



Wines of the Bible

By

A.M. Wilson

The Wines of the Bible

THE WINES
OF
THE BIBLE

AN EXAMINATION AND REFUTATION
OF THE
UNFERMENTED WINE THEORY

BY THE
REV. A.M. WILSON

LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS & CO.

EDINBURGH: ANDREW ELLIOT. GLASGOW: THOMAS D. MORISON

MANCHESTER: JOHN BOYD

1877

The Wines of the Bible

Preface

The question as to the nature of Ancient Wines in general, and of the Wines of the Bible in particular, has been forced into special prominence by recent discussions of the Wine of the Communion. Whether the writer of the following pages has been successful in exhibiting the true nature of these Wines, or has failed in the effort, he has at least, the satisfaction of knowing that he has done what he could. Having been a teetotaler for more than thirty years, his personal habits, associations, and sympathies have all been in favor of the unfermented theory; but the facts encountered in the present investigation, have constrained him, reluctantly, to conclude that, so far as the Wines of the Ancients are concerned, Unfermented Wine is a myth.

E. U. Manse,

Bathgate, April, 1877

The Wines of the Bible

Publishers Introduction

It is with extreme pleasure to reproduce A.M. Wilson's epic book, "The Wines of the Bible." It has been out of print for years and almost impossible to obtain a copy. This present reproduction was taken from photo copies obtained over 30 years ago from a borrowed library loan copy. The following pages were hand typed over many hours and so all spelling errors are due to the present publisher rather than the original copy used.

This work has never been repudiated. Indeed, I know of no one that has even attempted to respond to this work.

C.H. Spurgeon commenting on the "myth" of unfermented wine said:

"The fact is — there is not, and there never was, and never can be such a thing as unfermented wine, though it suits some men to call their messes by that name. At the same time it should be observed that much which is called wine in this country is not worthy of the name, and it is a shame to remember our Lord's death by drinking such vile decoctions. Let it be really wine, as pure and good as can be had, and no communicant has then any Scriptural right to object. As the slightest word on this subject generally brings a flood of angry letters, we beg to intimate that our columns are not open to discussion, and that our own mind is made up. We are at one with those temperate temperance friends who forbear to divide churches, and mar the unity of the saints upon this point: to them we wish God speed, and we hope ever to cooperate with them. They have their own sphere of action, and a very important one it is; and when pursued in subservience to the gospel, for the noble object of preventing and curing the great and crying sin of drunkenness, their work is philanthropic in the highest degree; nay, more, it is Christ like, and tends to benefit the souls as well as the bodies of men. To make men

The Wines of the Bible

sober is one thing, to make them quarrelsome is another:: we are content with the former. – C.H. Spurgeon, **The Sword and the Trowel**, Vol. 4.

C.H. Spurgeon upon reading Wilson's book said:

'UNFERMENTED wine' is a non-existent liquid. Mr. Wilson has so fully proved this that it will require considerable hardihood to attempt a reply. The best of it is that he is a teetotaler of more than thirty years' standing, and has reluctantly been driven 'to conclude that, so far as the wines of the ancients are concerned, unfermented wine is a myth.'*Mr. Wilson has written the thick volume now before us to settle the matter, and we believe that he establishes beyond reasonable debate that the wines of the Bible were intoxicating, and that our Lord did not ordain jelly or syrup, or cherry juice to be the emblem of his sacrifice."* - Charles Haddon Spurgeon (emphasis mine).

Nearly every single modern defense of the unfermented wine theory, especially William Patton's book *Bible Wines or the Laws of Fermentation* draws very heavily from such published works that Wilson exposed to be fraudulent and abusive use of ancient documents, history and customs.

It will help the reader to understand that Wilson was exposing the false scholarship found in *Tirosh Lo Yayin* published by Dr. Frederick Lees in 1841, and the *Bible Temperance Commentary* published by Dr. Frederick Richard Lees and Dawson Burns in 1863, and *Lectures on Biblical Temperance* by Dr. D.E. Nott published in 1868 along with the writings by Moses Stuart, and several others. These men, and those who use them as their sources (as William Patton did) have built an elaborate explanation in defense of their unfermented theory upon complete abuse of original sources. Hence, it is necessary to go

The Wines of the Bible

back to their original sources and place their quotations back in context in order to expose their erroneous conclusions. Wilson has done this for the reader, thus exposing the false, but complicated and elaborate arguments they palm off on their readers as “historical facts.”

It will also help the reader to understand *some* of the ancient historians and writers from which Wilson, a classical Greek scholar, drew from:

- Herodotus, (484 – c. 420 BC), Halicarnassus, "Father of History", wrote the Histories that established Western historiography
- Thucydides, (460 – c. 400 BC), Peloponnesian War
- Berosus, (early 3rd century BC), Babylonian historian
- Xenophon, (431 – c. 360 BC), an Athenian knight and student of Socrates
- Ptolemy I Soter (367 BC — c. 283 BC), General of Alexander the Great, Founder of Ptolemaic Dynasty.
- Manetho (3rd century BC), Egyptian historian and priest from Sebennytos (ancient Egyptian: Tjebnutjer) who lived during the Ptolemaic era.
- Timaeus of Tauromenium, (c. 345 – c. 250 BC), Greek history
- Quintus Fabius Pictor, (c. 254 BC – ?), Roman history
- Gaius Acilius, (fl. 155 BC), Roman history
- Polybius, (203 – c. 120 BC), Early Roman history (written in Greek)
- Julius Caesar, (100 – c. 44 BC), Gallic and civil wars
- Diodorus of Sicily, (1st century BC), Greek history

The Wines of the Bible

- Dionysius of Halicarnassus, (c. 60 – after 7 BC), Roman history
- Livy, (c. 59 BC – c. 17 AD), Roman history
- Marcus Velleius Paterculus, (c. 19 BC – c. 31 AD), Roman history
- Quintus Curtius Rufus, (c. 60–70), Greek history
- Flavius Josephus, (37 – 100), Jewish history
- Pamphile of Epidaurus, (female historian active during the reign of Nero, r. 54–68), Greek history
- Athenaeus – (2nd century AD), Greek historian. The value his work lies partly in the great number of quotations from lost works of antiquity that he preserves, with nearly 800 writers being quoted, and partly in the variety of unusual information it affords on all aspects of life in the ancient Greco-Roman world.
- Thallus, (early 2nd century AD), Roman history
- Plutarch, (c. 46 – 120), would not have counted himself as an historian, but is a useful source because of his *Parallel Lives* of important Greeks and Romans.
- Gaius Cornelius Tacitus, (c. 56 – c. 120), early Roman Empire
- Suetonius, (75 – 160), Roman emperors up to Flavian dynasty
- Appian, (c. 95 – c. 165), Roman history
- Arrian, (c. 92–175), Greek history
- Lucius Ampelius, (3rd century AD?), Roman history
- Dio Cassius, (c. 160 – after 229), Roman history
- Herodian, (c. 170 – c. 240), Roman History

A word must be said about the procedure used by Wilson in dealing with his opponents. Wilson first gives the best arguments of his opponents while responding with his weakest response to

The Wines of the Bible

those arguments first, and then progressively leading the reader to his strongest arguments. He also provides a culminate response by each subsequent section until his opponents arguments are completely exposed as absurd and ridiculous.

We take issue with Wilson only on two points; (1) the use of the term “sacrament” for this gospel “ordinance” – 1 Cor. 11:1, and (2) the denial that there is any moral obligation for gentile Christians to use unleavened bread in the Supper (p. 492). However, neither point effects the outcome of his arguments against the unfermented wine theory as the reader will readily observe.

In regard to the Biblical references to wine, Wilson provides the true historical background behind the Biblical uses and references to wine showing how the unfermented wine advocates have brutally abused the Scriptural references. It is difficult to see how any objective person who has read and examined the evidence provided by Wilson in this book could even give the idea of “unfermented wine” any serious consideration. Indeed, after looking at the quotations placed back in their original historical contexts, the response will be righteous indignation toward those who teach such a myth.

Mark W. Fenison, ThM
May 1, 2014

The Wines of the Bible

CONTENTS

Preface	3
Publisher's Preface	4
INTRODUCTION	13
I. WINE DRINKING OF THE ANCIENTS	17
1. Female Intemperance	17
2. Intemperance of Nations	30
A. Persia	32
B. Ethiopia	33
C. Germany	34
D. Spain	35
E. Carthage	36
F. China	37
G. India	37
H. Group of Tribes and Nations	40
I. Egypt	41
J. Greece	46
K. Italy	56
L. General	57
M. Judea	63
Summary	80
3. Drinking Laws and Customs	83
A. Prohibitory Laws	83
B. Drinking Customs	91
II. ANCIENT WINES – GENERAL	103
Tropical and Proleptical Usages	103
A. Fruit of the Vine	103
B. Blood of the Grape	113

The Wines of the Bible

C. Wine in the Grape	118
III. ANCIENT WINES – GREEK AND ROMAN	125
1. Fermentation	125
2. Means of Preventing Fermentation	132
A. Filtration	135
1. The Must before Fermentation	
2. The Wine after Fermentation	
3. The Wine at Table	
B. Sulphur Fumigation	140
C. Depuration	142
D. Fumaria	143
E. Immersion	147
F. Inspissation	158
1. Wines Boiled and Fermented	159
2. The Purpose of Boiling the Juice	164
3. Sapa and Defrutum	167
3. Thickness of Ancient Wines	187
4. Dilution of Ancient Wines	192
5. Sweetness of Ancient Wines	203
6. Strength of Ancient Wines	208
7. Sober Wine	213
8. Fiery Wine	217
9. Innocent Wine	222
10. Frozen Wine	231
IV. ANCIENT WINES – ALLOWED TO WOMEN	235
1. Murrina	236
2. Lora	241
3. Passum	245
V. ANCIENT WINES – OLD AND NEW	251

The Wines of the Bible

VI. ANCIENT WINES – EGYPTIAN	271
1. Barley Wine	274
2. Palm Wine	276
3. Grape Wine	280
VII. ANCIENT WINES – HEBREW	295
1. Yayin	296
A. In the Drink Offering	301
B. Gathered from the Fields.	302
C. Good and Evil	304
D. Symbol of Wrath and Blessing	312
E. Biblical Usage	314
F. A Poison	315
G. A Mock	320
H. When it is Red	328
2. Khemer and Khamar	337
3. Khometz	341
4. Mesech	345
5. Ahsis	350
6. Soveh	361
7. Shechar	381
8. Shemahrim	400
9. Tirosh	411
A. In the Cluster	414
B. In the Triad of Blessings	417
C. To be Eaten	420
D. Trodden, Gathered, and Laid up	421
E. A Beverage	425
F. In the Vat	431
G. Taking away the Heart	440
H. In Religious Offerings	453

The Wines of the Bible

VIII. ANCIENT WINES – SACRAMENTAL	461
1. Wine of the Passover	462
2. Wine of the Supper	491

The Wines of the Bible

THE WINES OF THE BIBLE.

INTRODUCTION

The reader of the sacred Scriptures cannot fail to observe that wine is referred to, more or less frequently, in almost every book, from Genesis to Revelation. On glancing over the texts we find wine and strong drink spoken of in 256 passages; and from the references we learn that, with some exceptions, wine was commonly used by Jews and Christians, in varied quantities and of different qualities, - old and new, sweet and sour, strong and weak, mixed and unmixed. It was drunk by the best men as well as by the worst; by the rich and poor, young and old, men and women, patriarchs and prophets, kings and people, not excepting even our blessed Lord. It was employed in domestic, social, religious, and national festivities; in banquets and suppers, in marriages and funeral ceremonies; in Jewish rites and Christian ordinances.

Some temperance writers admit that the wines of the Bible were, more or less alcoholic; that the moderate use of such liquors is in itself lawful, and was anciently sanctioned, when the people were distinguished for sobriety; but they allege that, in the present state of society, when intemperance has become a great national evil, such use is not expedient. This plea of expediency is rejected and disowned by a more advanced section of temperance advocates. Dr. Johnston, in an article on the Wine Question, in the *Princeton Review* for January, 1872, observes, - "We say it again, therefore, fearless of sustainable contradiction, that if Christ and the Bible are so on the side of the use of intoxicating wine, within the limits of sobriety, as it is held they are by those who say that wine is not wine unless intoxicating

The Wines of the Bible

then the doctrine of Christian expediency, in its application to the Wine Question, is not worth a puff' of empty air."

Dr. Lees also says, - "Those who contend that liberty to abstain is all that is need as an argumentative basis for abstinence, will find themselves undeceived when they attempt to urge the practice upon others as a duty; for how can that be a duty, it will be asked, the opposite of which is sanctified by both the *letter* and the *spirit* of the divine Word?"¹ The same writer says that both the Church and the world "put awkward questions, which have never been answered. For example-How can it be good to abstain permanently from that which God made to be used for our daily good? It may be reasonable to abstain from finery, but not from clothes; from gluttony, but not from food. Are abstainers wiser than God, and the Son of God? Wiser than He who supplies wine in His perpetual providence? Wiser than He who called it into being by miraculous power? If we are to cure drunkenness by temporary abstinence, and it is 'expedient' now to abstain, because drinking and drunkenness go together, then we may drink *after a while*, when drunkenness has vanished? But if drinking then will not *originate* drunkenness, and that call in turn for abstinence, why should drinking do so now? If it will, why should we drink ever? And if it is *never* expedient t drink, because social drinking can never be disassociated from prevalent drunkenness, then 'expediency' is only *necessity* disguised."²

Rejecting, as above, the plea of expediency, and maintaining the unlawfulness of using intoxicating wine as a beverage, these advanced abstainers allege that the wines of the Bible were of two kinds, fermented and unfermented; that both kinds were in

¹ *Temperance Bible Commentary*. By Frederick Richard Lees and Dawson Burns, p. xi. For the sake of convenience this book will be quoted as the work of Dr. Lee's, but without any intention of ignoring the joint-editorship of Mr. Burns.

² *Works*, iii. Cci.

The Wines of the Bible

common use among the ancients, Jews and Gentiles; and that the one is forbidden and the other is allowed in Scriptures. Dr. Ritchie says, "It appears manifest that this diversity of expression in Scriptures proves, beyond all reasonable doubt, a difference of character in these wines. The conclusion seems irresistible that it is an innocent, unintoxicating wine which the Spirit of God in His Word commends; while it is a deleterious, inebriating wine which he condemns."³ Moses Stuart also says, "Facts show that the ancients not only preserved wine unfermented, but regarded it as of a higher flavour and purer quality than fermented wine. What, then, is the difficulty in taking the position that the *good* and *innocent* wine is meant in all cases where it is commanded and allowed? Or that the alcoholic and intoxicating wine is meant in all cases of prohibition and denunciation."⁴ And Dr. Lees says, "If there is but one kind of wine – i.e., intoxicating, - criticism and argument are at an end, since the use of wine of some sort is palpably sanctioned by God in the Bible, and not merely permitted."⁵

If these allegations as to the existence and use of two kinds of ancient wine can be established by satisfactory evidence, every sincere inquirer will bow with reference to the imperial authority of truth and duty; but if it is found, on examination, that this theory of unfermented wine has no basis in fact, the inquirer must, with equal reverence for truth, conclude that the allegations in question are more dogmatic and unproved assertions. What, then, are the facts? Before entering upon an examination of the wines of the ancients, it will be desirable to inquire into their drinking habits and customs, as these may serve

³ Scripture Testimony against Intoxicating Wine. p. 9

⁴ Temperance Cyclopaedia, p. 365

⁵ Tem. Bib. Com., p. xix

The Wines of the Bible

to indicate the qualities of the liquors in command use among the people.

I. – WINE DRINKING OF THE ANCIENTS

1. Female Intemperance

A Writer in one of our serial publications gives expression to an opinion commonly relied on by those who believe in the alleged “sobriety of the ancients,” when he says, “At the time of our Savior on earth, and for a longer period after, it was considered infamous for a woman to taste wine. For a guest to offer a glass of wine to one of the women of the household was looked upon as a deep insult, as it implied a want of chastity on her part. History records several instances where women were put to death by their husbands because they smelled of ‘tometuam’ [?]. The consequence of this physical training, and abstinence from all intoxicating liquors was, that the Romans were noted for their endurance and strength.”⁶

These statements are probably founded on the fact that, at an early period in history of Rome, when the foundations of the city were laid, women were forbidden to use wine by Romulus and Numa, although a later period they were allowed to drink *passum*, a sweet raisin wine, made from the *uvae passae*, or sun-dried grapes. But long before the period referred to by the writer as “the time of our Saviour on earth,” that prohibitory law had become a mere tradition of mythic times, and women drank wine freely, without any restriction s to kinds or qualities. It is true, Athenaeus quotes a Sicilian writer, to the effect that “all women in Italy avoid drinking wine” on account of a story about Hercules

⁶ Brit. Work, No. 198

The Wines of the Bible

having petrified a cask of wine because a women having opened it for her own use, would conceal the theft from her husband, and give the demi-god only water to drink. "And this fact is proved," says he, "by the conduct of the women of the country, among whom it is reckoned disgraceful, to this day, to drink wine, on account of the above-mentioned reason."⁷ It is observable that the alleged abstinence of "all the women in Italy is here attributed, not to any prohibitory law, but to an apocryphal story about Hercules. And the alleged fact itself is disproved by the concurrent testimonies of more competent witnesses than this Sicilian writer.

Evans, in his notes to Juvenal, says, "Cicero, knowing the propensity of his country women to wine-bibbing, would exclude them from officiating at any sacred rites (at which wine was always used) after night-fall. The festival of the Bona Dea is the only exception he would make." In this Cicero, probably, had in view the fact that, in certain of the sacred festivals of Greece and Rome, wine was not only freely used, but even dipsomania was cultivated as an essential part of their religious devotions. Martial recommends a father not to spare "the old Falernian," with the view of leaving casks of such precious liquor to his young daughter, but to use it himself, and let her "drink the new wine," that "the wine-jar, now new, may grow old along with its mistress."⁸ says of women – "They sit up as much, drink as much" as men; "nay, in their very appetites they are masculine too; they have lost advantage of their sex by their vices." Homer testifies that the wealthy ladies and great princesses of early times drank wine at the banquets of their lords, and on other occasions. He tells us that when Nausica was going down to the river to wash

⁷ Athen, x., 56

⁸ Sympos, iii. 2

The Wines of the Bible

the household linen, her mother supplied her with provisions, and “poured wine into a flagon of goatskin” for her use. Plutarch discusses the question how it is that old men are more easily overcome than women by wine, in which the hard drinking of the latter is assumed as a well-known fact, and various reasons are alleged for their immunity, but without the slightest allusion either to abstinence or to the use of unfermented liquor.⁹ Apuleius speaks of women “drinking neat wine as for a wager.”¹⁰ Pausanias tells how the Thracian women, “in a drunken fit,” destroyed Orpheus.¹¹ Plato says, “The Scythians and Thracians indulging in wine, both their wives and themselves, to excess, and pouring it over their garments, think they observe an honorable and excellent custom.”¹² Ovid says – “See! My nurse is pouring wine upon the flames of favourable omen, and she says, ‘Tomorrow we shall be mire,’ and then she drinks.”¹³ He says Dipsas is “never in a sober state;” “her eyes are bleared with wine.”¹⁴ Describing the sacred rites of Tacita, he says, “Wine, too, she drops on it; whatever of the wine is left she either drinks it herself or her attendants, yet she herself takes the greater part....and then the drunken hag goes forth.”¹⁵ On the Ides of March, is the mirthful festival of Anna Perenna. “They pray for years as many as the cups they quaff, and reckon as they drink. There you will meet with the man who can drink off the years of nestor; the woman who becomes old as the Sibyl, by the number of her cups.” Fill out

⁹ Ep. vi. 27

¹⁰ Works, p. 176

¹¹ Book ix

¹² De Leg., i. 9.

¹³ Heroidus, xix. 154

¹⁴ Amores, i. 8.

¹⁵ Fasti

The Wines of the Bible

pure wine.¹⁶ Aristophanes speaks of the women of his day slaughtering jars of wine, and drinking the wine unmixed with water. He says, "Don't they also drink in the assembly? Yes, by Diana! And that too, unmixed wine." He represents Praxagora as recommending the state to employ women, in describing their character, says "They like their wine unmixed, just as before." The undiluted Thasian wine, of which he speaks as the favourite drink of women, is referred to in another passage, in which he says, "But the Thasian jars again, far surpass all these; for they abide in the head a long time, whereas all the rest lose their bloom, and fly off. Therefore, they are far the best, - far, certainly, ye gods! Fill out pure wine; it will cheer the women the whole night, who select whatever has the most fragrance."¹⁷

The testimony of Scripture agrees with that of profane history. Accordingly, Dr. Lees admits that, before the times of the Hebrew monarchy, female intemperance had become a prevalent social evil. He says, "That the readiness with which Eli concludes as to Hannah's inebriation indicates a prevailing corruption of morals, which had taken this peculiar form, and had deeply affected even the female population."¹⁸ In the times of the apostles drunkenness is noticed and condemned, and warnings against being "given to much wine" are addressed to both men and women (1 Tim. iii.8; Tit. ii. 3). Dr. Lees admits the intemperance of women at this period, but he repeatedly asserts that the intemperance which existed was merely an excessive use of unfermented grape juice. Thus he says, "An excessive addiction to liquors-even such as would not readily, or at all, intoxicate-was a vice of the apostolic age, and one that abounded in Corinth, the

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ecclez.

¹⁸ Temp. Bib. Com. P. 80

The Wines of the Bible

most profligate city of Greece.”¹⁹ Again, “Excessive drinking, even of uninebriating drinks, was a vice prevalent in the days of St. Paul, and corresponded to gluttony, also common, -the excessive use of food, but of an intoxicating kind.”²⁰ The wine used by women in the times of the prophet Samuel was an *inebriating* liquor, as admitted above, but it had become *unintoxicating* in the days of St. Paul! The writer cannot get rid of the fact of female intemperance, and therefore, to climate the alcohol from the wine, he emasculates the intemperance, and transforms it into a gluttonous imbibitions of unfermented grape juice!

He asserts, further, that “not satisfied with the use of *passum*, a sweet raisin wine which had been anciently permitted, fashionable ladies had come to rival men in drinking orgies; and Juvenal draws a disgusting picture of the zest with which they made even innocent *must* to pander to their debauched and morbid tastes.”²¹ Again, “The fact is, that by the Greek and Roman laws wine generically was prohibited to women under thirty or thirty-five years, but after that age, the unfermented wines were allowed. Now, both men and women were in the habit of drinking such wines to excess; and it is from the ancient platform that we must interpret these texts. Take, as a proof, this curious passage in Lucian: -‘I came, by Jove, as those who drink *gleukos* (swelling out of their stomach) required an emetic.’”²²

We shall inquire into the nature of *passum*, and the other alleged “unfermented wines,” as we proceed. Meantime, it is to be observed that, according to the above statements, the ladies of the olden time had gone from bad to worse. The “sweet raisin wine,” although it was an innocent, unfermented liquor, no longer

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 329

²⁰ Ibid. p. 368

²¹ Ibid., p. 369

²² Works, ii. 95, 96

The Wines of the Bible

satisfied them. It was either not weak enough, or not sweet enough, and it was discarded for “innocent *must!*” The appetite for drink grew by what it fed upon, and the *passum* drunkards became drinkers of “innocent *must!*” The unfermented juice of dried grapes did not satisfy their “debauched and morbid tastes,” and, therefore, they had recourse to the unfermented juice of fresh grapes! And they came “to rival men in drinking orgies” drinking “innocent *must!*” The theory which gives birth to these wonders is surely the quintessence of innocence!

The writer refers us to Lucian, Juvenal, and Athenaeus for evidence as to these extraordinary drinking habits of women. Now, as to Lucian, what is there in the “curious passage” which we must “take as a proof” of the alleged excessive use of “innocent *must!*” It is the reference *toan emetic*? Or the allusion to a swelling of stomach? Or the designation of the liquor? It cannot well be the first of these, unless emetics are required and used only by those who drink unfermented grape juice. But we suspect that both ancient and modern wine drinkers have had recourse to this remedy when they transgressed the bounds of moderation in the use of fermented liquors. Athenaeus says, “So getting drunk is a bad thing, my good friends;” and the same Alexis says, with great cleverness, to those who swallow wine in this way-

“Are you, then, full of such a quantity
Of unmixed wine, and yet avoid to vomit?”

He also quotes Mnsitheus, the Athenian physician as saying: “Occasional hard drinking for some days” is advantageous, the wine being “both liquid and heating.” “But, when you are drinking hard,” says he, “you should guard against three things, - against drinking bad wine, against drinking unmixed wine, and against

The Wines of the Bible

eating sweetmeats while you are drinking. And when you have had enough, then do not to sleep until you have had a vomit, moderate or copious, as the case may be; and when you have vomited, then go to sleep after having taken a slight bath.”²³ Thus the use of an emetic to empty the stomach of a “liquid and heating” wine, consumed by hard drinkers, cannot be accepted as proof of the use of “innocent *must*” by women.

As to the swelling of *the stomach* nothing requires to be said, for large draughts of wine would effect that distension, whether the liquors were fermented or unfermented. Accordingly Elihu says:- “My belly is as wine which hath no vent; it is ready to burst like new bottles” (Job xxxii. 19). The wine of this text is identified by the Seventy with Lucians’s *gleukos*: so that the mere swelling of the stomach affords no proof that the distending liquor was an “innocent *must*.” And, as to the *designation of the wine*, the argument is equally worthless, unless, indeed, the alleged proof can itself be proven. For Dr. Lees knows that the term *gleukos* simply designates new, fresh, sweet wine; and he acknowledges “the ambiguous meaning of the Greek *gleukos*, and the Latin *mustum*, which were undoubtedly sometimes applied to the juice of grapes in an initial state of fermentation.”²⁴ The same term occurs in Acts 2:13, where the apostles are charged with being “full of new wine” (*gleukos*). Even Dr. Ritchie repudiates the unfermented gloss which is put on this passage, and is “inclined, at once, to admit that *gleukos*, in this text, denotes an intoxicating liquor.”²⁵ Thus there is not a fragment of evidence in the whole passage of Lucian which can be regarded as a “proof” of the use of “innocent *must*” by either men or women.

²³ Athen, x. xi

²⁴ Temp. Bib. Com. P. xxiii

²⁵ Sc. Test., p. 221

The Wines of the Bible

As to Juvenal, the second authority appealed to by Dr. Lees, where does that plain-speaking satirist exhibit the “disgusting picture” referred to? We have examined his satires carefully, and have failed to discover any such reference. But we have found the following graphic sketch of female drunkenness:-

“For what does a drunken woman regard?
She knows not the difference between her top and bottom.
She who eats large oysters at midnights,
When ointments, mixed with Falernian wine, foam,
When she drinks but of a shell, when now, with a whirl, the house
Walks round, and the table rises up with double candles” – (Sat. VI.)

Here there can be no reasonable doubt as to the intoxicating quality of the Falernian wine imbibed by these “fashionable ladies,” which makes the house whirl round, and the table rise up with double candles, reminding us of the epigram on Pitt,-

“I can’t see the Speaker, Hal; can you?
Not see the Speaker? I see two.”

Eupripides, in like manner, makes Pentheus says: - “And, indeed, I think I see two suns, and twin Thebes, the seven gated city.” And our own Burns says-

“The rising moon began to glower,
The distant Cummock hills out owre.
To count her horns, wi’ a’ my power,
I set mysel’:
But whether she had three or four,
I couldna tell.”

Juvenal proceeds, in his Satire, to describe the intemperance of their women in the sacred festivals:-“The secrets of the Bona Dea

The Wines of the Bible

are well known: when the pipe excites them, and inflamed alike with the horn and the wine, these Maenads of Priapus rush wildly around, and whirl their locks, and howl.”²⁶ Here, again, there can be no question as to the quality of that *inflaming* wine which drove these women frantic.

Euripides gives an animated picture of the drunken revels alluded to by Juvenal. He describes, in the *Bacchae*, the wine-complexioned cheek of Bacchus; says, “he is, in fact, to man, at once the most terrible and the mildest of deities;” and indicates the character of the latter, saying, he who does not care for “the liquid drink of the grape,” which Semele has given to mortals to deliver from grief, and which gives sleep an oblivion of daily evils, and then which there is not any other medicine for troubles, “hates to lead a happy life by day and by friendly night.” Pentheus, wishing to see the women in their cups, is conducted by Bacchus to their place of meeting, when he beholds the holy *Bacchae* “frantic with the inspiration of the god.” One of them, Agavae, in her inebriated fury, blindly kills her own son: and Pentheus thereafter exclaims:—“Where the joy of the grape cluster is present at a feast of women, I no longer say anything of their mysteries.”

It is observable that these drunken revels were practiced by women as a religious service, and were imposed or sanctioned by religious laws and customs. The wine used on such occasions was obviously no mere “innocent must,” but fermented and inebriating liquor; and yet that alcoholic wine is designated “the liquid drink of the grape,” and “the joy of the grape cluster.” The effects of the wine are spoken of as “at once the most terrible and the mildest;” the reference being to moderate use in the one case, and excessive indulgence in the other, and not to two

²⁶ Sat. vi

The Wines of the Bible

different kinds of liquor. For “the mildest of deities” is given to mortals to “deliver from grief,” to “give sleep,” to induce “oblivion of daily evils,” and to be the best “medicine for troubles;” all which reads like a heathen commentary on the text-“Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heaven hearts. Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more” (Prov. xxxi. 6, 7).

Juvenal further describes the proceedings of these fashionable ladies when enjoying the luxury of the bath,-

“At last she comes somewhat ruddy, thirsting after
A whole flagon, which, in a full pitcher, is presented
Placed at her feet; of which another sextary
Is drunk up before meat, to provoke an eager appetite.
Till it returns, and strikes the ground with washed inside.
Rivers hasten on the pavement, or of Falernian
The wide basin smells; for thus, as if into a deep cask a long
Serpent had fallen, she drinks and vomits. Therefore her husband
Turns sick, and restrains his choler with his eyes covered.” – (Sat. VI)

Here, indeed is a “disgusting picture” of “debauched and morbid tastes;” but the designation of the wine use as “Falernian, and the description previously given of the intoxicating quality of that liquor, together with the fact that Pliny intimates that this is the only wine which “takes fire on the application of flame,”²⁷ show that the satirist has in view a fermented wine, and not a mere “innocent *must*.” He refers again to the same wine in another passage, -

“But they had rather betray
A secret, than drink of stolen Falernian,
As much as Lanfella, sacrificing for the people, drank.” – (Sat. IX)

²⁷ B. xiv.

The Wines of the Bible

This Lanfella was a “priestess of Vesta, who, in celebrating the rites of the Bona Dea, together with the women worshippers, drank herself into drunken fury.”²⁸ So that the Falernian wine consumed by the women in the bath must have been intoxicating liquor; and, therefore, the testimony of Juvenal affords no proof of the excessive use of “innocent *must*.”

We come not to Athenaeus, the last of the authorities appealed to by Dr. Lees on this point, and we find that in speaking of the use of wine in connection with the bath, he quotes Hermippus the lines-

“As to mischievous habits, if you ask my vote,
I say there are two common kinds of self-slaughter;
One, constantly pouring strong wine down your throat,
Together, plunging in up to your throat in hot water.” (B.I.)

As to the common practice of wine drinking by women, he says,-
“It is a well known fact that all the race of women is fond of drinking. And it is not without some art that Xenarchus introduces in his Pentathlum a woman swearing this most horrible oath,-

“May it be granted me to pass from life
Drinking abundant draughts of wine, while you,
My darling daughter, live and prosper here.”

And Axionicus says in his Philinna,-

“Just trust a woman to drink only water.” (Ibid.)

Similar references occur throughout the work, of which the following are examples: - Of one woman, Clio, it is said, that no

²⁸ Madan.

The Wines of the Bible

man “could at all contend with her in drinking.” Antiphanes, describing certain women among the Greeks who were addicted to intemperance, represents one of them as saying, “there is a certain neighboring victualler, and he, whenever I arrive, being thirsty, is the only man who knows the proper way to mix my wine, and makes it not too full of water, nor too strong and heady.” Alexis says, “But women are quite sure to be content if they have only wine enough to drink. But, by the heavenly twins, we now shall have as much as we can wish; and it shall be sweet, and not griping, -rich, well seasoned wine, exceeding old.” He also refers to a certain woman whom he calls “that wine cask.” Antiphanes, speaking of the drinking habits of women says, “He is a wretched man who ever marries, except among the Scythians, for their country is the only land which does not bear the vine.” Plato, in his *Phaon*, describing how many things happen to women because of wine, says, “Come now, ye women, long ago have I prayed that this wine may thus become your folly for you don’t think, as the old proverb goes, that there is any wisdom at a vintner’s.” Hermippus says that the Illyrians “take their wives to their entertainments, and it is reckoned a decorous custom for the women to pledge the guest who are present.” Pherecrates relates how the women contrived, with the aid of the potter, to provide goblets for the men “scarcely holding more than a mere shell, more like to tasting cups;” but for themselves they get “downright wine-carrying transports, wide and round of delicate substance, swelling in the middle. A crafty order; for with prudent foresight they were providing how, without much notice, they might procure the largest quantity of wine to drink themselves; and then when we reproach them that ‘tis they who’ve drunk everything, they heap abuse on us, and swear they they, poor injured dears, have only drunk one cup, though their one is larger than a thousand common cups.” Hedylus refers to a woman who

The Wines of the Bible

“contended against men in drinking,” and “when feasting, drank three whole choes of wine.” Theopompus says the Tyrrhenians “pledge whoever they please in their cups, and that they are wonder women to drink.” Aristophanes speaks of women somewhat advanced in age, pouring into their stomachs, “without restraint, from good-sized cotylai, dark Thasian wine, the whole contents of a large earthen jar, urged by their might love for the dark wine.” Phyllilius says of a woman, “She was always in the company of young men, who did nothing else but drink; and with a lot of aged women too, who always delight in good-sized cups.” Meander says, “The old woman did not leave untouched one single cup, but drank of all that came.” The same author says,- “And then, again, she carries round to all a cup of unmixed wine.” Euripides, in his *Cretan Women*, says,- “Farewell all other things, as long as cups of wine go freely round.” And Ararus, or Eubulus, says, “Right well must you have known the natures and the hearts of women, that they are not well pleased with scanty cups.”

The references in these extracts to the hard drinking of women; the particular descriptions of wine used, unmixed, Falernian, and Thasian; the banquets they attended, drinking with and pledging the guests, &c., show that the ladies of the olden time were not distinguished for their abstinence or even sobriety; nor did they limit themselves, in their portions, either to unfermented *passum* or innocent *must*. So that Athenaeus, like Juvenal and Lucian, gives no countenance to the assumption that the intemperance of women was a mere gluttonous imbibitions of unfermented grape juice.

The Wines of the Bible

2. Intemperance of Nations

The “sobriety of the ancients” is so frequently and confidently asserted, that one is almost tempted to ignore all the facts of history, and believe that the “drink curse” is quite a modern experience. Dr. Lees exhibits a more accurate knowledge of the facts, when he says:-“Contrary to modern and superficial notions, which confine temperance to northern climes, and exclude it from vine-growing countries, the people of Israel, following the example of their chief men, were addicted to the grossest indulgence in intoxicating liquors”²⁹ And “this picture crowns a series of prophetic declarations which conclusively negative the statement put forth by some writers and speakers, without any historical ground, that *wine* countries are sober countries, and that the insidious progress of the lust for liquor is not to be dreaded in the native ‘habitats of the vine.’ Neither a beautiful climate, nor sanitary and social laws, nor special teaching, nor religious privileges, nor peculiar circumstances, were safeguards against the growth of the drunkard’s appetite in all ranks.”³⁰

These conclusions as to the intemperance of Eastern countries are confirmed by the testimonies of competent witnesses, who lived among the people for many years, and have been familiarly acquainted with their social habits and customs. Thus, in an article on the Wine Question in the *Princeton Review* for January, 1872, Dr. Jessup, of Syria, says:-“The great besetting sin of the village is wine drinking. This part of Lebanon is famous for its vineyards and wine, and the people are more given to excessive drinking than those of any district I have known.” Rev. J.S.

