the Passover, includes a prohibition of all fermented drinks.*

The position that it does is distinctly assumed by both our authors, as is evident from the following extracts. "Attempts have recently been made to show that this prohibition extended to leavened bread only, and not to fermented liquors. A slight consideration of the passage in question, exhibits the inconsistency of this explanation with the original object of the festival." Bacchus, p. 363.

"As for the wine drunk at the Passover, we have the best proof that it was not fermented. The word חמץ (chomets), in Hebrew, signifies 'leaven,' 'vinegar,' and every kind of fermentation. . . . . Now the Jews at the Passover were commanded to have no leaven in their houses; and they, from that day to this, understood the term to refer just as much to fermented liquors as to fermented bread, and therefore at the Passover were exceedingly careful that no fermented wines should be among them." Anti-Bacchus, pp, 280–1.

We shall, in the first place, show that these writers have misapprehended the meaning of their own authorities, and that they are mistaken as to the customs of the Jews; and, in the next place, we shall undertake to prove, from an examination of the law respecting the use of leaven, that the prohibition did not extend to wine. That no fermented liquors made from grain of any description were used at the Passover we grant, and we shall establish this fact not only by an examination of the authorities adduced by our authors, but by others entitled to more consideration. "Gesenius," says Mr. Grindrod, "an oriental scholar of great ability, states that the Hebrew word *seor*, which the English translators have rendered *leaven*, applies to wine as well as bread." What then? Does it follow as a matter of course that the law which prohibits the use of bread which has been leavened or fermented, forbids also the use of fermented wine?

But does Gesenius say, that the Hebrew word שְׂאֹר (seor) applies to wine as well as to bread? Nothing of this is to be found either in his Hebrew and German Lexicon or in his Hebrew and Latin Lexicon. In one of these he gives, as the import of *seor* the term *fermentum*, leaven, and in the other *sauerteig*, sour dough, and assigns to it no other meaning. Under the head of the supposed root of *seor*, viz. שָׂאַר (saar), Gesenius observes that this term is not in use, and that it *probably* signified *to ferment*, *to bubble*, and that the Arabic verb *sara*, (not the Hebrew noun *seor*) is used in reference to *wine* and to *anger*.*

But admitting that the Arabic verb *sara* is used in reference to the conversion of must into wine, does it follow that

* The following are the words of Gesenius: שָׂאַר rad. inusit. cogn. verbis סִיר (q. v.) שָׂאַר ferbuit, efferbuit, fermentavit. cf. *thara* efferbuit, erupit (ulcus). (In linguis occidentalibus ejusdem stirpis est Germ. *suar*, ap. Ottfr., Anglo-Saxon *sur*, nostra *sauer*.) Inde.

שְׂאֹר m. fermentum, Exodus xii. 15, 19.

In his Hebrew and German Lexicon he defines שָׂאַר ungebr. Stw. wahrsch. ausgähren, aussieden, verw. mit *sara* med. waw ausspringen, ausbrausen vom Weine, vom Zorne (spoken of *wine* of *anger*) *thara* aufkochen, hervorbrechren von Geschwüren u. dgl. ausspringen. Davon.

שְׂאֹר Sauerteig. (Chald. סְאֹר dass.)

In his Lexicon compiled from the German works of Gesenius, Prof. Gibbs defines שְׂאֹר *leaven*, Chald, סְאֹר idem., and adds, "in Arabic, *sara*, med. Vav, to rise, ferment, spoken of *wine*, of *anger*." In the language of Gesenius there is nothing which of necessity leads us to suppose that he entertained different views from Golius, who, in his Arabic Lexicon, says that the verb *sara* is used to denote the *effects* of wine and anger: and he gives not the most distant intimation, that it is ever employed in reference to the fermenting of must. Among the different significations of *sara* given by Golius, are "ascendit, assilivit, saltavit, impetum fecit, Petivit *caput*, et in illud vim exeruit *vinum:* vehementer efferbuit *ira*,"—the words in *italics* being merely explanatory of the things with respect to which the words and phrases, "Petivit, vim exeruit," and "vehementer efferbuit," are used.

in another language a cognate term has precisely the same extent of meaning? Can Mr. Grindrod produce a single passage in which the Hebrew term *seor* is used in reference to wine made by fermenting the juice of the grape? If this could be done, which cannot, it would by no means follow that the law, which excluded from the feast of the Passover fermented bread, also prohibited the use of "fermented" wine. That question must be determined by an examination of the terms of the law itself: and at the proper place we shall show that the *leaven* which the Jews were required to put out of their houses at the feast of the Passover, was the leaven of bread, or of the corn or grain from which it was made, and not the *leaven* of wine or of anger.

The next authority adduced is the Rev. C. F. Frey, from whose remarks Mr. G. quotes the following passage. "Nor dare they (the Jews) drink any liquor made from grain, nor any liquor that has passed through the process of fermentation." We have not the work of Mr. Frey at hand, and therefore cannot venture to speak with confidence as to what it was his attention to affirm in using the words just cited. It may be that he uses the phrase "any liquor" in the first member of the sentence, to mean any spirituous liquor, as distinguished from fermented, and that it was his design to say, that the Jews dare not drink at the Passover any fermented or spirituous liquor made from grain. If this be his meaning he is correct, and if it be not, he is in error.

The third authority cited by Mr. Grindrod must be David Levi, author of "A Succinct Account of the Duties, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Jews," &c.; for although Mr. G. omits to mention both the work and the name of the author, yet it is evident that his quotation is from this work, published in London about sixty years ago. This writer says:

"Their drink during the time of the feast is either fair water or raisin wine prepared by themselves." He had previously said, "They likewise may not drink any liquor that is produced from any grain or matter that is leavened." From these two passages Mr. Grindrod, or some one else, whom he quotes, has made the following sentence: "Their drink during the time of the feast is either fair water or raisin wine, &c. prepared by themselves, *but no kind of leaven must be mixed.*" But does this prove that the "raisin wine" was not fermented? Do not raisins contain within themselves every thing essential to fermentation that is necessary to convert into wine the water in which the raisins are macerated? And is not "raisin wine" ordinarily a wine of great strength, and containing a large quantity of alcohol? It is true, indeed, it may be so prepared as to contain but a very small quantity of alcohol, and be but slightly fermented.

Levi does not say raisin water, but "raisin wine," and the only additional remarks which he makes concerning it is, that the Jews prepare it themselves. The reason for this may be readily inferred from his observation respecting Passover cakes, and the meal from which they are made. "The meal is obliged to be bolted in the presence of a Jew, otherwise it cannot be used, and the cakes are made of flour and water only, without either yeast or salt, and the dough is not left a moment without working of it, for fear lest it should rise." p. 40.

The obvious reason for all this care is, that by no carelessness or oversight of the persons concerned in the preparation of the meal or of the wine, the least quantity of leaven should be allowed to fall into either, and thus vitiate their bread or their drink for the purposes of their festival. But in all this there is no evidence that their "raisin wine" is not

fermented, though the evidence is direct that the modern Jews do not use malt liquors in celebrating the Passover.

The next testimony adduced by Mr. Grindrod is that of R. H. Herschel, author of "A Brief Sketch of the Present State and Future Expectations of the Jews." Before making his quotation from this writer, Mr. G. observes "The corroborative testimony of a recent writer of Jewish birth, and an individual well acquainted with the customs of his nation, contributes much to a satisfactory decision of the question." "The word *homitz*," remarks this author, "has a wider signification than is generally attached to that of *leaven*, by which it is rendered in the English Bible. *Homitz* signifies the fermentation of *corn* in any shape, and applies to *beer, and to all spirituous liquors distilled from corn.* While, therefore, there are four days in Passover week on which business may be done, being as it were only half holy-days, a *distiller* or *brewer* must suspend his business during the whole time. And I must do my brethren the justice to say, that they do not attempt to evade the strictness of the command, to put away all leaven by any ingenious shift, but fulfil it to the very letter. I knew an instance of a person in trade, who had several casks of *spirits* sent to him, which arrived during the time of the Passover: had they come a few days sooner, they would have been lodged in some place apart from his house, until the feast was over: but during its continuation he did not think it right to meddle with them, and, after hesitating a little while what to do, he at length poured the whole out into the street." Bacchus, p. 364. This passage is cited also by Mr. Parsons, Anti-Bacchus, p. 281, with the exception that the phrase "*all spirituous liquors made from corn*," in the last part of the first sentence given above, he has changed

into the phrase "*all fermented liquors*," the words "*from corn*" being altogether omitted.

Now what words can show more clearly than those of Mr. Herschel, that so far as their drinks were concerned, it was only from fermented and spirituous liquors made *from corn*, a general term for grain, and not from the fermented juice of the grape, that the Jews feel themselves bound to abstain at their Paschal feast?

That the Jews of the present day residing in Palestine are wont to drink the fermented juice of the grape during the feast of unleavened bread, is put beyond all doubt by the following passage in the letter of the Rev. Eli Smith.* "Even in the house of the chief Rabbi of the Spanish Jews at Hebron, I was once treated with fermented wine during the feast of unleavened bread. I knew it was fermented not merely from its taste, but because I had a discussion with him respecting the inconsistency of having it in his house at a time when he had professedly banished every thing that was leavened. The principal word, indeed, in the Arabic, for wine, *khamr*, is derived from the verb *khamar*, which means to ferment, from the same comes also *khamireh*, the word for leaven."