²⁹ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 160

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 171, 172

The Wines of the Bible

Cochran, of the Nestorian Mission, writes of his place of labour in the wine making season. "The whole village of male adults will be habitually intoxicated for a month or six weeks." Rev. J.H. Shedd, missionary at Oroomiah, in Persia, says:-"Every since the days of Noah that region has been the house of the vine. The wine is made in a very primitive manner, and is entirely unadulterated. All the varieties are very light. If any in the world are harmless, they are. But the fact remains that beastly intemperance is the besetting sin of the people. During the wine season beastly drunkenness is too common to excite comment. I have been in large villages on a feast day, when it was really impossible to find a sober man in the place."

The modern drunkenness described above is a true picture of ancient intemperance. The sobriety of the ancients is a myth, "without any historical ground." The drink curse, if not co-eval with the race, comes not far short of the antiquity of man. It may have come in with the flood; but however this may be, it has certainly flooded the earth to such an extent as to cover all the land, leaving indelible marks of its ravages in all countries, and nations, and times. In fact, the world has been a wine drinking, drunken old world, from the remotest ages known to us by ancient traditions, sculptures, or paintings, stretching far back beyond the furthest limits of any written historical records.

It is not intended by this that intemperance, or even wine drinking; has not been absolutely universal, without exception or limitation. For Dr. Lees, in his *History of Teetotalism*, has shown that "everywhere-in China, in India, in Persia, in Egypt, in Greece-amongst the oldest traditions of the earth, we meet with distinct traces of this doctrine, as, in later periods, we find it embodied in some of the most pure and potent of the practical systems of

The Wines of the Bible

ancient philosophy.”³¹ This is true, as far as it goes. We do, indeed, meet with those “*traces*” of abstinence, but we also find, going before, and running alongside of them, deep and well worn ruts which intemperance has made in the paths of nations.

A. Persia

It is to be observed, however, that the abstinence of which traces are discoverable is, in its reasons or grounds, altogether different from modern total abstinence. Thus, according to Herodotus, the early Persians were “strangers to the taste of wine; they drink water only.” But these people abstained from wine, not from any religious scruples as to its use, but merely because, at that period, it was unknown to them. They are described as “men who are clothed with the skins of animals; who, inhabiting a country but little cultivated, live on what they can procure, not on what they wish.” Accordingly they were not only “strangers to the taste of wine,” but “even figs are a delicacy with which they were unacquainted, and all our luxuries are unknown to them.”³² After this, however, they became acquainted with the previously unknown liquor; and Herodotus says:—“Of wine they drink profusely.....They are accustomed to deliberate on matters of the highest moment when warm with wine; but whatever they in this situation may determine is again proposed to them on the morrow, in their cooler moments, by the person in whose house they had before assembled. If at this time also it meets their approbation, it is executed, otherwise it is rejected. Whatever, also, they discuss when sober is always, a

³¹ Works, ii

³² Herod., i. 71

The Wines of the Bible

second time, examined after they have been drinking.”³³ This testimony is confirmed by Plato, who classes the Persians with other nations addicted to downright intoxication.³⁴ Heraclides, referring to Persian customs, says, when the king as a drinking party, and he has one very often, the guests eat by themselves, but they are invited to drink with the king. They do not have the same wine, “and when they are very drunk, indeed, they go away.”³⁵ Xenophon also says:—“It was likewise a rule among them not to bring *prochoides* (large cups) to their banquets; evidently thinking that abstinence from drinking to excess would tend less to impair their bodies and their minds; and the custom of not bringing such vessels still continues; but they drink to such excess that, instead of bringing in, they are themselves carried out, since they are no longer able to walk out upright.”³⁶

B. Ethiopia

The Macrobian of Ethiopia also abstained from wine, and drank milk as their beverage.³⁷ But their abstinence, like that of early Persians, was not founded on any objections to the use of such liquor, but to the want of it in the country; for to this day, although the Sacrament is administered in Abyssinia in wine made from raisins steeped in water, and “excellent red wine, honey wine, or hydromel, and a species of beer” is made and used, “wine is scarce in the country.”³⁸ Accordingly, Herodotus tells us

³³ Herod., i. 133

³⁴ Jowett’s Trans. Iv. 158

³⁵ Athen. iv. 26

³⁶ Cyrop. viii. 10

³⁷ Herod, iii. 23

³⁸ Dufton’s Narrative, pp. 89-97

The Wines of the Bible

that when Cambyses sent a cask of palm wine, along with a purple robe, gold, bracelets, and rich perfumes to the Prince of the Macrobian, the monarch despised all the other gifts; but “when he came to the wine, and learned how it was made, he drank it with particular satisfaction.” And when he had ascertained from the ambassadors how the Persians lived-“I am not at all surprised, said the Ethiopian prince, that, subsisting on dung, the term of life is so short among them; and unless, he continued, pointing to the wine, they mixed it with t his liquor, they would not live so long; for in this, he allowed that they excelled the Ethiopians.”³⁹

D. Germany

One of the German tribes, the Suevi, is said to have abjured the use of wine, “believing that by it men are enervated, made effeminate, and incapable of enduring labour.” If this was so, the abstinence must have been limited to that particular tribe; for Athenaeus says, “The Germans, as Posidonius relates in his 30th book, eat for dinner meat roasted in separate joints; and they drink milk and unmixed wine.”⁴⁰ Peter Heylin, in his *Cosmographie*, alleges that the ancient Germans were much addicted to intemperance; and he appeals to the testimony of Tacitus in evidence, “that it was no disgrace, *nulli approbrium*, to spend the whole day and night in drinking,” and “that they consulted over their cups of their weightiest businesses.” Even Dr. Lees himself is not ignorant of that intemperance; for he also appeals to Tacitus that they “took counsel first when drunk, and then when sober. And the historian adds, ‘They deliberate when

³⁹ Herod, iii. 22

⁴⁰ Book, iv. 39

The Wines of the Bible

unable to devise anything, they decide when not able to go wrong.”⁴¹ So that, however abstinent that one tribe of the Suevi may have been, these testimonies show that, as a people, the early Germans were grossly intemperate.

D. Spain

Spain is also said to have abstained from the use of wine, for Phylarcus is cited by Athenaeus as saying, that “all the Spaniards drink water, though they are the richest of all men.”⁴² But if this be so, the *water* which they drank must have been of that kind described by Pliny, when he says, “Alas! What wondrous skill! And yet how misplaced! Means have absolutely been discovered for getting drunk upon water even.”⁴³ For, in the opening words of the paragraph, Pliny says:—“The people of the Western world have also their intoxicating drinks made from corn steeped in water. These beverages are prepared in different ways throughout Gaul and the provinces of Spain – under different names, too, though in their results they are the same. The Spanish provinces have even taught us the fact that these liquors are capable of being kept till they have attained a considerable age.”⁴⁴ Plato is also quoted by Athenaeus as classing the Spaniards among those who are addicted to drunkenness.⁴⁵ Justin intimates that Italy imported from Spain “not only great plenty of corn, but also wine, honey and oil.”⁴⁶ Livy informs us that when Cato was Consul, and

⁴¹ Temp. Bib. Com. P. 110

⁴² Book ii. 21

⁴³ Book xiv. 22

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Athen, Book x. 39

⁴⁶ Hist. xlv. 1

The Wines of the Bible

in command of the troops in Spain, both he and the Spaniards refreshed themselves with “victuals and wine.”⁴⁷ And he says, “the discipline of the army was greatly relaxed through inactivity and intemperance.”⁴⁸ Polybius describes the royal palace of one of the Spanish kings, and says, “There stood in the middle of the palace huge silver and golden goblets full of wine made of barely.”⁴⁹ It thus appears that, instead of drinking water only, the Spaniards used both beer and wine to such an extent as to be ranked among drunken nations.

E. Carthage

Carthage had a prohibitory liquor law, but it was limited to the soldiers when in camp, and to judges and magistrates during the year of their magistracy.⁵⁰ With these exceptions, the Carthaginians both made and used wine to excess. Pliny, referring to their method of preparing wine, says, “They do contrary to all others, in that they use pitch to their houses, and lime to their wines, for in truth they turn up their new wines with lime.”⁵¹ And Plato, “not talking of the mere practice of drinking or not drinking wine in general, but about downright intoxication,” ascribes this “custom” of drinking to excess to the Carthaginians, in common with the Scythians and other drunken nations.⁵²

⁴⁷ Xxxiv. 16

⁴⁸ xl. 1

⁴⁹ Athen, i. 28

⁵⁰ Plato

⁵¹ Book xxxvi. 22

⁵² Jewett, iv. 158

The Wines of the Bible

F. China

China must also be included in the list of wine-drinking and drunken nations; for although, according to Dr. Lees, one of its emperors, about eleven hundred years before Christ, “forbade the use of wine, as what proves the cause of almost all the evils which happen on the earth,” we find that “twenty-two hundred years before Christ,” wine was introduced into China. Heavy duties were imposed in vain. “Those who had tasted could not refrain from tasting again, and indulging to excess; so that a sort of modern Tzar, named Kya, about 1500 B.C., filled a lake with it in one of his freaks of autocracy, and made three thousand of his subjects jump into it! Grape wine was always esteemed there the ‘wine of honor.’ Yet mandates have been issued at various periods for rooting up the vines, until the grape was almost forgotten. Grape wine is spoken of in the annals of China long before the birth of Christ. Rice and palm wine are made in large quantities.”⁵³

G. India

In India, according to Aristobulus, cited by Strabo, there is “a vine that produces wine;” whereas, according to the latter, “other authors affirm that there is no wine in India.”⁵⁴ But, Athenaeus informs us, on the authority of Chares of Mitylene, that “among the Indians a deity is worshipped who is called Soroadeus, which name, as interpreted in Greek, means winemaker.”⁵⁵ The divinity

⁵³ Redding on Wines, pp. 309,310

⁵⁴ Xv. 1,22

⁵⁵ i. 48

The Wines of the Bible

referred to here is, probably, either “Suradevi, the Hindoo goddess of wine,” or the Indian Bacchus – of whom Redding says, “The Indians said, according to Diodorus, that Bacchus first taught them the art of pressing grapes and making wine, and that he resided in his capital of Nyssa, in the modern Punjaub, that he ruled India with justice, and was after his death adored as a god.”⁵⁶ Dr. Lees alleges that “far as tradition and history carry us into the past of India, we find that the founders of sects and of empire, the priests, the sages, and the physicians united in teaching the doctrine of abstinence from intoxicating wine;” and he appeals to a passage from Megasthenes, preserved by Strabo as bearing out his statement: - “The Brachmanas, Germanas, and Hylobius, who abstained from wine.”⁵⁷ Now, in the first place, Strabo says, “Generally speaking, the men who hitherto have written on the affairs of India were *a set of liars*. Deimachus holds the first place in the list, Megasthenes comes next”⁵⁸ In the second place, “It is said that the Indians are divided into seven castes. The first in rank, but the smallest in number, are the philosophers.”⁵⁹ “Megasthenes divides the philosophers again into two kinds, the Brachmanes and the Garmanes.”⁶⁰ “Of the Garmanes, the most honorable, he says, are the Hylobii.” “Second in honor to the Hylobii are the physicians.”⁶¹ In the third place, of all these, the only persons to whom abstinence is ascribed by Megasthenes are the Hylobii, “who live in the forests, and subsist on leaves and wild fruits; and abstain from commerce with women and from wine.” In the fourth place, the philosophers,

⁵⁶ Wines, p. 367

⁵⁷ Works, ii. 4

⁵⁸ ii. 1, 9

⁵⁹ Xv. 1, 39

⁶⁰ Ibid, section 59

⁶¹ Ibid., section 60

The Wines of the Bible

thus divided into Brachmanes, Garmanes, Hylobii, and Physicians, are further divided into two sections, the one inhabiting the mountains, and the other the plains. And “he says that those who inhabit the mountains are worshippers of Bacchus,” and “the philosophers, who live in the plains, worship Hercules.”⁶² As these philosophic “worshippers of Bacchus” can hardly be regarded as “teaching the doctrine of abstinence from intoxicating wine,” and as the entire body of philosophers was “the smallest in number” of all the seven castes, the Indian teachers of abstinence at this period must have consisted of a very insignificant proportion of the millions who inhabited the country.

Dr. Lees further appeals to the one of the maxims of Buddha, “drink not liquors that intoxicate or disturb the reason.”⁶³ But either that law was limited to the Buddhists, or was generally disregarded; for the doctor, elsewhere, classes the Indians among those nations which have been “remarkably intemperate on wine.”⁶⁴ And even Strabo, who alleges on the authority of Megasthenes, whom he has branded as an untruthful witness, that “all the Indians are frugal in their mode of life, and especially in camp.....They never drink wine but at sacrifices. Their beverage is made from rice instead of barely;”⁶⁵ represents them as giving their elephants “dark wine” to drink, as a remedy for disease;⁶⁶ says, “the fifth caste consists of fighting men, who pass the time not employed in the field in idleness and drinking;”⁶⁷ and “a woman who puts to death a king when drunk is rewarded by

⁶² Ibid., section 58

⁶³ Works, ii. 5

⁶⁴ Ibid., iii. 64

⁶⁵ Xv. 1, 53

⁶⁶ Section 43

⁶⁷ Section 47

The Wines of the Bible

becoming the wife of his successor.”⁶⁸ Athenaeus also testifies that, instead of being distinguished for their abstinence, they were, on the contrary, remarkable for their love of wine. He intimates that Chares, in his history of Alexander, says: - “And he instituted, because of the great fondness of the Indians for wine, a contest as to who should drink the greatest quantity of unmixed wine.....And of those who entered for the prize, and drank the wine, thirty-five died at once by reason of the cold, and a little afterwards six more died in their tents. And he who drank the greatest quantity, and won the prize, drank four choes of unmixed wine, and received the talent; and he lived four days after it, and he was called the champion.”⁶⁹

H. Group of Tribes and Nations

Among the wine-drinking ancients there are a number of uncivilized tribes and nations, who may be grouped together here. Thus the Celtae are classed by Plato among the peoples who are given to “downright intoxication,” and whose drink was wine and beer.⁷⁰ The Scythians, whose excessive intemperance gave rise to the old proverb, “to drink like a Scythian.”⁷¹ The Thracians, of whom it is said that, when Alcibiades was at Thrace, he “out drank even the Thracians themselves.”⁷² The Byzantium makes all the merchants drink;” and Phylarcus says, “the Byzantians are so exceedingly fond of wine that they live in the wine shops.”⁷³ The

⁶⁸ Section 55

⁶⁹ X. 49

⁷⁰ Athen, iv. 36

⁷¹ Ibid., x

⁷² Ibid., xii. 47

⁷³ Ibid., x. 59

The Wines of the Bible

Medes, of whom it is said that Cyaxares the king, with his officers and servants, “drank to intoxication.”⁷⁴ The Armenians, who used “old wines of great fragrance,” and “very strong barley wine.”⁷⁵ The Lotophagi, who make and use a description of wine from the lotus.⁷⁶ The Thebans, whose cavalry behaved “like men who had drank a little too much in the heat of noon.”⁷⁷ The Corcyraeans and the Carducii, who possessed “well-constructed wine vaults.” The Mossyoeci, whose wine was disagreeable “by reason of its roughness when unmixed, but both fragrant and sweet when mixed with water.” The Babylonians, whose principle article of commerce is palm wine, which they carry in casks,” and who were attacked and destroyed by Cyrus while they were reveling in wine.

Truly does Athenaeus say, “And whole nations are mentioned as addicted to drunkenness.”⁷⁸ And with no less truth does Pliny say, “Indeed, in no part of the world is drunkenness ever at a loss.”⁷⁹

I. Egypt

We have, until now, purposely omitted all references to the drinking habits of the Jews and those nations whose histories are in some measure interwoven with theirs; and to these we must now direct attention. And, first, as to Egypt, Dr. Lees says, “Now, from the accession of Menes to the reign of Psammeticus a period embracing twenty-five dynasties of kings, teetotalism was taught

⁷⁴ Herod

⁷⁵ Xenophon

⁷⁶ Pliny

⁷⁷ Xenophon

⁷⁸ X. 59

⁷⁹ Xiv. 22

The Wines of the Bible

and practiced by them.”⁸⁰ This statement is made on the authority of Plutarch, who says, “that wine was wholly forbidden to the kings of Egypt, and that Psammeticus, who reigned about 600 years before Christ, was the first of the regal line who drank it.”⁸¹ And the statement of Plutarch is made “upon the authority of Eudoxus,” who had it “from the priests themselves.” Now, assuming the alleged fact to be true, it merely proves the abstinence of a certain number of successive kings; but what of the social habits and customs of the millions of people over whom they reigned? The alleged fact, however, is not only doubtful, but it is expressly contradicted by other equally competent witnesses. Herodotus, who also travelled in Egypt, and visited the priests, more than a hundred years before Eudoxus, is quoted by Dr. Lees as testifying “that the kings, like the priestly caste of which they were members, had a portion of wine allotted to them – a portion not large enough indeed, to satisfy them all.”⁸² The doctor further informs us that Hecateus, who lived about two hundred years before Eudoxus, and Diodorus Siculus, a later writer, “whose history is, in the main, a compilation from more ancient works, state that King Bocchoris, who reigned B.C. 766, enacted that the kings should take as much wine as would refresh but not inebriate.”⁸³ If the king referred to by these writers be the same Bocchoris spoken of by Lysimachus, Josephus says, “That is one thousand seven hundred years ago.”⁸⁴ So that according to these testimonies, inebriating wine was used by the kings of Egypt some hundreds of years before the reign of Psammeticus.

⁸⁰ Works, ii. 8

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Temp. Bib. Com. P. 19

⁸³ Ibid

⁸⁴ Apion, ii. 2

The Wines of the Bible

Sesostris, who lived some ages before the Trajan war, is said to have nearly burned to death by his brother, who “made him and his attendants drunk, and in the night set fire to his apartments. The guards, being intoxicated, were unable to assist their master; but Sesostris, imploring the interposition of the gods, fortunately escaped.”⁸⁵ Herodotus, referring to the times of Rhampsinitus, who succeeded Proteus, shows that even at the remote period inebriating wine was used in Egypt, for he relates a stratagem whereby the royal guards were made drunk with wine.⁸⁶ And Moses testifies that Pharaoh and Joseph, his prime minister, drank wine; and of the latter it is said his brethren “drank and were merry with him.” (Gen. xliii. 34).

But, even admitting that Psammeticus was the first king who used wine, there is abundant evidence that, at least after that period (B.C. 600), wine was freely and extensively used in Egypt both by kings and people. Herodotus frequently refers to their drinking usages, and explains that, besides the usual wine of the grape, palm wine, imported foreign wines and a species of home-made barley wine, were used by the people. He attributes the gift of the vine and the art of wine-making to the Egyptian deity Osiris, whom he identifies with the Grecian Bacchus. He notices the provision made for the “sacred ministers,” the priests, and says, “they have also wine.” He says, “A libation of wine is poured upon the altar” in their sacrifices, and “this is indiscriminately observed by all the Egyptians.” He tells us that palm wine is used in embalming the dead, and that “twice in every year” wine is imported into Egypt from Greece and Phoenicia. Describing their sacred festivals, and referring to that of Diana, which is “the first in dignity and importance,” he says “upon this occasion a greater

⁸⁵ Dio. Sic

⁸⁶ ii. 121

The Wines of the Bible

quantity of wine is consumed than in all the rest of the year. The narrative report that at this solemnity seven hundred thousand men and women assemble, not to mention children."

Athenaeus, a native of Naurcratis in Egypt, cites Dion as testifying that the Egyptians are "fond of wine and fond of drinking;" and he confirms the testimony, appealing for evidence to the means employed "as preventives against drunkenness."⁸⁷ He says the poor people drank beer, with which they were so pleased, "that they sang and danced, and did everything like men drunk with wine."⁸⁸ Referring to the observance of a sacred festival, he says they make a libation, and, after that, "each of them takes two cotylai of wine, except the priests of the Pythian Apollo, and of Bacchus, for each of them receives double portion of wine."⁸⁹ He quotes Apollonius, who wrote a treatise on the feasts of the Egyptians, that "formerly" they drank "only as much wine as was calculated to put them in cheerful spirits."⁹⁰

The drinking habits of the people are also indicated by Apuleius who describes Crassus as "celebrating his orgies" at Alexandria, frequenting "dens," and "seated in a wine-shop"⁹¹ And Juvenal adds his testimony: -

....."Rising from their cups, which day and night
These men had sat at till the sun's seventh light.
Egypt is still debauched; this truth know I,
Each poor town may with lewd Canopus vie.
Add that a victory comes easy, when
The foes are tippled, lisping, reeling men." Sat. XV.

⁸⁷ i. 61, 62

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ iv. 32

⁹⁰ iv. 18

⁹¹ Works, 306

The Wines of the Bible

To all these testimonies from ancient writers must be added the still more emphatic and enduring evidence afforded by the wall of pictures of Egypt – pictures which exhibit the customs and manners of the people at an early period of their history. Dr. Lees acknowledges that “the wall pictures prove that both men and women drank at feasts to intoxication, and some of the artists seem to have taken a sarcastic pleasure in holding up the intemperance of their contemporaries to ridicule.”⁹² Miss Marineau, in her *Eastern Life*, gives us a graphic description of the domestic and rural life of the ancient Egyptians in her account of the scenes represented on the tombs at Eliethyea. After depicting the processes of husbandry, she says—“Here is a winepress: no wonder! For we are coming presently to the picture of a banquet. We know that the kings and priests were much restricted in the use of wine; but the sculptures and paintings show that there was much wine-bibbing among gentlemen and ladies generally. Every landed proprietor seems to have had his winepress, as far as this evidence goes; and the sick and tipsy guests at banquets are really a scandal to those old times.”⁹³ Sir G. Wilkinson, in his *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, referring to the alleged teetotal age extending “from the accession of Menes to the reign of Psammeticus,” says it is improbable that the Egyptians committed excesses like the Romans; “but even before the close of the sixteenth dynasty, or about 1600 B.C., they had already begun to indulge in nearly the same habits as the later Pharaonic ages; and it appears from Diodorus and Plutarch that their original simplicity gave place to luxury as early as the reign of their first king Menes. Excesses they no doubt committed, especially in the use of wine, both on private and public occasions, which is not

⁹² Temp. Bib. Com., p. 17

⁹³ p. 167

The Wines of the Bible

concealed in the sculptures of Thebes; and in later times, after the conquest of Egypt by the Persians, and the accession of the Ptolemies, habits of intemperance increased to such an extent, and luxury became so general among all ranks of society, that writers who mention the Egyptians at that period describe them as a profligate and luxurious people, given to an immoderate love of the table, and addicted to every excess in drinking.”⁹⁴

All these varied testimonies show that at different periods, within the limits of Bible times, intemperance greatly abounded in Egypt.

J. Greece

Passing from Egypt to Greece and Italy, we are informed by Dr. Nott that “the ancient Greeks, like the ancient Romans, heathens though they were, furnished by their exemplary abstemiousness a severe rebuke to modern Christians. Their festivals were schools of temperance and sobriety.”⁹⁵ But on a subsequent page we read – “If this drunkard’s drink is to be hereafter drunk by Christians, let it be done by the authority of reason, and in the name of Ceres or Vesta, and not of religion and Jesus.....These exciting and maddening mixtures are in every sense profane, and befit the orgies of Bacchus rather than the festivities of Christians.”⁹⁶ Here the “exemplary abstemiousness” of the Greeks and Romans is associated with drinking the drunkards drink in “the name of Ceres or Vesta,” and their festive “schools of temperance and sobriety” are accompanied by “the orgies of Bacchus!”

⁹⁴ ii.381-2

⁹⁵ Lectures, p. 83

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 125

The Wines of the Bible

In contrast with this writer's idea of the ancient festivals, take the description of them given by Philo – "In every festival and assembly among men, the following are the most remarkable and celebrated points: - Security, relaxation, truce, drunkenness, deep drinking, reveling, luxury," &c.⁹⁷ Athenaeus says that the custom of drinking wine to excess on the occasion of some sacred festival was "the origin of the names *θοῖvai*, *θαλιαί*, and *μεθαι*, *θοῖvai* meaning that men thought it right *δία θεούς οἰvουςθαι*, to be drunk with wine on account of the gods."⁹⁸ And Sir Edward Barry says, "Aristotle observes that these festivals were called *εἶvαι*, *εὐvαι*, *ἀλλαι* [**Editor's note: first letter in each of the preceding three Greek terms is unrecognizable**] because they thought they were obliged, in honor of the gods, to get drunk on these occasions. *Ethic. Ad Nichomac., lib. viii.*"⁹⁹ Plutarch, in his *Banquet of the Seven Wise Men*, represents them as drinking wine, and he gives the following from Solon:-

"I love that ruby god whose blessings flow in tides."

He also makes Anacharsis say – "When there is a reward promised to the hardest drinker, why should I not demand my reward, having drunk down all my fellows; or inform me of any other end men drive at in drinking much wine but to be drunk?" Plato in his *Banquet* represents his guests as drinking wine to such an extent that Athenaeus says, "Men drink in such quantities that they cannot even stand on their feet."¹⁰⁰ Xenophon also, in his *Banquet*, represents the wise Socrates as saying, "I, too, my friends shall be very well pleased to drink; for really wine, by

⁹⁷ Cain, 27

⁹⁸ ii. 11

⁹⁹ Wines, p. 247

¹⁰⁰ v. 8

The Wines of the Bible

moistening the spirits, lulls care to rest, as mandragora puts men to sleep, and wakes up pleasant thoughts, as oil excites a flame.....So if we, likewise pour into ourselves drink in too great quantities, our bodies and minds will soon become powerless, and we scarcely shall be able to breathe, much less to articulate anything; but if our servants refresh us from time to time with small cups, as with gentile dew (that I also may speak in the phraseology of Gorgias), then, not being forced to grow intoxicated with wine, but being aptly persuaded by it, we shall arrive at more agreeable mirth.”¹⁰¹ At a late stage of the banquet, the old philosopher makes the apology, “If I express myself somewhat more freely than ordinary, do not be surprised, for the wine excites me.”¹⁰² Athenaeus quotes the utterance of Socrates on the above occasion,¹⁰³ and elsewhere says, “He drinks out of the bowl cleverly, like a man who is used to it.”¹⁰⁴ It is evident from these references that the wisest men of ancient Greece were accustomed to drink wine, and that of an intoxicating nature.

It is probable that the festive schools referred to by Dr. Nott are those of ancient Sparta, of which Plutarch says – “At all these public meetings they used a great deal of moderation, they being designed only for schools of temperance and modesty, not for luxury and indecency.”¹⁰⁵ But although the Spartans exhibited an “exemplary abstemiousness.” They did not abstain from wine. Their festive assemblies were, indeed, schools of sobriety, as compared with others, but in these schools of abstinence was neither taught nor exemplified. For Plutarch informs us that all

¹⁰¹ ii. 14-16

¹⁰² viii. 24

¹⁰³ B. xi. 3

¹⁰⁴ B. v. 18

¹⁰⁵ Laws and Customs of Lacedemonians

The Wines of the Bible

the Lacedaemonians were required to eat at public tables, and “each of them was obliged to bring in monthly a bushel of meal, eight gallons of wine, five pounds of cheese,” &c. And “after they had drunk moderately they went home without lights.”¹⁰⁶ Critias says, - “This is an old fashion, well established, and sanctioned by the laws of noble Sparta, that all should drink from one well-filled cup, and that no healths should then be drunk to any one....But those wise youths whom Lacedaemon breeds drink only what may stimulate their souls to deeds of daring in the adventurous war, and rouse the tongue to wit and moderate mirth.”¹⁰⁷ In the Peloponnesian War provisions were sent to the Spartans in the island of Sphacteria, consisting, among other things, of “two half pints of wine” for each person, “with half this quantity for the servants.”¹⁰⁸ Xenophon also informs us that the kings of Sparta received “the first of every libation,” and if they do not dine at the public tables, “a cotyla of wine is sent to their respective houses; but if they are present they receive a double portion.” Speaking of Clembrotus, the Spartan general, and his officers, who held a council of war after dinner, he says, “As they had drunk a little at noon, it was said the wine in some degree inspired them.” In his *Government of Lacedaemon*, he tells us that Lycurgus, “having put a stop to all unnecessary drinking, which weakens alike the body and the mind, he gave permission that every one should drink when he was thirsty, thinking that the drink would thus be most innoxious, and most pleasant. When they take their meals together in this manner, how can any one ruin either himself or his family by gluttony or drunkenness?...The practice of taking meals away from home is also attended with these advantages, that the people are obliged to walk in taking their departure

¹⁰⁶ Lycurgus

¹⁰⁷ Athen, x

¹⁰⁸ ii. 17

The Wines of the Bible

homewards, and to be careful that they may not stagger from the effects of wine, knowing that they will not remain where they dined.”¹⁰⁹ Plato’s Spartan says, “Any one who meets a drunken and disorderly person will immediately have him punished, and will not let him off on any pretence, not even at the time of a Dionysiac festival.”¹¹⁰ Athenaeus, also has several references to Spartan drinking usages. He says the feasts called Copides consisted, among other things, of “warmed wine.” At the Phiditia “a cup is placed before each person to drink whenever he pleases,” and every one contributes “about eleven or twelve choes of wine.” Referring to the banquets given by Clemenēs, this Spartan general, “a man of eminent wisdom,” he says, “And here was placed on a tripod a brazen wine-cooler, and a cask, and a small silver cup.....And wine was not brought round to drink unless any one asked for it, but one cyathus was given to each guest *before supper*; and had thus given the signal, the rest also asked for some wine.....And *while they were eating* they all kept silence; but a slave stood by, holding in his hand a vessel of mixed wine, and poured out for every one who asked for it. And in the same manner, *after supper*, there was given to each guest not more than two cyathi of wine, and this too, was brought to each person as he made a sign for it.” Later they had “come to such a pitch of luxury” as to serve up “many cups of wine,” and to use in their banquets “foreign wines.”¹¹¹ So that the Spartan “schools of temperance and sobriety” were schools of moderate drinking and not of abstinence from wine.

The Cretan customs were somewhat similar to those of Lacedaemonians. In every town of Crete two houses are set apart for the entertainment of strangers. “A bowl of wine is placed on

¹⁰⁹ i. 17

¹¹⁰ Jowett, iv. 158

¹¹¹ B. iv.

The Wines of the Bible

each table, mingled with water, and all drink of this in common at the common table; and when they have finished supper, then another bowl is put on the table. But for the boys one common bowl is likewise mixed; but the elders have liberty to drink more if they feel inclined.”¹¹²

Reference is made to Homer in evidence of the abstinence of the ancient Greeks, and the lines are quoted in which Hector says-

“Let chiefs abstain, and spare the sacred juice
To sprinkle to the gods, its fitter use.”

But Athenaeus explains the lines thus – “Hecuba, thinking that then he will remain in the city all the rest of the day, invites him to drink and to pour libations, encouraging him to abandon himself to pleasure. But he, as he is going out to action, puts off the drinking. And she, indeed, praises wine without ceasing; but he, when he comes in out of breath, will not have any. And she urges him to pour a libation, and then to drink; but he, as he is all covered with blood, thinks it impiety.”¹¹³ According to this explanation, Hector on one occasion refused the stimulating draught proffered by his mother, because as he was “going out to action” he feared its effects on his prowess; and on another occasion he declined the goblet, because, being “all covered with blood,” he thought it would be impiety to offer a libation with bloody hands. Hesiod forbids to “make libations of dark wine to Jove with hands unwashed.”¹¹⁴ A similar reference is found in the Aeneid, where Aeneas says, - “Do you, father, take in they hand the sacred symbols, and the gods of our country. For me, just come from war, from so fierce and recent bloodshed, to touch

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ i. 17

¹¹⁴ Works and Days, 723

The Wines of the Bible

them would be profanation, till I have purified myself in the living stream.”¹¹⁵ Accordingly, Earl Derby brings out the spirit and meaning of Homer-

“No, not for me, mine honoured mother, pour
The luscious wine, lest thou unnerve my limbs
And make me all my wonted prowess lose.
The ruddy wine I dare not pour to Jove
With hands unwashed.”

That Homer, had no intention of intimating that either the Grecian or Trojan chiefs abjured the use of wine, appears from the fact that he represents Agamemnon, Achilles, Ulysses, Nestor, Menelaus, and, in fact all the most eminent chiefs, as wine drinkers; and some of them, notably the king and leader of the Grecians hosts, Agamemnon, and wise old Nestor, as hard drinkers too. Athenaeus says, “And of all heroes, the greatest drinker is Nestor, who lived three times as long as other men; for he evidently used to stick to his wine more closely than other people, and even than Agamemnon himself, whom Achilles upbraids as a man given to much drinking.”¹¹⁶ Plutarch also says that Achilles calls the king a drunkard, “alleging his great drinking as the chiefest of faults.”¹¹⁷ And Athenaeus says, “Homer represents the Greeks also as drinking hard when sailing away from Troy, and on that account quarrelling with one another, and in consequence perishing.”¹¹⁸ So that instead of Pope’s notion, “Let chiefs abstain,” Homer’s idea is more correctly represented in the lines,-

¹¹⁵ ii. 716

¹¹⁶ Sympose., v. 4

¹¹⁷ i. 18

¹¹⁸ On the Athenians.

The Wines of the Bible

*“The ruddy wine for chiefs alone reserved,
Though other drink their share.”*

Plutarch informs us that the Athenians celebrate a naval victory on the 16th August and that on this occasion *the conduits of the city run with wine*.¹¹⁹ He also refers to Diogenes, who first put on his cloak “at a time when the Athenians celebrated a festival with extraordinary banquets, night-drinking, sports, and pageantry, usual at great solemnities.” The philosopher, as he lay in the corner of the street, rebuked himself, saying, Art thou out of humour because “thou canst not have the privilege at this merry time *to be drunk as well as others*.”¹²⁰

As an indication of the widely extended character of the drinking habits of the Greeks, we group together the following brief extracts from Athenaeus. The Macedonians “had no notion of moderation in drinking, but started off at once with enormous draughts before eating, so as to be drunk before the first course was off the table, and to be unable to enjoy the rest of the banquet.”¹²¹ The Thebans were “gluttons in eating and drinking.”¹²² A great feast was given at Daphne by Aniochus Epiphanes, which lasted thirty days, at which every one that came was entertained, and much wine was drank.”¹²³ The intemperance of Philip and Alexander is so well known that quotations are unnecessary. “The Thessalians were an intemperate race.”¹²⁴ Dioysius “encouraged and received those who had squandered their estates in drunkenness;” and of Philip

¹¹⁹ Progress in Virtue

¹²⁰ lii. 91

¹²¹ iv. 30

¹²² v. 22-24

¹²³ vi. 76

¹²⁴ vi. 77

The Wines of the Bible

it is said, “those who lived in gambling and *drunkenness he praised and honoured.*” The Boeotians “turned to feasting and drunkenness.”¹²⁵ The Greeks “having taken indolence and laziness for their allies, they have indulged in drinking in an immoderate and disorderly manner.”¹²⁶ “The nation of the Tapyri is so fond of wine that they never use any other unguent than that” and the Phigaleans “are addicted to drinking.”¹²⁷ “The Argives, too, are ridiculed by the comic poets as addicted to drunkenness.” The Tyrrhenian race “fights all its battles when drunk.” The Milesians “are very insolent when they are drunk.” Of the Eleans it is said, “Elis is always drunk, and always lying; as is each single house, so is the city.” The Chalcidians in Thrace are described as “rushing readily with great eagerness to drinking and laziness, and every sort of intemperance.” The Methymnaeans “live on the most sumptuous food, lying down and drinking.” The Illyrians “take their wives to their entertainments, and it is reckoned a decorous custom for the women to pledge the guests who are present. And they lead home their husbands from their drinking parties.” The Arieans “get drunk every day, and make large entertainments, and are very intemperate in their eating and drinking.”¹²⁸ Of the Colophonians it is said, “to such a degree did they carry their dissoluteness and unseemingly drunkenness, that some of them never saw the sun either rise or set.”¹²⁹ The Byzantians “were very intemperate, and in the constant habit of feasting and drinking at the wine-sellers.”¹³⁰ The Chalcedonians “fell into ruinous luxury, and from having been most temperate and moderate in their

¹²⁵ x. 11

¹²⁶ x. 31

¹²⁷ x. 59

¹²⁸ x. 59,60

¹²⁹ xii. 31

¹³⁰ xii. 32

The Wines of the Bible

daily life, they became a nation of hard drinkers, and very extravagant.”¹³¹ The Thessalians “spend all the day in dice and drinking, and similar pastimes.”¹³² The Arycandians of Lycia “got involved in debt on account of the intemperance and extravagance of their way of living.”¹³³ The Athenians “spent more money on their public banquets and entertainments than on the provision necessary for the well-doing of the State.”¹³⁴ Of the Aeolians it is said, “We see that a fondness for banquets and for amorous indulgences is common to the whole nation, and they indulge in every sort of relaxation.”¹³⁵

Dr. Lees adds his testimony to the same effect when he says that Greece has been “in other days remarkably intemperate on wine.”¹³⁶ Again, “the apostle, in the above passage, draws a dark picture of the times, but the testimony of contemporary writers corroborates its truth. The profligacy of the Gentile world was boundless, and associated in all its exercise with the intoxicating liquors then in use.”¹³⁷ And again, “Concerning the corruption of morals engendered by this conduct, and the degree in which it abounded both Pliny and Philo, contemporaries of St. Paul have left pictures of the gross sensuality of that age.”¹³⁸

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² xii. 33

¹³³ xii. 35

¹³⁴ xii. 43

¹³⁵ xiv. 19

¹³⁶ Works, iii. 64

¹³⁷ Temp. Bibl. Com., p. 385

¹³⁸ Ibid., p. 349

The Wines of the Bible

K. Italy

Italy is classed by Dr. Lees among the nations which “have been, in other days, remarkably intemperate on wine.”¹³⁹ But Dr. Nott, as we have seen alleges that the ancient Romans were distinguished for their “exemplary abstemiousness;” and Dr. Lees, elsewhere, quotes Bayle to the effect that in punishing a married woman with death who had been “detected as a wine drinker,” Romulus, “the first king of Rome, but followed therein the old laws of Italy.”¹⁴⁰ We are very much in the dark as to the “old laws of Italy before the reign of “the first king of Rome.” And could have wished that some evidence of these penal laws had been given. But however it may have been with those unfortunate women, and however abstemious the ancient Latins may have been, it is certain that, neither before nor after the reign of Romulus were the people of Italy abstainers from wine. When Aeneas arrived at Latium, about five hundred years before the birth of the first king of Rome, he gave a banquet to his followers, and “placed the wine profusely on the boards.”¹⁴¹ He was entertained at a banquet by Evander, “the founder of the Roman power,” at which the chosen youths “dispense the joys of Bacchus.”¹⁴² The Rutulians, the ancient people of Latium, attack the Trojan camp, but at night, stretching themselves on the grass “they indulge in wine, and drain the brazen bowls.”¹⁴³ During the siege the Rutulians are repeatedly found “buried in sleep and

¹³⁹ Works, iii. 64

¹⁴⁰ Works ii. 12

¹⁴¹ Aeneid, vii. 134

¹⁴² viii. 192

¹⁴³ ix. 166

The Wines of the Bible

wine.”¹⁴⁴ “Fiery Tarchon,” attempting to rouse the “dastardly faint-hearted Tuscans” to renew the fight, exclaims, - “But not so slothful are ye.....when the bent pipe of Bacchus hath summoned of choirs to wait for the banquets and bowls at the sumptuous board.”¹⁴⁵

Plutarch, in his Roman Questinas, tells us that “Mezentius, the Etruria general, sent to make a league with Aeneas upon the condition that he might have a yearly tribute of wine. Aeneas refusing, Mezentius engaged to the Etrurians, that he would take the wine by force of arms, and give it to them. Aeneas, hearing of his promise, devoted his wine to the gods; and after the victory, he gathered in the vintage, and poured it forth before the temple of Venus.” We find also that Romulus himself, who is credited with the prohibitory law against female wine-drinkers, was not an abstainer from wine; for, on the occasion of his triumph, “as soon as he entered Rome, they presented him with wine, and before the houses spread tables for those of the soldiers who wanted to refresh themselves.”¹⁴⁶ So that in the time of these “old laws of Italy” the people indulged themselves with wine.

L. General

Whenever we extend our inquiry into the drinking habits of the ancients, we find, more or less, direct evidence of the almost universal use of wine. Duris says, “that in ancient times the nobles had a positive fondness for getting drunk.”¹⁴⁷ Philochorus says, “that the ancients, when making libations, celebrate Bacchus with

¹⁴⁴ ix 192, 235, 318

¹⁴⁵ B. xi. 737

¹⁴⁶ Hooks History, i. 2, 12

¹⁴⁷ Athen, xii. 66

The Wines of the Bible

wine and drunkenness.”¹⁴⁸ And accordingly, the Dionysiac festivals in Greece, and the Bacchaalian orgies in Italy, were occasions of such gross intemperance that it is painful even to read of these old times. Athenaeus and Pliny devote entire chapters to the exposure of prevalent drunkenness; the former alleging that exposure of prevalent drunkenness; the former alleging that “whole nations” were addicted to it, and the latter declaration that “in no part of the world is drunkenness ever at a loss.” Plato, who taught “that no man should be allowed to be drunk but at the solemnities of the god that gave them wine,” says, - “Among our Tarentine colonists I have seen the whole city drunk at a Dionysiac festival.”¹⁴⁹ Speaking about “downright intoxication,” he intimates that this was “the custom of the Scythians, and Persians, and Carthaginians, and Celts, and Iberians.” Whitby says, “And when Megillus, the Lacedaemonian, had told the Athenians that he saw their whole cities drunk at the solemnities of Bacchus, and that the inhabitants of Tarentum did the same, - ‘Marvel not at that,’ saith the Athenians, ‘for the law with us requires it.’” (Com. Eph. v. 18) The Author of Anacharsis intimates, on the authority of Pausanians, that at the festival of Bacchus in Pellene, a city of Achaia, “wine is copiously distributed to the multitude.” Athenaeus says, “It was customary in Sicily to make a sacrifice from house to house in honour of the Nymphs, and for men to spend the night around their statues when quite drunk.”¹⁵⁰ The Tyrrhenian women “pledge whoever they please in their cups,” and are “wonderful women to drink.”¹⁵¹ Of Italy and

¹⁴⁸ Athen., xiv., 24

¹⁴⁹ Jowett, iv. 158

¹⁵⁰ B. vi. 56

¹⁵¹ xii. 14

The Wines of the Bible

Sicily, Plato is quoted as saying, “that as for being temperate and virtuous, none of them ever think of it.”¹⁵²

The drinking habits of the ancients is further evidenced by the following facts: - Hortensius left to his....ten thousand casks of Chian wine.”¹⁵³ Cato says that “the general allowance of wine to each servant in the family for a year was ten amphorae, which is somewhat more than a pint and half a day; but that during the time of the *Saturnalia*, he allowed to each of his servants a congius of wine every day, which is somewhat more than seven of our pints.”¹⁵⁴ Lucullus, “when he returned from Asia, distributed as a largess among the people more than a hundred thousand congiaria of wine,” – about seven hundred thousand pints.”¹⁵⁵ Sir Edward Barry says, “In these times no limits were fixed to their profusion and intemperance. Suetonius says, that those usually given by Caligula were so extra-ordinary, that he almost exhausted the treasures of the empire. Dio mentions that Vitellius spent in one year twenty-two thousand five hundred myrrhiads of drams or seven million two hundred and sixty-five thousand, six hundred and twenty-five pounds. Tacitus says he spent the same sum within a few months.”¹⁵⁶ Ptolemy Philadelphus made a great procession in honour of the gods, which exceeded everything of the kind that had ever been seen before. In the Dionysiac procession there were a number of wagons drawn by 300 and 600 men each, filled with casks of wine, which was allowed to escape and flow over on the road. The multitude who were assembled to witness the spectacle were liberally treated to draughts of

¹⁵² xii

¹⁵³ Pliny, xiv. 14

¹⁵⁴ Barry, On Wines, p. 150

¹⁵⁵ Pliny, xiv. 14

¹⁵⁶ Wines, p. 255

The Wines of the Bible

wine.¹⁵⁷ Conon feasted all the Athenians. Alcibiades feasted the whole assembly at the Olympic games. Leophron did the same. And Ion of Chios gave a pot of Chian wine to every Athenian citizen.¹⁵⁸ A rich citizen of Galatia gave notice that he would give all the Galatians a banquet every year. He divided the country into convenient stages, erected tents, in which he placed huge kettles of meat and casks of wine. The whole population, and even passing travelers, were invited by persons appointed for the purpose, and pressed to partake of the free entertainment.¹⁵⁹ Lyernius “enclosed a fenced space of twelve furlongs in length every way, square, in which he erected wine presses, and filled them with expensive liquors, and he prepared so vast a quantity of eatables that for very many days any one who chose was at liberty to go and enjoy what was there prepared.”¹⁶⁰ Heracleon the Beroean, gave entertainments to the soldiers, making them sit down on the ground in the open air by thousands; and the entertainment consisted of large loaves and meat; and their “drink was any sort of wine that could be got, mingled with cold water.”¹⁶¹ “When a general who is celebrating a triumph furnishes the entertainment, the whole preparation of the banquet is of a Herculean character; for honey wine is served out to the guests as wine, and the food consists of huge loaves,” &c.¹⁶² Among the Tarentines “the chief body of private individuals is always occupied in banquets and drinking parties.”¹⁶³ “When Sopater entertained his companions at a banquet, the preparation was

¹⁵⁷ Athen., v. 25-35

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., i. 5

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., iv. 34

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., iv. 37

¹⁶¹ Ibid., iv. 38

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ Ibid., iv. 61

The Wines of the Bible

very splendid, and foot tubs full of wine and spices were set before all who came in.”¹⁶⁴ In Sicily the “men do nought but drink like troops of frogs.”¹⁶⁵

Drinking was also fostered and encouraged by the sacred oracles and religious rites of the ancients. Athenaeus quotes an ancient oracle to the effect –

“Better your condition

By taking Bacchus for your sole physician.” – (i. 41.)

The gods, with some exceptions, were worshipped with libations of wine, and the festivals held in their honor were observed with mirth and revelry. These festive gatherings were very numerous. Dr. Robinson, in his *Archaeologia Graeca*, gives “not a complete collection of the Grecian festivals,” but only “the principal of them,” and yet his list numbers between two and three hundred festivals. Besides these there were numerous private, domestic, and social banquets of frequent occurrence, at which wine was freely used. Athenaeus further informs us that “wine appears to have a very attractive influence in promoting friendship, as it warms and also melts the soul. On which account the ancients did not ask who a man was before drinking, but afterwards; as honouring the laws of hospitality itself, and not this or that particular individual. But the lawgivers, taking care beforehand of the banquets of the present day, have appointed feasts for the tribe and feasts for the borough; and also general banquets and entertainments to the ward, and others called *orgeonica*.....And the Prytanes were accustomed every day to meet in well-regulated banquets, which tended to the advantage of the

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., iv. 67

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., iii. 59

The Wines of the Bible

State.”¹⁶⁶ He also tells us that “all the natives and inhabitants of Syria are accustomed to make frequent feasts after their necessary labours;” and at their public entertainments they live “as if in their own houses, and gratify their stomachs the greater part of the day with wine and meat, and also carry away a quantity of the same to their own homes.”¹⁶⁷

As these festivals, banquets, entertainments, and drinking parties were so numerous as to be of almost daily occurrence, and as wine was more or less freely used at all these festive gatherings, the daily consumption of wine must have been very large. But the following paragraphs from Athenaeus will make this more certain: - Philochorus says, “The Athenians, in the festivals of Bacchus, originally used to go to the spectacle after they had dined and *drunk their wine*; and they used to witness the games with garlands on their heads. But during the whole time that the games were going on, *wine was continually being offered* to them.....and when the choruses entered, *they were offered wine*, and also when the exhibition was over, as they were departing, *wine was offered to them again*. And Pherecrates bears witness to all these things, and to the fact that down to his own time the spectators were never left without refreshment.”¹⁶⁸ And the same Philochorus says, “When they pour libations, they celebrate Bacchus with wine and drunkenness, but Apollo with tranquility and good order.”¹⁶⁹ Ephippus says, it was the custom at the Amphidromian festival “to drink many cups of undiluted wine.”¹⁷⁰

It is manifest from the evidence we have adduced above that wine drinking was almost universal throughout the States of

¹⁶⁶ Athen., v. 2

¹⁶⁷ Ibid. v. 46

¹⁶⁸ xi. 13

¹⁶⁹ xiv. 24

¹⁷⁰ ii. 70

The Wines of the Bible

Greece and Italy; that intemperance was a common, widespread, and prevalent evil; that whole cities, the entire body of people, were found drunk on particular occasions; that drunkenness at those seasons was deemed lawful, approved by philosophers, imposed by legislation, observed as a religious duty, and offered as homage to the gods. How can any one, in the face of these facts, believe in the “exemplary abstemiousness” of the Greeks and Romans? or in the “sobriety of the ancients?” or in their festivals being “schools of temperance and sobriety?” Is there a nation or people on earth at this time, among whom the “drink curse” is so prevalent, or is regarded and treated as it was in Greece or Italy?

“In every street were found
Voluptuous Sybarites with roses crowned;
The rank Miletan and the Tarentine,
Lewd, petulant, and reeling ripe with wine.”

M. Judea

Passing out of the heathen world into the Holy Land, Dr. Lees says of the Jews, after the exodus from Egypt, that “whatever else might be their faults and failings, they were on their entrance into the promised land, at least, a sober people.”¹⁷¹ This may be true of the limited period referred to; for when they were “making bricks without straw” in Egypt, and while wandering in the wilderness for forty years, they had little or no opportunity for indulgence. Accordingly Moses says, “Ye have not eaten bread, neither have ye drunk wine or strong drunk” (Deut. Xxix. 6). But after their exile and wanderings were over, and they had settled

¹⁷¹ Works,, ii. 34

The Wines of the Bible

down in tribes and townships, in “a land of wheat, and barley, and vines” (Deut. Viii. 8), their enforced sobriety vanished; and Dr. Lees will inform us of the result: - “Not till long after the settlement of the Hebrews in Palestine do we find notices of the use of wine as a common beverage, or as a prized and prominent article of diet. Still, however, drunkenness does increase; the lust of liquor ‘grows by what it feeds upon.’ In the four centuries intervening between the conquest of Canaan and the reign of David, we have abundant proof of the fact that intemperance was fatally increasing.” Then follows a detailed account of the drunkenness of all classes – prophets, princes, and people – which at length reached such an extent that, with idolatry, it became the chief cause of the second captivity. The writer then says – “Now the prophets show how intemperance retarded the Messiah’s advent, by hindering this preparation; and how drunkenness, with its kindred vices, stupidity of intellect, and sensualness of heart, compelled to the great captivity. Then ‘men rose up early in the morning to follow strong drink,’ making it, as many now do, the business of life, and ‘continued until night till wine inflamed them.’ No rank or order of men were free from the vice; from priest and people, and from peasant to prince, ‘all tables were filled with vomit and filthiness, and there was no place clean.’”

The picture exhibited to us here of Israel’s social condition is very dark and very sad, but it is a faithful representation of the people’s character, founded on the united testimony of many of the sacred writers. At this period the Jews were not a sober people. Drunkenness was a prevailing vice of the nation and of the age. But Dr. Lees alleges that this national evil was eradicated; and that the painful experience acquired in the second captivity awoke repentance, and, with other causes, effected a thorough and permanent temperance reformation. He says, “But let us leap the gulf of centuries; let us pass from the lamentation by the river

The Wines of the Bible

of Babylon to the celestial song on the plains of Bethlehem, and what is Judea now? Enough of selfishness, and pride, and oppression; still more, as now, of hypocrisy, are there; but we find little drunkenness. The Son hath come, and come at least to a *sober land*, prepared by the providence of the Father."

According to this statement, the reformation effected by the causes alleged was a mere exchange of vices; the substitution of selfishness, pride, oppression, and hypocrisy, for drunkenness; the casting out of one devil for the entrance of seven other evil spirits. But before we "leap the gulf of centuries," which is rather a wide leap in this inquiry, it might be well to know something of the centuries themselves. Before the captivity there was "no rank or order of men" in Judea "free from the vice of drunkenness. During the captivity the people had tears for their drink, and their regimen was, as before, an enforced sobriety. But after the seventy years had expired, and the exiles came up from Babylon, as they had aforetime returned from Egypt, and became again a settled nation, dwelling every man under his own vine and fig tree, what were their social habits? Had the lesson which they had learned in captivity given them an abhorrence of their old national sin? Did they thenceforth utterly abjure the use of the cup which had led them astray, and imposed on them the painful discipline of the captivity? On the contrary, they have scarcely got settled in their own land and when we read of their vines and vineyards, wines and winepresses, titles and libations of wine. And so intent are they in looking after their vinous interests, that complaint is made of their violating the holy Sabbath in treading their winepresses, and bringing home their wines, even on the sacred day (Neh. xiii. 15). And their great and good leader, himself, acknowledges that there was prepared for his own table, "once in ten days, store of all sorts of wine" (Neh. v. 8).

The Wines of the Bible

Now, if the Jews did not abandon the wine cup on their return from captivity, as is shown above, neither did they do so to any subsequent period of their history, as far as we can discover. There had been abstaining Rechabites and Nazarites before that time, and probably there were such after it also. A new ascetic sect, the Essenes, arose somewhere about the time of the second exodus. But these were fragmentary sections of the people, inconsiderable in number, and of little social influence; for the very fact of their separation and isolation from the nation is itself evidence that the Jews, as a people, were not abstainers from wine as a common beverage. If, then, the Jews were wine drinkers, as their history shows, and yet a “sober people,” as alleged by Dr. Lees, must we thence conclude that they are standing witnesses that a nation may be sober without being teetotal? And that wine may be used in moderation without the usual attendant excesses? And that it does not always follow, as asserted, that “the lust of liquor ‘grows by what it feeds upon?’”

However this may be, what were the agencies by which the alleged temperance reformation of Israel was effected? Dr. Lees says, “Teetotalism and teetotalers were everywhere honourably associated with the grand work.” Be it so. If these agencies were “everywhere” associated with the work, they must have been associated with it *somewhere*? But where? In Babylon, or out of it! In their captivity the people were neglected and despised pariahs, for whom the heathen exhibited neither sympathy nor kindly consideration. Out of captivity they were fully occupied in rebuilding the old waste places, and were almost incessantly engaged in warfare, until they were at length finally broken and subdued under the iron heel of Rome. Who, then, were the teetotalers which, during either of these periods, effected their reformation? It could hardly have been a teetotal agency which left the reformed people wine-drinkers. But “affliction and foreign

The Wines of the Bible

teaching” are named by Dr. Lees as associated in the work. Be it so. The Babylonian affliction possibly brought the people to repentance, and may have contributed to make them a sober people; but, as we have seen, it left them wine-drinkers, and did not take the specific direction of teetotalism. And who were those foreign teachers from whose heathen lips or lives the proud and holy seed of Jacob were likely to receive or accept this moral instruction? The writer says, - “The now felt excellence and superiority of the Nazaritish self-denial led to reflection and reform.” This, of course, was not the foreign teaching referred to, but an old method of native instruction, which the nation had possessed almost from its foundation. It was none of the less valuable on that account. But if this old law led to that new “reflection and reform,” is it not curious that the reform which it effected did not take its own shape of self-denial? It made the Jews a sober people, but not a nation of Nazarites. If they had really felt the excellence of the law; and if that feeling had really led them to “reflection and reform,” it is certain that they would have practiced the self-denial which the law had taught them. But they did not, for they were wine drinkers. So that whatever agency may have contributed to the alleged reformation, it could not have been the Nazarite law which, as a nation, they never observed.

Who, then, were the teachers of the reformed Jews? Dr. Lees says, the “illustrious example of Daniel and his brethren – and, in later period of the captivity, by the Persian teachers of temperance in the train of Cyrus. It was in the palaces of Babylon that the great Conqueror and the great Prophet, both teetotalers, probably conversed together, - on the rebuilding of Jerusalem.” If Daniel and his brethren, and the Persian teachers, and the great Conqueror, were all Israel’s teachers; and if these illustrious persons combined teaching effected Israel’s reformation from

The Wines of the Bible

drunkenness, it is not surprising that the reformation which they effected, instead of taking some teetotal shape as their own, should merely have assumed the form of sober wine drinking? But what evidence is there of the alleged teetotalism of the teachers themselves? Daniel and his brethren refused to eat the king's meat, or to drink his wine, not from any teetotal scruples or aversion either to the meat or the drink itself, but solely because, as Jews, they would not profane themselves by partaking of anything which had been defiled by heathen observances. Accordingly, it is expressly said, "But Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the portion of the king's meat, nor with the wine which he drank: therefore he requested of the prince of the eunuchs that he might not defile himself" (Dan. i. 8). To construe this rejection of the king's *meat* and *wine* into a teetotal objection to the use of wine, and to allege therefrom that these Hebrew children were teetotalers, is not to interpret, but to pervert the facts of history.

As to Cyrus, who is also said to have been a teetotaler, we are referred by Dr. Lees to Xenophon, who represents him as refusing to taste wine at the court of his grandfather, because it was poisonous liquor. We might object to this testimony on the ground that, according to Cicero and Plato, the *Cyropaedia* was intended rather to show what a prince ought to be, than to give a true history of what Cyrus really was. But apart from this, the fact that the young prince abjured wine when he was a little boy affords no evidence that he also did so when he had become a man. Xenophon himself testifies to the contrary; for he tells us that, when preparing for a long march, Cyrus said to his officers, we must "collect of wine only so much as is enough to accustom us to drink water, for a great part of the way is entirely unprovided with wine.....that we may not, therefore, by being suddenly left without wine, fall into diseases, we must act thus: -

The Wines of the Bible

let us at once begin to drink water with our food; for by so doing now, we shall make no very great change.....But if, after a meal, we drink a little wine upon it, our appetite, not having less than usual, rests satisfied. We must, however, proceed to diminish the quantity that we drink after our food until we become insensibly water drinkers; for an alteration, little by little, brings any nature to bear a total change.”¹⁷² Now, if all this elaborate arrangement was necessary, “little by little,” to prepare both Cyrus and his troops for a “total change” of habits, when their provisions of wine had failed them on the march, they could not at that time have been abstainers from wine.

Moreover, it is reported, on the authority of Polyaeus, that in an account of the daily provisions consumed in the royal establishment of Cyrus, found by Alexander, inscribed on a brazen pillar at Persepolis, 3750 gallons of wine are recorded. We find also that, before the battle of Thymbra, Cyrus drank a little wine, pouring libation to the gods before drinking, and “all the company followed his example.”¹⁷³ Herodotus also informs us that, in the attack on the Massagetae, Cyrus had recourse to a stratagem, by which he intoxicated the young prince and defeated his army; upon which the queen, addressing her conqueror, said to Cyrus, “When you yourself are overcome with wine, what follies do you not commit? By entertaining your bodies it renders your language more insulting. By this poison you have conquered my son, and not by your prudence or your valour.”¹⁷⁴ Thus, the, although “the great Conqueror and the great Prophet” may, as alleged, have “conversed together on the rebuilding of Jerusalem,” or other topics of which we have no information, it is morally certain that

¹⁷² Cyr. vi. 2

¹⁷³ Rollin, i. 170

¹⁷⁴ i. 212

The Wines of the Bible

they never did, and never could have done so, as being “both teetotalers.”

As to the “Persian teachers of temperance in the train of Cyrus,” we are utterly in the dark as to who these were. Possibly Zoroaster, or Pythagoras, or some of their followers may be intended. But if the learned Prideaux is to be credited, these reformers did not appear until long after the time of Cyrus. Dr. Lees referring to the Jews, says, “It is remarkable that they learned sobriety at last in the court of Cyrus, the Magian teetotaler – royal fashion and Persian philosophy doubtless co-operating to that end.”¹⁷⁵ The fact is, indeed, “remarkable,” if it be a fact, and not a mere fancy of the writer. Instead of frequenting “the court of Cyrus” to learn “royal fashion and Persian philosophy,” the exiled Jews hung their harps upon the willows, and bewailed their hard fate beside the streams of Babylon. Daniel, indeed, and it may be the three Hebrew children, may have been favoured by royalty; but being already, as alleged, abstainers from wine, they had no lessons to learn in this direction either from “royal fashion” or “Persian philosophy.” Moreover, the Persians did not get a “philosophy” till Zerdusht or Zoroaster came and transformed the crude nations of people, which he licked into the shape of his philosophy. But this reformer did not appear till Cyrus was in his grave, and Darius Hystaspes reigned in his stead.¹⁷⁶ Cyrus may, indeed, have been a Magian, as the Persian kings after Darius, at least, usually were; but why should he be termed a “Magian teetotaler”? Darius assumed the title, after the death of Zoroaster, of Archimagus; and according to Porphyry, cited by Prideaux, “he ordered, before his death, that among other his titles, it should be engraven on his monument,

¹⁷⁵ Text Book, p. 138

¹⁷⁶ Prideaux

The Wines of the Bible

that he was *Master of the Magians*.” But this Archimagus could not have been a teetotaler, or possessed of any special aversion to the use of wine; for, among other of his gifts to the Jews on their return to Palestine, he ordered that they should be supplied with a liberal allowance of wine for the service of the house of God at Jerusalem (Ezra vi. 9). And if Cyrus was a Magian teetotaler, his son Cambyses, who succeeded him on the throne, must have been Master of the Magians also; but if so, he must have been a Magian anti-teetotaler; for he was so greatly addicted to intemperance, that he behaved more like a madman than a rational being. On one occasion an old servant was asked by Cambyses what the Persians thought of him? Prexaspes replied, “Sir, in all other respects they speak of you with honour, but it is the general opinion that you are too much addicted to wine.” “What!” returned their king in anger, “I suppose they say that I drink to excess, and am deprived of reasons.” And the drunken despot, in revenge for the plain speaking which he had himself invited, and to demonstrate the steadiness of his aim, threw his spear, and killed the old man’s son on the spot.¹⁷⁷ We find also that Cyrus the younger, who was trained up in the precepts of the Magi, and who, as competitor for the crown, claimed the office of Archimagus, which was now held by the kings of Persia, not only had no teetotal aversion to wine, but when writing to the Lacedaemonians for assistance against his brother Artaxerxes, actually founded his claim for their support on the assurance that “he had a stronger heart than his brother, and could drink more wine unmixed than he, and bear it better.”¹⁷⁸ Is this the kind of Magian teetotalism, royal fashion, or Persian

¹⁷⁷ Herod., iii. 36

¹⁷⁸ Plutarch’s Apothegma

The Wines of the Bible

philosophy by which the Jews “learned sobriety at last in the court of Cyrus”?

But whoever may be intended by Dr. Lees in the reference to “Persian teachers of temperance in the train of Cyrus,” it is evident that if these persons did not, or could not, effect the teetotal conversion of their own people, it is highly improbable that they were more successful in converting the high-spirited Jews, whom they held and treated as slaves. Israel was eventually restored by Cyrus, and was protected and liberally supplied with wine by Darius and Artaxerxes. Immediately on their return to Palestine the people made and used wine. Their pious governor, instead of abjuring wine, was the king’s cupbearer, and possessed “store of all sorts of wine.” Looking, then, at the wine-drinking of all the restored Jews; the drinking habits of the Persians, as shown elsewhere; and the use of wine by Cyrus and his successors, it is obvious that whoever these “teachers of temperance” may have been, they cannot be credited with the honour of having effected the teetotal conversion of either Jews or Persians.

Passing on to the period of the Grecian conquests, Dr. Lees says, that with these “the doctrines and discipline of the famous Pythagoras also spread, and, as Josephus intimates, his principles were adopted by the purest sect of the Jews.” But even accepting this testimony of the Jewish historian, the fact that these Pythagorean principles were adopted only by a single “sect” of the Jews, and that an inconsiderable sect, numbering altogether about four thousand persons, including both the Therapeutae of Egypt and the Essenes of Palestine, is far from proving that Judea was thereby transformed into either a sober or a teetotal land. On the contrary, it implies that, to whatever extent that small sect may have been influenced by these “principles,” the alleged reformation was limited to that section of the Jews, and did not extend to the general population. As Geiseller says – “The

The Wines of the Bible

Essenes led an ascetic life in retirement, and exerted but little influence over the people.”¹⁷⁹ They were men who, according to Pliny, had been drawn together “by the tempests of fortune, and wearied with the miseries of life.”¹⁸⁰ In this mood they adopted an austere mode of life; withdrew from Jewish society, and lived by themselves in small communities, having little intercourse with the world; and were not likely to have had much influence in moulding or reforming the character of the people from whom they had separated themselves, and who neither adopted their principles nor followed their practices.

Those Jews who were living in Gentile cities may, indeed, have been more or less influenced by their intercourse with the heathen; but the Jews of Palestine, who had suffered for their religion, and fought for their independence, were too jealous of foreign interference, too proud of their own institutions, and too intolerant of others, to accept pagan philosophers for their teachers, especially in the direction of social and moral improvement. Geiseller justly says, “Oppression under a foreign yoke, and especially the persecution of religion by Antiochus Epiphanes, had produced among the Jews a strict separation from all that was un-Jewish, inflaming their contempt and hatred for all foreign customs, and at the same time, raising to a higher degree their national feelings and attachment to the religion of their fathers. But, alas! A spiritual feeling for religion had expired with the spirit of prophecy.....Hence, there arose at this time the most obstinate attachment – yea, a fanatical zeal for the Mosaic ceremonial, apart from any real religious feeling and moral improvement, and accompanied rather by a more general and deeper corruption of the people.”¹⁸¹ After this the character of

¹⁷⁹ Church History, i. 38

¹⁸⁰ Book v. 17

¹⁸¹ Church History, i. 36,37

The Wines of the Bible

the nation, instead of exhibiting an improvement, became more depraved; so that Josephus was constrained to say, "Never did any age ever breed a generation more fruitful in wicked practices, than this was, from the beginning of the world."¹⁸² "Indeed, that was a time most fertile in all manner of wicked practices, insomuch that no kind of evil deeds were then left undone; nor could any one so much as devise any bad thing that was new, so deeply were they all infected."¹⁸³

If, then, the Grecian conquests brought Pythagorean principles to the sect of Essenes, we may well ask, did these conquests also bring sobriety and morality to the general population of Jews? or did they not rather import some of their own drinking habits and looseness of manners? The Jews were slow to learn goodness from any one, but they were ready enough to follow evil example in anything that ministered to their cupidity or sensual indulgence. Even in captivity, when suffering for their sins, they took unto themselves foreign wives, in defiance of the law (Ezra x. 2), when they put away on their return to Palestine (v. 11), but brought back again when the fit of repentance was over (Neh. xiii. 23). They also became lax in their observance of the holy Sabbath, and other religious duties after the captivity, for which they were censured by Nehemiah. So that it seems to us incredible that a people who were so easily lead into evil by the contagious example of the heathen, should at the same time have become a reformed nation through that means of pagan philosophers or their ascetic philosophy.

Admitting that, after the return from Babylon, the Jews were brought into more frequent intercourse with the Grecians, was that intercourse more likely to affect them for good or for evil?

¹⁸² Wars, v. 10, 5

¹⁸³ Ibid., vii. 8, 1

The Wines of the Bible

Was Alexander, the great drinker, or were his boon companions, or successors, the kind of persons to reform a previously besotted people? Or were these Grecian conquerors, with the attendant philosophers and friends fit representatives of the “teetotalism and teetotalers” who are said to have been “everywhere associated with the grand work” of Israel’s reformation? We fear that if “foreign teaching,” whether in Babylon or in Palestine, had any effect on Jewish thought and life, its influence tended in an altogether different direction. The heathen world was beginning to be what it subsequently became, religiously atheistic, socially depraved, and morally corrupt to the very core. The gods were superstitiously revered by the ignorant multitude, who were being gradually educated out of their ancient beliefs by the contempt of the philosophers, and the ridicule of the dramatists. Men had to a great extent, lost faith in the spiritual and unseen; and the lowest forms of materialism and sensuousness pervaded the literature and thought of the age. The multitude took the power of deification into their own hands, and voted divinity to a successful general, as promptly, and devoutly, as they decreed him a triumph. The popular motto of life was embodied in the maxim, - “Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die.” The appetite for evil grew by what it fed upon, and the last state was worse than the first. Schools of philosophy arose, embodying opposite extremes, and in antagonism to each other; until at length we find that Socrates and Plato philosophized, Cato and Cicero moralized, Junvenal and Persius satirized, Euripides and AEschylus dramatized, Horace and Virgil poetized, with view of averting or arresting the demoralization of the age. But their united efforts were as futile as the attempt to bind the sea with fetters, or to sweep back the advancing tide with a broom. The world was sick and out of joint, waiting for the advent of the great Physician; and, therefore, the “foreign teaching” of heathen life

The Wines of the Bible

and manners was not of a kind to engraft either teetotalism or eminent sobriety on the social character of the Hebrews.

We proceed now to examine the evidence furnished by Scripture; and here it may be observed in the outset, that in the condensed summary of the world's history before the flood, we have no reliable information as to the cultivation of the vine, or the use of wine, in the regions covered by the deluge, so that we are wholly ignorant of the usages of "the worlds grey fathers" in that respect. They may or may not have been addicted to intemperance. If they were, the fact may partly account for their sin and its punishment. If they were not, the fact will serve to show that, notwithstanding their abstinence from wine, they were a world of incarnate wickedness.

Separating the Old from the New Testament period, we find in the former numerous references to and examples of drunkenness, with divine warnings, threatening, and prohibitions against the evil, couched in such language, and so frequently repeated, as to indicate the prevalence of the sin in the times covered by the references. Thus, immediately after the flood, Noah "drank of the wine and was drunken" (Gen. ix. 21). Lot's daughters "made their father drink wine" until he became stupefied (Gen. xix. 35). "This our son is a glutton and a drunkard" (Deut. Xxi. 20) "I shall have peace, though I walk in the imagination of mine heart, to add drunkenness to thirst" (Deut. xxix. 19). "Nabal's heart was merry within him, for he was very drunken" (1 Sam. Xxv. 36). David made Uriah drunk (2 Sam. Xi 13). King Elah was in Tirzah "drinking himself drunk" (1 Kings xvi. 9). Benhadad, King of Syria was "drinking himself drunk in the pavilions, he and the kings, the thirty and two kings that helped him" (1 Kings xx. 16). Eli thought Hannah to be drunken, and said to her, "How long wilt thou be drunken! Put away thy wine from thee" (1 Sam. i. 13-14). "I was the son of the drunkards" (Psalm lxi. 12) "The drunkard and the

The Wines of the Bible

glutton" (Prov. xxiii. 21). Who hath woe? "They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine" (Prov. xxiii. 29-35). "Blessed art thou, O land, when thy princes eat in due season, for strength, and not for drunkenness" (Eccl. X. 17). "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink, that continue until night till wine inflame them" (Isaiah v. 11). "Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink" (Isaiah v. 22). "Woe to the drunkards of Ephraim.....them that are overcome with wine.....The drunkards of Ephraim shall be trodden under feet....But they also have erred through wine, and through strong drink: they are swallowed up of wine; they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment. For all tables are full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place clean" (Isaiah xxviii. 1-8). "His watchmen are blind.....Yea, they are greedy dogs which can never have enough.....Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink" (Isaiah lvi. 9-12). "I am like a drunken man, and like a man whom wine hath overcome" (Jer. Xxiii. 9). "Awake, ye drunkards, and weep, and howl, all ye drinkers of wine (Joel i. 5). "While they are drunken as drunkards, they shall be devoured" (Nah. i. 10). "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness" (Hab. li. 15).