In this discussion we are disposed to side with the Jewish Rabbi, in opposition to the etymological argument of our much esteemed correspondent. The fact that the words *khamireh* and *khamr* are derived from the same root can be no evidence that the law which prohibits the use of leaven forbids also the use of wine, until it be shown that *khamireh* includes the ferment of wine as well as of bread, and also that *khamireh* is the Hebrew as well as the Arabic

* See p. 25.

term for leaven. But this will not be pretended. Corresponding to the Arabic verb *khamara*, to ferment, and the Arabic noun *khamr*, wine, there are in the Hebrew the terms *hhamar*, to ferment, and *hhemer*, wine, but for the Arabic term *khamireh* or *khamirat*, leaven, there is no cognate word in the Hebrew. In this language, the word for leaven is שְׂאֹר (seor) and for the thing leavened חָמֵץ (hhamets); therefore could it be shown that in the Arabic the term *khamireh* included the ferment of wine as well as that of bread, it would be of no avail in an attempt to prove that the terms *seor* and *hhamets* do the same. Unless this be done, there is not the shadow of proof that the Jews were required to exclude from their tables the fermented juice of the grape during the Paschal feast: and were it done, yet the evidence in favour of the exclusion would be defective, until it were shown from an examination of the terms of the law, that the words denoting leaven were to be taken in their most extensive meaning. What the evidence is on this point we shall consider presently, and we hope to show that these terms express merely the fermentation of corn, as mentioned by Mr. Herschel in his remarks on the import of the חָמֵץ (hhamets), given in Bacchus, p. 364.*

"The word *Chomets*," says Mr. Parsons, "in Hebrew

* ζύμη, the Greek term for leaven, is derived from ζέω, to ferment, and yet while the verb is applied by Greek writers to the fermentation of wine, the noun ζύμη is never thus used. And in Latin, while the verb *ferveo* is applied to the transition of must into wine, the noun *fermentum* never is; and yet it is employed to express a drink made from grain.

"Et pocula laeti
Fermento atque acidis imitantur vitea sorbis."—Virgil's Georgics, III. 379, 380.

This use of *fermentum* has some resemblance to the use of חָמֵץ which includes fermented liquors made from corn as well as leavened bread.

signifies *leaven, vinegar,* and every kind of fermentation." From this remark it is apparent he confounds the words חָמֵץ (hhamets) and חֹמֶץ (hhomets); the first of which denotes something *leavened,* and the latter *vinegar:* and if חָמֵץ (hhamets), and חֹמֶץ (hhomets), were the same word, it would be of no use to his argument, as it could only serve to show, and that without being conclusive as to the fact that wine, when it had become acid, or had undergone the *acetous* fermentation, not the *vinous,* was prohibited during the feast of the Passover. The following is the testimony of the Rev. Mr. Schauffler, for several years past a missionary to the Jews, and a resident in Constantinople. "But what makes an end to all strife on the subject is the invariable practice of the synagogue in the celebration of the Passover. . . . . It has happened here, once or twice, that the sale of wine was prohibited by the government, and then to be sure, the Jews did as well as they could. They mingled *petmez* and water together, because *petmez* is proper *must-sirup;* or they made some kind of currant wine. But this is not left to their discretion when wine can be had. For then every Jew, even the poorest, must have four cups of wine, and if he cannot get sufficient alms together for the purpose, he must sell whatever he has, and buy the requisite proportion of *fermented* wine." Biblical Repository, vol. viii. p. 301.

No farther evidence can be required to prove that in all wine countries the Jews do, at this day, make use of the *fermented* juice of the grape in their observance of the Passover.

Let us now examine the statements of the Mishna, and the comments of Maimonides and Bartenora.

In the beginning of the Tract on the Passover it is said in the Mishna: "On the night of the fourteenth they make

search for leaven by the light of a lamp. Places into which leaven is not taken need not be searched. But wherefore have they said two rows of the *cellar* מרתף ? (To point out) the place into which they take leaven."

On this passage Maimonides thus comments: "מרתף is the name of the *wine cellar*. Wine and oil cellars have no need to be searched." Bartenora, in answer to the question "wherefore have they said two rows of the cellar?" gives, as the proper explanation, "that this is not said except in reference to that cellar into which they take leaven, viz. the cellar from which they obtain wine for the table; so that it may sometimes happen that the servant may draw wine with bread in his hand, and a portion of the bread be let fall in the cellar."* Bartenora also mentions, that in the wine cellars it was usual to arrange the casks in rows, until the whole floor was covered, and then upon these others were placed, till the cellar was filled from the ground to the roof. This statement will serve to explain why, in the Mishna, mention is made of "two rows."

Again, in Chap. III. of the Mishna, we have enumerated the different kinds of drink, the use of which is deemed a transgression of the Passover; and the general rule regulating this whole matter is stated in terms the most explicit. "This is the general rule, whatever is made of *any species of grain*, transgresses the Passover."† And under this head fall all drinks, except pure water and juices from fruits. With respect to these, Maimonides and Bartenora both say, that the Jews have a hypothesis that the

* Under the last head we showed that by *wine* Bartenora understood a fermented liquor; and that it was in his opinion intoxicating, we shall show presently.

† זה הכלל כל שהוא ממין דגן הרי זה עובר בפסח

waters of fruits do not ferment, and therefore the Jews consider themselves at liberty to use meal boiled with the juices of fruits, but not with water. Among the drinks not permitted to be used at the Passover, the Mishna mentions the cutach of Babylon, a drink consisting of bread macerated in milk, the *shekhar* of the Medes, a beer or ale made from barley, and the vinegar of Idumea, made from water in which barley has been steeped. No mention is made of any kind of wine as excluded from the tables of the Jews at the Paschal feast; nor of any kind of vinegar except that of Edom or Idumea. See Mishna by Surenhusius, Tom. II. pp. 142–3.

From Chap. X. 1, we learn that "on the evening of the Passover, near *Minhha* (i. e. while two and a half hours remain), a man will not eat unless the darkness has begun. Even a poor man in Israel will not eat unless reclining, and they will not diminish aught from the four cups, not indeed if in extreme poverty." And in the next section it is said, "When they pour out the first cup, the school of Shammai says, he blesses the day and then blesses the wine; the school of Hillel, that he blesses the wine and then blesses the day." And in section seventh we are told that "between the first and third cups, if any one is disposed to drink he may; but that between the third and fourth cups he may not drink."

"The reason," says Maimonides, "that we do not permit him to drink between the third and fourth cups is, that he may not become intoxicated: for wine drunk while eating does not inebriate, but without food it does inebriate." Bartenora makes a similar remark, and assigns as the reason why he may not drink between the third and fourth cups, that he may not become drunk, and be rendered un-

able to finish the hymn, viz. a portion of the cxv. cxvi. cxvii. and cxviii. Psalms, which were always sung at the Paschal feast. See Lightfoot, I. 967.

Whether the reason assigned be sufficient or not, there can be no doubt as to the opinions of Maimonides and Bartenora respecting the kind of wine used at the Passover.*

From the testimony cited, it must be apparent that our authors can derive but little support for their opinion on the point under discussion, from what is said by some recent writers respecting the customs of the Jews at the present day; even were it admitted that our authors have in no instance mistaken the views of their own authorities. With respect to the customs of the ancient Jews, we presume that none will venture to regard as of equal authority the testimony of the Jews of our own times, and that of the compiler of the Mishna,† and of its learned annotators. But the statement of Mr. Herschel, quoted both by Mr. Grindrod and Mr. Parsons, so far from being at variance with the authorities cited by us, is, as has been shown, in entire accordance with them.

Neither of our authors has undertaken to show, from a full and careful examination of the statute prohibiting the use of leaven at the Paschal feast; that the fermented juice of the grape was included in the terms translated 'leaven' and 'leavened bread.' Their main dependance for this hypothesis is the supposed practice of the modern Jews, and also, in the case of Mr. Grindrod, the supposed design of the

* Those who have not access to the Mishna, and the comments of Maimonides and Bartenora, edited by Surenhusius, may consult with advantage Lightfoot's account of the Passover.

† The Mishna is generally believed to have been compiled by Rabbi Judah Hakkodosh, or Judah the Holy Doctor, in the latter part of the second century.

law relating to the use of leaven. Mr. G. does indeed quote Exodus xiii. 7, "Unleavened bread shall be eaten seven days: and there shall no leavened bread חָמֵץ be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven שְׂאֹר seen with thee in all thy quarters." And he imagines that he has the authority of Gesenius for asserting that שְׂאֹר (seor) applies to wine as well as leavened bread; and the authority of Mr. Herschel, a converted Jew, for maintaining the same respecting חָמֵץ (hhamets): and so confident is he of the correctness of his inferences, and of the value of his authorities, that he ventures to change the expression used in our English Bibles, and to call the feast of unleavened *bread* "the feast of unleavened *things*," (see Bacchus, p. 363,) as if the words 'unleavened bread' were of too limited import to express the meaning of the original.

Let us now examine some passages of scripture in relation to this subject; and first the original command in regard to it: "Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses; for whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel. And in the first day there shall be a holy convocation, and in the seventh there shall be a holy convocation to you: no manner of work shall be done in them, save that which every man must eat, that only may be done of you. And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; for in this self-same day have I brought you out of the land of Egypt, therefore shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance forever. In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month, at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread until the one and twentieth day of the month at even. Seven days there shall be no leaven found in your houses; for whoso-

ever eateth that which is leavened, even that soul shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel, whether he be a stranger or born in the land. Ye shall eat nothing leavened; in all your habitations ye shall eat unleavened bread." Exodus xii. 15—20.

Had we not evidence to the contrary, we should deem it impossible for any person to imagine that the prohibition in the above passage had respect to any thing else than the leaven of bread; no other food than bread is mentioned in the passage, and the reason why leavened bread should be forbidden, and unleavened bread should be directed to be used, may be readily ascertained by a comparison of the above passage with the 33d, 34th, and 39th verses of the same chapter. "And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead men. And the people took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading-troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders. And they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not leavened, because they were thrust out of Egypt, and could not tarry, neither had they prepared for themselves any victuals."

When God instituted the Passover, he declared of the day on which it was observed, "And this day shall be unto you FOR A MEMORIAL, and ye shall keep it a feast unto the Lord throughout your generations, ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever," and we can readily perceive how the eating of unleavened bread would serve to remind the children of Israel of *the haste* with which their fathers left the land of Egypt, when urged by the Egyptians to depart; "the people took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading troughs (or dough) being bound up in their clothes on

their shoulders, because they were thrust out, and could not tarry."*

In the next chapter, Exodus xiii., the command is repeated, that the feast of the Passover should be kept throughout their generations, as a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, and of the circumstances attending it. "And Moses said, Remember this day, in which ye came out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, for by strength of hand the Lord brought you out from this place: there shall no leavened bread be eaten," v. 4. "Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread, and in the seventh day shall be a feast to the Lord. Unleavened bread shall be eaten seven days; and there shall no leavened bread be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters. And thou shalt show thy son in that day, saying, This is done because of that which the Lord did unto me when I came forth out of Egypt. And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes," &c.