References of a similar kind occur in the Apocryphal books, which, although without canonical authority, may be accepted as illustrative of the social usages of the period. Thus we read of "men in their cups" (1 Esd. iii. 22). "Raguel said, Eat and drink, and be merry" (Tob. Vii. 9). "Fear not to drink wine and be merry with us" (Jud. Xii. 13). "Press not on him with urging him to drink" (Ecclus. Xxxi. 31). "Wine is good if it be drunk moderately" (Ecclus. Xxxi. 27). "Wine, measurably drunk, bringeth gladness of heart"

The Wines of the Bible

(Ecclus. Xxxi. 15). "Drink not wine to make thee drunken" (Tob. iv. 15). "A drunken woman causeth great anger" (Ecclus. Xxvi. 8). "Wine, drunken with excess, maketh bitterness" (Ecclus. Xxxi. 29). "Nor let drunkenness go with thee in thy journey" (Tob. iv. 15). "He did lie in his drunkenness" (Jud. Xiii. 15). "A man given to drunkenness" (Ecclus. Xix. 1). "Wine proves the hearts of the proud by drunkenness" (Ecclus. Xxxi. 26). "Drunkenness increaseth the rage of a fool." (Ecclus. Xxxi. 30). "Let us fill ourselves with costly wine" (Wisd. li. 7). "Wine and women will make men to fall" (Ecclus. Xix. 2). "Wine is as good as life to a man if it be drunk moderately" (Ecclus. Xxxi. 27). "Wine and music rejoice the heart" (Ecclus. Xi. 20).

Passing on to the New Testament, we find there the same allusions to, warnings and threatening against excess of wine. Thus we read, "To eat and drink with the drunkards" (Matt. Xxiv. 49). "To eat and drink, and be drunken" (Luke xii. 45). "Take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness" (Luke xxi. 34). "These men are full of new wine" (Acts ii. 13). "These are not drunken, as ye suppose" (Acts ii. 15). "Let us walk honestly, as in the day, not in rioting and drunkenness" (Rom. Xiii. 13). "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a drunkard, with such an one no not to eat" (1 Cor. V. 11). "Drunkards shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. Vi. 10). The works of the flesh are "drunkenness, revellings, and such like; of which I tell you before, as I have told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. v. 21). "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess" (Eph. v. 18). "Therefore let us not sleep as do others, but let us watch and be sober. For they that sleep in the night; and they that be drunken in the night" (1 Thes. V. 6, 7). A bishop must be "not given to wine" (1 Tim. iii. 3). Likewise must the deacons be "not given to

The Wines of the Bible

much wine" (1 Tim. iii. 8). "The aged women likewise "not given to much wine" (Tit. ii. 3). "The time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in – excess of wine, revellings, banqueting; wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot" (1 Peter iv. 3,4). "One is hungry and another is drunken" (1 Cor. Xi. 21). "And such were some of you" (1 Cor. Vi. 11).

Without burdening this section with corroborative evidence from Philo and Josephus, or any of the Rabbinical writers, the above references may suffice to show that in Judea, as in almost every other part of the ancient world, intoxicating liquors were freely used by the people, with a few trifling exceptions of individuals, tribes, and sects; and that in private and public life, in domestic and social usages, in religious and national festivities, drunkenness as the bane of the old world, as it is of the new. In the remote ages of national history, extending far away back amid the obscurities of mythical traditions, when the foundations of ancient empires were laid, we find "traces" of ascetic abstinence, and strong grapplings with intemperance. Thus we have the prohibitory laws of Romulus and Numa in Italy, Solon and Lveugus in Greece, and emperor in China, a king in Thrace, Zerdusht in Persia, Buddha in India, with Brahminical priests, Pythagorean philosophers, Jewish Nazarites, Rechabites and Essenes. All these we find different ages and among different nations, separated in some cases by great gulfs of space and time; but everywhere, alongside of these inconsiderable sects, and more or less partial prohibitory laws, we have evidence both of the use and the abuse of fermented wine.

The Wines of the Bible

Summary

That the ancient world was a drunken old world, can hardly be denied by anyone conversant with its history; and, if all the circumstances are duly considered, it seems impossible to arrive at any other conclusion. 1. *The ancients possessed extraordinary facilities for indulging in wine.* In the lands of vineyards, where almost every man sat under his own vine and fig tree, grapes must have been abundant, and wine plentiful. In those places where the vine was not grown at all, or only partially cultivated, the date-tree supplied the people with “palm wine;” and grain, steeped in water, gave them a species of beer or “barley wine.” Where the fruits and grain were so abundant, the wine manufacture must have been extensive; and where the foreign exports were comparatively small, the home consumption must have been large. 2. *Wine drinking was almost universal.* The exceptions are so inconsiderable as merely to confirm the general rule. In particular periods when the vine and its wine were unknown, certain tribes and nations drank milk or water as their beverage; but in later periods of their history, when they had learned to cultivate the vine, the use of wine became general. Accordingly, whenever we find a fragment of ancient history we discover some references or allusions to the use of wine as a common beverage. Prohibitory laws enacted by one monarch were repealed by another, or fell into desuetude. Absent tribes and nations became wine-drinkers. And the contagion of example and common usage would inevitably tend to maintain, develop and extend the practice. 3. *The occasions of drinking were almost innumerable.* At births, deaths, and marriages; at the “morning meal, which we call *akratismos*, because we soak crusts of bread

The Wines of the Bible

in pure wine, *akratos*;"¹⁸⁴ at the mid-day meal and evening supper; at private banquets and public entertainments; at religious and national festivities; at social and sacred observances; at the harvest and the vintage seasons; in summer and winter; in the city, the village, and the country, wine was used by all ranks and classes, in more or less moderation or excess. Wine manufactories were established in different places; wine shops were opened; Thermopolia were instituted; and wine-waggons travelled the country for the supply of the vintners and private customers. Drinking matches were held, and prizes given to the greatest drinkers. Casks of wine, bestowed as donations were broached on the public streets for the free use of the populace by competitors for their political support, and by successful generals on occasion of their triumphs. 4. *And, finally, wine-drinking was interwoven into the very fabric of ancient society, both civil and religious.* It was not only an integral part of an ancient meal; it was also a religious observance. It was not merely an act of pleasure or of convivial enjoyment; it was also a religious duty. It was no mere transient custom of questionable propriety, but a permanent and authoritatively recognized institution of the Church and State. The priests had a legal claim on the tithes and offerings of the people, among which wine was included. The first-fruits of the increase of the field were offered in worship, and with these a libation of wine was included. At every meal, in banquets, and other festive gatherings, a portion of wine was poured forth to the gods. Some deities, from the character which they were supposed to represent, were worshipped with milk instead of wine libations, and in other cases milk, or even water, was used for this purpose, where wine was not available. In some festivals the gods were honoured not only with wine offerings,

¹⁸⁴ Athen. i. 19

The Wines of the Bible

but also with exhibitions of absolute drunkenness on the part of the worshippers, both men and women. But excluding these observances, the use of wine was almost universal in ancient rituals, particularly in connection with meals and banquets, sacrifices and other acts of worship, and at nearly all the religious festivals held at different seasons, and in connection with the worship of different deities. Now, as these occasions were occurring daily, and as wine was used in almost every case, and as the worshippers partook even of the cup of libation offered to the gods, it is evident that the people had endless opportunities and inducements to drink to excess. And with those established and recognized usages it is simply inconceivable that they could have been pre-eminently distinguished either for their abstinence or sobriety.

Even among the Jews, with a purer faith and ritual, the use of wine formed an essential part of religious worship. Here we have wine included among the tithes and first-fruits to which the priests and Levites had a claim, and which were provided for their own use as well as for the service of the sanctuary. Almost all the numerous sacrifices were accompanied with libations of wine as “drink offerings.” In their social gatherings and religious festivals wine was used. And notwithstanding the warnings and threatening of priest and prophet against excess, intemperance abounded. The heathen were not thus restrained by religious laws, and hence, as we have seen, a world-wide drunkenness.

3. Drinking Laws and Customs

A. Prohibitory Laws

Appeal is made by some writers to a particular class of ancient laws and customs relating to the use of wine, which are thought to evidence the sobriety of the old world, and to smile favourable on the unfermented theory. In the early days of ancient history sumptuary laws were enacted by the rulers of some nations, which were subsequently either relaxed or wholly abrogated by succeeding legislators. Thus Zachary Bogan, in his *Archaeologiae Atticae*, informs us that the ancient Greeks fed on acorns, and “afterwards, when fine wheat and teeth came up, it was made a punishment to use it,” as Suetonius says, “decimates hordes pavit.”¹⁸⁵ Chrysippus also says – “And at Rhodes, though there is a law against shaving, still no one ever prosecutes another for doing so, as the whole population is shaved. And at Byzantium, though there is a penalty to which any barber is liable who is possessed of a razor, still every one uses a razor none the less for that law.”¹⁸⁶ And Plutarch tells us that the Spartans, observing the corrupting influence of money, called upon their rulers to send all the silver and gold out of the country “as evils destructive in the proportion they were alluring.” Accordingly a decree was passed “that no coin, whether gold or silver, should be admitted into Sparta, but that they should use the money that had long obtained.” This money, says Plutarch, “was of iron, dipped in vinegar while it was red hot, to make it brittle and unmalleable, so that it might not be applied to any other use. Besides, it was heavy and difficult of

¹⁸⁵ Vi. 4

¹⁸⁶ Athen., xiii. 18

The Wines of the Bible

carriage, and a great quantity of it was but of little value.”¹⁸⁷ But the love of money in this case, like the love of fine wheat, shaving, and razors in the others, proved too strong for the prohibitory law, and therefore silver and gold were again introduced into Sparta, “and brought avarice and meanness in their train, on the one hand; on the other, profusion, effeminacy, luxury;” so that “the State soon degenerated from its original virtue, and sunk into contempt.” Not by the use of the “cursed drink,” but by the use of the “cursed gold.”¹⁸⁸

The prohibitory laws of the ancients relating to the use of wine are of different kinds. Thus Zaleucus, King of the Locrians, decreed that “if any one drank untempered wine, except by the express command of his physician, and for the sake of his health, he was liable to be punished with death.”¹⁸⁹ Amphictyon, King of Athens, who is said to have learned to mix wine with water from Bacchus himself, is also said to have “enacted a law that only wine tempered with water should be drunk at entertainments, which, being afterwards disused, was revived by Solon.”¹⁹⁰ It appears from Horace, Plato, and others, that the Thracians were greatly addicted to wine. This fact may explain the cruel treatment which Lycurgus, King of Thrace, and namesake of the Spartan lawgiver, received at the hands of his subjects. According to mythologists, he drove Bacchus out of his kingdom and abolished his worship, for which impiety he was severely punished by the gods. “he was put to death in the greatest torments by his subjects, who had been informed by the oracle that they should not taste wine till Lycurgus was no more. This fable is explained by observing that the aversion of Lycurgus for wine, over which Bacchus presided,

¹⁸⁷ Life of Lysander.

¹⁸⁸ Life of Agia

¹⁸⁹ Athen, x. 33

¹⁹⁰ Potter's Antiq. ii. 360

The Wines of the Bible

arose from the offence which the vice of intoxication gave him; and therefore the monarch ordered all the vines of his dominion to be cut down, that himself and his subjects might be preserved from the extravagance and debauchery which are produced by too free use of wine.”¹⁹¹ Clearly the wine of Thrace, like that of the Locrians, was an intoxicating liquor.

The Carthaginians enacted a law “that no sort of wine be drunk in the camp, nor anything save water, and that every judge and magistrate abstain from wine during the year of his magistracy.”¹⁹² And yet we find Hannibal’s troops disregarding the law, and drinking wine freely in Italy; so much so, indeed, that they became utterly demoralized by their excesses. Pittaeus, one of the seven wise men of Greece, and the chief ruler of Lesbos, made a law “that if a man committed a crime while drunk, he should receive double punishment, in the hope of deterring men from getting drunk, as wine was very plentiful in that island.”¹⁹³ However, “innocent” the Lesbian wine may have been, the above statement shows that it was an intoxicating liquor. Solon, another of those wise men, decreed that “an Archon, who was the chief magistrate, if seen drunk in public, was to be punished with death.”¹⁹⁴ This law was limited to one officer, “the chief magistrate,” to one offence, “seen drunk,” and to that one offence when exhibited “in public.” But certainly the wine of that ancient time was an intoxicating liquor. Solon himself was no abstainer, for Plutarch gives us some of his verses in praise of wine-

“I love that ruby god whose blessings flow in tides” – Banquet

¹⁹¹ Lempriere.

¹⁹² Plato

¹⁹³ Dio. Laert. 36

¹⁹⁴ Lee’s Works, ii. 11

The Wines of the Bible

"The sports of Venus now are my delight,
Or else with Bacchus to carouse." – Love

"Wine, wit, and beauty, still their charms bestow,
Light all the shades of life, and cheer us as they go." – Life of Solon

We are frequently reminded by the advocates of the unfermented theory that Romulus made libations with milk and not wine, and that his successor issued an edict to the effect, "Sprinkle not the funeral pyre with wine." All this may be admitted, but it is utterly irrelevant. It affords no evidence that these ancient rulers, or their people, were abstainers, or that they abjured alcoholic liquor, and used only unfermented wine. Pliny infers that the laws were passed "in consequence of the remarkable scarcity of that commodity in those days."¹⁹⁵ But Plutarch supplies us with information which explains, both the laws in a much more natural and satisfactory manner. He says the libations of milk made by Romulus were offered to "the goddess who presides over the nursery, Rumilia, whose rites they celebrate without wine, and only with libations of milk."¹⁹⁶ And elsewhere he explains that the goddess "did not permit wine, as being hurtful to the infants."¹⁹⁷ We have shown in the previous section that Romulus himself was not an abstainer from wine; for when he entered the city "they presented him with wine, and before the houses spread tables for those of the soldiers who wanted to refresh themselves." The prohibition of Numa had reference to certain funeral rites, and to these only, for wine was used in other observances. Plutarch says, "His sacrifices, too, resembled the Pythagorean worship, for they were without any effusion of blood, consisting chiefly of flour, libations of wine, and

¹⁹⁵ Book xiv.

¹⁹⁶ Life of Romulus.

¹⁹⁷ Roman Questions.

The Wines of the Bible

other very simple and inexpensive things.” Referring to Numa’s precepts, which also resembled the Pythagorean, he says, - “As not to offer to the gods wine proceeding from a vine unpruned, nor to sacrifice without meal;” and these he interprets as signifying that agriculture is a part of religion. He remarks further – “They tell us that Numa having mixed the fountain of which they used to drink, with wine and honey, surprised and caught” the Sylvan deities¹⁹⁸ These statements are remarkable as evidencing that even the Pythagoreans, whose precepts and forms of worship resembled those of Numa, did not uniformly abjure the use of wine. But however this may be, they show that the first kings of Rome did not abstain from wine, and that the wine then used was, as the last paragraph indicates, a fermented liquor.

Plato was not a lawgiver, but a philosopher. It was not his work to found a state, or to enact laws for its government, but he sketched a model republic, and gave an outline of the laws by which it should be administered. In doing so, he discourses at length on the subject of wine-drinking, and proposes a series of laws for its regulation. He appears to be altogether ignorant of the existence or use of unfermented wine; for he says, “Let us not then simply censure the gift of Dionysius as bad and unfit to be received into the state. For wine has many excellencies.” And the nature of that wine, having “many excellencies,” may be gathered from the observation,-“There is a tradition or story which has somehow gone about the world, that Dionysius was robbed of his wits by his mother Here, and that in revenge for this he inspires Bacchic furies and dancing madresses in others, *for which reason he gave men wine.*”¹⁹⁹ He thinks that drinking, even to intoxication, may be permitted “under due regulations, and with a

¹⁹⁸ Life of Numa

¹⁹⁹ Jowett’s Plato, iv. 193

The Wines of the Bible

view to the enforcement of temperance;" but he would limit the indulgence to particular seasons, for he says, "Drunkenness is always improper, except at the festivals of the god who gave wine."²⁰⁰ he also proposes to regulate the age at which wine should be used, saying, "Shall we begin by enacting that boys shall not taste wine at all until they are eighteen years of age; we will tell them that fire must not be poured upon fire, whether in the body or in the soul, until they begin to go to labour; this is a precaution against the excitableness of youth; afterwards they may taste wine in moderation up to the age of thirty; but while a man is young he should abstain altogether from intoxication and excess of wine; when at length he has reached forty years, and is feasted at public banquets, he may invite not only the other gods, but Dionysius above all, to the mystery and festivity of the elder men, making use of the wine which has given them to be the cure of sourness of old age."²⁰¹

If these regulations are not attended to, and "if the State makes only an amusement of it, and whoever likes may drink whenever he likes, and with whom he likes, and add to this any other indulgences, I shall never agree or allow that this city, or this man, should adopt such a usage of drinking. I would go farther than the Cretans and Lacedaemonians, and am disposed rather to the law of the Carthaginians, that no one while he is on a campaign should be allowed to taste wine at all; but I would say that he should drink water during all that time; and that in the city no slave, male or female, should ever drink wine; and that no rulers should drink during their year of office; nor pilots of vessels, nor judges while on duty, should taste wine at all; nor any one who is going to hold consultation about any matter of importance, nor in

²⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 291

²⁰¹ Jowett's Plato, pp. 186,187

The Wines of the Bible

the daytime at all, unless in consequence of exercise or as medicine; nor again at night, when any one, either man or woman, is minded to get children. There are numberless other cases also in which those who have good sense and good laws ought not to drink wine; so that if what I say is true, no city will need many vineyards.”²⁰²

In all these references there is not the slightest allusion to, or exception in favour of an innocent, unfermented wine. Certain persons, at certain times, are not to drink wine at all; other persons at other times may drink it even to intoxication. But the wine forbidden in the one case, and permitted in the other is the same liquor. It is neither to be censured a bad, nor to be universally prohibited, for “it has many excellencies.” It is the gift of a god, the produce of the vineyard, useful in labour, exercise, and medicine, fit for banquets and festivities, and given for “the cure of the sourness of old age.” But it is “fire poured upon fire” it inspires “furies” and “madnesses”; it is not to be drunk by “whoever likes,” and “whenever he likes,” but under proper regulations, for it is unsafe for soldiers, sailors, pilots, judges, and others. Clearly, therefore, that wine was a fermented and alcoholic liquor.

The prohibitory laws of the ancients affecting women are noticed by several writers. Plutarch says, “Romulus made the drinking of wine, as well as adultery, a capital crime in women. For he said, adultery opens the door to all sorts of crimes, and wine opens the door to adultery. Numa also taught them to be sober, and accustomed them to silence, entirely to abstain from wine.” Pliny, in like manner says, “At Rome it was not lawful for women to drink wine.....And Cato tells us that it was the usage for the male relatives to give the females a kiss, in order to ascertain

²⁰² Ibid., p. 195

The Wines of the Bible

whether they smelt of '*temetum*'; for it was by that name that wine was then known, whence our word "*temulentia*," signifying drunkenness." Athenaeus, Polybius, and others give similar account of this old law; but further quotation is unnecessary.

It will be observed that this ancient prohibition dates back to the semi-mythic age, when the reputed sons of gods ruled the earth. It was originally devised by Romulus, who is said to have been the son of Mars, and the founder and first king of Rome, some time after the Trojan war. It was re-enacted by Numa, his successor; and the latest notice of its existence is given by Athenaeus, on the authority of Theophrastus, who lived about 400 B.C. he says, "And among the people of Massilia there was a law that the women should drink water only. And Theophrastus says that to this day that is the law at Miletus."²⁰³ But in Pliny's time the law had apparently become obsolete in Italy, and was spoken of as an ancient tradition of early Rome.

It would appear also that in course of time the rigour of the old law had become so far relaxed that the women were permitted to drink *passum* as their beverage, a true wine made from raisins, or dried grapes, but not classed among the ordinary grape wines. And at the time when the Twelve Tables were introduced as Roman laws, the old prohibition which forbade the *use* of wine was limited to its *abuse*; for, according to Hook's version of these Tables, the prohibitory enactment stands thus:—"If a man catches his wife in adultery, or *finds her drunk*, he may, with the consent of her relatives, punish her even with death."²⁰⁴ After that period the law was either abrogated, or had fallen into neglect, and become a dead letter; so that in the later times of Roman history it was known only as an ancient tradition.

²⁰³ Athen., x. 33

²⁰⁴ Rom. Hist. ii. 27

The Wines of the Bible

Besides these ancient laws relating to wine, there were others of a similar character pertaining to particular nations, tribes, and sects, which need not occupy our attention here. From all these prohibitory enactments we infer, (*a*) that wine was extensively used in the remotest times; (*b*) that its free use had developed dangerous excesses; (*c*) and that the wine thus used and prohibited was a fermented and alcoholic liquor.

B. Drinking Customs.

Passing from the laws to the drinking customs of the ancients, we are informed by Dr. Lees that prizes were often offered with the object, not of producing inebriation, but of testing the powers of incontinent imbibitions to the utmost.”²⁰⁵ The Rev. B. Parsons also appeals to this practice, and refers to the younger Cicero and others, who were notorious for their vinous excesses. “These facts,” says he, “show that to drink an immense quantity, without being intoxicated, rather than to take liquor for the sake of inebriation, was the custom of the people of old.”²⁰⁶ It is inferred by these writers, from the large quantities of wine consumed on such occasions, that the liquor must have been unfermented. But in this, as in many other instances we shall have to notice, the inference is not justified by the facts.

It may be that these prizes were offered, as Dr. Lees says, “with the object, not of producing inebriation, but of testing” the drinking powers of the combatants; but the purpose of the contest was to determine as Mr. Parsons puts it, who could drink the largest quantity of liquor “without being intoxicated.” Those

²⁰⁵ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 368

²⁰⁶ Anti-Baachus

The Wines of the Bible

who were able to bear their wine best carried off the prize. But how could such a test be applied, if the wine used in the contest was not intoxicating liquor? It may be also, that the prizes were offered, not with the object of *producing* intoxication, but they were certainly given with the object of testing the intoxicating power of the quantity of liquor consumed; and how could this be determined if the wine was not an intoxicating liquor?

Pliny begins his chapter on Drunkenness with a description of the quality of wine used, which he terms “a liquid that deprives man of his reason, and drives him to frenzy, and to the commission of a thousand crimes.” Surely that wine was an intoxicating liquor. He then details the various expedients resorted to by drinkers to create an artificial thirst, such as “a dose of hemlock before they begin to drink, that they have the fear of death before them to make them take their wine” – this liquor being regarded as an antidote to that poison. After noticing these strange devices of the intemperate, he says, “Thus we see wines quaffed out of impurities, and inebriety invited even by the hope of a reward, - invited, did I say? may the gods forgive me for saying so, - purchased outright. We find one person induced to drink upon the condition that he shall have as much to eat as he has previously drunk, while another has to quaff as many cups as he has thrown points on the dice.” Then, as if to remove all doubt as to the quality of the liquor used, he proceeds to describe the effects of the potations: - “Should he, however, fortunately escape all these dangers, the drunkard never beholds the rising sun, by which his life of drinking is made all the shorter. From wine, too, comes that pallid hue, those drooping eyelids, those sore eyes, those tremulous hands, unable to hold with steadiness the overflowing vessel, condign punishment in the shape of sleep agitated by Furies during the restless night, and the supreme

The Wines of the Bible

reward of inebriety, those dreams of monstrous lustfulness, and of forbidden delights.”

He next specifies some of the most noted of those champions of drink, among whom he names Mark Antony and the younger Cicero, referred to by Mr. Parsons, and says, “Tergilla reproached M. Cicero, the younger, that he drank two gallons at a single draught, and that, one day being intoxicated, he had thrown a glass at the head of Marcus Agrippa. Truly these are the works of drunkenness. But doubtless Cicero, the son, wished to take from Mark Antony, the murderer of his father, the palm of drunkenness; for it is well known that before him Antony had been very jealous of the title of a first-rate drinker, and even published a treatise on his drunkenness, in which he dares to apologize for that vice. But this treatise persuades me only, that the drunkenness of Antony was the cause of all the evils with which he has afflicted the earth.”²⁰⁷ Athenaeus informs us that when Antony was staying at Athens, he converted the threatre into an exhibition of Bacchus, “and sat there with his friends, getting drunk from daybreak.” He then crossed over to the Acropolis, “and after that he ordered himself to be proclaimed as Bacchus throughout all the cities in that district.”²⁰⁸

Surely no one can read these lines, and fail to perceive that here is no mere “incontinent imbibitions” of innocent *must*, but a veritable contest for the “palm of drunkenness” in the consumption of intoxicating wine.

If we could be certain as to the capacity of the Roman measure referred to by Pliny, it must be confessed that the quantities of liquor consumed by these ancient toppers, who were truly “mighty to drink wine” (Isaiah), are excessively large, almost incredibly so,

²⁰⁷ Book xiv. 22

²⁰⁸ Book iv. 29

The Wines of the Bible

whether the liquor was wine or water. But there have been men of beastly appetites, both gluttonous and drinkers in all ages. The practice was not uncommon in our own country during the last century. Accordingly, we are told that “men in those days not only drank inordinately for fellowship’s sake, but were mighty in drinking; and to compete with accomplished toppers at the board was a task of any social Hercules.” Bishop Hall’s Duke of Tenterbelly, drinks off a large goblet of twelve quarts. Joseph Paisely, the Gretna-green parson, frequently drank a pint of brandy at a draught; and on one occasion the parson and a fellow toper, in the course of three successive days, drank no less than ten gallons of liquor. At a convivial party in Venice a German drank as much wine as would be laid a dozen Italians on the floor. It was not uncommon to designate persons by their drinking capacities. Thus certain individuals are spoken of as two, three or five bottle man; and the head of a ducal house was noted as a six bottle man; these being quantities of alcoholic wine consumed by the individual at a sitting. During the contest for the Whistle, celebrated by Burns, it is said that the poet drank two bottles of ardent spirits, the one of brandy, the other of rum, while the combatants, after having consumed six bottles of wine a piece, continued the contest, and drank one or two bottles more.

Examples of inordinate drinking are common also among the ancients. Seneca speaks of certain senators noted for such excess in wine as to have been carried to the Senate House repeatedly in a state of intoxication. Aristotle tells us that Dionysius, the younger, would sometimes continue in a state of intoxication for ninety days at a time. The Emperor Zeno, who was in the daily practice of drinking till he was insensible, was taken up in one of these drinking fits by order of his wife Aradne, and committed to the tomb, where he was left to perish. Caius the emperor, surnamed Caligula, “was not only called the young Bacchus, but

The Wines of the Bible

was also in the habit of going about dressed in the entire dress of Bacchus, and he used to sit on the tribunal as judge in that dress.” The Emperor Tiberius was so dissipated, that it is said he was only drunk once in his life, and that was from the moment he became intoxicated to the day of his death.

Athenaeus discourses at length on the huge gluttons and wine drinkers of ancient times, in the course of which he describes a contest between Proteas, a very great drinker, and Alexander the Great, who was equally notorious for his excesses, of which the former died. He tells us of Darius, whose tomb bore the inscription, “I was able to drink a great deal of wine, and to bear it well.” Philip of Macedon was “a very hard drinker, and very often would attack the enemy while he was drunk.” And he says, “Theopompus gives us a regular catalogue of men found of drinking, and addicted drunkenness;” and then follows a list of these famed drinkers, with remarks on their intemperance. One of them was called “The Funnel,” because he used such an instrument in his potations. Another cut himself to pieces when he was drunk. He also notices the drinking contests, already alluded to, “as to who should drink the greatest quantity of *unmixed* wine,” at one of which forty-one persons died. Then follows another list of noted drinkers, who are variously described as being “very fond of drinking and delighting in drunkenness,” “addicted to drinking and drunkenness,” incessantly drunk both night and day,” “a great drinker, and was drunk the greater part of the day,” &c., &c.²⁰⁹

Referring to the “venerable line” of “ancient worthiness” who “not merely preached teetotalism as a theory, but adopted it as a practice,” and among whom the first place is given to Pythagoras, Dr. Lees says – “Nor should we forget here the Italian Samson,

²⁰⁹ Book x.

The Wines of the Bible

Milo, a disciple of Pythagoras, who was so strong that he carried a four-year-old bullock on his shoulders a distance of forty yards,"&c²¹⁰ But, in relating the acts of prowess performed by this ancient athlete, why does Dr. Lees not tell us the whole story? Why does he suppress the important fact that this illustrious *teetotaler* was as famous for his exploits in eating and drinking as for feats of strength? Athenaeus gives us the story of the bull, but he also informs us that "Milo of Crotona, as Theodorus of Hierapolis tells us in his book upon games, at twenty minae weight of meat, and an equal quantity of bread, *and drank three choes [about 9 quarts] of wine.*"²¹¹

It is evident from these references to the excessive drinking of the ancients, the copious draughts consumed, the drinking contests held, the prizes offered to the greatest drinkers, the inebriation thereby "invited" or "purchased," and the habits of intemperance resulting from those indulgences, that the wine used was an intoxicating liquor. So that these drinking customs afford no evidence in favour of the unfermented theory. Confirmatory evidence of this conclusion is furnished by some other ancient practices, which indicate the quality of ancient wines.

At one time, as we have seen, the law was invoked to prescribe the kind of liquor to be used by women, the dilution of their wines by men, the times and seasons for abstinence and indulgences by soldiers, judges, and magistrates; and the violation of the law in these cases subjected the offenders to punishment and even death. Special examples were in some instances added to public laws, with the view of inculcating lessons of sobriety. The poor oppressed helots were made drunk, and exhibited to Spartan

²¹⁰ Works, ii. 14

²¹¹ B. x. 4

The Wines of the Bible

youths in banqueting halls as public spectacles of the degrading effects of drunkenness. Plutarch says, "The ancient Spartans at their feasts used to compel the helots to drink an excessive quantity of wine, and then bring them into the public halls where they dined, to show the young men what drunkenness was."²¹² This was not done to enforce total abstinence from wine upon the Spartan youths, as has been falsely alleged, but, as Plutarch elsewhere says, to preserve them "from all kinds of intemperance and excess of wine, by presenting before them all the indecencies of their drunken helots."²¹³ However desirable the object sought may have been, this ancient custom would have been more honoured in the breach than in the observance; for, apart from its brutalizing tendency on the poor slaves,-

*"Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
But, seen too oft, familiar to the face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."*

At an early period, also, the drama was employed to ridicule the foolish sayings and doings of the worshippers of Bacchus and other inebriates; but the well-meaning effort to make the stage a school of virtues failed in its object, and the theatre degenerated into something like a school for scandal. Religion also, was invoked, and the people were taught to make libations to the gods of all their drinks in all their domestic and social festivities, both private and public, secular and sacred; as if, thereby, to place them under some measure of religious restraint, and thus promote a well-regulated sobriety. In some of the festivals, such as the worship of Ceres, the Rumilia, the Sun, the Furies, it was

²¹² Life of Demetrius

²¹³ Laws and Customs of Lacedaemonians

The Wines of the Bible

not lawful to offer libations of wine, and therefore in these cases wineless libations were presented. Hence the Chorus, in directing CEdipus to propitiate the goddesses, expressly exhorted him μηδε προσφερειν μεθυ, "not to bring wine." Among the Greeks, as well as the Egyptians the worshipper of the Sun "make their libations of honey, as they never bring wine to the altars of the gods."²¹⁴ But when Ulysses and his companions were on a desert island of the sun, having neither wine nor honey, they offered libations of water. At Rome, as we have seen, libations were made to Rumilia, the goddess of the nursery, with milk instead of wine.

Ancient writers do not seem to be agreed as to the social habits of the gods themselves. Homer, in one place, says –

"They eat no bread, they drink no ruddy wine;
Thence are they bloodless, and exempt from death."

But, in the hymn to Venus, he describes Ganymede as cup-bearer to the gods, "a marvel to behold, honoured among all the immortals, pouring ruby nectar from a golden cup." We frequently read of the banquets of the gods, at which the cup circulates freely; and we are told that when Vulcan had fastened his mother, Juno, in the golden throne with concealed springs, none of the gods could set her at liberty, until Bacchus intoxicated him and got him to release her. Plato, in his *Republic*, referring to the gifts which Musaeus and his son offer the just, says, "They take them down into the world below, where they have the saints feasting on couches, with crowns on their heads, and passing their whole time in drinking; their idea seems to be that an immortality of drunkenness is the highest need of virtue."²¹⁵ Thus, even in the

²¹⁴ Athens

²¹⁵ Jowett, ii. 183

The Wines of the Bible

other world, the wine of the just is represented as an intoxicating liquor!

Cicero says that the poets, speaking of the gods, refer to “their indulgences in all kinds of intemperance;” but neither he nor Aristotle believed in these representations. The latter interprets them as being spoken metaphorically;²¹⁶ and the former says, “These were mere inventions of Homer, who gave his gods the imperfections of men. I would rather that he had given men the perfections of the gods.”²¹⁷ However this may be, there can be no doubt that among the Greeks and Romans the popular belief, which is always the most powerful over a people, ascribed these bibulous propensities to the deities; and this notion was not only fostered by the poets and mythologists, but was confirmed by the prevailing religious customs of the age, when line libations were almost universal, and the gods were worshipped with the accompaniments of “Bacchus furies and dancing madnesses.” Nay, it would seem as if some of these religious festivals were specially intended to enforce general sobriety, by providing occasional seasons of universal license, when an entire population gave itself up to vinous excesses. Hence, perhaps, the curious notion of Plato, already quoted, as to the practice of drinking to intoxication “with a view to the enforcement of temperance,” and his approval of drunkenness “at the festival of the god who gave wine.”

It is obvious that the social habits of the people were not likely to improve under such teachings and customs. Accordingly the Satrists appeared, holding the mirror up to nature, and severely castigating the vicious follies of the age. With them were associated the Philosophers, who taught the people to get drunk

²¹⁶ Poetic., xxv. 14

²¹⁷ Tusc. Disp., xxvi

The Wines of the Bible

only under proper regulations and at proper seasons.²¹⁸ Aristotle recommended moderation in all things, saying, "In like manner drink and food, whether there be too little or too much of them, destroy health; but moderation in quantity causes, increases, and preserves it."²¹⁹ Anacharsis taught "that a vine bore three bunches of grapes. The first, the bunch of pleasure; the second, that of drunkenness; and the third of disgust."²²⁰ Apuleius quotes a similar utterance – "The first cup is for thirst, the second for mirth, the third for delight, and the fourth for madness."²²¹

It cannot be said that the people were altogether indifferent to the ridicule or counsel of their teachers. On the contrary, they appear to have been desirous of carrying the precepts or sobriety into practice; but instead of abjuring the wine cup, they had recourse to various expedients to lessen the potency of their liquors, and to prevent or counteract the inebriating effects of their potations. To accomplish the former of these objects they filtered, diluted, and partially boiled their *fermented* wines, as we shall see in future sections. And to effect the latter purpose they adopted the following measures: - On sitting down to a banquet they encircled their heads with wreaths or garlands of flowers, with the view of thereby binding and cooling their temples when drinking, and by their fragrance preventing or diminishing the headiness resulting from the alcoholic wine. Anointing the head with fragrant oil was also resorted to for the same purpose; and various substances were introduced into the wine, or used along with it, as antidotes to drunkenness. Athenaeus notices several of these, and Pliny mentions others, such as a black stone, called

²¹⁸ Plato

²¹⁹ Ethics, ii. 2

²²⁰ Dio. Laert. p. 47

²²¹ Works, p. 402

The Wines of the Bible

“Dionysias;”²²² the “sea grape putrefied in wine,” which will excite a “loathing and dislike” for wine.²²³ And “if you would know a remedy against drunkenness, mark this experiment; Give for three days together to great drunkards the eggs of an owl continually in their wine; They will take a loathing thereto, and forbear drinking. Whosoever taketh the lights of a mutton roasted, and eateth the same before he sit down to drinking, shall not be overtaken or drunken, how freely soever he poureth down the wine. The ashes of swallows’ bills incorporate with myrrh will secure any man from drunkenness, and cause him to bear his drink well, in case the wine that he drinketh be spiced therewith. And Horus, King of the Assyrians, devised first this recipe against drunkenness”²²⁴ “To conclude, for to avoid drunkenness take the lungs of a hog, be it boar or sow, it matters not; in like manner of a kid, and roast it; whosoever eateth thereof fasting shall not be drunk that day, how liberally soever he takes his drink.”²²⁵

Besides these curious remedies for the prevention and cure of drunkenness, Pliny and Athenaeus give special prominence to the virtues of cabbage! The latter, in the closing section of his first book, exhibits the power of this popular vegetable as an antidote against drunkenness. “The citizens of Sybaris also, as Timaeus says, used to eat cabbages before drinking. And so Alexis says, -

*“Last evening you were drinking deep,
So now your head aches. God to sleep;
Take some boiled cabbage when you wake,
And there’s an end of your headache.”*

²²² Book xxxvii

²²³ Book xxxii

²²⁴ Book xxx, Holland’s Translation

²²⁵ Book xxviii. Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

And Eubulus says, somewhere or other,-

*"Wife, quick! Some cabbage boil, of virtues healing,
That I may rid me of this seedy feeling."*

And Amphis tells us, -

*"When one's been drunk, the best relief I know
Is stern misfortune's unexpected blow;
For that at once all languor will dispel,
As sure as cabbage."*

Now, if unfermented wine was a common beverage among the ancients, as alleged by the advocates of that theory, it is surprising that, in devising these various remedies for the prevention and cure of drunkenness, no reference is made to that innocent drink, nor any suggestion given for the substitution of the unfermented in place of the fermented and intoxicating liquor. This fact we take to be a strong indication that, so far as these ancient writers, lawgivers, and philosophers are concerned, unfermented wine is a myth.

II. Ancient Wines – General

Having shown the intemperance of the ancients, and some of their drinking laws and customs, we proceed, in the next place, to inquire into their wines. The field of inquiry is very wide; for according to Pliny, there were “no less than one hundred and ninety-five different kinds” of drink in use among the ancients; “indeed,” says he, “if all the varieties are reckoned, they will amount to nearly double that number.”²²⁶ But we have no intentions of travelling over the entire length of that wide field, or of inquiring into the specific qualities of such a large variety of liquors. We shall merely try to discover if, among all these, there were any unfermented wines.

²²⁶ Book xiv. 22

The Wines of the Bible

Tropical and Proleptical Usages.

A. Fruit of the Vine

In prosecuting this inquiry we find, in the outset, that wine is spoken of on one occasion by our Lord as “the fruit of the vine,” and from this it is inferred that the liquor designated must have been the unfermented juice of the grape. But why should this be so? What is there in the words to necessitate such a conclusion? It is said that Christ carefully avoids using the word οἶνος, and employs this phrase, “fruit of the vine,” instead. Be it so; but it is οἶνος which the cup contained when he said, “Drink ye all of it.” What else could it have been? It is true the word γεννημα “produce” or “offspring” is used interchangeably with καρπος, “fruit,” in Luke xii. 17,18; and both terms are employed there to denote solid produce. But it cannot be supposed that the communion cup contained *solid* fruit, or that Christ himself intended to intimate that he would not again drink solid fruit until He drank it new in the kingdom of his Father. As He certainly refers to a liquid *drink*, how otherwise can the expression be regarded than as a simple periphrase for wine? And as Dr. Lees interprets οἶκος as “‘sour wine,’ οἶνος being understood,”²²⁷ and γλυκος as “‘sweet,’ οἶνος, ‘wine,’ being understood,”²²⁸ why should the words of our Lord not be similarly interpreted with οἶνος understood, so that the sentence will stand thus, εκ τουτο οινου, του γεννηματος της αμπελου, “I will not drink henceforth of this wine of the fruit of the vine?”

In using this particular phrase, our Lord may have intended thereby to distinguish the wine which is the produce of the vine from other wines, the produce of the palm tree, barely, honey,

²²⁷ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 300

²²⁸ Ibid., 313

The Wines of the Bible

and the like; as the Jews commonly distinguished *Yayin* from *Shechar*, and as Herodotus distinguishes οἶνος ἀμπελος, "wine of the vine," from οἶνος κριθινος, "barley wine." Anacreon, whose drinking songs are of the true Bacchanalian type, nevertheless, uses an expression somewhat akin to that now under consideration, when he calls wine γονον ἀμπελον τον οἶνον; and Pindar, in like manner, designates it παῖοα ἀμπελον. As, however, the words of our Lord were spoken on the occasion of his last Passover and first supper, they had doubtless reference to the usual formula in the paschal thanksgiving,—"Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, the King of the Universe, who hast created the fruit of the vine." We shall find in an examination of these two ordinances that there is nothing in the circumstances or records of either of them to justify the conclusion that the wine thus referred to was an unfermented liquor. Reserving this point for future consideration, it is, meantime, alleged that, as the vine does not produce a fermented wine, the produce of the vine must be regarded as the unfermented juice of the grape. But it might with equal propriety be asserted that as whisky is a Celtic term, *uisque*, signifying water, and is termed *aqua vitae*, the liquor so designated must be an innocent unintoxicating beverage, for *water* is not an intoxicant. The same might be said of other spirituous liquors, whose names are equally innocent. Thus *Perry*, an old English beverage, is "pear water." *Kirchwasser*, a Swiss drink, is "cherry water." *Aguardiente*, a Mexican strong drink, is "burning water;" hence also the "fire water" of the American Indians. *Ardent spirits* used to be called in this country "distilled waters." *Brandy* is still termed *eau de vie*, "water of life." Old Giles Fletcher, speaking of a Russian fermented drink, called *Quass* or *Kvas*, describes it as "nothing else but water turned out of his wittes, with a little brawn meashed with it." And Pliny, referring to certain fermented

The Wines of the Bible

liquors made from grain, and of the nature of modern beer, says, "Means have absolutely been discovered for getting drunk upon water even."²²⁹ In like manner, when Erasmus says, "Well may Burgundy be called the mother of man, suckling him with such milk," it might be alleged that Burgundy wine is an unfermented liquor, for milk is not intoxicating.

If the vine does not produce a fermented or alcoholic liquor, neither does it produce an inspissated or boiled liquor; and yet Dr. Lees admits that "grape juice, previously boiled down," is a true "fruit of the vine."²³⁰ It may be objected that fermentation totally changes the nature of the liquor, and converts it into a different substance, the product of art, and not of nature. This may be quite true, and yet the changed liquor may none the less truly be designated "the fruit of the vine." Anacreon's "offspring of the vine," Herodotus's "wine of the vine," and "barley wine," and Pindar's "son of the vine," are, for anything that appears to the contrary, designations of fermented wines. The innocent terms water and milk are also, as we have seen, applied to fermented and distilled liquors.

Moreover, we read in one passage, "They shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof;" and in another, "They shall plant vineyards, but not drink the wine thereof" (Amos ix. 14; v. 11). Now "the wine thereof" (lit. "their wine") is clearly the wine of the said *vineyards* – i.e., "the fruit of the vine." In another text it is said of Noah, "he planted a vineyard, and drank the wine (lit. 'from the wine'), and was drunken" (Gen. ix. 20). The wine he drank was the wine of his vineyard he had planted; and the wine of the vineyard, as before is "the fruit of the vine," and yet in this case, an intoxicating beverage. Scripture also speaks of the *butter*

²²⁹ Book xiv. 22

²³⁰ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 283

The Wines of the Bible

of kine (Deut. xxxii. 14), and of *the cheese of kine* (2 Sam. xvii 29). But before these substances can be produced and preserved for domestic use, their constituents must be separated from the milk of the cow by artificial means; and in each case there is a true fermentation. "Milk, whilst in the udder of the cow," undergoes, in a healthy state, no alteration of its properties. But in contact with air milk coagulates without any evolution of gas, and becomes acid; the casein separates in the form of a curdy mass. "The cheese of animal milk begins to undergo alteration from the instant it leaves the udder of the cow, and the change proceeds in it continuously, although it only becomes perceptible after the lapse of some time in the coagulation of the milk."²³¹ "When milk turns sour, its alkali is gradually neutralized and overpowered by lactic acid produced by the fermentation of sugar of milk."²³² *Rennet*, "decomposed mucous membrane," having the same properties as *yeast* or *leaven*, when introduced into milk in making cheese, communicates its decomposition "to the milk sugar, the elements of which transpose themselves into lactic acid, which neutralizes the alkali, and thus causes separation of the cheese."²³³

The fruits of trees, including the solid "fruit of the vine," when stored up for use undergo fermentation. "The maturation, as it is called, or sweetening of winter fruits, when stored up for their preservation in straw, is called the result of true fermentation. Unripe apples and pears contain a considerable amount of starch, which becomes converted sugar by the nitrogenous constituent of the juice passing into a state of decomposition, and transmitting its own mutations to the particles of starch in contact with it."²³⁴

²³¹ Liebig's *Letters*, xvii. , xviii.

²³² Gregory's *Chem.*, p. 504

²³³ Liebig, xviii.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*

The Wines of the Bible

Bread also undergoes a true fermentation. The porosity and lightness of bread “are produced in the dough by a process of fermentation.”²³⁵ Where leaven is employed in the manufacture, “the yeast induces the vinous fermentation in the sugar of the flour, and the alcohol and carbonic acid escaping, raise the bread and render it porous.”²³⁶

Even a mutton chop is not exempt from that transformation. “From the moment the animal is slain, the herb gathered, or the cluster of the vine plucked, the process of decay commences, which, unless arrested, will continue in each till all alike are rendered unfit for use by progressive fermentation.”²³⁷ “The process of decay is a process of combustion taking place at the common temperature, in which the products of the fermentation and putrefaction of plants and animal bodies combine with the oxygen of the atmosphere. No organized substance, no part of any plant or animal, after extinction of the vital principle, is capable of resisting the chemical action of air and moisture.”²³⁸

If, then, preserved grapes, to say nothing further of the other substances, may be designated the “fruit of the vine,” notwithstanding the initial fermentation which they have undergone when removed from the living tree, there is no apparent reason why the expressed juice should not similarly designated, even although it also has undergone that fermentation.

The same tropical usage obtains in all countries and ages. Thus, although all grapes are alike sober and unintoxicating, Pliny describes one kind, called the “inerticula,” but which, he says

²³⁵ Ibid., xxxii

²³⁶ Gregory, p. 509

²³⁷ Nott’s *Lectures*, p. 76

²³⁸ Liebig, xix.

The Wines of the Bible

“might with more propriety have been styled the ‘sobria.’”²³⁹ Columella probably refers to the same species when he designates a particular description of grape the *amethyston*, or unintoxicating, both writers having reference to the quality of the wine made from that kind of grape. Anarcharsis, as we have seen, used to say that “the vine had three clusters – the first, which produced pleasure, the second intoxication, and the third remorse.” And Dr. Lees quotes the Turkish proverb, “A devil lurks in every berry of the vine.” There is, therefore, nothing incongruous in designating fermented wine “the fruit of the vine,” which produces different effects according as it is used. Philo calls the vine “the tree of drunkenness,”²⁴⁰ and speaks of the intoxication which proceeds from the vine.²⁴¹ Speaking of wine in connection with drunkenness, and therefore of intoxicating wine, he says, Moses “was in all respects great and wise on this subject; for, in many places of his history of the giving of the Law, he mentions wine and *the plant which produces wine – namely, the vine*; and commands some persons to drink it, but some he does not permit to do so,” &c.²⁴² He says also, - “Bacchus rendered the vine susceptible of cultivation, and extracted a most delicious drink from it, which.....causes every city on earth, both Grecian and Barbarian, incessant festivity and mirth, and entertainment and revelry; for all these things is good wine the cause.”²⁴³ This “delicious drink,” extracted from the vine, is clearly the “fruit of the vine,” and, yet, an intoxicating beverage. Sir Robert Porter speaks of drinkers “reveling in the juice of the vineyard.”²⁴⁴

²³⁹ Book xiv.

²⁴⁰ The Planting of Noah

²⁴¹ Dreams

²⁴² Drunkenness

²⁴³ Ambassadors

²⁴⁴ Travels, i., p. 436

The Wines of the Bible

Josephus, also, referring to Pharaoh's butler, says, "He let him know that God bestows the fruit of the vine upon men for good; which wine is poured out to him, and is the pledge of fidelity and mutual confidence among men; and puts an end to their quarrels, takes away passion and grief out of the minds of them that use it, and makes them cheerful."²⁴⁵ The effects here attributed to the fruit of the vine are such as were usually regarded by the ancients as flowing from the moderate use of fermented wine, of which more anon. Pliny, describing the vine-clad hills of the Campania, uses the expression, *temulentia nobilis succo per omnes terras*, which Holland paraphrases – "The hills full of vineyards an famous for drunkenness, proceeding of strong wine and the liquor of the grape, commended so highly in all countries."²⁴⁶ This "liquor of the grape," was clearly the "fruit of the vine" grown on these hills, and yet it was an intoxicating beverage.

There can be no doubt that the juice in the grape is an unfermented liquor; but there can be as little doubt that the juice extracted from the grape may still be designated the juice of the grape, or the fruit of the vine, even after it has undergone fermentation. Thus Horace tells Maecenas that if he comes to visit him at his Sabine farm, he will "drink the juice of the grape of the Caecuban and mild Caleno; for neither the produce of the Falernian vines, nor that of the Formian hills, mingles with the tempering water," –

*"Caecuban et praelo domitam Caleno
Tu bibes uvam; mea nec Falrnae
Temperant vites, neque Formiani
Pocula colles." (Odes, i. 20)*

²⁴⁵ Ant., ii. 5,2

²⁴⁶ Book iii. 5

The Wines of the Bible

A similar usage is found in both modern and ancient poetry.
Hence, -

Milton, -

*"first from out of the purple grape
Crushed the sweet poison of misused wine."*

*"I drank, from the clear milky juice allaving
Thirst, and refreshed; nor envied them the grape,
Whose heads that turbulent liquor fills with fumes."*

Oriental, -

*"This day be rapture, let no bosom rue!
Son of the clouds! The grape's fair daughter woo."*

*"I drank the water of the vine. That draught had power to rouse
Thy wrath, grim father! Now, indeed, 'tis joyous to carouse."*

*"Who of the fruit of life can share,
Yet scorn to drink of the grape's sweet dew."*

Spenser; -

*....."Forth she brought
The fruitful vine; whose liquor, bloody read,
Having the minds of men with fury fraught,
Might in them stir up old rebellious thought,
To make new war against the gods again:
Such is the power of that same fruit."*

Campbell says of whisky-

*"And plied the beverage from his own fair sheaf,
That fired his Highland blood with mickle glee."*

Atheneaus –

The Wines of the Bible

*....."Other poets call wine
Fruit of the field, which makes the heart to leap."*

Hybrias, -

*...."And from the vine
Squeeze out the heart-delighting wine."*

Horace, -

*"Say, shall I drink this heady wine,
Pressed from the rough Falerian vine?"*

Plutarch, -

*"See the cluster-bending vine!
See, and drink, and drop supine."*

Astymadus says that Bacchus –

*"gave men the vine, which cures all mortal grief,
Parent of genial wine."*

Ion, the Chian, referring to the vine and its grapes, says, -

*"And from its buds burst forth a numerous race
Crushing, as one upon the other pressed;
But when the noise has ceased they yield their juice,
Divinest nectar, which to moral men
Is ever the sole remedy for care,
And common cause of joy and cheerfulness.
Parent of feasts, and laughter, and the dance,
Wine shows the disposition of the good,
And strengthens all their noble qualities.
Hail! Then, O Bacchus."*

Antiphanes explains the usage, -

The Wines of the Bible

“Shall I speak of rosy sweet from Bacchie spring?
I’d rather you’d say wine. Forbear those sad, long-winded
Sentences, those long and round-about periphrases.”

It is evident from these varied references, sacred and profane, ancient and modern, that the phrase, “fruit of the vine,” is a simple periphrasis for wine; and that there is nothing in the expression to necessitate the conclusion that it is, and must be, a designation of unfermented grape juice.

B. Blood of the Grape

The “blood of the grape” is another of those tropical expressions for wine which we find in Scripture, and from which it is inferred that the wine so designated was an unfermented liquor. Dr. Lees says, - “‘Blood’ is a poetical name for ‘juice’ and is evidence of the ancient signification of *yayin* as ‘the juice of the grape’ prior to fermentation.”²⁴⁷ But this is a mere assumption; for neither the term “blood,” nor the word “juice,” nor the phrase “blood, or juice of the grape,” furnishes any evidence of a *yayin* “prior to fermentation.”

Virgil says, -

*“Legean juice
Will stamm’ring tongues and staggering feet produce.”*

Swift, -

*“And Bacchus for the poet’s use
Poured in a strong inspiring juice.”*

²⁴⁷ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 22

The Wines of the Bible

Burns, -

*"I sing the juice Scotch beare can mak' us
In glass or jug."*

The expression "blood of the grape" is used in a similar manner. Dr. Lees, in a note, quotes from Achilles Tatius to the effect that "Bacchus once being entertained by a Tyrian shepherd, gave him some wine to drink. The shepherd, after he had tasted it, asked Bacchus, 'Where did you procure blood so sweet'" Bacchus answered him 'This is the blood of the grape.'"²⁴⁸ The quotation bears to be part of an extract from "*Tirosh to Yayin*, pp. 67,68. (1841)." But this part of the extract is dropped from the edition of that work published in the works of Dr. Lees, 1853; and, doubtless, with good reason. For the wine given to the shepherd, and designated "blood," was a fermented liquor, as the following words show: - "Having taken a hearty draught, and *becoming very jovial from its effects*, he said, 'Whence, stranger, did you procure this purple water, this delicious blood? It is quite different from that which flows along the ground; for that descends into the vitals, and affords cold comfort at the best; whereas this, even before entering the mouth, rejoices the nostrils, and though cold to the touch leaps down into the stomach, and begets a pleasurable warmth.' To this Bacchus replied, "This is the water of an autumnal fruit, this is the blood of the grape"; and so saying, he conducted the neat-herd to a vine, and squeezing a bunch of grapes, said, 'Here is the water, and this is the fountain from whence it flows.' Such is the account which the Tyrians give as to the origin of wine."²⁴⁹

²⁴⁸ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 181

²⁴⁹ Achilles Tatius, Book ii.

The Wines of the Bible

The “blood of the grape” is described in Deut. xxxii. 14, as *Khemer*, the Hebrew equivalent of the Chaldee *Khamar*; and this latter is the term employed to designate the intoxicating wine used by Belshazzar and his lords on that night of drunken revelry when the King of the Chaldeans was slain. Pliny informs us that Androcydes wrote to Alexander the Great:- “My good lord, saith he, remember when you take your wine that you drink the very blood of the earth; hemlock, you know, sir is poison to man, even so is wine to hemlock.”²⁵⁰ Wine is frequently called “the blood of Bacchus,” as modern beer and whiskey are termed “the strong heart’s blood of Barleycorn.” Timotheus, referring to the wine with which Ulysses intoxicated the Cyclops, represents it as mixed with water –

*“And twenty measures of the sober stream
He poured in, and with the blood of Bacchus
Mingled fresh tears, shed by the weeping nymphs.”*

Athen., xi. 13

Plutarch quotes an ancient epigram on earthen vessel of wine –

*“The Grecian earth now hardened by the flame,
Holds in its hollow belly Bacchus’ blood,
And has its mouth with Isthimian branches stopped.”*

Sympos.

Bayard Taylor, describing the Drunken Bacchus, by Michael Angelo, says, “Perhaps, too, the rich blood of the Falernian grape produced a more godlike delirium than the vulgar brandy which upsets the moderns.”²⁵¹ He also says, “Wine is the universal beverage of the laboring classes in Italy, or I might say of all

²⁵⁰ Book xiv. 5

²⁵¹ Views, A—Foot, ii. 264

The Wines of the Bible

classes; it is, however the pure blood of the grape, and although used in such quantities, one sees little drunkenness,- far less than in our own land.”²⁵² But the “pure blood of the grape” Mr. Taylor does not mean mere fermented grape juice, but unadulterated fermented wine; for he describes its manufacture in an “enormous tun,” “covered air-tight, and left for three or four weeks, after which the wine would be drawn off at the bottom.”²⁵³

Redding, referring to the freedom from acidity of German wines, and attributing it to the perfect fermentation which they have undergone, says this is the safest wine to be drunk of “any blood of the grape whatever.”²⁵⁴ A similar expression was employed by Rev. Dr. Duff several years ago, which has been taken advantage of by the advocates of the unfermented theory; but, as we learn from a letter recently published, contrary to the meaning of the eminent missionary. Referring to the wine used by the French peasants, the doctor had said:-“Instead of milk he has a basin of pure unadulterated ‘blood of the grape.’ In this is native original state, it is a plain, simple, and wholesome liquid; which, at every repast, becomes to the husbandman what milk is to the shepherd, not a luxury but a necessary; not an intoxicating, but a nutritive beverage.”²⁵⁵ In the letter recently published, Dr. Duff explains the above reference: - “On inquiry I found it was the pure juice of the grape which, as you know, ferments spontaneously when expressed from the husk – *fermented, therefore, but still pure, i.e.,* wholly undrugged or unadulterated with any extraneous matter of any kind. It was also very weak, that is, contained very little spirit, but still enough to preserve it. Being so weak, and so free

²⁵² Ibid., p. 286

²⁵³ Ibid.

²⁵⁴ Wine, p. 222

²⁵⁵ Richie’s Sc. Test. p. 77

The Wines of the Bible

from all adulterating mixtures, and taken in the manner in which I saw it taken, it was utterly incapable of intoxicating a child, and constituted a wholesome refreshing beverage, instead of milk, which was not to be had in that quarter. That is the sum and substance of what I wrote, or meant to write. *Such a thing as unfermented wine I never heard of in any country.*" Thus the "pure blood of the grape," referred to by Dr. Duff, was a fermented and alcoholic liquor.

The tropical usage now under consideration is further illustrated by the following examples, in which fermented wine is exhibited as the "blood of the grape." Thus an American wine is described as-

*"The fierry flood,
Of whose purple blood,
Has a dash of Spanish bravado."*

Byron says,-

*"Fill high the bow with Samian wine!
Leave battles to the Turkish hordes,
And shed the blood of Scio's vine."*

Scott speaks of –

*"A goblet crowned with mighty wine,
The blood of Valez' scorched vine."*

Sir. D. Sanford says,-

*"With this I tread the luscious grape,
And drink the blood-red wine."*

Spenser, as we have seen, speaks of

The Wines of the Bible

*"The fruitful vine, whose liquor, bloody red,
Having the minds of men with fury fraught," &c.
Another poet says, -*

*"Come, fill the bowl, the golden bowl,
With the blood of the blushing grape!
On its bountiful stream the jovial soul
May make for its cares escape."*

So far then as this designation is concerned, it is evident that a wine may be described as the "blood of the grape," and yet be a fermented liquor; for there is nothing in the expression to necessitate the conclusion that the liquor so designated unfermented grape juice.

C. Wine in the Grape

Various passages in ancient authors are appealed to in behalf of the unfermented theory, in which the words *yayin*, *oinos*, and *vinum*, and employed to designate the grape itself, and the juice itself, and the juice in the grape, *vinum pendens*: and from this usage it is inferred that these three terms are designations of two kinds of vinous liquor, fermented and unfermented. But the inference is not well founded; for whatever may have been the primary and real signification of *yayin*, and its cognate terms, it is manifest that in such cases as the above they are used proleptically. If for example, *yayin* is derived from *yon*, and signifies a fermenting and effervescing liquor;²⁵⁶ or from *yun-yavan*, and signifies a pressed out liquor;²⁵⁷ or from *yavan* or

²⁵⁶ Gesenius

²⁵⁷ Fuerst

The Wines of the Bible

yanah, “the primary idea of both being turbidness, or ‘boiling up,’ so characteristic of the appearance of the grape juice as it rushes foaming into the wine-vat,”²⁵⁸ it must be used proleptically, and not in its true primary signification, when it is applied as above; for neither the grape itself, nor the juice in the grape is a fermenting, effervescing, pressed out, turbulent, foaming, or boiling up liquor. If this be so, then instead of signifying two different kinds of wine – fermented and unfermented – this usage proves that hanging grapes, and the juice in the grapes, are not yet *yayin*, *oinos* or *vinum*, but are called proleptically, or by way of anticipation.

On the other hand, when Pliny speaks of a grape which might properly be styled the *sobria*, and Columella of a *grape* called the *amethyston*; and Layard says, the love songs of the poets produce an excitement which “exceeds that of the grape;”²⁵⁹ and Sir Robert Porter speaks of “the genial flow of the grape;”²⁶⁰ and Sir Walter Scott says, “I love to feel the grape in my very finger ends before they make the heart-strings tinkle,”²⁶¹ the word “grape” is used tropically for the *wine* made from it.

In like manner, when a modern housewife is preparing her domestic preserves, she calls the boiling *juice* currant or apple *jelly*, before it has *congealed*. We say of a boy, “the child is father of the man”; and little children are called “the *men* and *women* of the future.” “Centuries before the dawn of history,” the terms son and daughter were used proleptically, “the son, *suma*, the begetter, not the begotten, named from what he was to be, not from what he was; and the daughter, *dhughtar*, the milker, so named, not because she was the primitive dairymaid, but because

²⁵⁸ Lees

²⁵⁹ *Nineveh and Babylon*, xiv. 329

²⁶⁰ *Travels*, i. 348

²⁶¹ *Ivanhoe*

The Wines of the Bible

she was to be a giver of milk, a full-breasted nurse.”²⁶² The farmer speaks of his grain crops, *while still in the blade*, as oats, wheat, or barley; and of his green crops, *ere ever a root or bulb is formed*, as turnips, potatoes, or the like. All these are examples of a proleptical usage, in which the particular terms are employed to designate the persons and things referred to, not as they then really are, but as they shall be. In this way it was said to Abraham, while he was yet childless, “I have made thee a *father* of many nations;” which the apostle explains was spoken by the way of anticipation by “God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were (Rom. iv. 17).

Thus the “wine in the grape,” the “growing wine,” the “hanging wine,” the “expressed wine,” and the like, are expressions which, like the farmer’s “growing turnips,” or the housewife’s “boiling jelly,” denote, not what the liquid juice then was, but what it was to be, as when Addison says,-

*“On foreign mountains may the sun refine
The grape’s soft juice, and mellow it to wine.”*

Or Burns, -

*“let half-starved slaves in warmer skies
See future wines, rich clustering rise.”*

Dr. Lees says, - “To affirm, as Mr. Rule does, that ‘grape juice is not wine, and more than chaff is bread,’ is to overrule the plainest facts in language, and to mistake a contrast for a comparison. Chaff is the *husk* of corn, not the material of bread; but ‘grape juice’ is the very substance of wine, as Thomas Aquinas

²⁶² *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion and History*, By A.M. Fairbairn, p. 273

The Wines of the Bible

has it, of ‘the specific nature of wine.’”²⁶³ But for “chaff,” read *flour* in the objection, and what then? Flour is the very substance of bread. Is it, therefore, bread? Is the flour of the miller identical with the bread of the baker? And is a sack of flour precisely the same thing as a bag of biscuits? The expressed juice of the garden fruits, unboiled and unfermented, is juice only, and neither domestic jelly or home-made wine. The juice of the barley, extracted from the grain by steeping it in water, but unfermented, though it could be kept for a thousand years, would be barely water still, and not barley wine. And it would be quite as appropriate for a jar of that barely water to receive “honourable mention” as a jar of *unfermented beer*, as for the mere juice of the grape to be distinguished as unfermented wine.

The distinction between mere *juice* and real *wine* is fully recognized by both ancient and modern writers. Thus, in the Talmudic legend of the trees of Paradise, the palm tree says “O that he would prefer me. I will feed him with my golden dates, and the *wine* of my *juice* shall be his beverage.” The Rev. Dr. Ritchie, an advocate of the unfermented theory, speaks of the *must* “which flowed from the clusters,” and which was reserved for manufacturing a particular species of rich *wine*.²⁶⁴ He discourses on the properties of “ordinary *wine*,” which is “made from *grape juice*.”²⁶⁵ Dr. Lees, in like manner, says, “So far as is known of the ancient uses of the filter, whether applied to *wines* or *musts*, it is obvious,” &c.²⁶⁶ And again, “thus whether *must* or *wine* were used at discretion, one of them formed the basis of the compound,” &c.²⁶⁷ He also gives a variety of directions from

²⁶³ Nott’s *Lectures*, p. 222

²⁶⁴ Sc. Test, p. 91

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 230

²⁶⁶ *Review* of Nott, p. 16

²⁶⁷

The Wines of the Bible

ancient authors for the manufacture of different kinds of *wine* from *must*. Thus campanian, wormwood, hyssop, myrtle, and other wines, are not merely various kinds of *musts*, but are different sorts of *wines* made from *must*, with particular medicinal herbs added in the manufacture.

Abarbanel speaks of the “*wine* and *must*” being delightful products of the earth. Columella says, “Before you take the *must* from the vat, fumigate the vessels with rosemary, laurel, or myrtle, and fill the vessels full, that, in fermenting, the *wine* may purge itself well.” Here the liquor in the vat is *must*, and in the vessels *wine*. Varro also says, “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*.” Here again, the liquor before fermentation is merely *must*, and it is fermented that it may be “converted into wine.” Pliny says the mixture of different varieties of vines “deteriorates the flavour not only of the *must*, but the *wine* even as well.” “Thus it is, too, that *wine* is more odoriferous than *must*.” “There is a difference, too, between the kinds of *must* from which wine is made, and those from which *passum* [raisin wine] is prepared.” This writer not only distinguishes between *must* and the *wine* made from it, as above, but he almost expressly intimates that wine was a fermented and alcoholic liquor. He says, “There is no subject that presents greater difficulties than this, or, indeed, a more varied field for discussion, it being extremely difficult to pronounce whether wine is more generally injurious in its effects or beneficial. And then, in addition to this, how very uncertain is it, whether the moment we have drunk it, it will be productive for salutary results, or turn out no better than so much poison.”²⁶⁸ He says, “It is the property of wine, when drunk, to cause a feeling of

²⁶⁸ Book xiv.

The Wines of the Bible

warmth in the interior of the viscera, and when poured upon the exterior of the body, to be cool and refreshing.”²⁶⁹ This clearly shows that the wine was alcoholic. Distinguishing between oil and wine, and remarking that the former becomes unusable if kept beyond the year, he explains that this is a wise provision of Nature to render the use of oil “common and universal by the very necessity there is of using it while fresh;” whereas, “wine, which is only produced for the drunkard, she has seen no necessity for us to use when new” – *Quippe temulentia nascentibus tinis vi necesse non est.*²⁷⁰ He also says, “We must bear in mind that wine is nothing else but juice which has acquired strength by the process of fermentation;” or, as Holland puts it, “But this we must remember, every one of us, that the liquor of wine gets all the force and strength that it hath by working, spurning, and seething (as it were) in the lees while it is must,” – *Meminerimus succumbesse, qui fervendo vires e’ musto sibi feceit.*²⁷¹ And finally, as if to settle the question, he intimates that it was precisely this fermentation which in his day was regarded as differentiating mere grape juice from wine, for he says, “Taking care that the must does not ferment; for so they call the passage of must into wine,” – *Id evenit cura quoniam fervere prohiteur; sic appellant musti in vina transitum.*²⁷²

Now if these ancient writers, to say nothing of modern authors and advocates of the unfermented theory, such as Drs. Lees and Ritchie, thus distinguish between *must* and *wine*, and ascribe the difference between the two sorts of liquor to the process of fermentation; and if they are to be credited with a sufficient knowledge of the usages of their age, we must conclude that the

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

²⁷⁰ Book xv. 2

²⁷¹ Book xxiii. 1

²⁷² Book xiv. 9

The Wines of the Bible

ancient wines were fermented liquors – “for so they call the passage of must into wine.”

III. ANCIENT WINES – GREEK AND ROMAN

1. Fermentation

The inquiry we are now presenting is not a question of grapes, but of wine; not mere grape juice, but of grape preserved and used as a beverage by the ancients. Therefore, although the advocates of the unfermented theory should produce passage after passage, and pile argument on argument to prove that the growing grape was anciently called *vinum pendens*, “hanging wine,” and that the juice in the grape, or expressed from the fruit into the vat, was an unfermented liquor, called *yayin* by the Hebrews, *oinos* by the Greeks, and *vinum* by the Latins; after that mountain in labor has brought forth its little mouse, they must then produce evidence that the wine preserved in the cask or bottle, poured into the drinking vessel, and served up at the festive gathering, was also an unfermented liquor. We have no concern here with grapes, or with any sort of grape juice, but such as was thus preserved and used by the ancients as a beverage; for the question at issue in this controversy relates to the drinking usages of the people, and in substantially this – Were any of the vinous beverages of the ancients unfermented liquors?

We are not prepared to affirm with some writers that it is “quite impossible to preserve” grape juice unfermented, for Liebig and other chemists have shown that it is quite possible, and have explained the means by which it may be effected. Dr. Lees also testifies that he has “not only preserved such imported from Florence for sixteen years together,” and has “induced an able chemist to prepare such wine extensively, for both medical and sacramental uses,” but that “for many years past such wine has

The Wines of the Bible

also been at a vineyard in the neighbourhood of Cincinnati.”²⁷³ Without further questioning the right of such a preserved juice to the name of wine, we respectfully submit that these facts can in no way determine the question now at issue. Able chemists and others may have discovered, by the aid of modern science, methods of preserving the juice of the grape unfermented, but what evidence is there that these modern discoveries have been anticipated by the ancients? The so-called Passover Wine, for example, bears that it is prepared “only by Frank Wright.” Had the ancients any knowledge of such a mode of preserving the juice? Or is it “only” the recent discovery of one “able chemist” in the nineteenth century? If they were ignorant of that chemical process, was there any other method of preservation known to, or practiced by them? Before answering these questions, it may be well to know by what means grape juice can be preserved unfermented.

Liebig gives directions for this purpose, telling us that it may be effected by filling a bottle with juice, making it air-tight, and then heating it for a few hours in boiling water; but he informs us that when the flask is again opened, and its contents brought into contact with the air, “from this moment the same alteration begins to manifest itself which fresh juice undergoes. After the lapse of a few hours the contents of the flask are in full fermentation, and this state may be again interrupted and suspended as at first by repeating the boiling.”²⁷⁴ Bande says, - “Grape juice expressed in an atmosphere of hydrogen or carbonic acid, may be kept for months, if excluded from air or oxygen; but the admission of a few bubbles of either of these latter causes fermentation presently to commence, and it goes on if it once

²⁷³ Temp. Bib. Com. p. xxxiv

²⁷⁴ Letters, xx

The Wines of the Bible

begins.”²⁷⁵ Frank Wright’s Passover Wine, which is “preserved in *vacuo*,” is prepared, we understand, by an elaborate steaming process, in which the juice is heated to a certain point, both before and after bottling. Now, these modern preparations of grape juice “in a flask,” and “expressed in an atmosphere of hydrogen,” and “preserved in *vacuo*,” savour more of the exact processes of eminent chemists in their laboratories, than of the rude appliances of unscientific peasants in the open vineyards of ancient times. Moreover, although the wine vessels of the ancients were of different kinds and sizes, some of them were wooden casks of large capacity. Pliny speaks of a wine cask containing fifteen amphorae, which is equal to about 135 gallons.²⁷⁶ Virgin speaks of a wine jar so large as to conceal a fear stricken soldier who sought to hid himself behind it.”²⁷⁷ And Strabo, referring to Cisalpine Gaul says, “Their casks give evidence of the abundance of wine; these are made of wood and are larger than houses.”²⁷⁸ The size of these huge casks precludes the idea that the wine contained in large vessels of that description could have been subjected to processes like those described above with flasks and bottles. And the fact that when the flask of preserved juice is opened for use, though it should only be to fill a cup, and the exposure be only momentary, fermentation begins and goes on till the whole contents of the vessel have become alcoholic, shows that the common wines of the ancients, used as beverages much have been fermented liquors.