In this passage, as in the one cited from the preceding chapter, no other eatable but bread is mentioned in connexion with the terms denoting leaven; and with respect to bread, it is required that it be unleavened during the Passover and the following six days.

What reason then is there for supposing that the Hebrew terms *seor* and *hhamets* are, in these passages, to be applied to any thing else than the leaven of bread, even ad-

* It was for a like purpose that the Israelites were required to dwell in booths seven days in a year. "Ye shall dwell in booths seven days; all that are Israelites born shall dwell in booths. That your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt. I am the Lord your God." Lev. xxiii. 42, 43.

mitting what we have already shown is not the fact, that they may include the ferment of wine as well as of bread? There is not in the words of the law the shadow of a reason for any such application of these terms as our authors would give them. And this view of the subject, we think, is abundantly confirmed by what is said in Deut. xvi. 2, 3. "Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the Passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd. . . . . Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith, *even* the bread of affliction: for thou camest out of the land of Egypt IN HASTE: *that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy life.*" Besides establishing our position, that the Israelites were required to eat unleavened bread as a memorial of the circumstances attending their deliverance, this passage is of itself sufficient to determine the meaning of the Hebrew term מַצּוֹת (matstsoth), the plural form of the word מַצָּה, rendered by our translators "unleavened bread," and styled by the sacred penmen "the bread of affliction," לֶחֶם עֹנִי And although this word, *matstsoth*, is used more than forty times in the Hebrew scriptures, in no instance is it used to express any thing else than an unfermented preparation of meal or flour. Sometimes it is used in connexion with לֶחֶם the general term for bread, sometimes with חַלּוֹת cakes; also with עֻגּוֹת small cakes; and again we meet with the phrase רְקִיקֵי מַצּוֹת unleavened wafers, but for the most part it is used alone, and yet from the context or parallel passages it is evident that it has reference to unleavened bread, cakes or wafers. Striking examples o this are furnished by the following passages. Judges v. 19, 20, "And Gideon went in, made ready a kid, and *unleavened cakes* (מַצּוֹת), of an ephah of flour. . . And the angel

said, take the flesh and the unleavened cakes (מַצּוֹת).” 1 Samuel xxvii. 25, “And the woman . . . took flour, and kneaded it, and did bake unleavened bread (מַצּוֹת) thereof.” With the strictest propriety therefore is *matstsoth* rendered by our English translators “unleavened *bread*.”

In farther confirmation we will cite Matthew xvi. 5—12, “And when his disciples were come to the other side they had forgotten to take bread. Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. And they reasoned among themselves and said, It is because we have taken no bread. Which when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have brought no bread? Do ye not yet understand, nor remember the five loaves of five thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? How is it that ye do not understand, that I spake not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees.” The Greek term for leaven is ζύμη, the word by which the Seventy render the Hebrew term שְׂאֹר. That in the above passage it has no reference to fermented wine, and that it is confined to the leaven of bread, will, we presume, be conceded by our authors and all who agree with them in opinion: and if this be so, does it not follow that when the term for leaven, viz. שְׂאֹר in Hebrew, or ζύμη in Greek, is not used figuratively, but in reference to an article of diet, it is sometimes at least undeniably restricted in its meaning to the leaven of bread? and if this be the case, it belongs to our authors to prove that in the

scriptures it is ever used to express any thing else than the leaven of bread; and not only this, but also that in the passages relating to the Passover it is used in the more extended sense. But this they neither have nor can do.

We have a still farther confirmation of our position in the remarks of Paul, 1 Cor. v. 6—8, "But your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread (ἀζύμοις) of sincerity and truth." In using the expression "old leaven," Ainsworth supposes, and not without some reason, that Paul had reference to שְׂאֹר (seor), and in the phrase "leaven of malice and wickedness," he alludes to חָמֵץ, the terms used in Exodus xii. 19 and xiii. 7, to denote leaven and leavened bread, שְׂאֹר, according to Ainsworth, expressing a remnant of leavened dough, and חָמֵץ its sourness of taste, or rather the first denoting the leaven by which the dough or bread is fermented, and חָמֵץ denoting the leavened bread or dough itself.

That our translators have correctly supplied the word *bread* after unleavened, in v. 8, to express the exact import of ἀζύμοις, is put beyond all question by the use of the word 'lump' in v. 6, the original term, φύραμα, denoting a mass or lump of macerated and kneaded flour, and ἄζυμα is the term employed by the translators of the Septuagint to express the meaning of מַצּוֹת which, in the other cases cited, we have shown denotes unleavened bread, cakes or wafers. In this passage, be it remembered, Paul is referring to the customs connected with the observation of the Passover.

The above cited passages do, in our opinion, furnish evi-

dence the most conclusive in favour of our position, and they show that מַצּוֹת in Hebrew, and ἄζυμα in Greek, when not used figuratively, do invariably denote unleavened bread, cakes or wafers, and nothing else; and also that שְׂאֹר (seor) and חָמֵץ (hhamets) do invariably denote a fermented preparation of meal or corn, and nothing else: and hence we infer that the law prohibiting the use of leaven at the Passover, had no reference whatever to the use of wine or the fermented juice of the grape. Hence, too, we can perceive why the Jews, in their care to avoid all leaven forbidden by their law, abstained, during the Passover, from all drinks made from grain, and which in making them required the use of yeast or leaven, while at the same time they hesitated not to use the fermented juice of the grape, if it had been kept in such a position that no particle of leavened bread could have been dropped into the vessel containing the wine through the carelessness of a servant, as is witnessed by the most learned of the Rabbinical writers, whose testimony has already been given in the previous pages. Were it a fact that the Jews did not use the fermented juice of the grape at the Passover, would it not be a most marvellous circumstance that amidst all the various directions given by their Mishna or Oral Law for the right observation of the Passover, not the most distant allusion should be made to the supposed fact, and yet sundry fermented drinks are mentioned, the use of which is declared a transgression of the Passover, they being drinks made from corn; and the general rule regulating the exclusion of drinks is explicitly said to be this, viz. "that every thing made from corn is a violation of the Passover." And while no kind of wine is interdicted as being a transgression of the Passover, the drinking of four cups of wine is required of every person, even

the poorest. How passing strange then, if the fermented juice of the grape was a transgression of the Passover, it should not have been mentioned in the Jewish traditions with the other prohibited and fermented drinks, the cutach of Babylon, the shechar or beer of the Medes, and the vinegar of Edom?

We have now examined the testimony of our authors, and we have shown, 1. That they have misapprehended the meaning of their own authorities, at least in every case where that is of any account. 2. We have shown, from the best Jewish authorities, in all matters relating to the customs of the Jews, that wine capable of producing intoxication was not prohibited at the Jewish Passover, but on the contrary was used. 3. We have shown, from the testimony of the Rev. Eli Smith and the Rev. Mr. Schauffler, that fermented wine is used by Jews at the present day. 4. We have shown that the argument founded on the etymology of the Arabic terms denoting leaven and wine is of no account. And, finally, we have shown, from a careful examination of the scriptures, that the prohibition of leaven at the feast of the Passover had respect merely to the leaven of bread.

We are now prepared to enter upon an examination of the next position.

VI. The sixth position to be examined is this, viz. *that as our Saviour instituted the sacrament of the Lord's Supper at the Passover, he could not have used the fermented juice of the grape.*

"It is therefore certain," says Mr. Parsons, "that our blessed Lord did not use fermented alcoholic liquor at the first sacrament." Anti-Bacchus, pp. 281, 282. And on this subject Mr. Grindrod thus writes: "The institution of the

Lord's Supper is another example commonly adduced in testimony that the Saviour both sanctioned and participated in the use of intoxicating wine. There is strong reason to believe that this occurrence took place before the conclusion of the Passover, and, in this case, the arguments in support of the absence of fermented wine during the latter observance will apply with equal force to the former." Bacchus, p. 419.

Although it is denied by Lightfoot and others that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was instituted at the Passover, we are not disposed to question, in the least, the statement of Mr. Grindrod on this point; on the contrary, we fully accord with it. That our Lord made use of wine at the institution of the Eucharist is distinctly admitted both by Mr. Grindrod and Mr. Parsons, and their aim is to show that it must have been unfermented, from the fact that the sacrament was instituted at the Passover, when, according to their view of the matter, the Jews were forbidden to have in their houses either leavened bread or fermented liquor of any description. That they were altogether in error on this point we undertook to show under our last head; and if successful in attaining our object, it follows of course that their conclusion falls with their premises; and that our Saviour, as was usual at the Passover, used the fermented juice of the grape, and with it and with bread instituted the memorial of his death.

Here we might rest the matter; but as there is abundant evidence in the writings of the early Christian fathers, and in the history of the Church, to corroborate our position, that the Saviour, at the institution of the Eucharist, used wine or the fermented juice of the grape, we presume that it will gratify our readers to present them with some of this

evidence. In giving this testimony, we shall begin with that of Clemens Alexandrinus, one of the most learned and able men of his age, and of whom Mr. Grindrod thus speaks: "The writings of Clemens Alexandrinus, who flourished during the latter part of the second century and the commencement of the third, contain much information respecting the drinking habits of the people, and the injurious effects thereby produced on the prosperity of the church. . . . . This writer exhibits what ought to be the conduct of *genuine Christians*, and enters into directions concerning the *appetites*. He strongly reprobates *gluttony* and *luxury*, and, in particular, the use of a variety of aliments." Bacchus, p. 424. We have here then a witness, as to the value of whose testimony Mr. Grindrod and ourselves are agreed, and of whom Mr. G. farther says, "In the second chapter this celebrated father writes concerning the *moderate use of wine*, which he says should in general be mixed with water. There is, however, much said by this writer which probably has escaped the notice of Mr. Grindrod, and which is of no little importance in regard to the practice of the primitive church. Not only does he say that it is best to mix wine with a very large quantity of water, and that both wine and water are creatures of God, ἄμφω μὲν γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ ποιήματα, and that a mixture of both contributes to health, the one being necessary, the other useful; but in immediate connexion he describes the effects of the immoderate use of wine, viz. that by it "the tongue is tied, the lips relaxed, the eyes are turned aside, as if the sight were swimming from the abundance of the moisture; and compelled to be deceived, they imagine all things to have a circular motion."*

* Οἴνῳ δὲ ἀμέτρῳ ἡ μὲν γλῶττα παραποδίζεται· παρεῖται δὲ τὰ χείλη·

Again he says, "With propriety therefore does the divine Teacher, anxious for our salvation, in the strongest terms announce the prohibition, 'Drink not wine to drunkenness.'"*

From these passages we may learn what Clemens understood by the term οἶνος wine, viz. a liquor which when used with prudence contributed to health, but when used immoderately produced drunkenness, with all its attendant evils.