This will be further evident if we duly consider the nature and results of the fermenting process. Dr. Lees tells us, on the authority of the *Penny Cyclopaedia*, “It is known also that the juice

²⁷⁵ Chem., ii. 1649

²⁷⁶ Book ix

²⁷⁷ AEnid., ix

²⁷⁸ V. 1. 12

The Wines of the Bible

of the grape, or vegetable juice in general, becomes *turbid* when in contact with air *before fermentation commences*, and this turbidity I sowing to the formation of an insoluble precipitate of the same nature as ferment.”²⁷⁹ The doctor adds, - “The process is this: the oxygen of the air *first* unites with a nitrogenous substance (albumen) in the grape, causing its decay, and, in fact, converting it into yeast or ferment: this *next* proceeds to excite the vinous fermentation, which consists in the decomposition of the sacchar or sugar, and its conversion into alcohol and carbonic acid.”²⁸⁰ The fermentation of grape juice is here exhibited in two stages of its operation, “first” and “next.” But these are, in fact, two *inseparable* stages in one process. The “first” *necessitates* the “next.” The decomposition of albumen, by which it is “converted into the yeast or ferment,” is as certainly a true fermentation as the “decomposition of the *sacchar* or sugar.” And the yeast thus formed in the first stage must, in the very process, and to the precise extent of its formation, act as a ferment in the next stage in decomposing the sugar of the juice, thereby converting it into alcohol and carbonic acid. Accordingly, Dr. Lees elsewhere describes “the well known nature of ferment as the *product* and producer of *corruption*.”²⁸¹ He also informs us – “now, it must have been patent to all careful observers, *first*, that the juice of crushed grapes did ferment – ‘boil up’ or ‘bubble’ – when left exposed to the air for some hours, and without the adoption of preventive measures; and *secondly*, that the cause of this fermentation was the prior fermentation of something (gluten) in the grape, which had thus become a powerful ferment, i.e., a *seor*. This *seor* decomposes the sugar of the grape juice (*glucose*), the elements of which, entering into a new chemical relation, are

²⁷⁹ Works, ii. 186-86

²⁸⁰ Ibid.

²⁸¹ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 328

The Wines of the Bible

changed into alcohol and carbonic acid gas.”²⁸² Here again are the two stages of that one process: first, the *boiling up* (and *turbidity*) of the expressed juice; the said boiling up evidencing the fermentation of the *gluten*, and conversion into “a powerful ferment;” and, secondly, the fermentation of the glucose by the operation of that ferment, and the production of alcohol and carbonic acid. Thus, upon his own showing, the boiling up and turbidity of the juice in the vat ‘exposed to the air’ is demonstrative evidence of its actual fermentation. The decomposition of the sugar and its conversion into alcohol is caused by the action of a “powerful ferment.” This ferment is produced by the ‘prior fermentation’ of the gluten. And this prior fermentation is the cause of that boiling up and turbidity of the liquor. It was, doubtless, in view of this fact that Thomas Aquinas “cautioned against the use of *must* just expressed on *account of its turbidness*.”²⁸³ For, as Dr. Lees says, “Feather-white wine (wine fermenting in the vat) is far more pernicious than fully fermented wine. ‘Feather-white wine,’ so called in Germany, incautiously drunk may produce a most incurable ferment of the blood itself (as in putrid fever), the poor victim’s vital fluid being literally dried up.”²⁸⁴

Such being the nature and results of the fermenting process, when does it begin? We purposely say *begin*, that we may keep in view the two stages in the one process pointed out above, and not confound the beginning with the continuance, or with the end of the process; the initial fermentation with its completion. The two stages, as we have seen are inseparable and inevitable, “without the adoption of preventive measures,” which will be inquired into further on. Meantime it is to be observed that “the

²⁸² Ibid., p. 28

²⁸³ Ibid. p. 285

²⁸⁴ Nott’s *Lectures*, p. 202

The Wines of the Bible

juice of the grape, while it is protected by the external skin from contact with atmospheric air, scarcely undergoes any perceptive alteration, but the slightest perforation through its external covering, as *with the point of a needle*, for instance, is sufficient to alter all the properties of the juice.”²⁸⁵ If this be so, the crushing of the grapes, and the consequent exposure of the expressed juice in the vat to the air, must necessitate an immediate fermentation. Accordingly Liebig says, “It is obvious that, by the contact of these organic bodies with the oxygen of the air, a process begins, in the course of which their constituents suffer a total change in their properties.....The continuance of these processes, even when the oxygen, the original exciting cause of them, no longer acts, shows most clearly that the state of decomposition which has been produced among the elements of a *particle* of the mass, exercises an influence on the other particles which have not been in contact with the oxygen of the air: *for not only the first particle, but by degrees, all the rest, undergo the same change.*”²⁸⁶

Thus the action of the oxygen begins on the first particles of the juice exposed to the air, and proceeds, by degrees, until the whole is changed. Dr. Lees speaks of *debash*, the honey of dates, “in its natural state,” as exhibiting a “remarkable tendency to ‘corrupt *immediately*;’” whereas the dates themselves “were not liable to *sudden* fermentation and corruption like the liquid *shechar* or ‘honey.’”²⁸⁷ Dr. Nott also says, “From the moment.....the cluster of the vine is plucked, the process of decay commences, which, unless arrested, will continue in each, till all alike are rendered unfit for use by progressive fermentation.”²⁸⁸ Schutzenberger says, “Gay Lussac proves by well known experiments that

²⁸⁵ Liebig’s *Letters*, xvii

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁸⁷ *Works*, ii. 78

²⁸⁸ *Lectures*, p. 76

The Wines of the Bible

fermentation is only developed in the must of grapes when it has been placed for *a moment* in contact with air; he concludes from his experiments that oxygen is necessary to commence the fermentation, but that it is not required to continue it.”²⁸⁹ Pereira and Brande both refer to these experiments, and the latter says, - “Gay lussac found that even a *momentary* exposure of bruised grapes to air confers on them the capability of fermenting.”²⁹⁰ Liebig says, the change once begun “continues when, *after transient contact with air*, the atmospheric oxygen is entirely excluded.” “The affinity of these substances for oxygen is very powerful; *during the short space of time necessary to transfer wine from one cask into another*, they absorb oxygen from the air, and induce a state of acidity in the wine, which goes on irresistibly if it be not checked by artificial means.”²⁹¹ “the state into which an organic substance is brought by contact with the atmosphere, although this contact may have been but for an instant,” may “be destroyed by a high temperature,” &c.²⁹² When “the flask is again opened, and its contents brought into contact with air, from this moment the same alteration begins to manifest itself.”²⁹³

Now if the process of fermentation be so immediate in its action as that a momentary exposure of the grape juice to the atmosphere is sufficient to induce it, and if the action once begun by the absorption of “a few bubbles of air,” irresistibly goes on to complete fermentation, it must have been simply impossible for the ancients to have preserved their juice *liquid* and *unfermented*, unless they had boiled it in air tight flasks,²⁹⁴ or had expressed it in

²⁸⁹ On Fermentation, pp. 35,36

²⁹⁰ Chem., ii. 1640

²⁹¹ Letters, xix.

²⁹² Ibid., xx

²⁹³ Ibid.

²⁹⁴ Liebig.

The Wines of the Bible

“an atmosphere of hydrogen and carbonic acid,”²⁹⁵ or had subjected it to a steaming process, and preserved it in *vacuo*.²⁹⁶ But they trod their grapes in an open winepress, and pressed out the juice into an open vat, in the open air, so that fermentation was inevitable. When an active fermentation was desired they left the juice in the vat for a time, and then transferred it to the wine vessel in which the fermentation was completed. When a slow fermentation was sought, they hastened the transference from the vat to the cask, but not before the liquor had imbibed “an appreciable volume of oxygen;” so that fermentation was again inevitable.

It will be observed further, that no amount of care to prevent the access of oxygen to the grape juice after the liquor has been casked, and the vessel has been made air-tight, could possibly avert fermentation; for it had been demonstrated by Gay Lussac and others “that oxygen is necessary to commence the fermentation, but that it is not required to continue it.” M. Pasteur, who holds the germ theory of fermentation, has reported a series of carefully conducted experiments which show that “it is not the air which brings germs of the alcoholic ferment which propagate and multiply so rapidly in the must of grapes, or if it brings any, they are in so minute a quantity that they would not be sufficient to set up fermentation in so short a time. These germs are found on the very surface of the fruit, on the grapes which contain the saccharine liquid, the decomposition of which they excite as soon as they are placed in contact with it when the fruit is pressed.”²⁹⁷ To prove this M. Pasteur washed in water part of a bunch of grapes, and introduced into ten flasks “some drops of the liquid in which the grapes had been washed. And “there

²⁹⁵ Brande

²⁹⁶ Wright

²⁹⁷ Schutzenberger, p. 329

The Wines of the Bible

appeared some flakes of mycelium some alcoholic ferment, and afterwards *Mycoderma vini*; at the end of forty-eight hours the ten flasks were in full fermentation.”²⁹⁸ Thus, the mere pressure of grapes, without regard to the action of the atmosphere introduces into the liquid juice the “alcoholic ferments,” which necessitate its fermentation; so that the juice of the grape, expressed by the ancients, gathered in the vat, and filled into the cask, must have contained in it, at each stage, the elements of an inevitable fermentation.

It was, probably, in view of these phenomena that Elihu spoke of his belly “as wine which hath no vent; it is ready to burst like new bottles” (Job xxxii. 19). Had he referred to “new wine in old bottles,” the allusion to fermentation might have been accounted for, as by some writers, by supposing that portions of decaying albumen, adhering to the sides of the old skin bottles, would act as a ferment to the new wine. But as no such substance could have been contained in the “new bottles,” we must conclude that the presence of germs, or the absorption of oxygen in the vat, before the bottles were filled and closed, originated the fermenting process which was “ready to burst” the new bottles.

2. Means of Preventing Fermentation

It thus appears that all the expressed juice of the grape, without exception, in ancient times, must have undergone, at least, an initial fermentation; and that no subsequent effort, short of destroying the existing ferment, could possibly have arrested its progress towards a complete fermentation. With these living “germs,” or those “few bubbles of air,” in the grape juice, which

²⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 330

The Wines of the Bible

were unavoidable in the extraction of the juice, continued fermentation was inevitable, for it “goes on irresistibly if it be not checked by artificial means;”²⁹⁹ and “it is impossible to procure a partly and slightly fermented wine that will stop at a given point.”³⁰⁰

If, then, it be simply impossible to extract the juice from the grapes as the ancients did it, without inevitably fermentation; and if the expressed juice can only be preserved unfermented by destroying the ferment “by artificial means,” were they acquainted with any such method of destruction? Or was any such practice resorted to by them for this purpose? The advocates of the unfermented theory maintain the affirmative, and appeal to a variety of processes in ancient manufacture, which we must now inquire into. Before doing so, however, it may be well to repeat that we have no concern with “wine in the grape,” “hanging wine,” “growing wine,” and the like. These have been disposed of already, and it only remains to inquire into the wines prepared, preserved, and used as beverages, or for other purposes.

The ancient wines were of two classes, which we may describe as table wines and medicinal wines, the latter being chiefly used as remedies for particular diseases. These ancient wines, also, were made from different substances. Thus there were grape wines, barely wines, date wines, raisin wines, honey wines, and wines made from a variety of garden and other fruits. Were all of these, or any of them, unfermented liquors? Whatever they may have been when used as beverages, all of them, as we have seen, must have undergone an initial fermentation in the preparation; and if they were subsequently preserved and used as

²⁹⁹ Liebig.

³⁰⁰ Lees in Nott, p. 88

The Wines of the Bible

unfermented beverages, then ferment, unavoidably present in the extracted juice must have been destroyed “by artificial means.” Was any such practice employed by the ancients for this purpose?

Referring to the words of Christ, “neither do men put new wine in old bottles,” &c., Dr. Lees says, “The facts stated by the Saviour are only intelligible in the light of the efforts used by the ancients to prevent grape juice from fermenting, by straining the juice so as to free it from much of its gluten, and then bottling it with sulphur fumigation; or by subjecting the juice to a boiling heat, which checks all incipient fermentation, and then enclosing it in bags or other vessels made air-tight.”³⁰¹ Here, then, are three methods of preventing fermentation “used by the ancients,” viz., *filtration*, *fumigation*, and *inspissations*.

A. Filtration

There can be no doubt that filtration was extensively employed by the ancients, both in the manufacture and the preparation for use of their wines.

1. In some cases the *must* was strained after pressure. Dr. Nott quotes from Delphin Notes on Horace: - “Certainly the ancients strained and defecated their *musts* through the filter repeatedly, before they could have fermented; and by this process, taking away the foeces that nourish and increase the strength of the wine, they rendered them more liquid, weaker, lighter, sweeter, and more pleasant to drink.”³⁰² This statement is so far correct, if the fermentation referred to be understood, not as the initial fermentation unavoidable to the expressed juice, but the

³⁰¹ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 266

³⁰² Lectures, p. 79

The Wines of the Bible

complete fermentation effected after the juice had been transferred from the vat to the wine vessel. But no amount of filtration could possibly “prevent” either the one fermentation or the other. The straining of the juice would no doubt “free it from much of its gluten;” but how could that “prevent grape juice from fermenting,”³⁰³ if some of the gluten still remained in the liquor? Filtration might also take “away the foeces that nourish and increase the strength of the wine,” and thereby render “it more liquid, weaker, lighter,” &c., but how could this prevent fermentation? Pliny says, “The most useful wine is that which as all its strength broken by the filter,” but to break the strength of the wine is not necessarily to avert fermentation. Nicrus, in Plutarch, objects to the practice, alleging that “they certainly take off all the strength of the wine by straining it;” but Aristo, while admitting that “purging the wine takes from it all the strength which inflames and enrages the mind, and gives it instead therefore a mild and wholes temper,” denies that the liquor has thereby lost its force, for he says, “Nor have I brought you wine to the table, but such as is only purged of its dregs and filth.”³⁰⁴ It is evident from all this that the wine thus “purged of its dregs and filth,” was, none the less, a truly fermented liquor; and that while the straining might lessen the force of the wine, it could not, by any possibility, convert that fermented liquor into an absolutely innocuous, or unfermented wine. On the contrary, the exposure of the juice to the atmosphere in the vat before filtration, and its continued exposure to the air during repeated or frequent filtrations, render fermentation absolutely inevitable; and if this initial fermentation once sets in, it must go on to a complete fermentation, unless means be taken not merely to strain out the

³⁰³ Lees

³⁰⁴ Sympose

The Wines of the Bible

lees, but to destroy the ferment already existing in the filtered liquor. So obvious is this, that even Dr. Lees admits that “however interesting it might be to establish the fact that alcohol could be dissipated by any ordinary filtrations, we must still doubt the success of any resort to Greek and Roman writers in its verification.”³⁰⁵ The object of the ancients in filtering the must in the manufacture of wine was not to prevent fermentation, which was simply impossible, but to weaken its strength by straining out the lees which increased the potency of the liquor. If, however, the must was thin and weak, a quantity of lees was added to it, with the view of increasing the strength of the wine. Hence, Columella says, - “If you wish to preserve it to grow old, add to every *cadus* of two *urnae* one *sextarius* of the very best wine, or three *sextarii* of fresh and generous lees; or if you have vessels from which wine has been recently taken, mix it up in them. Anything of this kind will make the wine better and fuller bodied.”

2. After the must had become wine, the fermented liquor was again strained before it was fully sealed up in the ampora. Pliny says: - “Hyginus recommends us to strain and even rack off the wine at the seventh day after the winter solstice.”³⁰⁶ According to Pliny, the mass of grapes was left floating on the top of the liquor for five days; and according to Mago, “after it had remained for twenty days in this state it was racked into another vessel, closed up from the air, and covered with a skin.”³⁰⁷ Now, the fact that the grape juice, with its lees remaining in it, continued to be exposed to the air for five days, in one case, and twenty days in another, before the liquor was racked off into another vessel, proves, beyond question, that this strained wine was a fermented liquor. The object of this second filtration may have been to clarify

³⁰⁵ Review of Nott, p. 17

³⁰⁶ Book xviii.

³⁰⁷ Muspratt, p. 1107

The Wines of the Bible

the wine, or to weaken its strength. Harmer says: - "Thevenot, I remember, tells us the wine of Shiraz in Persia, 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."³⁰⁸ And Vizetelly, referring to certain modern wines, says: - "The Vernatsher red varieties were somewhat sweet, a circumstance due to the custom of filtering the must through sacks, after the first turbulent fermentation, and suppressing all further ebullition."³⁰⁹ Pliny also says: - "So vast are our efforts, so vast our labours, and so boundless the cost which we thus lavish upon a liquid which deprives man of his reason, and drives him to frenzy, and to the commission of a thousand crimes! So great, however, are its attractions, that a great part of mankind are of opinion that there is nothing else in life worth living for. Nay, what is even more than this, that we may be enabled to swallow all the more, we have adopted the plan of diminishing its strength by pressing it through filters of cloth, and have devised numerous inventions whereby to create an artificial thirst," &c.³¹⁰ Clearly, these filtered wines must have been fermented liquors.

3. A third filtration was given to the wine when it came to the table. Accordingly we find that, among the prisoners taken by Alexander from Darius, there were "seventeen artists who mixed drinks, and seventy slaves who strained wine."³¹¹ Pherecrates describes certain maidens who "did through a strainer pour red mantling cups of fragrant wine for all who wished to drink."³¹² Apelles at a banquet given by Arcesilaus attempted to strain the wine, but from want of practice blundered, "so that the wine

³⁰⁸ Obs., ii. 143

³⁰⁹ Wines of the World, p. 73

³¹⁰ Book, xiv. 22

³¹¹ Athen., xiii. 87

³¹² Ibid., vi. 9

The Wines of the Bible

appeared much thicker than usual.”³¹³ Pherecrates says: - I’ll give you then some wine to drink; put over the cup a strainer, and then pour in some wine.”³¹⁴ Martial also has several references to this practice, but without any allusion to the alleged purpose of preventing fermentation. He says, “you may use linen strainers for inferior wines.”³¹⁵ He speaks of “straining turbid Caecuban anxiously through linen filters.”³¹⁶ He also says: “Let the contents of this amphora, diminished by the lapse of a hundred consulships, flow forth, and let it grow brighter, turbid as it now is, strained through the purifying linen.” And that this filtered wine of great age was a fermented liquor, appears from the succeeding line – “When will it be mind to be warmed with wine so fitly quaffed?”³¹⁷

It must be evident from what has been said, that no filtration, however, frequently or carefully conducted, could, by any possibility, either prevent or arrest fermentation. The strainer might abstract the lees, and thereby both clarify and weaken the liquor, but it could not neither prevent, nor remove, nor destroy, the “alcoholic ferment,” whether germ or oxygen, which originates and maintains the fermentation. Therefore, the use of filter by the ancients furnishes no evidence in favour of unfermented wines.

³¹³ Ibid. x. 16

³¹⁴ Ibid., xi. 61

³¹⁵ Ep., xiv. 103

³¹⁶ Ibid., xii. 69

³¹⁷ Ibid., viii. 45

The Wines of the Bible

B. Sulphur Fumigation

This is the second “artificial means” attributed b Dr. Lees to the ancients, as having been employed to prevent the grape juice from fermenting. After the filtration came the “bottling with sulphur fumigation.” Dr. Ritchie asserts the same, observing that the action of this vapour “neutralized and destroyed the fermenting principle, existing as yet undeveloped in the must fresh pressed from the grape, leaving untouched the saccharine parts.”³¹⁸ But neither of these writers furnish any evidence of this alleged usage; and until that is done, their statements must be regarded as mere unproved assertions. Sulphur fumigation, we believe, is employed in modern manufacture; but the only allusion to its use by the ancients which we have been able to discover, occurs in a reference by Pliny to the preparation of fermented wine.

It appears that various substances were introduced into the liquor at different stages in the manufacture, and for different purposes; but none of them, so far as we can learn, for the prevention of the primary or alcoholic fermentation. Gypsum and lime were to “neutralize the acidity” of the wine. Potters’ earth, pounded marble, and salt, to “briskness to their wines when too flat.” Brown pitch, resin, old wine lees, and vinegar, to “season them.” *Sapa* and *defructum* to “modify their harshness, &c.”³¹⁹ “And the method used for seasoning wines is to sprinkle pitch in the must during the first fermentation, which never lasts beyond nine days at the most, so that a bouquet is imparted to the wine, with, in some degree, its own peculiar piquancy of flavour. It is generally considered that this is done most effectually by the use

³¹⁸ Test., p. 85

³¹⁹ Book xiv.

The Wines of the Bible

of raw flowers of resin, which imparts a considerable degree of briskness to the wine; while, on the other hand, it is thought that *erapula* ["headache," i.e. heady wine, seasoned with resin³²⁰] itself, if mixed, tends to mitigate the harshness of the wine and subdue its asperity, and when the wine is thin and flat, to give it additional strength and body." After remarking on the different kinds of pitch to be used, Pliny proceeds to say, "Cato recommends that wines should be got-up, *concinnari* is his word, by putting of lie ashes, boiled down with *defrutum*, one-fortieth part to the culens, or else a pound and a half salt, with pounded marble as well; *he makes mention of sulphur* also, but only gives the very last place to resin. When the fermentation of the wine is coming to an end, he recommends the addition of the must, to which he gives the name of *tortium*, meaning that which is pressed out the last of all."³²¹

Here, indeed, is a very brief reference to the usage appealed to – "he makes mention of sulphur also" – but in that reference there is not the remotest allusion to any practice of "bottling with sulphur fumigation" to prevent the grape juice from fermenting. Whatever object may have been intended by the use of sulphur, whether to prevent or correct acidity, it is evident from the whole paragraph that it had no reference to the prevention of the primary fermentation, for it was employed in the *getting up* of wines, and was introduced while the liquor was undergoing fermentation. Hence the words "during the first fermentation," and "when the fermentation of the wine is coming to an end." So that here is no evidence of that grape juice of the ancients was prevented from fermenting by the alleged practice of "bottling with sulphur fumigation."

³²⁰ Book xxiii. 1

³²¹ Book xiv. 20

The Wines of the Bible

C. Depuration

Dr. Lees, elsewhere, refers to a third effort on the part of the ancients to preserve “some of their wines by depurating them.” He quotes from Carr’s Roman *Antiquities* to the effect that “the must or new wine was refined with the yolks of pigeons’ eggs,” and adds, “which occasioned the subsidence of the albumen or ferment.”³²² It is hardly conceivable that the doctor is serious in appealing to this practice as an ancient method of preventing the grape juice from fermenting. The very authority from whom he quotes, and in the very words quoted, expressly intimates that the purpose of the practice referred to was not to prevent fermentation, but to *refine* the liquor. And it is difficult to conceive how the mere “subsidence of the albumen or ferment,” which neither removed the obnoxious substance, nor destroyed its properties, could possibly avert fermentation in the already fermented or fermenting liquor!

Horace refers to the practice appealed to, and indicates its true purpose when he says, -

*“He who with art would pour a stronger wine
On smooth Falernian lees, should well refine
The’ incorporated mass with pigeons’ eggs;
The falling yolk will carry down the dregs.”*

But neither the carrying down, nor the entire removal of the “dregs” from the liquor, whether effected by the purifying linen, or by the refining eggs, could possibly abstract or destroy the “alcoholic ferment” in the wine. So that here, again, is no evidence of the use of “artificial means” by the ancients to prevent grape juice from fermenting.

³²² Works, ii. 160

The Wines of the Bible

D. Fumaria

The Rev. Mr. Parsons, asserts, "on the highest chemical authority, that juices which are thick and syrupy are not of a consistence sufficiently liquid to admit of vinous fermentation." And he quotes Dr. Ure, - "The saccharine solution must be sufficiently diluted with water; when too much concentrated it will not ferment, hence very sweet musts furnish wines containing very much undecomposed sugar. For a complete fermentive action, one part of sugar should be dissolved in ten parts of water." Mr. Parsons then observes: - "In the facts given above respecting fermentation, it is worthy of remark, that Dr. Ure affirms that if 'the sugar in the juice be concentrated' fermentation will not take place; now, both by placing their wines in fumaria or ovens, and by boiling them down, the wine manufacturers of former days concentrated the saccharine matter of grape juice, and rendered it unfermentable. By filtering they abstracted the yeast, by ovens or boiling they concentrated the sugar, and therefore, rendered fermentation impossible."³²³

The "facts" most "worthy of remark" in this statement are the careless inaccuracy of the quotation, the false reasoning founded upon it, the slipshod mixing together of different processes, and the unwarrantable inferences deduced therefrom. Dr. Ure does not affirm that "if 'the sugar in the juice be concentrated,' fermentation will not take place," or how could he add, "hence very sweet musts furnish wines containing very much undecomposed sugar?" He merely says, "when *too much* concentrated it will not ferment." And even in this he evidently refers, not simply to fermentation, but to "a complete fermentive action," which has for its object the decomposition of all, or

³²³ Anti-Bacchus, pp. 84,85

The Wines of the Bible

nearly all, the saccharine matter, and the consequent production of a strong alcoholic liquor. In making certain descriptions of modern sweet wines, the fermentation is artificially arrested at a particular stage, with the view of retaining “very much undecomposed sugar” in the liquor. Redding says, - “An agreeable sweet wine is made in the island of (Madeira) by checking the fermentation, and adding brandy to the must.”³²⁴ Moreover, luscious wines furnished by “very sweet musts,” and containing “very much undecomposed sugar,” like that of Homer, referred to by Mr. Parsons, and others yet to be noticed, were in fact, as we shall see, fermented and highly intoxicating liquors; and some of the strong and heady wine of modern manufacture are distinguished by their lusciousness.

The writer appeals to three different processes in evidence of the preparation of unfermented wine by the ancients, and which he alleges “rendered fermentation absolutely impossible.”

The first of these, *filtration*, we have already noticed, and our readers will judge for themselves whether it supports this conclusion or not. The last of the processes, *inspissations*, will be inquired into as we proceed with our investigation. There remains, therefore, for present consideration, the use of the *fumaria*, which may be reckoned the fourth of the “artificial means” alleged to have been employed by the ancients to prevent grape juice from fermenting.

What, then, are the facts as to this usage? There can be no doubt that wine was anciently smoked in fumaria, and in blacksmith’s forges; but the liquor subjected to that treatment was an already fermented wine, and the practice was resorted to, not for the purpose of preventing fermentation, which had already taken place, but with the object of mellowing the

³²⁴ Wines, p. 265

The Wines of the Bible

harshness of the new wine, giving the fermented wine a factitious appearance of age, and artificially maturing it. The process is referred to and condemned both by Pliny and Martial. The former says, - "Some grapes receive from the smoke of the blacksmith's forge that remarkable flavour which it I also known to impart to wines."³²⁵ And he characterizes the practice as follows: - "Wine that has been mellowed by the agency of smoke is extremely wholesome – a fraudulent method of preparation that has been invented in the wine-lofts of the retail dealers. At the present day, however, this plan is adopted in private families even, when it is wished to give the appearance of maturity to wines that have become carious.....and yet we, on the other hand, persuade ourselves that as adventitious age may be imparted to wines by the bitter twang derived from smoke."³²⁶ Martial also says: - "Whatever the dishonest wine vaults of Marseilles contain, whatever cask has assumed age by the help of the flame, comes to us, Munna, from you: to your unfortunate friends you send, across seas and by circuitous paths, cruel poisons."³²⁷ And again, - "Since your sportula attracts to you hundreds of citizens, you may set before them the smokey wines of Marseilles."³²⁸

It will be observed that Pliny denounces the practice as a "fraudulent invention" which makes the wine "extremely unwholesome," and martial declares that these liquors come from "dishonest wine vaults," and are "cruel poisons." Notwithstanding, however, of these unfavourable opinions, and as illustrating how tastes differ, Horace says: -

³²⁵ Book xiv.

³²⁶ Book xxiii.

³²⁷ Exp. x. 36

³²⁸ Ibid., xiii. 123

The Wines of the Bible

*"We'll pierce a cask with mellow juice replete,
Mellowed with smoke, since Tully ruled the state." – Odes, iii. 8)*

Ovid also says: - "he draws the wine which he had racked in his early years, when stored in a smoky cask."³²⁹

The same practice is still resorted to by modern manufacturers, Redding, referring to Maderia, says, - "They ripen and mellow their wines in stoves, which they keep in a temperature from 80° to 90° of Fahrenheit, by which they save six years of age; but a voyage to the East or West Indies gives a preferable quality to the wine."³³⁰ Muspratt, in like manner, says, - "The wines were placed in a smoky receptacle to ripen, the object being the same in ancient as in modern times, to assume maturity.....It is well known that Madeira ripens rapidly if the bottles are plunged into a hot bed, or into stable dung. Madera and such like wines are sent to warm countries to improve. Mulder had Madeira which had been seven times in cask to the East Indies and back, and truly, says he, such nectar was unknown to the gods of the ancients."³³¹

It will be seen from these references that the use of this ancient smoke was intended for something altogether different from that alleged by Mr. Parsons; and that the practice appealed to affords no evidence of the existence or use of unfermented wine.

³²⁹ Trist.

³³⁰ Wines, p. 265

³³¹ Chem. Pp. 1107, 1108, 1120

The Wines of the Bible

E. Immersion

Appeal is also made to a fifth effort on the part of the ancients to preserve grape juice from fermenting, which is thought to be referred to by Pliny when he says, "*Medium inter duleia vinumque est quod Graecia aigleukes vocant, hoc est semper mustum,*" &c.³³² Dr. Laurie, in an article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (1869), drops the conjunction *que* from *tiaum*, and translates the passage; "The medium quality amongst sweet wines is that which the Greeks," &c. He is thereupon accused "of mis-reading the text of an ancient author, and then foisting upon the reader a translation not faithful even to the reading so perverted."³³³ The accuser should have made sure of his facts before publishing such a serious charge against the character of the writer. Is he quite certain that Dr. Laurie has misread the text? In the folio edition of Pliny, published in "*Coloniae Allobrogum,*" 1615, the *que* is dropped in the marginal reading, and *vinum est* is given as the reading in the oldest manuscripts. This being so, Dr. Laurie has simply followed that old reading, of the existence of which his accuser is apparently in ignorance; and if that reading is correct, *dulcia vinum* must denote sweets of the genus *vinum*, vinous sweets, or sweet wines. We are inclined to think, however, that the *que* has been dropped from the text by some old copyist, either by accident or design; for Pliny further on makes a similar distinction between the *vina* and the *dulcia*.³³⁴

It is of little importance to the general question whether we interpret the *medium* of the text as "medium quality," according to Dr. Laurie, or an "intermediate thing," according to his critic, or

³³² Book xiv. 9

³³³ *Answer to the Unanswerable*, p. 153

³³⁴ Book xiv. 13

The Wines of the Bible

the liquor of “middle quality,”³³⁵ or as “intermediate article,”³³⁶ there can be no doubt that the reference is to a species of wine occupying an intermediate place between the *dulces*, previously described, and the *nobilia*, or generous wines, afterwards described. The former (*dulces*) include different varieties of *passum*, *sapa*, and *defrutum*; and the latter (*nobilia*) exclude secondary wines (*deuteria*), and embrace “eighty different kinds,” “which may with propriety be reckoned in the class of *nobilia*,” generous wines. So that this intermediate liquor will be a wine of medium quality, partaking partly of the nature of the sweets, and partly of the nature of the best wines – i.e., it will be a special preparation of sweet fermented wine.

It is to be observed, however, that there were different varieties even of this description of intermediate liquor. One was a Greek wine, *quod Græci aigleukos vocant*, “which the Greeks name *aigleukos*,” always sweet; and in the preparation of which was conveyed directly from the vat to the cask before active fermentation had set in; and the filled cask was there after plunged into water, and left there until the winter solstice was past. Another variety was a native wine, of which Pliny says, “There is another kind, again, of natural *aigleukos*, which is known in the province of Narbonensis by the name of *dulce*, and more particularly in the district of the Voconti.” In the preparation of this variety of *aigleukos*, special attention was given to the grape, and its mode of treatment. Accordingly it is said, “The only grape, however, that is used in these various processes, is that of the vine known as the *helvinnaca*,” and “in order to make it [the *aigleukos*], they keep the grape hanging on the tree for a considerable time, taking care to twist the stalk. Some, again,

³³⁵ Bohn’s Trans.

³³⁶ Lees.

The Wines of the Bible

make an incision in the bearing shoot, as deep as the pith, while others leave the grapes to dry on tiles." The object of this treatment was obviously to increase the saccharine quality of the fruit, by partially drying the grapes in the sun, as in the preparation of *passum*, one of the *dulces*, thereby thickening and sweetening the juice, and fitting it for preparation of the *aigleukos* known "by the name of *dulce*."

Besides these two varieties of this intermediate wine, there are three others mentioned by Pliny, which "some persons add to the list of these sweet wines." One of these is named *diachyton*, "poured," or "strained through." It was made almost in the same manner as, and appears to have been nearly identical with, the "natural *aigleukos*" just described. Another is the liquor known as *melititos*, honey wine. "It differs from *mulsum* in being made of must," and it was prepared by boiling. And to all of these is known as *protropium*; such being the name given by some to the must that runs spontaneously from the grapes before they are trodden out."

Such, then, were the wines of medium quality, which were assigned an intermediate place between the *dulcia* and the *nobilia*; and which partook of the sweetness of the one class, and the generous quality of the other. Were these intermediate wines unfermented liquors? We shall find in another section that even *passum*, one of the *dulces*, was fermented. We are told by Pliny that the *protropum*, classed with the intermediate sweet wines was put into flagons, "and allowed to ferment" (*defervere*). And as "the only grape" used in "these various processes" of preparing the *aigleukos* was that of the vine known as the *helvonnaca*, we are further informed by Pliny that "it is generally agreed, however, that the produce of the vine called *helvonnaca*, if taken

The Wines of the Bible

in too large a quantity, is trying to the head;" ³³⁷ so that thus far there is nothing to indicate the absence of fermentation in the intermediate wines.

It is, however, urged that the wine is termed *aigleukos*, which Pliny interprets as *hoc est semper mustum*, and that both terms *gleukos* and *mustum*, designate the unfermented juice of the grape. This is no doubt true in many cases, but there are numerous instances in which these words are used to denote fresh newly made, fermented wine. Even Dr. Lees admits this, and says, "*Gleukos* is properly an adjective signifying 'sweet,' and *oinos* is always implied, so that *gleukos* in a certain condition, - one of great sweetness, frequently but not necessarily free from fermentation."³³⁸ Referring elsewhere to the Hebrew *Ahsis* he says, "It is grape juice purely; and never seems to have acquired the ambiguous meaning for the Greek *gleukos* and the Latin *mustum*, which were undoubtedly sometimes applied to the juice of grape in an initial state of fermentation."³³⁹ And he says again, "Mr. Rule contends, and contends rightly, that both *mustum* in Latin, and *gleukos* in Greek, included an intoxicating liquor."³⁴⁰

This being so, the mere use of these "ambiguous" terms, in the above connection can afford no certain evidence in favour of the unfermented theory. The intoxication attributed to the apostles (Acts ii. 13) is expressly ascribed to the use of a liquor called *gleukos*; so that a wine may be truly *aigleukos* – "always *gleukos*," – and yet none the less a fermented liquor. Moreover, if the term *aigleukos*, with its explanation by Pliny, *semper mustum*, were intended to designate "grape juice purely," it would apply to all grape juice of every kind, when newly expressed from the fruit,

³³⁷ Book xxiii. 1

³³⁸ Temp. Bib. Com. pp. 431-32

³³⁹ Ibid. p. xxiii

³⁴⁰ Nott's Lectures, p. 222

The Wines of the Bible

whereas it is here limited to one particular description of liquor, made from one particular description of grape, and preserved in one particular way. We conclude, therefore, that the wine so designated was *semper mustum*, “always fresh,” or *aigleukos*, “always sweet,” – i.e., it was justly called “by the name of *dulce*,” for it was a sweet wine which retained its freshness, and was not so liable to acidity as some of the other wines were.