Again, p. 68, after remarking that the Scythians, Celts, Iberians and Thracians are warlike nations, and given to drunkenness, and that Christians, being a peaceful race, and feasting for enjoyment and not for violence, drink sober healths, that their friendships may be exhibited in truth as well as in name, he adds, "How do you suppose the Lord drank when on our account he was made man? So shamelessly as we? Did he not do it becomingly? Decorously? With consideration? Ye know well he also partook of wine; for even he was also a man; and he blessed the wine, saying, Take, drink, this is my blood . . . . . and that it was wine which was blessed, he shows again, saying to his disciples, I will not drink of the fruit of this vine, until I drink it with you in the kingdom of my Father."†

ὀφθαλμοὶ δὲ παρατρέπονται, οἷον κολυμβώσης τῆς ὄψεως ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῆς ὑγρότητος· καὶ ψεύδεσθαι βεβιασμένοι, κύκλῳ μὲν ἡγοῦνται περιφέρεσθαι τα πάντα. p. 66.

* Εἰκότως οὖν στερρότατα ὁ παιδαγωγὸς ἀπαγορεύει, τῆς ἡμετέρας κηδόμενος σωτηρίας, Μὴ πίνετε οἶνον ἐπὶ μέθη. p. 67.

† Πῶς οἴεσθε πεπωκέναι τὸν κύριον, ὁπηνίκα δι ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο; οὕτως ἀναισχύντως ὡς ἡμεῖς; οὐχὶ ἀστείως; οὐχὶ κοσμίως; οὐκ επιλελογισμένως; εὖ γὰρ ἴστε, μετέλαβεν οἴνου καὶ αὐτός· καὶ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος καὶ αυτός· καὶ εὐλόγησέν γε τὸν οἶνον, εἰπών, Λάβετε· πίετε· τοῦτο μου ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα. . . . . ὅτι δὲ οἶνος ἦν τὸ εὐλογηθὲν, ἀπέδειξε πάλιν, πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς

What testimony can be more to the point? This passage contains the very language of our Saviour when he instituted the Eucharist, and gave the cup to his disciples. If on that occasion he used an unfermented and an unintoxicating wine, surely Clemens Alexandrinus could never have heard of the fact. In confirmation of his position, Clemens adds, "And that it was wine which was drunk by the Lord, (is evident,) for he again speaks of himself, reproaching the Jews for their hardness of heart, the Son of man, says he, came, and they say, behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of sinners. Let this be firmly fixed in our minds against those called Encratites,"* a heretical sect, who opposed marriage, the use of animal food, and wine, accounting them an abomination.

Commenting upon the command given to Aaron and his sons, with respect to wine and strong drink, Origen observes, that before they approached the altar, they indulged in the use of wine; but that when they began to draw nigh to the altar, and to enter into the tabernacle of testimony, they abstained from wine; and he proposes, as a subject of inquiry, whether any thing similar can be found in the conduct of our Saviour and his apostles. And in order to show that there existed a striking resemblance, he says, "The Saviour had come into the world that he might offer his own flesh a

λέγων· Οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ταύτης, μέχρις ἂν πίω αὐτὸ μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου. p. 68.

* Ἀλλ' ὅτι γε οἶνος ἦν τὸ πινόμενον πρὸς τοῦ κυρίου, πάλιν αὐτὸς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λέγει, τὴν Ἰουδαίων ἐπονειδίζων σκληροκαρδίαν, ἦλθεν γάρ, φησιν, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· καὶ λέγουσιν Ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος. Τουτὸ μὲν ἡμῖν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐγκρατητὰς καλουμένους παραπεπήχθω. p. 68.

sacrifice to God for our sins. Before he made this offering he drank wine. But when the time for him to be crucified was come, and he was about to approach the altar that he might immolate his own flesh, 'taking the cup, he blessed it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take and drink of this.' Drink ye, he says, who are not now about to approach the altar. But he, about to approach the altar, says of himself, 'Verily, I say unto you, that I will not drink of the fruit of this vine, until I drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father.' "

That Origen here speaks of the wine used at the institution of the Lord's Supper is evident from the fact that he quotes the very words of the Saviour on that occasion. It is also evident that Origen believed that the wine distributed by our Lord to his disciples, was the wine from which the priests were required to abstain when they entered into the tabernacle of the congregation. And that the wine from which Aaron and his sons were required to abstain was an intoxicating wine, no one pretends to question: consequently, according to Origen, in instituting the Eucharist, our Lord made use of an intoxicating wine.*

* "Quid ergo praecepit lex Aaron et filiis ejus? ut vinum, et siceram non bibant, cum accedunt ad altare. Videamus quomodo id vero pontifico Jesu Christo Domino nostro, et sacerdotibus ejus ac filiis, nostris vero Apostolis possimus aptare. Et perspiciendum primo est, quomodo prius quidem quam accedat ad altare verus hic pontifex, cum sacerdotibus suis bibit vinum, cum vero incipit accedere ad altare, et ingredi in tabernaculum testimonii, abstinet vino. Putas possumus invenire tale aliquid ab eo gestum? . . . . . Venerat in hunc mundum Salvator, ut pro peccatis carnem suam offerret hostiam Deo. Hanc priusquam offerret inter dispensationum moras, vinum bibebat. . . . . Ubi vero tempus advenit crucis suae, et accessurus erat ad altare ubi immolaret hostiam carnis suae, *accipiens*, inquit, *calicem benedixit, et dedit discipulis suis dicens. Accipite et bibite ex hoc.* Vos, inquit, bibite, qui modo accessuri

St. Cyprian is the next writer whose authority we shall adduce on this subject.* From his LXIII. Epistle it appears that even prior to his time some of the early Christians, from ignorance or from fear of being discovered by their enemies, were wont to use water instead of wine in their *morning* celebrations of the Lord's Supper. This practice Cyprian condemns in the most explicit terms; and in the course of his remarks, he undertakes to show that it was directly at variance with the example and command of Christ: and he maintains that our Saviour used wine mixed with water; and farther he speaks of the wine as inebriating. Our limits forbid our quoting all that is said on this subject by St. Cyprian; and we shall therefore content ourselves with citing what may suffice for our present purpose, and to show that we give a fair representation of the views of this father. His words are, "Since therefore neither the apostle himself, nor an angel from heaven, can announce or teach otherwise than that which Christ once taught and his apostles preached, I marvel that, contrary to the evangelical and apostolical discipline, it is come into use, that in some places water, which alone cannot represent the blood of Christ, is presented in the cup of the Lord. Of this sacrament the Spirit speaks in the Psalms, making mention of the Lord's cup, and saying, Thine inebriating cup, how excellent. A cup

non estis ad altare. Ipse autem tanquam accessurus ad altare, dicit de se: Amen dico vobis, quia non bibam de generatione vitis hujus, usquequo bibam illud vobiscum novum in regno patris mei." With respect to the genuineness of the homilies from which the above extract is given, let the reader consult the Bibliotheca Graeca of Fabricius, Tom. V. As mentioned before, our quotation from this homily is made from the Latin translation of Rufinus.

* Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage, and suffered martyrdom A. D. 258. He ranks among the most distinguished of the early Christian fathers.

that inebriates is surely mixed with wine, for water cannot inebriate any one. But the cup of the Lord so inebriates, as Noah, in Genesis, drinking wine, was inebriated."* To prevent all abuse of this remark, Cyprian proceeds to distinguish between ebriety produced by the cup of the Lord and the ebriety occasioned by the use of common wine: and he shows that he regards the exhilarating effects of common wine as symbolical of the joys attendant on a right participation of the cup of the Lord.† It is Cyprian's object to show that in the administration of the Lord's Supper, it was proper to use wine mixed with water, and not water only; and in doing this, he is led to speak of the inebriating qualities of the wine used by our Lord in the institution of that ordinance.

Chrysostom, in his exposition of Matthew xxvi. 29, observes, that after his resurrection, our Saviour drank wine, that he might pluck up by the roots the wicked heresy of those who used water instead of wine in the celebration of

* Cum ergo neque ipse apostolus, neque angelus de coelo annunciare possit aliter aut docere, praeterquam quod semel Christus docuit, et apostoli ejus annunciaverunt; miror satis unde hoc usurpatum sit, ut contra evangelicam et apostolicam disciplinam, quibusdam in locis aqua offeratur in dominico calice, quae sola Christi sanguinem non possit exprimere. Cujus rei sacramentum, nec in Psalmis tacet Spiritus sanctus, faciens mentionem dominici calicis et dicens, '*Calix tuus inebrians quam peroptimus!*' calix autem qui inebriat, utique vino mixtus est: neque enim aqua inebriare quenquem potest. Sic autem calix dominicus inebriat, ut et Noe in Genesi vinum bibens inebriatus est.

† Origen and Augustine take the same view of Psalms xxiii. 5, that is taken by Cyprian. See Origen, seventh homily on Leviticus, and Augustine, Tom. IX. 253. These writers all follow the Septuagint in their rendering of this verse, and whether they are right or wrong as to its meaning, their explanation of it leaves no doubt as to their views respecting the kind of wine used at the institution of the Lord's Supper.

the mysteries, that is, of the Lord's Supper.* The kind of wine made use of may be inferred from his comments on the next verse, in which he inveighs most severely against those who rise from the table drunk, when thanks are to be returned and the hymn to be concluded. . . . . Καὶ ἀνίστανται μετὰ μέθης, δέον εὐχαριστεῖν καὶ εἰς ὕμνον τελευτᾶν.

Again, commenting on 1 Cor. xi. 21, Chrysostom says that the apostle brings two charges against the Corinthians; one, that they treat their supper with disrespect in not waiting for the poor; and the other, that they eat insatiably and drink to drunkenness: and he adds, "therefore he said not, one is hungry and another is full, but *is drunken*," &c.†

We could readily quote more from this father, but the above must be sufficient to show what was his opinion in regard to the kind of wine used.

We shall next adduce the testimony of Augustine, who says of the cup of the Lord, that "it *inebriates* the martyrs to the apprehending of heavenly things, and not vagrants to the defiling of precipices."‡

Again, writing in answer to Faustus, he says, "Why Faustus can suppose that we have the like religion with respect to the bread and the cup, I know not; since the Manichaeans esteem it not religion but sacrilege to drink wine,"§

* Καὶ τίνος ἕνεκεν οὐκ ὕδωρ ἔπιεν ἀναστὰς, ἀλλα οἶνον; ἄλλην αἵρεσιν πονηρὰν πρόῤῥιζον ἀνασπῶν. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἰσί τινες ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις ὕδατι κεχρημένοι.

† Πρῶτον μὲν, ὅτι τὸ δεῖπνον αὐτῶν ἀτιμάζουσι· δεύτερον δὲ, ὅτι γαστρίζονται καὶ μεθύουσι . . . . . καὶ εἰς ἀπληστίαν καὶ εἰς μέθην ἐξέβαινον. διὸ οὐδὲ εἶπεν, ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ ὃς δὲ κορέννυται, ἀλλὰ μεθύει κ. τ. λ.

‡ Et *inebrians* ad capessenda caelestia martyres, non ad funestanda praecipitia Circumcelliones. Tom. IX. p. 253.

§ Cur autem arbitretur Faustus parem nobis esse religionem circa panem et

and that by *wine* he did not mean *must*, is evident from the fact, that in his book concerning Heresies, he distinguishes between these two things, and says that the Manichaeans "do not drink wine, ... nor do they sup any must, even the most recent."*

Of the Aquarians, Augustine says, "that they derive their name from the circumstance, that in the sacramental cup, they offer water, *and not that which the whole church offers.*"†

Such is the testimony of these distinguished fathers of the church, in the second, third and fourth centuries, respecting the contents of the cup used in the administration of the Lord's Supper, by the Saviour himself, at the institution of this ordinance, and by his church after him. In confirmation of their statements, much may be found in other early Christian writers. From the extracts given, it is evident, that Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom and Augustine teach that, in instituting the Eucharist, our Lord made use of wine capable of producing intoxication if used freely and not diluted.

The Encratites, the Severians, Manichaeans,* and other

calicem nescio, cum Manichaeis vinum gustare non religio, sed sacrilegium est. Tom. VIII. p. 342.

* Nam et vinum non bibunt, ... nec musti aliquid, vel recentissimi, sorbent. Tom. VIII. p. 16.

† Aquarii ex hoc appellati sunt, quod aquam offerunt in poculo sacramenti, non illud quod omnis Ecclesia. Tom. VIII. pp. 20, 21.

‡ The Encratites held in abhorrence marriage, the flesh of beasts, and also wine. See Aug. and Clemens Alex. The Severians held that the wine was the offspring of Satan and the earth; and the Manichaeans, that wine was the poison of the princes of darkness. See Aug. VIII. In his History of the Eucharist, L'Arroque expresses the opinion that the Encratites had also the name

heretics, mentioned by these writers as condemning the use of wine, did not maintain that the Saviour used *must*, and that in celebrating their mysteries, Christians should do the same; but holding wine in abomination, they rejected all use of the juice of the grape, whether fermented or unfermented: and therefore it is that the early Christian writers speak only incidentally of the qualities of the wine used in the sacramental cup; yet enough is said by them to show most clearly that the wine was possessed of intoxicating qualities.

It is not till the latter part of the seventh century, that we hear any thing of the use of *must* in the sacrament of the supper. Bingham, in his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," xv. 3, after mentioning the different reasons assigned for mixing water with the wine, and among others that of Cyprian, says, "And the third Council of Braga relates Cyprian's words correcting several abuses that were crept into the administration of this sacrament; as of some who offered milk instead of wine; and of others who only dipped the bread into the wine, and so denied the people their complement of the sacrament; and *others who used no other wine but what they pressed out of the grapes that were then presented at the Lord's table.* All which they condemn, and order that nothing but bread and wine mingled with water* should be offered, according to the deter-

of Aquarians, and that they are to be distinguished from the Aquarians mentioned by Cyprian, who were not heretics, but timid and ignorant Christians.

* It is by no means certain, that our Saviour used wine mixed with water when he instituted the Eucharist; but it is certain, that it was wine and not water, that he made the symbol of his blood. Of mixing water with the wine, Vossius says: "Est enim in se αδιάφορος, eoque Ecclesiae hodie non tantum jus illud habent, ut mero uti in Eucharistia liceat, sed vero postquam ritus miscendi

mination of the ancient councils." Add to the foregoing statements the fact, not to be denied, that all the different branches of the Christian church, however much they differ in other respects, are yet agreed as to the use of wine, the fermented juice of the grape, in the celébration of the Eucharist. The Roman church, the Greek church, the Armenian, the Nestorian, and all the various branches of the Protestant church are, as it regards this matter, of one mind. Is it then possible, that the whole church of Christ, from the times of the apostles, and, for what appears to the contrary, from the time of our Saviour's death, to the present time, should have agreed as to the propriety of using the fermented juice of the grape in the sacrament of the Holy Supper, and yet their doing so be contrary to the example and will of the blessed Redeemer? Let him believe this who can.

The facts stated under this head must be sufficient to establish our position, that in the institution of the Eucharist, the Saviour used the fermented juice of the grape, had we even failed to show that when wine is mentioned in scripture, it denotes an intoxicating drink, or that at the Paschal feast the Jews were wont to use an inebriating wine. On the other hand, if we succeeded in our attempt to establish these points, then we have so much additional and independent testimony in support of our views respecting the kind of wine distributed by the Saviour to his disciples, when he made it the symbol of his blood.*

necessarius haberi coepit, prudenter merum praeferunt, ut suam in talibus libertatem ostendant. Quemadmodum et si meraci necessitas statui coeperit, melius fortasse ad mixturam redeatur." Theses Theologicae. pp. 307–8.

* We find that, on page 108, we have inadvertently mentioned Lightfoot as denying that the Saviour instituted the Eucharist at the Passsover. Lightfoot mentions, Vol. I. p. 995, that "some Christians have held that Christ and his

VII. We are next to examine the position, *that our Saviour on no occasion used fermented wine, or furnished it for the use of others.*

That this position is held by Messrs. Grindrod and Parsons is obvious from the whole tenor of their essays: but as we have, in all our previous discussions, quoted one or more passages to show that they held the opinions ascribed to them, we shall do so now. At the conclusion of some remarks on this subject, Mr. Grindrod observes, "Hence arises a strong argument against the presumption that the Son of God made use of, or countenanced the use of intoxicating liquor." Bacchus, p. 421. "We may indeed rest assured that so holy a being as the Son of God would not partake of any thing improper in itself, or calculated to lead his followers into sin." Bacchus p. 417.

In confident assertion Mr. Parsons seldom fails to surpass Mr. G., and hence we are not surprised to find such language as this: "Those who insist that the wine made by our Lord for the marriage of Cana was an intoxicating drink, appear to be reckless of every thing but their own taste for modern wines." Anti-Bacchus, p. 273.

Notwithstanding the risk we run of being regarded by Mr. P. as reckless of every thing but our own taste for modern wines, we do insist that the wine made by our Lord was intoxicating, and we farther insist that nothing but self-confidence, equal to that displayed throughout his entire essay, could render him blind to his ignorance of Jewish customs, and of the practice of the Saviour, with respect to the use of wine.

In no one passage in the gospels is their the least intima-

disciples kept their last Passover one day before the Jews kept theirs;" but this is not his own opinion.

tion that the term οἶνος (wine) is to be understood in a sense different from its common acceptation; and we have already shown that it always denotes an inebriating drink, unless connected with some term that qualifies its meaning. Why then is the term *oinos* to be understood in this instance as denoting an unintoxicating liquor? We agree with Mr. Parsons that μεθυσθῶσι, the Greek term rendered in our version "have well drunk," does not in this instance mean "intoxicated," but merely "have drunk more or less freely." Yet, at the same time, we maintain that it always denotes the use of an inebriating liquor; and that either within the bounds of sobriety or otherwise.

Clemens Alexandrinus, who, to say the least, understood the import of the term οἶνος (wine) full as well as Parsons, evidently regarded the wine into which the water was changed by our Saviour as intoxicating. His words are, "Although he converted water into wine, at the marriage, he did not permit them to drink to intoxication."*

For maintaining that our Saviour was wont to drink intoxicating wine, we have not only the authority of this eminent father, and of Origen, and of Chrysostom, all three Greek writers, but, what is of greater moment, we have the authority of the Saviour himself. Reproving the Jews for their perverseness, he says to them on one occasion, "For John the Baptist came neither eating bread, *nor drinking wine*, and ye say, He hath a devil. The Son of Man is come eating and *drinking*, and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." Luke vii. 33, 34. From this passage it is evident, 1. That

* Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον ἐν τοῖς γάμοις πεποίηκεν, οὐκ ἐπέτρεψε μεθύειν. p. 67.

our Saviour drank wine of some description. 2. That for so doing he was styled "a wine-bibber," or, in other words, a drunkard. That the charge of his being a wine-bibber was utterly false, we all believe; but does the fact, that this charge was false, prove that he *never* drank any intoxicating wine? Would he have been justly chargeable with being a wine-bibber, had he occasionally used an intoxicating wine, and that too, as Clemens Alexandrinus expresses it, in a becoming, reputable and considerate manner? Is every person who drinks fermented wine, in any quantity however small, justly liable to the charge of being a wine-bibber, a lover of wine? If not, and if in the case supposed with respect to the Saviour, he would not have rendered himself justly obnoxious to the charge made against him; then surely the falseness of the charge is no evidence that the Saviour never drank intoxicating wine. And the very fact that he was called a wine-bibber, from drinking that wine from which John abstained, renders it morally certain that the wine used by himself, and in common use among the Jews, was an intoxicating wine, otherwise the charge would have been not only false, but unspeakably absurd. The absurdity would have been no greater, had they styled him a drunkard for drinking water. The Saviour admits the fact on which the false charge was founded, viz. that he drank wine from which John abstained. For his not drinking wine, John was charged with having a devil, and for his drinking, the Saviour was charged with intemperance. Shall we conclude, because the charge in the case of John was false, that it was not a fact that he abstained from wine? as Mr. P., in the case of the Saviour, infers that it was not a fact that our Saviour ever used intoxicating wine, because he was falsely charged with being a wine-bibber. If the

falseness of the charge in the one case is evidence of the falseness of the fact upon which the charge is founded, why not in the other case also?