It is further alleged, that the *aigleukos* was prepared “by using great precaution, and taking care that the must does not ferment,” from which it is inferred that the reference is to the preparation of unfermented wine. But it must be obvious that if the supposed “precaution” be possible, and be taken with the juice of any kind of grape, the liquor will be preserved unfermented, and be *semper mustum*, “always must.” The *aigleukos* in question, however, is made, as we have seen, from only one kind of grape, and is preserved only in one particular way; so that it cannot have been a mere preserved must. It is true that in making this wine care was taken to prevent fermentation; but the question is, what fermentation? And when? In modern wine manufacture the fermentation passes through three stages – first in the vat, second in the cask, and third after the wine has been racked. “Fermentation in the vat is what is called “tumultuous.” “The second fermentation in the case is a miniature repetition of that in the vat. A precipitation again takes place, and the wine is afterwards racked. A third, called the insensible fermentation, continues for a long period after the wine appears as perfect as art can mature it.”³⁴¹ The same writer says, “if the quantity in the vat be considerable, and the weather warm, the wine should remain but a short time, for the

³⁴¹ Redding, p. 62

The Wines of the Bible

fermentation is quickly perfected.”³⁴² When a strong wine was required, the ancients appear to have fermented the must in the vat before filling it into the *dolia* or *amphora*, in which the fermentation was completed; but when a weaker and sweeter liquor was desired, they hastily transferred the must from the vat to the cask in the earth, or immersed it in water, as in the present case. If this had not been the purpose intended in the preparation of the *aigleukos*, it is certain that no subsequent immersion or burial could possibly have averted fermentation, if the juice had once, and only momentarily, imbibed a few bubbles of air. Now as the must of the *aigleukos* was taken from an open vat, after exposure to the atmosphere, such an absorption of oxygen must have taken place as would have rendered fermentation inevitable. Therefore the fermentation sought to be averted in the manufacture of this “always sweet” wine, must have been the active fermentation of the juice in the vat before it was casked and immersed.

This conclusion is confirmed by all the facts of fermentation already noticed, and may be further established by the following considerations. Thus Brande says, “Contact of air is unnecessary, and sometimes even injurious during the progress of fermentation.” Fabroni says, “Wine is formed equally well in closed vessels as in the open air.” Gay-Lussac has shown “that oxygen is necessary to commence the fermentation, but that it is not required to continue it.” M. Pasteur found the mere washings of grapes in full fermentation in closed flasks. “M. Bechamp had already proved by former experiments, that grapes bear on their surface all that is necessary to cause saccharine water to ferment, even when protected from the air.”³⁴³ Liebig says, “In many cases

³⁴² Ibid., p. 66

³⁴³ Schutzenberger, p. 331

The Wines of the Bible

the change once begun in organic matters, continues when, after transient contact with air, the atmospheric oxygen is entirely excluded. Must, the fermenting grape juice, continues to ferment in closed vessels; and the fermenting wine, in the manufacture of champagne, often bursts the strongest bottles. Milk, once exposed to the air, coagulates, and becomes sour, even in hermetically sealed vessels.”³⁴⁴ Dr. Lees admits that “a slow and slight fermentation will, however, form carbonic acid gas in wine closed .p (as in the making of champagne), which, being retained, accounts for the headiness that has been ascribed to such wine.”³⁴⁵ Wirtzung informs us that “in Liefeland they have in some places a custom that they hoop their vessels with iron, and so bury the meade under the earth, and this will be stronger than any wine.”³⁴⁶ Redding says, “Though wine will ferment when excluded from atomospherical communication it then ferments exceedingly slow.”³⁴⁷ He also says, “The wine being barreled, is removed into the first cellar. The best cellars should be slightly humid, and as deep under ground as the nature of the soil will permit them to be, *even fifty feet*.”³⁴⁸ Burchardt, describing the manufacture of palm wine in Nubia says, “It is then strained, and the clear juice put into earthen jars, which are well shut up, and *then buried in the ground*, where it ferments.”³⁴⁹ Niebuhr says, “At Loheya we bought a sort of wine prepared from an infusion of dry grapes in water in a pot, which is *buried in the ground* to make the liquor ferment.” He also refers to a fermented liquor called *Busa*, which is “common in Armenia, where the inhabitants keep

³⁴⁴ *Letters*, xviii.

³⁴⁵ *Works*, ii. 150

³⁴⁶ *Practice of Physic*, p. 748

³⁴⁷ *Wines*, p. 60

³⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 67

³⁴⁹ *Lees Works*, ii. 150

The Wines of the Bible

it in large earthen pots, *half buried* in the ground.”³⁵⁰ Liebig, referring to the desirability of discovering some method “to preserve wine and beer for an unlimited period,” says, “Experimental art has discovered a means of accomplishing this purpose perfectly. It consists in keeping the fluid at a low temperature when undergoing fermentation.”³⁵¹ Accordingly he recommends wine-growers to “employ in the manufacture of wine the deep rocky cellars, which are found so advantageous for the making of the finer sorts of beer in preference to all others.” And he says, in explanation, “Thus we obtain from the same grape juices, when fermented in different temperatures, wines of different quality and character; for, according as the temperature of the air in the harvest season is high or low, according to the depth of the fermenting cellar, and its temperature during the fermentation, the quality, the smell, and the taste of wine varies.”³⁵²

To obtain a wine that would thus keep “for an unlimited period,” and be “always sweet,” the ancients hastily transferred the must from the vat to the cask before active fermentation had set in, and then immersed the vessel in water, or buried it in the earth, much in the way recommended by Liebig as above.

Sir Edward Barry refers to a similar practice when he says, - “Baccius mentions that some of the Spanish wines were in great estimation at Rome in his time, and were exported in large quantities to different countries on account of their superior qualities. Their usual method of preserving them, after they had been well depurated, was to *bury them underground*, in earthen vessels, for two or three years, and afterwards to dig up every year as many as they expected a demand for, which they

³⁵⁰ Travels, ii. 186

³⁵¹ Letters, xix

³⁵² Ibid., xvii.

The Wines of the Bible

immediately removed to their cold vaults. The coldest was always preferred to any other in which the wine gradually acquired more strength, and such a delicate fragranc y, that even the smell of it quickly revived the spirits; and taken in moderate quantity, was particularly useful to sick persons in a low and languid state.”³⁵³ A still closer imitation of the ancient method is noticed by Sir Edward in a description of wine made in England by the Hon. Charles Hamilton. After referring to the careful gathering of the grapes, and the flow of the juice by the pressure of their own weight, which was “clear as water, and sweet as syrup,” he proceeds, - “As fast as the wine ran from the press into a large receiver, it was put into the hogheads, and closely bunged up. In a few hours one could hear the fermentation begin, which would soon burst the casks, if not guarded against by hooping them strongly with iron, and securing them in strong wooden frames, and the heads with wedges; in the height of the fermentation I have frequently seen the wine oozing through the pores of the staves. These hogheads were left all the depth of winter in the cool barn, to reap the benefit of the frosts.”³⁵⁴ Muspratt says, “The wine being in casks is directly placed in the cellar. The cellars are deep in the earth, *like mines*, with huts over them.”³⁵⁵

Redding also describes the manufacture of a wine which was prepared somewhat after the manner of the Greek *aigleukos*, and was like it a *wine for keeping*, “always sweet” and yet fermented. He says, “The white wines *de garde*, or wines for keeping, as it may be rendered, are made of the best white grapes, from the must of a single pressure. The must is put up in iron-bound casks, very strong, as it comes from the press. The bung is made as close as possible, and they cover it with linen soaked in oil, over which

³⁵³ Wines of the Ancients, p. 74

³⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 474

³⁵⁵ Chem. P. 1117

The Wines of the Bible

are placed fine ashes well pressed down. The wine is racked twice at the end of eight or ten months from the vintage. After this the cask is left without closing or filling up for ten or twelve years, when the wine is bottled, and improves the longer it is kept.”³⁵⁶

The immersion of the casks in water, or burying them in the earth, was evidently intended by the ancients, not to prevent fermentation, which, as we have seen, was impossible, but to lessen the activity, to prevent acidity, and to keep the wine cool and sweet. Accordingly we find that several of the wines already noticed were similarly treated, and when a Grecian lady was asked how she kept her wine so cool, she replied, “I cool it in a well.”³⁵⁷ Athenaeus refers to this custom of immersion when he says, “We use our wells to cool it in, and then we mix with snow.” And again, “Your father has just dropped down into the well to cool himself, as men cool wine in summer.”³⁵⁸ In like manner the *aigleukos* was immersed in water, and left to remain “until frosty weather has made its appearance.”

The tendency towards acidity is noticed by several ancient writers, and seems to have been the chief difficulty which had to be encountered in the manufacture of ancient wines. Ovid speaks of wine flowering, “and the scum covers the casks.”³⁵⁹ Apuleius says, - “One of the servants came running from the wine cellar, and announced that all the wine that had long ago been racked off, was boiling up in all the vessels, with a heat as if a large fire had been put under it.”³⁶⁰

To avert this evil various substances were introduced into the liquor in the process of manufacture, such as pitch, resin, &c. But

³⁵⁶ Wines, p. 187

³⁵⁷ Anacharsis, v. 216

³⁵⁸ iii. 98

³⁵⁹ Fasti

³⁶⁰ Works, p. 187

The Wines of the Bible

the Greeks seem to have followed the advice of Pliny, when he says that to avert “a spontaneous fermentation a second time,” “weak thin wines should be kept in *dolia* sunk in the ground.”³⁶¹ Plutarch also says, - “That the air will impair wine no man doubts, and therefore we usually bury or cover our barrels, that as little air can be might come near them.”³⁶² Redding explains that fermentation is “rendered active by warmth, while it is retarded by cold”; that “when excluded from atmospherical communication it then ferments exceedingly slow”; and that “it is an excellent thing to throw cold water over the casks, and apply ice below them, when there is reason to apprehend that wine is turning, thus early allaying the elements of mischief.”³⁶³

Reviewing the whole of these facts, and taking into consideration the method of preparing the *aigleukos*, we seem to be shut up to the conclusion that the special object sought by the manufacturer was to prepare a wine which would keep, free from acidity, and always sweet. And if it was so difficult to preserve even fermented wine from degenerating into vinegar, it must have been simply impossible to preserve the grape juice unfermented by any of the “artificial means” already noticed. Indeed, the author of *Tirosh lo Yayin*, with all his pleadings on behalf of the unfermented theory, is constrained to admit that there was only one possible means of preservation: - “It is also a well authenticated fact that the more luscious the grape, the greater tendency to the acetous fermentation; and the warmer the climate, the greater the proneness to lusciousness in the grape. In Palestine, then, even more than in Italy, *the necessity*

³⁶¹ Book xiv. 21

³⁶² Sympose

³⁶³ Wines, pp. 58, 60, 74

The Wines of the Bible

existed for boiling down the grape juice to preserve it at all as wine."³⁶⁴

If this be so, and there can hardly be a doubt of it, then – (a) filtration, fumigation, depuration, immersion, &c, were neither intended nor fitted to prevent grape juice from fermenting; (b) the ancients had no means of preserving the juice unfermented except boiling it; (c) if any unfermented wine was prepared, preserved, and used by the ancients as a beverage, it must have been boiled wine; (d) if any preserved, unfermented wine is spoken of in the Bible as the beverage of Jews or Christians, or otherwise employed, it must have been grape juice boiled down. (e) Accordingly the whole controversy as to the existence and use among the ancients of unfermented wine as a beverage, converges on this point, and must be fought out on this line. If such a beverage was known or used, it must have been boiled wine. This being so, we now proceed to examine the sixth effort of the ancients to prevent grape juice from fermenting.

F. Inspissation

The advocates of the unfermented theory appeal, with almost endless iteration, to the fact, which no one acquainted with ancient usages ever thinks of denying, that it was a common practice with the ancients to boil their grape juice. This appeal is so strongly insisted on, and so confidently relied upon by these writers, that they seem to think it entirely conclusive of the whole question at issue; and accordingly, the boiling fact is thrust forward on every opportunity, and *sapa* or *defrutum* crops up on almost every page. Now, in this they have either deceived

³⁶⁴ Sec. xix

The Wines of the Bible

themselves by an imperfect investigation, or they are desirous of misleading their readers in regard to three important facts. In the first place, they speak of *sapa* or *defrutum* as if it were the only boiled grape juice known to the ancients; whereas, in fact, there were several preparations of this kind. In the second place, they infer that boiling was resorted to for the exclusive purpose of preventing fermentation; whereas, in fact, it was employed for several different purposes. And in the third place, they allege that this *sapa* or *defrutum* was an unfermented wine, the common and favourite drink of the people, whereas, in fact, it was not a beverage at all.

(a.) Wines Boiled and Fermented

Sapa or *defrutum*, the one differing from the other merely in the degree of its consistence, was undoubtedly boiled grape juice; but so also were several of the ancient wines, some of which, at least, were manifestly fermented liquors. Athenaeus says, "Aleman somewhere speaks of a wine as free from fire and smelling of flowers, which is produced from the Five Hills, a place about seven furlongs from Sparta.....The Carystian wine is that which comes from Carystus, in Laconia, on the borders of Arcadia. And he calls it 'free from fire,' as not having been boiled; for they often used boiled wines."³⁶⁵ The Abbe Barthelmen, and Potter, in his *Antiquities*, ii. 360, inform us on the authority of Democritus and Palladius, that this boiled wine of Laconia was used by the Spartans; that it was boiled till a fifth part had evaporated; and that it was kept four years before it was used. And the former says, it was drank in moderation on account of its intoxicating power, for "such is the spirit of the answer which a Spartan

³⁶⁵ i. 57

The Wines of the Bible

returned one who asked him why he was so moderate in the use of wine? 'That I may never,' said he, "stand in need of reason of another,"³⁶⁶ Horace intimates that the Chian, one of the famous Greek wines of the Augustan age, was a boiled wine; for he says, - "A little Chian's better when 'tis boiled"³⁶⁷; and we shall see in another section that this was a fermented wine. Pliny and other writers refer to a variety of wines which were boiled in their preparation. Thus *axymel*, sour honey wine, *hydromel*, sweet honey wine, *passum*, raisin wine, *lora*, the *vinum operarium* of the Latins, *andmyrtites*, a species of myrtle wine, were boiled and fermented.

The same practice is still followed in modern times. Accordingly Redding says, - "Boiled wines, *vins cuits* (*vino cotto*, Italian), are of ancient date, having, it is supposed, passed very early from Asia into Greece. They are common in Italy, Spain, and France.....This wine is very pleasant to the taste, of a deep amber colour, delicate and generous. Corsica is famous for such wines, which are treated so judiciously in the boiling, that in the north of Europe they are taken for Malmsey or Canary. When very old they are often passed off for Cyprus, Tinto, or Malaga, of the best kind.....Boiling is also adopted to make new wine have the appearance of old.....Bordeaux wine two years old will thus acquire the flavour of that which is ten or a dozen in age. Port wine is often thus treated in England, by placing the bottles in tepid water, and raising it to the boiling point."³⁶⁸ Clearly these boiled wines were fermented liquors. Dr. Bowring also says that in Syria "the habit of boiling wine is almost universal, and destroys its character," in his opinion. Redding says, "Marco Polo, the traveler, met with boiled wines on the confines of Persia as long

³⁶⁶ Anacharsis, iv. Pp. 185-7

³⁶⁷ Sat., ii. 8

³⁶⁸ Wines, pp. 78, 79

The Wines of the Bible

ago as the middle of the thirteenth century. He says that the Mahomedians of Taurus, to whom wine was forbidden by their religion, used to boil it, by which means they changed the taste of wine, and consequently the name, whence they might lawfully drink it, through the gloss thus flung over the stumbling block which their faith cast in the way of their enjoyment. The same writer adds that *the people were great drunkards*.”³⁶⁹ In Wilkes’ *U.S. Exploring Expedition*, we learn that the Chilians manufacture some of their grape juice “into a hard and acid wine, called *masta*, or boil this juice down to the favorite drink of the lower classes, called *chichi* which somewhat resembles Perry or cider in flavour.”³⁷⁰ “The *chichi* is made by boiling down the clear grape juice *after fermentation*, for several hours, over a slow fire. After this process, it was put in enormous earthen jars, containing from 60 to 120 gallons, which are covered over and tightly luted.”³⁷¹ And that this boiled wine was an intoxicating beverage is evident, not only from the express statement “after fermentation,” but also the subsequent reference to the stupidity of the guide who had “indulged too much in his favourite *chicha*.”³⁷²

³⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 305

³⁷⁰ Pp. 187, 188

³⁷¹ Ibid., p. 193

³⁷² 198. Dr. Lees manipulate this testimony as follows: - “It is pitable to see you settling the tastes of all the world by your own taste for teddy or brandied port. A passage from Wilkes *U.S. Exploring Expedition* may be usefully cited: - ‘They (the Chilians) only manufacture some grapes into a hard acid wine, called *masta*, - or boil the juice down to the favorite drink of the lower classes, called [dulces,but] after it has passed through a fermentation, *chicha*.’ (i. 68-72). You confound sour wine, boiled wine, alcoholic wine, and grape juice altogether.” (Works, iii. Liv).

Here we have – (a) a wrong reference to the pages of the volume, as will be seen from our quotations above; (b) “*dulces*” is interjected as the name of the boiled juice, whereas no such term is used by the explorers, the liquor being termed *chicha* ; (c) the passage is made to read as if the Chilians made two

The Wines of the Bible

The famous wines of Lebanon are for “the most part boiled.” The golden wine “called *vino d’oro*, is in much esteem there, a dry delicate wine, which, when boiled, sparkles like champagne.”³⁷³ Volney, in his travels, did not appreciate “the wines of Lebanon, so boasted by the Grecian and Roman epicures. The Europeans may try them, and see how far they agree with the ancients in opinion; but they should observe that the passage by sea *ferments boiled wines a second time*, and bursts the casks.”³⁷⁴ Sir Francis Head describes the manufacture of a low classed wine in France, in which the pulp is put into a cellar made for the purpose; several pails of water are added, it is then left to boil for five or six days, and after that it is distilled for brandy.³⁷⁵ Lady Hester Stanhope’s physician, describing the vintage at Meshmush on Lebanon, says, - “Those who wish to have a dry wine put the juice thus expressed into large earthenware jars, which hold from nine to eighteen gallons or more, where it remained to ferment.....Those who are desirous of having a sweet wine, put the juice on the fire in a cauldron, and heat it short of boiling, until a scum forms on the surface, which they take off. They then put it in the same kind of jars for fermentation.”³⁷⁶ Mr. Homes, missionary, says, - “Whether boiled or not, whether sweet or sour, all the known wines are intoxicating.....We might say the same of the sweet wines, that, although by drying the grapes in the sun, or by boiling the must, the wine is preserved sweeter

kinds of boiled juice, the one unfermented, and called *dulces*, and the other fermented, and called *chicha*, whereas only one kind of boiled juice is spoken of, and that a fermented liquor, and its name *chicha*.

Is it not “pitiable” for a writer to manipulate his authorities in that fashion?

³⁷³ Redding, p. 307

³⁷⁴ Travels, pp. 382, 382

³⁷⁵ Faggot of French Sticks, i. 376, 377

³⁷⁶ Travels, ii. 391-94

The Wines of the Bible

than it would otherwise be, such wines are still intoxicating, and some of them extremely so. In some districts the people regard the boiled wines as stronger than the simple fermented ones. Those of Mount Lebanon are stronger than the majority of the wines of France.”³⁷⁷ Eli Smith, an American missionary in Syria, having inquired into the nature of the wine manufacture in seven districts of Mount Lebanon, says there are three different processes. “Sometimes the simple juice of the grape is fermented without any previous preparation. The quantity thus made is small, and does not keep well.....Sometimes the grape juice is desiccated or boiled down before fermentation. The quantity made in this way is very great.....As soon as this [scum] ceases to rise, the boiling is stopped, and the must set aside for fermentation. The quantity is usually diminished only four or five per cent. By boiling, and the wine is commonly sweet. A third process is to dry the grapes partially in the sun, ere they are thrown into the winepress.....Sometimes Mr. Smith adds, there is a combination of these various processes. The practice of adding to the strength of wine by the infusion of brandy is unknown in these regions, and drugged wines are equally unknown.”³⁷⁸

It will be seen from these various testimonies, to which others might be added, that the boiling of grape juice is not an uncommon practice either in ancient or modern times; that it was not limited to the preparation of *sapa* or *defrutum*; and that there can be no doubt of the fact that a boiled wine may be, nevertheless, a fermented liquor. All quotations, therefore, which merely show that the grape juice was boiled by the ancients, though they were as numerous, would be as valueless in this

³⁷⁷ Eadie’s *Ency.*, Art. “Wine”

³⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

The Wines of the Bible

controversy as the autumn leaves that strew the value of Vallambrosa!

(b.) The Purpose of Boiling the Juice

It being admitted that the ancients sometimes boiled their grape juice, it is assumed by the advocates of the unfermented theory that the purpose of this boiling was to prevent fermentation; and it is hence inferred that the boiled wines were unfermented liquors. The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* says, - "The object of the inspissations was to prevent fermentation, and it seems to have answered that purpose very well."³⁷⁹ If by this it is intended that the only purpose of the boiling was to prevent fermentation, we deny the assertion, and appeal to the facts advanced above to prove the contrary. In some preparations, indeed, to be noticed immediately, such prevention was undoubtedly secured, but in making wines the boiling had a totally different object, as we have seen.

When the purpose of the manufacturer is to make grape syrup for table use, the juice must needs be boiled to the required consistency, and by this boiling a sweet preserve or jelly may be prepared, free from fermentation. In making grape syrup for seasoning wines and other similar purposes, the juice is also boiled to the required consistency, and is free from fermentation. See Muspratt, Redding, Vizetelly, and Pliny for evidence of this usage. But as these grape syrups are not vinous beverages, they do not concern us at present.

The wine manufacturer sometimes aims at producing a sweet and strong wine, and for this purpose condenses the grape juice

³⁷⁹ See xvi

The Wines of the Bible

by boiling before fermentation, as in the preparation of the boiled wines of Lebanon. At other times, in consequence of the nature of the grape, or on account of the unfavourable season, the expressed juice is defective in saccharine matter, and consequently thin, weak, and watery. The wine is made from such juice must inevitably partake of the same bad qualities, and therefore boiling is resorted to, not with the view of preventing the alcoholic fermentation, but in order to promote it. By this means a certain proportion of the watery fluid is dissipated by evaporation, the consistency of the juice is increased, the primary fermentation is promoted, the secondary fermentation (acetous) is averted, and the general result is an improved and superior wine. In certain districts, noticed by Pliny, where the produce of the vine was inferior, and in particular seasons when the weather had been unfavourable, this boiling process must have been frequently employed by the ancients. They appear to have had great trouble with their wines. Do what they could, there was a constant and almost universal complaint at times, that the wine would not keep. Careful racking and straining were resorted to, resin and other substances were introduced into the liquor, the casks were immersed in water buried in the earth, stored in cellars, seasoned with syrups, preserved on the lees, matured in ovens, exposed for weeks to the sun; but whether from saccharine defect or other causes, the wine would not keep. Now, wherever this tendency was indicated, the boiling of the liquor, with the addition of honey, or *defructum*, or old wine, must have been employed to prevent, not the primary fermentation, which it was designed to promote, but the secondary fermentation, which it was sought to avert. And thus this boiling was intended to make good wine which would keep, and to prevent the good wine from degenerating into a worthless *vappa*, or vinegar.

The Wines of the Bible

In addition to all these varied boiling, there was yet another which was employed for an altogether different purpose. In the case of the former the liquor was boiled, either to prevent or to promote fermentation, as the special object required, but in the case of the latter the liquor subjected to the boiling process was an already fermented and alcoholic wine, and it was boiled with the object of lessening the potency of the liquor. It is known that Alcohol boils and passes off as vapour at 180° Fahr., while water requires 212°. Accordingly, in boiling a strong fermented wine, a certain portion of the alcohol is thereby abstracted, and the boiled wine is made proportionately weaker in alcoholic strength. This fact is noticed by the *Christian Guardian*, the organ of the Wesleyan Church in Canada, in an article in favour of unfermented wine, reprinted in this country in the *Social Reformer*, the organ of the Scottish Permissive Bill Association. The writer says, "No educated man need be told that when we boil fermented wine, we drive off its strength in the form of alcohol; but when we boil unfermented wine, we concentrate its strength in the form of molasses."

Now, it is to be observed that Aristotle, in a treatise on Drinking, says, "If the wine be moderately boiled, then, when it is drunk, it is less apt to intoxicate; for, some of its power has been boiled away, it has become weaker."³⁸⁰ The practice referred to by the Stagivite could not have been the boiling of grape juice to prevent fermentation; for, in that case, the boiling of the liquor would simply have "concentrated its strength in the form of molasses," and the only "power" which could have been "boiled away" would have been the power of water! Neither could it have been the boiling of grape juice to promote fermentation; for, in that case, the boiling would have concentrated the liquor,

³⁸⁰ Athen., x. 34

The Wines of the Bible

promoted its alcoholic fermentation, and increased its potency. It must, therefore, have been an already fermented wine which he directed to be “moderately boiled,” that, by the evaporation of some of its alcohol, it might lose a portion of its alcoholic strength, and thus “become weaker,” and be “less apt to intoxicate” the drinker. In all this there is not, as yet, a fragment of evidence of the preparation of an unfermented boiled wine.

(c.) Sapa and Defrutum

Among the preparations of boiled grape juice made by the ancients, *sapa* and *defrutum* hold a conspicuous place. They are the chief, and we might also say the only pillars of the unfermented wine theory. As such they demand a full and careful examination. Before entering, however, directly upon the investigation as to their nature and uses, a preliminary inquiry here presents itself. The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* raises the question, “Which of the sweet wines noticed were the most popular and most frequently used in Palestine?” And he adds, “Bearing in mind the preliminary definitions, the contest will clearly rest between *ausis*, fresh pressed juice, or must, - *sobhe*, *sapa*, inspissated wine, - and *hhometz*, vinegar or sour wine. Whichever it was, the most ordinary beverage was water.”³⁸¹ Extending the inquiry beyond the narrow limits of Palestine, and giving up must, as popularly deemed injurious,³⁸² and vinegar, as too acid for the sweet tooth of the people,³⁸³ we seem to be shut up to the conclusion that *sapa*, or boiled grape juice, was the

³⁸¹ Athen, x. 34

³⁸² “Every kind of must is unwholesome to the stomach.” – Pliny, xxiii. 1

³⁸³ “Sour or acid wine we scorn and loathe.” – Athen, iii. 97

The Wines of the Bible

“most popular and most frequently used” vinous beverage of the ancients. Was this so? We shall see.

1. If *sapa* was an unfermented liquor, and the favourite drink of the people, it must have been chosen either from taste or principle. We shall find in another section that the popular taste was not in favour of unfermented beverages; and if this be so, then unless the masses of the people were ascetics who deprecated the use of alcoholic stimulants, such a beverage as *sapa* could never have obtained the preeminence as *sapa* could never have obtained the preeminence thus assigned to it. Ancient abstainers, of whom more anon, would undoubtedly abjure fermented liquors, and restrict themselves to water, or other equally innocent drinks; but if neither taste nor principle intervened, it is simply inconceivable that such liquors would be used as beverages. The presumption, therefore, is, that if *sapa* was an unfermented wine, it certainly could not have been the “most popular and the most frequently used in Palestine,” or anywhere else.

2. We have abundant evidence in ancient writings of the use of water, milk, wine and other liquors as beverages, by different nations, tribes, classes, and sects in all ages of the world. Water and milk were the exclusive drinks of certain persons who abstained from wine. *Posca*, or *lora*, was used by soldiers and slaves. *Passum* was, at different periods, the prescribed drink of women. Beer was extensively used among those people where wine was scarce. But, apart from water, “the most ordinary beverage” everywhere, wine was the common and favourite liquor. Pliny, who discourses at length, with much pathos and indignation, on the great “industry of man” in making wine, the “vast labour” and “boundless expense” lavished in procuring it, and the various extraordinary methods adopted by certain drinkers to stimulate their appetite for it, describes the endless

The Wines of the Bible

variety of liquors used by men, and says, - Democritus is the only person who has been of opinion that every kind could be enumerated; but "the rest of the authors have stated that they are quite innumerable and of infinite extent.....The varieties are very nearly as numberless as the districts in which they grow." "There are eighty different kinds of generous wines" (*nobilis*). Of the various kinds of drink "there are no less than one hundred and ninety-five different kinds of it; indeed, if all the varieties are reckoned, they will amount to nearly double that number."³⁸⁴ After describing certain liquors made from fruits, herbs, &c., he says, "Different beverages, too, are made from the cereals – *zythum* in Egypt, *caelia* and *cerea* in Spain, *ceresia* and numerous liquors in Gaul and other provinces."³⁸⁵ "The people of the Western world have also their intoxicating drinks made from corn steeped in water. These beverages are prepared in different ways throughout Gaul and the provinces of Spain; under different names, too, though in their effects they are the same. The Spanish provinces have even taught us the fact that these liquors are capable of being kept till they have attained a considerable age. Egypt, too, has invented for its use a very similar beverage made from corn; indeed, in no part of the world is drunkenness ever at a loss. And then, besides, they take these drinks unmixed, and do not dilute them with water, the way that wine is modified; and yet, by Hercules! One really might have supposed that there the earth produced nothing but corn for the people's use. Alas! What wondrous skill, and yet how misplaced. Means have absolutely been discovered for getting drunk upon water even."³⁸⁶

It is uncertain whether, by this intoxicating water, Pliny refers to the foreign beer he has spoken of, or to the otherwise unrecorded

³⁸⁴ Book. xiv.

³⁸⁵ Book xxii.

³⁸⁶ Book xiv.

The Wines of the Bible

discovery of distillation, or to such strong waters, as those spoken off by other writers. Theopompus says “that near the river Erigone all the water is sour; and that those who drink of it become intoxicated, just like men who have drunk wine.”³⁸⁷ Pliny says, “Let a man drink of the Lake Ciltorius, he shall take a misliking and loathing of wine, saith M. Varro. And yet Eudoxus and Theopompus report that the water of the fountains before said make them drunk that use it.”³⁸⁸ Ovid, who refers also to the “Clitorian Spring,” says of the River Lyncestis that “as soon as any one has drunk of it with immoderate throat, he reels just as if he had been drinking unmixed wine.”³⁸⁹

However this may be as to that water, it is to be observed that ancient writers, in describing the personal and social habits and customs of different peoples and nations, take notice of the several kinds of food, fruits, and liquors used; remarking on abstinence from wine and other things; referring to fermented and unfermented bread; speaking of the fermentation, boiling, seasoning, keeping, spoiling, and drinking wine; describing its manufacture and the substances from which it is made, as grapes, dates, orchard fruits, herbs, roots, cereals, &c.; and noticing its different varieties, qualities, and characteristics, such as sweet and sour, old and new, thick and thin, strong and weak, austere and mellow, fierce, fiery, heady, and mild, light and innocent. –

*“And to wash all those dainties down,
There’s wine, both native and imported,
White and red, and sweet and acid,
Still or effervescent.” – Athens. lv. 7*

³⁸⁷ Athen., ii. 18

³⁸⁸ Book xxxi. 2

³⁸⁹ Meta., xv.

The Wines of the Bible

Now, if *sapa*, or any other fermented wine, was preserved by the ancients, and, especially, if it was “the most popular and most frequently used” beverage of any people, it is surely not unreasonable to expect some evidence of that popularity and frequent use. But although we have found innumerable references to the use of water and milk, fermented and unfermented bread, the sour drink of the slaves, and the sweet drink of the women, we have not been able to discover the slightest vestige of evidence anywhere that *sapa* or *defrutum* was the common and favourite beverage of any one.

3. It is admitted that there have been abstainers from wine, more or less numerous, in nearly all ages and nations of the world. Notices of such persons, tribes, and sects are found in the works of Pliny, Strabo, Plutarch, Herodotus, Philo, Josephus, Athenaeus, and others. From these references we learn the reasons of that abstinence, the modes of life followed by the abstainers, and the beverage which were substituted for the liquors abjured. But nowhere can we find an instance of unfermented wine, whether *sapa* or *defrutum*, or any other, having been included among these substituted drinks. *Passum* was permitted to women, while wine was forbidden, but no exception was made in favour of the more innocent *sapa*. Ascetics abstained from wine as an unlawful drink, but they made no exception in favour of *sapa* as a lawful beverage. Indeed, ancient writers seem to have been ignorant of any prepared drink between wine and water, which abstainers either could, would, or did use. Hence, when these latter are spoken of, they are usually described as being “water drinkers;” and when their dietetic usage is referred to, the contrast is uniformly between wine and water, and not between fermented and unfermented wine, as in those cases where a contrast is made between the use of leavened and unleavened bread.

The Wines of the Bible

Eubulus says that “water makes those who drink nothing else very ingenious, but wine obscures and clouds the mind.” Amphis, on the contrary, says, -

*“There is, I take it, often sense in wine,
And those are stupid who on water dine.”*

Phylarcus says that Theodorus, the Larissean, was a water drinker. He asserts also that all Spaniards drink water. Pythermus mentions Glaucon as having been a water drinker. Hegesander says that Anchimolus and Moschus were water drinkers all their lives. Matris, the Athenian, as long as he lived, abstained from wine and every other kind of drink, except water. Lamprus, the musician, was a water drinker; and Machon, the comic poet, mentions, Mosehion as a water drinker. Polemo, the Academic philosopher, from the time that he was thirty years of age to the day of his death, never drank anything but water. Demosthenes, the orator, who may well be admitted as a witness in his own case, says, that he drank nothing but water for a considerable length of time. Pythias contrasts the conduct of Demosthenes with that of Demades, saying, “the one is a water drinker, and devotes his nights to contemplation, as they say; and the other is a debauchee, and is drunk every day, and comes like a great potbellied fellow, as he is, into our assemblies.”³⁹⁰ Dr. Lees also supplies some extracts to a similar purpose. Of the Macrobianus it is said, “their meat is baked fresh, their drink milk.” The Suevi of Germany “live for the most part on milk and flesh. No wine is allowed to be introduced among them.” The Spaniards – “their common drink water, seldom wine.” Epicurus – “Wilt thou support life, says the philosopher? Have bread and water.” Seneca

³⁹⁰ Athen., ii. 19-22

The Wines of the Bible

– “himself a water drinker.”³⁹¹ It will be observed that in all these cases the contrast is invariably between wine and milk, or wine and water, never between fermented and unfermented wine, or wine and *sapa*.

Moreover, we find that references to wine are scattered profusely through all ancient literature. Poets and philosophers, historians, geographers, naturalists, and others, discourse at length of its power and flavour, its medicinal qualities and special characteristics, its use in moderation and excess; but they are silent as to the employment of any kind of liquor like unfermented *sapa*, in social usages or public festivities. With them, as before, the common distinction is between wine and water. Clement of Alexandria says, “I admire those who desire no beverage than water, the medicine of a wise temperance, avoiding wine as they would fire.”³⁹² Athenaeus says, “Among the Greeks, those who sacrifice to the sun make their libations of honey, as they never bring wine to the altars of the gods, saying, it is proper that the god who keeps the whole universe in order, regulating everything, and always going round and superintending the whole, should be in no manner connected with drunkenness.” From which it may be inferred that these old Greeks knew nothing of an unfermented wine, otherwise they would have been under no necessity of “making libations of honey” that the sacrifice might not be “in no manner connected with drunkenness.”

It may further be observed here that *passum*, not *sapa*, was the beverage prescribed to women; that *posca* or *lora*, not *sapa*, was the common drink of the soldiers and slaves; that milk or water, not *sapa*, was the usual beverage of abstainers; and that various sorts of wines, not *sapa*, were the favourite beverages of other

³⁹¹ Works, ii.

³⁹² Temp. Bib. Com. p. 352

The Wines of the Bible

classes. Whatever, therefore, *sapa* may have been, and by whomsoever or for whatever purpose it may have been used, it certainly was not “the most popular and most frequently used “vinous beverage in Palestine, or anywhere else.