Upon what principle of interpretation are we to limit the drinking, on the part of Christ, to the drinking of the unfermented and unintoxicating juice of the grape? He made use of a drink from which John abstained: if then we ascertain what kind of wine John did not drink, we at the same time ascertain what kind of wine the Saviour did drink. Can there be any doubt as to what kind of wine it was that John did not drink? If there be, it must, we presume, be removed by reading what is said in Luke i. 15, "For he (John) shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and *shall drink neither wine nor strong drink*," or, in other words, he shall drink no intoxicating drink whatever.

Mr. Grindrod assumes as a fact, that the use of such wine is inconsistent with the holiness of the Saviour's character, and with the rules which, as Son of God, he laid down in the scriptures for the government of prophets, priests and kings: and thence, and also from his submitting to the rites and customs of the Jews, very conclusively infers, that "these things are a strong argument against the presumption that the Son of God made use of, or countenanced the use of intoxicating wine." When he establishes his several premises, we shall grant his conclusions.

After proving that our Saviour used fermented wine in instituting the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, it may seem superfluous to discuss the points considered above. But our doing so may serve to show that on other than sacramental occasions it is lawful to use wine.

VIII. The last position of which we proposed to speak,

is as follows, viz. *that it is an offence against God and man to affirm that the scriptures ever speak with approbation of the use of fermented wine.*

Quotations are hardly necessary to show that our authors maintain this position. To prove that the use of intoxicating drink is a sin against God, and is always injurious in its effects upon men, is the great object of the Essays. And speaking of the miracle at Cana, Mr. Parsons says, "He wrought that miracle to show forth, or manifest his glory, that his disciples might believe on him; *but no one, except an infidel or drunkard, would say, that his 'glory was manifested' in producing a drink* (i. e. fermented wine) *which poisoned his friends; and the knowledge that he did so, instead of awaking or confirming our faith in him, would be calculated to beget unbelief.*" Anti-Bacchus, p. 335. We will not trust ourselves to comment on such language as this,* any farther than to say, that we have no objections to be classed with drunkards or infidels by any one who is capable of penning such a sentence.†

* In the Essay of Mr. Grindrod we find nothing of this character. Mr. G. never charges those who differ with him as to the qualities of the wines used by the Saviour, with being infidels or drunkards. In "Bacchus" there is nothing in the language unbecoming a Christian writer. His statements are often inaccurate, and his reasonings not seldom unsound; sometimes indeed they are almost puerile: and if his modes of interpreting scripture were universally applied in determining matters of faith and practice, it would be no difficult matter, in our opinion, to establish, apparently on the authority of scripture, the most pernicious heresies. Not that we regard Mr. Grindrod, or any of his fellow-labourers, in promoting total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks as heretics, but merely as adopting, inadvertently we would believe, the modes of arguing employed by heretics in supporting their preconceived opinions.

† After the last quotation from Anti-Bacchus, no one can be surprised at meeting with the following: "I have before shown that at the first sacrament

If the scriptures forbid the moderate use of wine, we acknowledge ourselves justly liable to the charge of sinning against God and our fellow men, in maintaining the sentiments to which we have given utterance. But if, on the contrary, we have the sanction of scripture for those sentiments, it is a matter of small moment what reproach we shall encounter for our avowal of them. And whether the views presented by us are the views of God's word, we submit to the judgment of our readers, merely requesting that, before a decision be made, our arguments may be calmly and carefully considered.

It was our purpose, when we began, to take notice of sundry criticisms of our authors, upon different passages and terms found in the sacred writings, which could not with convenience be made subjects of comment in the above discussions; but the limits of our Review admonish us that we have already trespassed too far upon its pages. And we the more readily waive farther comment upon particular texts and terms, from the conviction, that if we have made good the several points we undertook to establish, nothing more is required to show that the views which we have been defending are those of the sacred scriptures.

In the foregoing discussions we have handled, as the read-

our Lord drank an unfermented wine. . . . . Surely we ought not to change the cup of the Lord into the cup of devils." This observation involves a charge against the church of Christ, from the age of the apostles to the present time, of participating in the cup of devils. We mean not to represent Mr. Parsons as *designedly* preferring such a charge against the body of Christ, but as employing language which of necessity involves it. Into such extravagance will fanaticism and ignorance carry a man, especially if confident of his superior knowledge and learning.

er will observe, our several points separately and independently of each other. The same facts indeed are sometimes cited in support of different positions, but the arguments themselves are distinct. If therefore we have proved each of the following propositions—1. That the wine in common use among the ancient Romans, Greeks, and Hebrews, was fermented—2. That in Palestine the wine was not only fermented, but strong and intoxicating—3. That the term *shekhar*, "strong drink," always denotes an inebriating drink—4. That intoxicating drinks were permitted at the Jewish feasts—5. That fermented wine was, and is yet used, at the Jewish Passover—6. That in instituting the Eucharist, the Saviour used the fermented juice of the grape—and 7. That our Lord, on other occasions than the one just mentioned, used such wine, and provided it for others—the whole of these propositions combined must furnish an irrefragable argument that the scriptures do not condemn the moderate and temperate use of wine and other drinks which, when taken in excess, produce intoxication.

We cannot, however, conclude without an expression of our earnest desire, that no one will pervert our remarks to his own injury or the injury of others. The apostle Paul tells us of some in his day, who turned the grace of God into licentiousness, and who hesitated not to say, "Let us continue in sin, that grace may abound." The conduct of these men furnished no reason to the mind of the apostle for his omitting to preach the doctrine of free grace; nor can the circumstance that some will pervert the truth, be deemed a sufficient reason for a suppression of the truth in regard to any matter of faith or practice. If any one will use to excess intoxicating drink, because the scripture does not condemn the temperate use of such drink, he wilfully perverts the

truth of God, and he must expect to reap the fruit of his doing: viz. wretchedness in this world, and eternal misery in the world to come.

So far from being designed to afford a pretext for the free and unreserved use of inebriating drinks, our remarks, if fairly and impartially considered, will be found not to have had for their object the encouragement of even the temperate use of them. We have endeavoured not to lose sight of the fact, that though the use was lawful, it might nevertheless, in certain circumstances, be altogether inexpedient, and therefore wrong. Whether there is any thing in the present condition of our own country, or of the world at large, that calls, at this time, for entire abstinence from every species of intoxicating drink, is a question for serious and prayerful inquiry. It is a question of expediency for every one to determine for himself: and for his decision he is responsible to his God and Judge, and to him alone. "To his own master he standeth or falleth." It would occasion us no regret, if every one should come to the conclusion that it is his duty to abstain from all use of intoxicating drinks; unless he should be led to entertain scruples in regard to the lawfulness of using wine at the table of our Lord. Had this subject been left untouched, and had no rude hand been laid on the memorials of our Saviour's death, we should probably have taken no part in the discussions respecting the lawfulness or unlawfulness of using inebriating drink, content to let every one adopt that view of the subject which he deemed most in accordance with the word of God.

The wonderful success which at this very time attends the temperance enterprise, calls for the most sincere and devout expressions of gratitude to the author of all good: and while we contend for our own liberty and that of others in

matters of meats and drinks, we mean not to insist upon the expediency of using that liberty. We feel not the least difficulty in adopting as our own the words of the apostle: "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." And again, "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth."

APPENDIX.

In annexing this appendix to the foregoing pages, we have it in view to examine sundry criticisms of our authors, which could not readily be made subjects of remark in our article as prepared for the Princeton Review. The proposed examination we do not regard as of any importance in establishing the several propositions maintained by us; yet it may serve to elucidate the meaning of some passages in the sacred writings, the true import of which has been misapprehended by Mr. Grindrod, Mr. Parsons, and others.

A text much misunderstood and perverted is Proverbs xxxi. 4, "It is not for kings, O Lemuel, it is not for kings to drink wine, nor for princes strong drink." The obvious meaning of this passage, viz. that it is improper for kings and princes to indulge constantly and freely in the use of intoxicating drink, Mr. Parsons regards as a perversion of the truth; and yet it is easy to show that this passage contains no such command as he, Mr. G. and others imagine. The Hebrew verb signifying to drink has the same extent and variety of meaning that the English verb has, and they both denote not only the act of drinking, but also drinking to excess. What is more common in conversation than to designate a drunkard by saying of him, 'he drinks?' And that the Hebrew term also denotes drinking to excess, is evident from the expression in Psalms lxix. 12, "I was the song of the drunkards," in He-

brew, "of the *drinkers* of strong drink," as in the margin of our English Bibles.

But this verse, Proverbs xxxi. 4, no more enjoins upon kings to abstain altogether from wine, than the preceding verse requires them to abstain from marriage; and in fact it has less the form of a command, than when in verse third it is said "Give not thy strength unto women, nor thy ways to that which destroyeth kings."

Mr. Parsons' witticisms respecting the commands "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not steal," are very poorly applied by him in the present instance. He conceits that if the expression "it is not for kings to drink wine" signifies that it is ill suited to their station and to the proper discharge of their duties to indulge freely in the use of wine, then "thou shalt not kill," "thou shalt not steal," must mean thou shalt not slay and defraud except with moderation. It will be time enough to take this ground when he has shown that "to kill" and "to steal" ever signify to do acts, some innocent, and others sinful; as in the case of the verb "to drink," which in some instances means merely "to swallow liquids," "to quench thirst," and in others to drink to excess.

Another text also misapprehended is Proverbs xxiii. 31, 32, "Look not upon wine when it is red, when it giveth its colour in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." If those who conceit that the word "look" in this passage is used in the sense of "simply directing the eye to an object," had taken the pains to compare the passage with the two preceding verses, they would have seen that its true meaning is, let not thine eyes be fixed upon wine with admiration of its red and sparkling colour, and of its sprightliness, lest thou thirst inordinately for it. "Who hath wo? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? who hath babblings? who hath wounds?

who hath redness of eyes? They that TARRY LONG at the wine, they that GO TO SEEK mixed wine. Look not thou on wine when it is red," &c.

When our Saviour said, "Whosoever *looketh* on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart," did he mean that it was sinful to look at a woman; or is it only the lustful looking that he condemns? So in the passage we have been considering, does the sacred writer forbid all looking at wine, or the continued and lustful looking upon it? A looking that is attended with an excessive indulgence, and followed with all the evils mentioned.

Farther, these very qualities of the wine described in this passage are spoken of in other passages as indicative of the excellence of the wine. For proof, compare this passage with Genesis xlix. 11, "He washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the *blood* of grapes," mentioned among the blessings pronounced by Jacob on Judah: also with Canticles vii. 9, "And the roof of my mouth, like the best wine, for my beloved, *that goeth down sweetly*," this expression, "that goeth down sweetly," being in the original the same as that in Proverbs xxiii. 21, rendered "that moveth itself aright," with the exception, that in the one text the future form of the verb is used, and in the other the present participle. The expression "giveth its colour in the cup" is indicative of its sparkling; like to the irradiating of the eye, the word עַיִן rendered colour, being the Hebrew term for eye.

In this way, from want of attention to the connexion, or from overlooking the qualifying terms or expressions in the several texts; many other passages in the scripture are often cited as condemning altogether the use of wine and other strong drinks, when it is only the excessive use of them that is condemned, or the use of them under peculiar circumstances. There is not a single passage in the Bible which shows that the

use of wine was ever prohibited except to the Nazarite during the time of his vow, to the priests while engaged at the altar, to Samson and his mother, and to John the Baptist. The temperate use of wine is no where in scripture forbidden to kings or prophets. Samuel indeed abstained altogether from the use of wine; not because he was a prophet or a judge, but because he became a Nazarite by the vow of his mother. Mr. Parsons either disregards the context, or overlooks the very pith of the passages which he cites, and adverts not to the fact that the disapprobation expressed in them refers to acts indicative of too great fondness for such drink, and not to the mere use of it.

This we have shown to be the case in the passages just cited: and Isaiah v. 11, furnishes another instance, "Wo unto them that *rise up early* in the morning, that they may *follow* strong drink; that *continue* until night, till wine *inflame* them." This passage, so expressive of an inordinate thirst after intoxicating drink, and the following verses, descriptive of the dreadful consequences of this thirst, are quoted to show the supposed sin and folly of all use, however moderate, of wine and other inebriating drink. With what propriety let the reader judge.

Leviticus x. 9, "Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou nor thy sons with thee, WHEN *ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation*, lest ye die, it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations," is quoted by Mr. Parsons as requiring total abstinence from intoxicating drinks, although the very words accompanying the command show as clearly as any thing can do, that the prohibition was limited to the time during which the priests were discharging the duties of their office. Mr. Grindrod admits this to be the case, and yet, strange to say, one of his reasons for maintaining that the Saviour never drank any wine is that the Saviour was a priest.

This might be conclusive as to his not drinking, when employed in the duties of the priest's office, had he belonged to the Levitical Priesthood. But our Saviour, though the High Priest of his people, never discharged any of the duties of that priesthood.

Having explained the import of this passage on pages 66, 84, we shall make no farther comment upon it, but merely cite the exposition of this law as given in the Mishna, "The priests of the weekly guard are permitted to drink wine in the night time, but not in the day. To the men of the house of the father it is prohibited by night and day." Tract on Fasts.*

Romans xiv. "But if thy brother *be grieved* with thy meat, thou walkest not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died," and 1 Corinthians viii. 13, "If meat make my brother *to offend*, I will eat no meat while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend," are two passages not unfrequently quoted in discussions respecting the lawfulness of using wine: the import of which is not always correctly apprehended. The simple meaning of both is that in matters of indifference we should not so use our liberty as to lead others to sin.

The phrase "*be grieved*," in the first verse, does not signify either to be made sad or to be displeased, but to be hurt or injured, as appears from the latter part of the verse in which the

* The priests were divided into twenty-four classes, called guards, and the guards into seven smaller divisions, each of which was styled "house of the father." The guards were required to attend at the sanctuary in regular succession, and for one week at a time. Each division of a guard, or house of the father, served one entire night and day: but during the day this division of priests was assisted by all the priests of the hebdomadal guard. And this is the reason assigned both by Maimonides and Bartenora, why the priests of the house of the father were not allowed the use of wine either by day or night, while the other priests of the same weekly guard were permitted to drink wine at night, but not during the day, for then they were employed in the duties of their office.

phrase occurs, "Destroy not him by thy meat;" and by the use of the term σκανδαλίζεται in verse 21, rendered in our English version "*offended.*" And the verb "*to offend*" does not in these passages signify to give offence, or to displease, but to commit sin, in consequence of some temptation cast in one's way, that acts as a stumbling block, and causes one to stumble and to violate his conscience. We are no where taught in scripture that we are bound to abstain from acts that are lawful, merely because they are displeasing to others. Our Saviour did not condemn the conduct of his disciples, but on the contrary defended it, when the Pharisees were indignant at them for the plucking the ears of corn and eating them as they passed through the fields on the Sabbath day. We should indeed avoid giving all unnecessary occasion for dissatisfaction on the part of others, and respect their prejudices so far as this can be done consistently with a due regard to truth and Christian liberty; but we should earnestly resist all attempts to make the prejudice, the ignorance, or the cavilling spirit of others a rule for the regulation of our conduct. These remarks are not suggested by any thing in the writings of our authors; and with the view given by Mr. Grindrod of Rom. xiv. 14, and 1 Cor. viii. 13, we in general accord: yet knowing that these texts are not unfrequently misapprehended, we have thought it proper to give the above exposition of them.

Besides the texts usually adduced in support of their opinions, there are others, the obvious meaning of which is attempted to be evaded by those who maintain that our Saviour and his disciples never drank any fermented wine. Among these are John ii. 1–11, in which is recorded the Saviour's first miracle, by which he supplied the wine that was wanted for the due entertainment of the guests at the marriage in Cana of Galilee. This passage gives our authors no little trouble, and they are not exactly agreed as to the mode of explaining it. Mr. Grind-

rod says, that the phrase '*well drunk*' "cannot with any kind of propriety be applied to the persons then present;" but Mr. Parsons maintains the opposite of this opinion, and correctly "suggests that if it be otherwise, the words '*thou hast kept the good wine until now*' can have no meaning." The governor of the feast, finding the wine made by the Saviour to be better than that previously furnished to the guests, and not knowing the source from which it was obtained, calls the bridegroom, and expresses his surprise that, contrary to custom, the best wine had been kept till the guests had "well drunk." Now let us inquire what is the meaning of the term μεθυσθῶσι, rendered "well drunk."

In the first place, the root of this word is μεθυ,* the poetic term for wine, pure, unmingled wine, an intoxicating liquor; and, secondly, the verb itself, unless figuratively employed, *always* implies the use of an intoxicating liquor; and no instance to the contrary has or can be produced. It does not, however, of necessity, imply a state of inebriation on the part of those to whom the term is applied, but merely a greater freedom than usual in the use of such drink; and yet a use not inconsistent with sobriety. It is a well known fact that either eating or drinking to any extent impairs the delicate sensibility of the organs of taste; and hence after guests have indulged their appetites in any degree, even the least, they are incapable of discriminating so accurately between the flavours of different wines or viands as can be done before such indulgence; and the fact that the governor of the feast, notwithstanding he had tasted the other wine, at once perceived the

* In making this remark, we are aware that Philo Judaeus and Athenaeus mention that some derive μεθύειν, from the free indulgence in wine, that in ancient times was customary *after sacrificing*, μετὰ τὸ θύειν; and this derivation also would confirm our view of the import of μεθύειν, especially as both the writers mentioned speak of the intoxicating effects of the wine used on these occasions.

superiority of the wine made by the Saviour to what they had already drunk, shows the excellence of that wine, the goodness of which could be observed, notwithstanding the guests had already partaken more or less of the wine previously furnished. And it is no impeachment of our Saviour's character, as our authors imagine, that he produced for the guests an additional supply of wine, which, if used to excess, would produce intoxication, but if used with prudence and moderation, would serve only to sustain, during the continuance of the feast, that innocent hilarity, in which they had previously indulged, and which was perfectly consistent with sobriety and devotional feelings.

This view of the passage, while it does no violence to the import of the different terms employed, presents an explanation of the narrative at once simple and free from all solid objection: while, on the other hand, the explanation given by our authors serves rather to embarrass than to explain the subject.

To vindicate the Saviour's character from false aspersion, or to show that this miracle of our Saviour gives no countenance to free and unreserved indulgence in the use of intoxicating drink, we have no need to resort to Mr. Parsons' unfounded hypothesis, that the term *wine* in the scripture ordinarily denotes the unfermented juice of the grape. By taking the words in their plain and obvious meaning, it is perfectly easy to give an explanation of the whole passage in entire consistency with the rest of God's word, which condemns, in the severest manner, all indulgence to drunkenness. Mr. Parsons supposes that if the wine used by the guests was intoxicating, then the use of the term μεθυσθῶσι (well drunk) in this connexion must indicate that the guests were all "drunk," and that our Saviour must be regarded as countenancing their drunkenness, by furnishing the means of continuing and increasing it. But these inferences surely exist only in the imagination of Mr. P.,

there is no foundation for them in fact. Mr. P. himself maintains, that the verb rendered "well drunk," does not, in this instance, "mean to intoxicate, but only to drink freely, or to be filled with liquor." In saying that the Greek term means only "to drink freely, or to be filled with liquor," he obviously intends to convey the idea, that this free drinking, or this being filled with liquor, was perfectly consistent with freedom from excess, otherwise his own interpretation would be pressed with the very difficulty which he seeks to fasten upon that of those who maintain, that the wine used at the feast was intoxicating, viz. that after the guests had already been guilty of excess, the Saviour enabled them by working a miracle to go into still greater excess; and if there were any excess, it matters not whether it was in the use of fermented or unfermented wine. Now if the term admits of the explanation given by Mr. Parsons,* then no possible exception can be taken to our explanation of the passage. We have said that while the Greek verb rendered "well drunk" always implies the use of an intoxicating liquor, and generally an intemperate use of it, yet that in the instance before us, it means nothing more than a greater freedom than usual in the use of wine; and yet a use of it within the bounds of sobriety.

From the above specimens and those mentioned in the article itself, the reader may readily judge what dependance can be placed upon the criticisms of our authors, upon the different

* Mr. Grindrod evidently inclines to the opinion, that in the passage under consideration, the term μεθυσθῶσι is indicative of excess in the use of wine, be it fermented or unfermented, and hence to avoid the difficulty above stated, he insists, for the reason suggested, that the term has no application to the guests then present. At the same time, he says that if it be applicable to them, then "it necessarily had reference only to the use of a *moderate* quantity, and not to more than was *necessary* for temperate persons." If it can have this meaning, what becomes of Mr. Grindrod's argument against the position that the wine was an intoxicating wine?

passages which have a bearing upon the principal points under discussion. In their criticisms upon individual terms and phrases, they are not more happy than in the exposition of entire texts of scripture, as we shall now show.

"Bishops, therefore," says Mr. Grindrod, "are prohibited indulgence in wine." And in confirmation of this remark, he quotes the saying of the apostle that "A bishop must be μη παροινος, me paroinos, *not given to wine*," and adds—"This passage has in general been understood to refer merely to the *free* use of wine. The original word, however, from which the translation has been made is derived from παρα, para, *near* or *by*, and οινος, oinos, *wine*. Literally, a bishop must not be seen in company with wine, at a wine banquet, or in other words, as we may reasonably infer from the nature of the passage, partaking of wine *as a common beverage or means of sensual gratification*." Bacchus, p. 409.

For this criticism he acknowledges himself indebted to Professor Stuart, by quoting with commendation the Professor's comments on this subject. With all due deference to Mr. G. and Prof. S., we must be permitted to say, that in determining the import of a Greek term, we prefer to rely upon the usage of the Greek writers, rather than upon conjectures derived from an analysis of the term, or a resolution of it into its constituent parts. The fact that πάροινος is derived from παρὰ and οἶνος, were there no usage to determine its meaning would be no evidence that it has the meaning assigned to it by Mr. Grindrod; for in composition παρὰ sometimes denotes intenseness, and in this very term πάροινος, it implies a continued sitting at wine. And if there are any terms in Greek, the meaning of which can with certainty be determined, πάροινος is one; and its meaning is accurately expressed by our English translators, "*given to wine*." And that this is the case, may be seen by consulting the authorities cited by Parkhurst and Schleusner: the first of whom gives as the meaning of πάροινος, tippler, one

who sits *long* at the wine, whether to drunkenness or not, and gives as authority Lucian, Timon, tom. i. p. 94; and the latter defines it, "vinosus, vinolentus, in quem cadit vinositatis culpa et omnium illorum vitiorum, quae ex illa evenire solent;" and cites in support of his definition Chrysostom and Theophylact, Aristophanes, the Scholiast on Aristophanes, and Hesychius.

Schleusner adds, that the noun παροινία and the verb παροινέω have the same extent of signification, and to the authorities given by him, may be added Arrian, Αναβ. Αλεξανδρου, iv. 8, Xenophon, Συμποσ. vi., Aristotle, Προβλ. iii., and Philo Judaeus, ΦΥΤΟΥΡΓ. ΝΟΕ, p. 186.

Neither Mr. G. nor Professor Stuart produces a single authority for limiting the import of the term in the way they do; and whether or not, as Prof. Stuart supposes, the use of the word πάροινος by Paul in reference to bishops, shows that a greater restriction is laid upon bishops than upon deacons, who are directed not to be "addicted to much wine," not "to be enslaved to much wine," it is evident that the use of the phrase μὴ πάροινος, does not require bishops or ministers to abstain altogether from wine as a beverage."*

Νηφάλιος (or Νηφάλεος) and Νήφω are terms used in the New Testament, the true import of which is not given by our authors. They imagine that these words, even when used meta-

* When in the same connexion bishops are commanded not to be given to wine, and deacons not to be given to much wine, it is certainly fair to infer that the same kind of wine is meant in both cases. And if so, then if the wine be not intoxicating, and if Mr. G.'s explanation of the words μὴ πάροινος be correct, bishops are not allowed to use even the unfermented, or "healthful juice of the grape," as it is styled by Mr. G., nor are they at liberty to drink fermented wine diluted with water, which Mr. G. tells us was drunk by the ancient Christians, and the use of which he says differs very little from the use of water itself, Bacchus, p. 426. On the other hand, if it be intoxicating, then deacons are *allowed* to drink intoxicating wine, in moderate quantities—"not given to *much* wine." He may choose which of these he pleases.

phorically to express vigilance or watchfulness, imply entire abstinence from all use of intoxicating drink. And to sustain them in this opinion, they rely upon the etymology as given by different lexicographers, of the verb νήφω, viz. νὴ *not*, and πίνω *to drink*. They advert not to the fact, that this combination may denote nothing more than the avoiding of all excess in drinking, and that νήφω, from which νηφάλιος is derived, is the opposite of μεθύω or μεθύσκω, which ordinarily implies drunkenness or the excessive use of intoxicating liquor. The terms νήφω and μεθύω are thus used in contrast with each other by the apostle Paul, 1 Thess. vi. 7, by Aristotle, Problem iii. 8, 12, 19, 27, and by Philo Judaeus, who in so many words says that they are opposed to each other καὶ μὴν τό γε νήφειν καὶ τὸ μεθύειν ἐναντία, ΠΕΡΙ ΦΥΤΟΥΡΓΙΑΣ ΝΟΕ, and he had previously remarked, that some derive μεθύω from the circumstance that after sacrificing (μετὰ τὸ θύειν) it was customary with the ancients to indulge freely in the use of wine, (ἔθος ἦν τοῖς πρότερον οἰνοῦσθαι); and he also says, that οἰνοῦσθαι and μεθύειν do not differ in signification, but both signify a too free use of wine, τὸ, τε οἰνοῦσθαι καὶ τὸ μεθύειν ἕν, ἑκάτερον δὲ πλείονος οἴνου χρῆσιν ἐμφαίνει. From this definition of μεθύειν, it is fair to infer that νήφω, as opposed to μεθύω, according to Philo Judaeus, implies abstinence from the immoderate use of wine. When not opposed to μεθύω, it signifies to be vigilant, watchful, or attentive, and the adjective νηφάλιος is of like import; and it is thus used whenever it occurs in the New Testament. Clemens Alexandrinus inveighing against the immoderate use of wine, yet urging the example of our Saviour as a warrant for Christians drinking wine, says, "we (Christians) being a peaceful race, and feasting for enjoyment and not for injury, *drink sober healths*," νηφαλίους πίνομεν φιλοτησίας, and in this respect they differed from the barbarous and warlike nations previously mentioned, who were wont to drink to excess.

Mr. Parsons gives as one of the definitions assigned by

Schleusner to the term νήφω, "abstineo omnis potus inebrianti s usu," and he observes that "it is rather remarkable that the interpretation of the lexicographer should contain the very words of the tetotal pledge." Had not Mr. P. mutilated Schleusner's definition of νήφω, and carefully concealed the definition of νηφάλιος, given by this lexicographer, the readers of Anti-Bacchus would have seen, that in the opinion of Schleusner these terms are, with the strictest propriety, applied to persons who abstain from the *immoderate* use of wine and other intoxicating liquor. The sentence, from which Mr. Parsons culled the words quoted byhim, is as follows: "proprie, sobrius, non ebrius sum, abstineo ab omni (Soph. Oed. Col. 100,) aut immoderato vini et omnis potus inebriantis usu, quasi ex νὴ et πίνω." In the earlier editions of Schleusner's Lexicon, the words "omni (Soph. Oed. Col. 100) aut" do not occur, and the whole structure of the sentence shows that νήφω ordinarily signifies abstinence from the immoderate use of wine and other intoxicating drink.

Under the head of νήφω, Schleusner, after giving its proper signification, quotes from an ancient grammarian the following expression, νήφει τις ὅταν ἐκτὸς μέθης ἐστὶ. κ. τ. λ. "a person is sober when he is not drunk," &c. And νηφάλιος he thus defines: "1. Proprie, sobrius, ab *immoderato* potu abstinens, qui vino et omni potu inebriante *modice* utitur, a νήφω quod vide. Hesych. νηφάλιοι· νήφοντες, μὴ πεπωκότες. 2. Metaphorice ad animum transfertur et significat, cautum, vigilantem, *circumspectum, prudentem in munere suo administrandi.* Sic ter legitur in N. T."

What dependance is to be placed upon the statements of a writer that can cite authorities in the garbled way that Mr. Parsons has done, not in this instance only, but in several others as before shown?

We will add no more, but leave it to the reader to decide whether the opinions advanced by us are in accordance with the word of God.

CONTENTS.

Introductory Remarks, ... Page 1

The wine in common use among the ancient Romans, Greeks and Hebrews, ... 12

The strength of the wines in Palestine, ... 55

The import of the phrase "strong drink," 60

Intoxicating wines used at the Jewish festivals, . . . 76

Fermented wine used at the Jewish Passover, . . . 88

The Saviour used fermented wine in instituting the Eucharist, ... 107

The Saviour not only used fermented wine, but also furnished it for the use of others, ... 119

It is no offence against God or man to maintain that the scriptures speak with approbation of the use of fermented wine, ... 122

Appendix, ... 128

3469 ①

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service
Washington, D.C.
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service
Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE
NLM 03288524 0