4. It is admitted that the practice of boiling grape juice is of very ancient date, and was resorted to alike by the Jews, and the Greeks, and the Romans. One description of inspissated juice had a special designation among the Israelites, which we shall examine in our investigation into the wines of the Hebrews; while among the Greeks it was known as *siraion* and *hepsema*, and among the Romans as *sapa* and *defrutum*. These latter designations are all included and explained by Pliny in the following paragraph: - “As to *siraeum* [or *siraion*], by some known as *hepsema*, and which in our language is called *sapa*, it is a product of art, and not of nature, being prepared from must boiled down to one-third: when must is boiled down to one-half, we give it the name of *defrutum*.” Some differences are found in particular writers as to the exact proportions of the condensation: Varro, reversing the order of Pliny, making the *sapa* a half, and *defrutum* a third, Columella agreeing with Varro; and Palladine slightly differing from both, but all agreeing that the two substances were preparations of boiled grape juice.

Accepting this conclusion, from which there is no escape, the first point to be determined is the question, For what purpose was this boiling resorted to? The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin*, who is followed in this by other advocates of the unfermented wine theory, summarily settles the matter in the ex-cathedra fashion, - “The object of inspissations was to prevent fermentation, and it seems to have answered that purpose very well.”³⁹³ Granting that the inspissations secured that result, was this the special object

³⁹³ Sec. xvi.

The Wines of the Bible

sought, or the purpose for which must was boiled? We have shown that boiling was practiced to effect condensation, to promote fermentation, to prevent acidity, and to lessen the potency of a fermented liquor. The object, therefore, of the inspissations of *sapa* and *defrutum* may have been to prepare and preserve a liquor, or to manufacture a solid – i.e., to prepare a grape *wine*, or to make a grape *jelly*. These writers argue as if the mere fact of the boiling determined the purpose of the inspissations, which is absurd and illogical. Because a modern housewife boils currant juice, must we therefore assume that her intention is to make currant wine? Is it not equally possible and probable that her object is to make currant jelly?

It is for the advocates of the unfermented theory to establish their position by facts, and not by mere assumptions and dogmatic assertions. Where, then, are their facts? What are their proofs that *sapa* and *defrutum* were liquids and not solids? Or that this boiled juice was “the most popular and most frequently used” beverage of the ancients, whether Jews or Gentiles? We find that *sapa* and *defrutum* turn up often enough in their writings, but without a shred of evidence that they were beverages, and not jellies.

We find minute and detailed accounts given by Pliny, Athenaeus, and other writers of the drinking habits and social usages of the ancients, of the different kinds of cups and wines used, with full particulars of the processes of vine culture and wine manufacture, and the like; but when, where, or by whom is *sapa* or *defructum* ever spoken of in connection with these drinking habits and social usages? We have references to persons of sober, and abstinent, and intemperate habits; to the drinking laws and usages of different nations and ages; to the use of water and milk, and *passum* and *lora*; to preferences for old wines, to preferences for old wines, and sweet wines, and strong wines,

The Wines of the Bible

and mixed wines, and unmixed wines; but nowhere can we discover and reference to the common and popular use of *sapa* and *defrutum*. Ancient writers were familiarly acquainted with the two substances, their properties, and modes of preparation, and the purposes for which they were used. Now, if they had been common and popular beverages, is it conceivable that, amid all these varied references, there should have been no allusion to their use as favourite drinks? *Credat Judaeus Apella!*

It is true, *sapa* and *defrutum* are included by Pliny in the chapter in which he discourses on *dulcia*, sweets,³⁹⁴ but *murrina*, *passum*, *defrutum*, and honey are all classed together, and “reckoned not only among the wines, but among the sweets (*dulcia*) also.”³⁹⁵ It is evident, therefore, that the mere association of different varieties of sweets affords no more evidence that sweet *sapa* was an unfermented wine. Moreover, in another passage, instead of intimating that *sapa* was a wine of any description, he carefully and expressly distinguishes it from vinous beverages, saying, - “*Sapa* has a close affinity with wine, being nothing else but must boiled down to one-third.” – *vinu cognate res sapa est usto decoct donec tertia pars supersit.*³⁹⁶ Columella, also, distinguishes it from the beverages, when he says, “*Defrutum*, however carefully made, is liable to grow acid just as wine does.”

What, then, was this boiled juice? With what object was it inspissated? And for what purpose was it used? Pliny, in a paragraph describing its nature and various designations, says, - “All these mixtures have been devised for the adulteration of honey.” If *sapa* was a thickening syrup or jelly, it might easily have been used to mix with honey; but if it was a liquid wine, and a common and popular beverage, it would have been utterly unfit

³⁹⁴ Xiv. 9

³⁹⁵ Xiv. 13

³⁹⁶ Book xxiii. 2

The Wines of the Bible

for such a purpose. The same writer informs us that *sapa* was employed, with other substances for fattening periwinkles;³⁹⁷ and that *defrutum* was used as food for bees.³⁹⁸ Ramsay tells us that *carenum*, *defrutum*, and *sapa*, were boiled preserves, and says, “these jellies were used for a great number of domestic purposes.”³⁹⁹ Pliny mentions that *sapa* was employed as a preserve for olives;⁴⁰⁰ as a preserve for grapes;⁴⁰¹ as a preserve for sorbs;⁴⁰² that *defrutum* was used in making *elecampagne*, a fruit conserve;⁴⁰³ that *sapa* was used in a variety of medicinal preparations – with flour as a poultice,⁴⁰⁴ with purslain,⁴⁰⁵ and with the seed of the nettle.⁴⁰⁶ He also intimates that wines were “got up” with the aid of *defrutum*;⁴⁰⁷ that *sapa*, and other substances, were used for seasoning wines,⁴⁰⁸ and to modify their harshness,⁴⁰⁹ The Author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* says, “Cato notices it both as a condiment for other wines, like the *vin cuit* of Provence, and the *vino cotto* of modern Italy, and also as syrup for preserving grapes, apples, pears, sorbs, and even olives.”⁴¹⁰ The same author refers also to Columella, who describes it as useful “to season (*comdire*) the must made from (the produce of) old

³⁹⁷ Book ix. 56

³⁹⁸ Book xxi. 14

³⁹⁹ *Antiquities*

⁴⁰⁰ Book xv. 3

⁴⁰¹ Book xxiii. 1

⁴⁰² Book xv. 21

⁴⁰³ Book xix 5

⁴⁰⁴ Book xxii. 5

⁴⁰⁵ Book xx 20

⁴⁰⁶ Book xxii. 13

⁴⁰⁷ Xiv. 20

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid. 21

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid. 19

⁴¹⁰ See xvi.

The Wines of the Bible

vineyards.”⁴¹¹ Rev. Mr. Burns describes the *soveh* of the Hebrews, which Dr. Lees and others identify with the Latin *sapa*, as “a rich thick, and probably boiled wine, greatly relished, not for any alcoholic property, but for its luscious quality, being more of a jelly than a liquid.”⁴¹² Alexis, also, places it among his seasonings.⁴¹³ Antiphanes includes it in his catalogue of seasonings for food.⁴¹⁴ Ovid speaks of it as being used to sweeten milk as a drink.⁴¹⁵ Virgil represents the busy housewife preparing her domestic preserves for the season –

*“Or boils in kettles must of wine, and skims
With leaves the dregs that overflow the brims.”*

He also directs that a preparation be made for sickly bees, -

*“Mix it with thickened juice of sodden wines,
And raisins from the grapes of Psythian vines,”*

It will be observed from these various references to the purposes for which this boiled juice was used, that it was not a vinous beverage at all, but merely a grape syrup, or, as Mr. Burns says, “more of a jelly than a liquid.” This being so, it is as absurd to rank it among the ancient wines, with which it has merely “a close affinity,” as being like them prepared from the juice of the grape, as it would be to class our modern fruit preserves among our domestic, or home made wines.

Dr. Lees quotes from a variety of authors, to show the modern use of this boiled juice. Some of the quotations are indeterminate;

⁴¹¹ Ibid.

⁴¹² Basis of Temperance Reform, pp. 91-92

⁴¹³ Athen, ii. 77

⁴¹⁴ Ibid., iv. 69

⁴¹⁵ Fasti.

The Wines of the Bible

but those which describe the nature and use of the minate; but those which describe the nature and use of the boiled juice show that it is an article of food rather than a vinous beverage. Thus Capt. Frankland says, it is boiled “and becomes a rich syrup,” and it is “used by the mountaineers as *a substitute for sugar*.”⁴¹⁶ Dr. Robinson says, “The juice is boiled down to a *syrup*, which, under the name of *dibs*, is much used by all classes wherever vineyards are found, as *a condiment with their food*.”⁴¹⁷ Capt. Treatt says, “The poor people mix flour with theirs, while boiling, to make it go further. It is eaten at their meals with bread, and very nice it is.”⁴¹⁸ Alexander speaks of “the comfortable meal of fine bread, dipping it into *yeourt* (cruds) sweetened with *sheera*, or the boiled juice of the grape.”⁴¹⁹ Capt. Cook speaks of the palm juice, of which “both a syrup and coarse sugar” are made, and says that “the *syrup* is not unlike treacle in appearance, but is somewhat thicker,” and it was *eaten* by the sailors in very great quantities.⁴²⁰ Rev. S. Robson says, “*dibs is eaten with bread*,” and is a very common meal in winter and spring.⁴²¹ Tavernier says, “They prepare all sorts of *conserves*, dry and liquid, and several sorts of *syrups*.”⁴²² Dr. Ranwolff says, “They have many sorts of preserves, very well done with sugar and honey.”⁴²³ Curzon “ate biscuits and *jelly* of dried grape juice.”⁴²⁴ Olearius describes a “syrup of sweet wine,” made in Persian, boiled down to a “drug, called *duschab*, reduced to a “paste,” cut “with a knife,” and dissolved in water! In

⁴¹⁶ Works, ii. 136, 137

⁴¹⁷ Ibid., p. 144

⁴¹⁸ Ibid.

⁴¹⁹ p. 148

⁴²⁰ Ibid.

⁴²¹ p. 152

⁴²² p. 155

⁴²³ Ibid.

⁴²⁴ p. 156

The Wines of the Bible

another case it is mixed with beaten almonds, flour, &c., put under pressure and made into a paste, "which grows so hard that a man must have a hatchet to cut it!!" A conserve is also made of it "like a pudding," with a thread of cotton inserted "to keep the paste together."⁴²⁵ And all this is a "syrup of sweet wine!!" Ranwolff speaks of two kinds of boiled juice, "one very thick, and the other somewhat thinner;" the former is the best, and it is exported; the latter, mixed with water, is given to servants "instead of a julep."⁴²⁶ Brown describes *dibs* as "a *confection* made of the grounds of wine and almonds."⁴²⁷ Burchardt says, grapes "are boiled to form the sweet glutinous extract called *dibs*, which is a substitute for sugar all over the East."⁴²⁸ Buckingham describes "a very curious article" of desert, "*probably* resembling the dried wine of the ancients, which they are said to have preserved in cakes." This article was made out of the "fermented," or, as he afterwards thinks, the unfermented "juice of the grape made of *jelly*."⁴²⁹ And Capt. Frankland notices a curious description of "preserve made of boiled grapes."⁴³⁰ Thus every one of his own authorities negatives the very theory which they are produced to support, each of them testifying that the modern *sapa* is a grape jelly, and not a vinous beverage.

An appeal is also made to testimony of Mr. Alsop in favour of the existence and use of an unfermented boiled wine in France.⁴³¹ And what does the respected Friend say? In the first place, he carefully distinguishes between boiled grape *juice* and *wine*. In the

⁴²⁵ Ibid.

⁴²⁶ P. 157

⁴²⁷ Ibid.

⁴²⁸ Ibid.

⁴²⁹ Ibid.

⁴³⁰ Ibid.

⁴³¹ Temp. Bib. Com. p. xxxv

The Wines of the Bible

third place, he intimates that the former ("*syrup*") is "an article of domestic manufacture in almost every house in the vine districts of the south of France"; whereas the use of the latter ("*wine*") is "almost entirely confined to the men." And finally, he expressly says that the boiled juice is a "*syrup*" for making "family preserves" and embalming fruit; and, therefore, he substantially testifies that the unfermented boiled wine is a myth, the only boiled juice of which he knows anything being a "*syrup*" for "family preserves," and not a vinous beverage at all.

The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* is not more successful with his testimonies. He quotes from a few modern writers, and with very much the same result as the above. Thus Paxton says, "The juice that was extracted when I visited the press *was not made into wine*, but into what is called *dibs*. It resembles molasses.....It forms a pleasant article *for table use*, and is decidedly preferable to molasses."⁴³² Dr. Bowring says, "the habit of boiling wine is almost universal";⁴³³ but the boiled wine of Lebanon, as we have seen, was a fermented liquor. Sieber's reference to "the process of making wine by boiling in large coppers"⁴³⁴ is indeterminate, as nothing is said as to the quality of the boiled liquor. It is the same with the observation of Eustace as to the "boiling and storing the wine."⁴³⁵

The Manual for the Tuscan vine grower says, "Sapa is now used for sauce." The French Encyclopaedia describes *raisine* as, "in domestic economy, a kind of preserve made of the juice of the grapes before it is fermented, and which is called also *rob de*

⁴³² Sec. xiv

⁴³³ Ibid.

⁴³⁴ Sec. xx

⁴³⁵ Sec. xxii.

The Wines of the Bible

raisins, or sapa.” It is “used as a nutritious *article of food*,” and “this rather sharp preserve is a cordial.”⁴³⁶

There is, in fact, a general consensus of opinion among modern travelers and others, as to the nature of this boiled juice, and the purposes for which it is used. Mr. Homes, missionary, says, “The boiling which the people of certain districts choose to give to their must, for the purpose of securing a wine that will keep better, should not be confounded with the boiling of the same must for the purpose of making sugar and molasses. In the former case it is boiled perhaps half an hour, and not reduced one-twentieth in bulk; in the latter case it is reduced more than three-fourths in quantity. And hence an ‘inspissated wine’ should never be confounded with ‘inspissated grape juice.’ The former gives us an intoxicating liquor, and the latter a *syrup*, or molasses.”⁴³⁷ The Rev. W.G. Schauffler, a missionary, says, “The article of *syrup* made of must boiled down before fermentation to a third, or to a half the original contents, was not only known to the ancient Greeks and Romans – for this would never seriously affect our question, - but it was and is known among the natives of the East. The American residents in this place use it with great pleasure in the place of molasses. Its name in Persian and Turkish is pronounced *petmez*, and the Arabs in Syria call it *dibs*. It should not be forgotten, however, that these words never designate *wine* or must, and that the articles themselves are no more considered a drink, or used as such, than molasses in America.”⁴³⁸ Dr. Robinson, who describes the method of preparing *dibs*,⁴³⁹ says, “The Arabs give

⁴³⁶ Sec. xxxv.

⁴³⁷ Eadie’s Cyclo., Art. “wine.”

⁴³⁸ American Bib. Rep., viii 290

⁴³⁹ Bib. Reseraches, iii. 381

The Wines of the Bible

this name (*dibs*) to the *syrup* made from the juices of grapes by boiling. The same word in Hebrew signifies honey.”⁴⁴⁰

In an article in the *Princeton Review* on the Wine Question (Oct. 1871), the following testimonies are given on the point under consideration. Dr. Perkins says, “The juice of the grape is used three ways in Persia. When simply expressed it is called ‘sweet,’ i.e., sweet liquor. It is not drunk in that state, nor regarded as fit for use, any more than new unsettled cider at the press in America; nor is it even called wine till fermented. A second and very extensive use of the grape is the syrup made from boiling it from this sweet state, which resembles our molasses, and is used in the same way for sweetening, but is never used as a drink. This is in fact neither more nor less than Oriental molasses.”⁴⁴¹ Dr. Van Dyck says, “Syrup is made of the juice of the grape, and molasses, as you know, but nothing that is called wine is unfermented.”⁴⁴²

We quote these extracts apart from, and without any reference to, the question raised and discussed in the *Review* by the missionaries, as to the existence and use of unfermented wine in the East, which they deny, and solely with the view of showing the nature and use of this modern *sapa*. Whatever may be the facts as to the former question, there is here satisfactory evidence as to the latter, for the several writers all agree that the boiled juice is a grape *syrup* or *jelly*, and not a vinous beverage.

Passing from the *Review*, we have still further evidence to the same purpose. Mr. Baird, in his book on *Modern Greece*, says, grape juice “enters into the composition of a number of national dishes. Mixed with flour it forms the *mustallerria*, a refreshing food of about the consistency of the ‘apple butter’ of our Western

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 40

⁴⁴¹ p. 587

⁴⁴² p. 589

The Wines of the Bible

States, which it resembles in colour also.”⁴⁴³ A friend of our own, long resident in Smyrna, writes us that “grape juice is boiled to the consistency of thick treacle or stiff starch, and is used with bread as an article of diet, by the poor people, much as treacle is used in England.” Dr. Russell, describing the food of the people of Aleppo, says, “Bread, *dibs* – the juice of grapes thickened to the consistence of honey, - *leban* – coagulated sour milk, - butter, rice, and a very little mutton, make the chief of their food in winter, as rice, bread, cheese, and fruits do in the summer.”⁴⁴⁴ Dr. Shaw and Pococke take notice of the custom among the Arabs of breaking their bread or cakes into little bits, and either mixing them together in a bowl of syrup, or “dipping them into a syrup called *becmes*, which is made by boiling the juice of grapes to a consistence.” And to this observation Dr. Adam Clark appends the remark, - “This is not infrequent in the West Currant jelly is often eaten with bread here in England.”⁴⁴⁵ Lady Hester Standhop’s physician mentions that among the articles for sale at Khudder, between Saida and Tyre, he found “*dibs*” a kind of treacle;” he made a poor supper at Hassyah on “treacle and durra bread;” he was entertained by the Arabs to a dish of cakes and *dibs*, which had “much the taste and appearance of treacle; it is a favourite dish with all the Arabs;” among these people he had “nothing but dry bread and treacle;” his food at Maronite monastery was “*dibs*, grape juice concentrated;” and in describing the vintage at Lebanon, he says, “At the same time with the wine was made likewise *dibs*, called in French *raisine*, which in taste and appearance resembled treacle, and formed an important article of food throughout Syria, more especially among the middle and

⁴⁴³ P. 26

⁴⁴⁴ Harmer, i. 393

⁴⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 411

The Wines of the Bible

lower classes.”⁴⁴⁶ Frederika Bremner, in her book *Greece and the Greeks*, referring to a dinner at Thebes, says, “Amongst the delicious viands of which I must mention, one called *musta*, a *jelly* of unfermented wine, which is especially agreeable and refreshing.”⁴⁴⁷ Volney describe *dibs* as “a confection of grapes,” and intimates that it is used as an article of diet in Egypt.⁴⁴⁸ Redding says that in Germany the people “use the sweeter unfermented juice for syrup, in place of sugar,” and that, in the south of France, the must is “employed in making a rich confection with citron and aromatic sweets.”

Thus, then, ancient and modern writers, including those appealed to by the advocates of the unfermented theory, unite in testifying that this boiled grape juice is variously designated by different nations; that it is a thick, sweet substance, of the consistence of “thick treacle or stiff starch;” that it is a syrup, a conserve, a treacle, a jelly, a great delicacy, a favourite dish, an article of food; that it is used as a seasoning for wines, a substitute for sugar, a syrup for preserving fruits, a domestic jelly; that it is eaten with bread for dinner, supper, &c. But that it is not a beverage of any description, nor has ever been the common and popular drink of any people, ancient or modern.

If, then we accept the statement of the author of *Tirosh lo Yayin*, that in Palestine, even more than in Italy, “the necessity existed for boiling down the grape juice to preserve it at all as wine,” we must conclude that the only unfermented wine, preserved and used by the ancients, was this boiled juice, named *siraeum* and *hepsema* by the Greeks, and *sapa* and *defrutum* by the Latins. If this be so, then the alleged unfermented wine of the Bible, which has a blessing in it, which cheereth God and man, which was

⁴⁴⁶ *Travels*, i. ii.

⁴⁴⁷ li. 186

⁴⁴⁸ *Travels*, p. 153

The Wines of the Bible

poured out as a libation in the sacrifices, drank at the Passover, made by our Lord at the marriage of Cana, used in the Supper as a symbol of the shed blood of Christ, recommended by Paul to Timothy, directed to be used in moderation, and the like, was, after all, a solid, not a liquid; a food, not a drink, a grape syrup or jelly, not a vinous beverage! And as this boiled juice was the only unfermented wine which could have been preserved and used by the ancients, it follows that all wines alleged by the advocates of the unfermented theory to have been innocent, pure, unfermented, unintoxicating, and however otherwise designated as the “fruit of the vine,” the “blood of the grape,” and the like, were not wines at all, but merely grape syrups or jellies!

If, however, that boiled juice is to be reckoned a liquor, drink, beverage, or wine, we see no reason why treacle, syrup, honey, and jelly, should not also be regarded as drinks, and be classed among our domestic wines! Nehemiah was “wine-pourer” to the king; was it a grape jelly which he poured into the monarch’s cup? He had “once in ten days store of all sorts of wine” prepared for his use; was this a preparation and provision of all kinds of grape jellies? When Hannah brought a bottle of wine as an offering to the house of the Lord; when Jesse sent a bottle of wine to Saul; and when Ziba brought a bottle of wine to David, “that such as be faint in the wilderness may drink,” were all these gifts merely bottles of jelly? When the Jewish worshipper brought “the fourth part of an hin of wine for a drink-offering,” did he pour out three pints of jelly as a libation? Was it grape jelly which the governor of the feast commended so highly at the marriage in Cana? Was it also jelly which was drunk at the Passover and the Supper, and which our Lord exhibited as a symbol of His blood? We read frequently of the use of mixed and unmixed wines among the ancients in their religious worship and convivial meetings. Some persons drank their wine unmixed, and were said to drink like

The Wines of the Bible

Scythians. Others of more temperate habits mixed their wine with certain proportions of hot and cold water. Was the *unmixed* wine of these hard drinkers merely undiluted syrup? And was the *mixed* wine of the others nothing more than jelly and water? These questions carry their own answers, and are sufficient to show the absurdity of this grape-jelly theory.

It is alleged that these syrups may have been diluted with water, and used in that form as beverages. Possibly they may, but were they so used? Where are the facts? But even if they had been thus used, would that use have transformed the syrups into wines? A modern housewife makes liquid drinks for invalids from oatmeal, barely, honey, jelly, and the like; but does she, or any other rational being, class these *solids*, from which those drinks are made, among her home-made or domestic wines? Barley and water is not barely wine, *mead*, or *mulsum*. Jelly and water is not currant or gooseberry-wine. And neither is *sapa* and water, even if its use could be proved, ever classed among the vinous beverages of the ancients.

3. Thickness of Ancient Wines

In defense of the jelly theory, noticed in the previous section, it is alleged that some of the wines of the ancients were thicker than any of our modern liquors; so thick, indeed, as to have been syrups, and to be entitled to the designation of “syrup wines.” In support of this assertion appeal is made by Dr. Lees to Aristotle, who “classed amongst ‘wines’ what was so thick that it could be scraped with a knife.”⁴⁴⁹ The same authority is again appealed to in evidence “that many of the oldest wines, and such as were

⁴⁴⁹ Answer to the Unanswerable, p. 36

The Wines of the Bible

most esteemed, acquired a honeyed thickness and sweetness, that made their extreme dilution imperative, in order to their being drunk. Aristotle testifies that the wines of Arcadia were so thick that they dried up in the goatskins, and that it was the practice to scrape them off, and dissolve the scrapings in water.”⁴⁵⁰ The reader would naturally infer from these statements – (1.) That the wines of Arcadia were “so thick” as to solids rather than liquids; (2.) that this extraordinary thickness was the common and distinguishable characteristics of “the wines of Arcadia” in general; (3.) that these wines dried up in the goatskins because they were “so thick” in their nature; (4.) that they derived their thickness from having been boiled, and dried up after long keeping; (5.) and that these wines were unfermented liquors.

Now, on referring to Aristotle, we find that these inferences are in no way justified by anything he has said. He is speaking not of “the wines of Arcadia” in general, but of a particular phenomenon which had been witnessed on some occasion “in Arcadia.” And he has no reference either to the supposed boiling or long keeping of the wines, but to the effect which had been produced in it by the agency of smoke. Accordingly he says, *ωσπερ εν Αρκαδια ουτος αναξηραινεται υπο τον καπνον εν τοις ασκοις ωστε ξυμενος πενεσθαι*, “In Arcadia, wine was so dried up in the skins by the smoke, that it had to be scooped out to be drunk.” There are two points worthy of notice here. In the first place, the wine spoken of was not, as alleged, one of “the oldest wines,” which had “acquired a honeyed thickness and sweetness” through long keeping; and neither was it a species of *siraion* or *hepsema*, which had been boiled to the thickness of a syrup or jelly. If it had been the former, the drying up would not

⁴⁵⁰ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 295

The Wines of the Bible

have been a particularly remarkable phenomenon, and the wine would have been a fermented liquor, for we have seen that, *without boiling*, the grape juice could not be preserved *at all* as wine. And if it had been the latter, the phenomenon, instead of being a wonderful occurrence, deserving of special notice, would have been among the most common and ordinary events of every household where grape syrups were made – that thickness being the normal condition of such substances. In the second place, the wine spoken of was neither thickened nor dried up, either by boiling or long keeping, but by the agency of smoke - *υπο τον καπνον*. Now, we have seen that this practice was resorted to by the ancients, not with must, but with wines; not for the preparation or preservation of a syrup or jelly, but for the cure of old wines which had become *carious*, and to give a factitious maturity to new wines. We cannot, therefore, suppose that Arcadians smoked these wines to the extent and with the intention of converting them into either jellies or scrapings. But it is quite conceivable that if, on any occasion by accident or neglect, the wine had been left in the fumarium for an undue length of time, the continued evaporation would inevitably dry up the liquor to such an extent as to exhibit the phenomenon noticed by Aristotle.

An equally wonderful occurrence is reported in an account of the excavations at Pompeii: - “Amphorae were also found ranged against the walls, in some of which the contents, dried and hardened by time, were still preserved. Archaeologists, it is said, pretend to recognize in this substance the flavour of the rich strong wine for which the neighborhood of Vesuvius is celebrated.” To this the following note is appended: - “Sir Thomas Browne would have rejoiced in this opportunity – ‘Some find sepulcall vessels containing liquors which since hath incassated into jellies. For, besides their lachrymatories, notable lamps, with

The Wines of the Bible

vessels of oil and aromatical liquors, attended noble ossuaries. And some yet retaining a vinosity and spirit in them, which if any have tasted, they have far exceeded the palates of antiquity. Liquors not to be computed by years of annual magistrates but by great conjunctions, and the fatal periods of kingdoms. The draughts of Consulary date were but crude unto these, and Opimian wine but in the must unto them.”⁴⁵¹

The scrapings of these “sepulcrall vessels, containing liquors which hath since incrassated into jellies,” and yet “retaining a vinosity and spirit in them,” do not prove that the “rich strong wine” of the Romans was an unfermented liquor, any more than the scrapings of the wine skins prove that the wines of Arcadia were of that character. It may be admitted that some unknown quantity, of some unknown wine, on some unknown occasion, was thus dried up by the smoke of the fumarium, or the blacksmith’s forge; but this is much too narrow a foundation on which to build such a top-heavy conclusion as that “the wines of Arcadia” were merely jelly scrapings! Scrapings, indeed! Pliny says that “in Arcadia there is a wine made which gives madness to men,” – *viris rabem*.⁴⁵² And Athenaeus confirms the statement, on the authority of Theophrastus, saying, “that a wine is made in Heraea in Aracadia, which, when drunk, drives men out of their senses.”⁴⁵³ So that if we accept the broad statement as to thickness of “the wines of Arcadia,” we must qualify it by the above testimony as to their potency also.

In further evidence of the alleged syrupy character of ancient wines, Dr. Lees refers to a famous old wine, of which he says, - “Some of the celebrated Opimian wine mentioned by Pliny had, in his day, two centuries after its production, the consistence of

⁴⁵¹ *Hydriotaphia*, a Treatise on Urne Buriall, chp. iii

⁴⁵² Book xiv. 18

⁴⁵³ Book i

The Wines of the Bible

honey.”⁴⁵⁴ Now, it is to be observed here – **1.** That the wine referred to was neither a boiled wine nor a grape jelly. It was merely the product of a particularly favourable year, when, as Pliny says, “the growth of every wine was of the very highest quality.” And if it was not a boiled juice, it must have been of “necessity” a fermented liquor. **2.** No “extreme dilution,” nor, indeed, any dilution at all, was necessary, in consequence of the “honeyed thickness and sweetness” of the wine; for Pliny expressly says, “Such, in fact is the nature of wines that, when extremely old, it is impossible to drink them in a pure state, and they require to be mixed with water,” not because of their syrupy thickness, but because “long keeping renders them intolerably bitter.” The same quality is ascribed to certain modern wines of great age. “The wines of Burgundy, in particular, become bitter when extremely old.” **3.** But, however this may be, it is certain that, notwithstanding the “honeyed thickness” of this old Opimian wine, it was none the less a fermented liquor. Martial says, - “Let the contents of this amphora, diminished by the lapse of a hundred consulships, flow forth, and let it grow brighter, turbid as it now is, strained through the purifying linen. When will a night so auspicious cheer my board? When will it be mine to be *warmed with wine* so fitly qualified?”⁴⁵⁵ Referring to Zoilus and “his creatures,” who drink “Opimian nectar,” the poet says, “Finally, overcome by many draughts from his large cups, he falls snoring asleep.”⁴⁵⁶ And again, - “After I have taken seven cups of Opimian wine, and am stretched at full length, and beginning to stammer from the effects of my heavy potations, you bring me some sort of papers,” &c.⁴⁵⁷ It is clear, from these references, that

⁴⁵⁴ Temp. bibl. Com. p. 295

⁴⁵⁵ Ep., viii. 45

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid., iii. 82

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid., ix. 87

The Wines of the Bible

the “Opimian nectar” which had acquired “the consistence of honey,” whether diluted or undiluted, was neither an unfermented wine nor a grape jelly, but a veritable intoxicating beverage. Some modern wines which possess a syrupy character are also fermented liquors. Accordingly Vizetelly notices a sample of Tokay Essenz exhibited at Vienna, nearly a hundred years old, of which he says, “Although all its sugar had turned to spirit, it still had the softness which one terms silken.”⁴⁵⁸ Thus the mere thickness of the ancient wines is no evidence that they were either jellies or unfermented liquors.

4. The Dilution of Ancient Wines.

In further defense of the unfermented theory, appeal is made to the common custom with the ancients of diluting their wines with water, hot and cold, before using them; and it is inferred that this dilution was necessary, because the “syrup wines” in common use were so thick as to undrinkable until they were dissolved with water. We admit the ancient custom, but deny the inference drawn from it; and we are justified in this denial by the concessions of some of the advocates of the unfermented wine theory themselves. Thus the Rev. B. Parsons says, Ancient wine was “often diluted with 80 per cent water,” and that, not because of its thickness, but to make it “innocuous to the nerves, head, and mind.” Dr. Lees, in like manner, says, “Far too much emphasis is laid upon watering wines; for we must not forget that Aristotle says, as cited by Athenaeus, that some of the diluted wines were so strong that one and a half pints would intoxicate forty men.”⁴⁵⁹

⁴⁵⁸ *Wines of the World*, p. 82

⁴⁵⁹ *Review of Nott*, p.17

The Wines of the Bible

It may be alleged that, in making these concessions, the writers in question referred to alcoholic and not to unfermented wine, and it may be conceded that dilution was practiced with both descriptions of liquor. But even assuming the existence of an unfermented liquor, we demand evidence that any of the common wines of the ancients were so thick as to be undrinkable without dilution, and that such dilution was practiced because of that alleged thickness. The reference to a mere accidental drying up of an Arcadian wine, or to the honeyed thickness of a two hundred year old Opimian wine, affords no evidence of the character of the ordinary wines of the ancients. Dr. Lees, however, in his edition of Nott's *Lectures*, publishes an engraving of the *Thermopolium*, copied from the plan obtained by Baccius from the ruins of the Dioclesian Baths, and says, "Nothing can more clearly exhibit the contrast between the ancient wines and those of modern Europe, than the widely different modes of treating them." The inference intended to be conveyed by this observation is that, as the *Thermopolium* was an ingenious contrivance for mingling the wines of drinkers with hot, cold, or tepid water, at pleasure, this method of treatment proves that the wines so mingled must have been vinous syrups or jellies. It may be so, but where is the proof? What evidence does the engraving, or the admitted custom afford of the alleged syrups? It cannot be denied that modern wine-drinkers occasionally temper their draughts with hot or cold water, but is their practice evidence that the tempered wines are unfermented liquors? It is true that *defrutum* was used at *Thermopolium*, as well as wine, water and honey; but, as Pliny informs us, that *sapa* and *defrutum* were employed to mellow the harshness of the wine, it is to be inferred that the honey and *defrutum* were used here, not as drinks, but to soften and sweeten the mingled wine. Accordingly, the character of the liquors drunk at *Thermopolium* may be

The Wines of the Bible

gathered from the following references: “It frequently happened that the servant who had been employed to mix the wine with the water at the Thermopolium drank privately of it, and sometimes so freely as to get drunk there, which is particularly mentioned by Plautus.”⁴⁶⁰ Again, - “It was usual with such who had not wine in their own cellars, on occasional entertainments, to send for it prepared at the Thermopolium, and cool it afterwards in snow; others often stopped there, as in a dram-shop, and drank the hot wine; and this vice was so common, that Thermopolare expressed a drunken fellow who had been tippling there; for wine thus heated inebriated them sooner than cold wine. On this account old debauchees, whose stomachs could no longer bear liquors cooled, drank the wine thus heated. This was a length the case of Nero, who was thence called *Coldus Nero*, and *Tiberius, Biberius Coldus*. As the Thermopolium was thus a necessary part of luxury to the great, and of debauch and mirth to others, Dio mentions that Claudius, to subdue more effectually the temper and spirit of the people, ordered all the Thermopolia to be demolished.”⁴⁶¹

It is evident from these references that the hot water of the ancient wine-shop was not intended for dilution of mere grape syrups, but was employed in the preparation of mulled wine, sweetened with honey or *defrutum*. Consequently the practice appealed to affords no evidence of the syrup theory. The custom of drinking hot wine is also referred to by Philo, who says, “The men of the present day do not use wine now as the ancients did. For now they drink eagerly without once taking breath, till the body and soul are both relaxed; and they keep on bidding their cup-bearers to bring more wine, and are angry with them if they delay while they are cooling what is called by them *the hot drink*;

⁴⁶⁰ Barry's *Wines of the Ancients*, p. 166

⁴⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 167, 168

The Wines of the Bible

and in a vile imitation of the gymnastic contexts, they institute a contest among their fellow-revellers as to who can drink most wine, in which they do many glorious things to one another, biting one another's ears and noses, and the tips of the fingers of their hands, and other parts of the body they can get at."⁴⁶² The above allusion shows that the mingling of hot water with wine was a common practice, designed to gratify the taste of the "revelers," and that the wine thus treated was not a mere thickened syrup, but a veritable intoxicating liquor.

Athenaeus indicates the purpose of the ancient dilution of wine when he says, "But Homer praised that wine most which will admit of a copious admixture of water, as the Maronean. And old wine will allow of more water being added to it, because its very age has added heat to it."⁴⁶³ Cicero, referring to the intemperance of the Gauls, says, "That after this they would drink their wine more diluted, because they thought that there was poison in it."⁴⁶⁴ Plutarch says, "Water mixed with wine takes away the hurtful spirits, while it leaves the useful ones in it."⁴⁶⁵ To mix wine with water makes it "wholesome and gentle to the body."⁴⁶⁶ "When wine is mixed with a great deal of weak liquor, it is empowered by that, loseth its strength, and becomes flat and waterish."⁴⁶⁷ "They who are afraid of being drunk, pour not their wine upon the ground, but dilute it with water."⁴⁶⁸ In the libations to the gods by the Greeks the wine was thus *mixed*; hence Homer

⁴⁶² Planting, 39

⁴⁶³ i. 47

⁴⁶⁴ For M. Fonteius.

⁴⁶⁵ A young Man

⁴⁶⁶ Sympos.

⁴⁶⁷ Ibid., ii. 7

⁴⁶⁸ Book xiv. 12

The Wines of the Bible

*"From the same urn they drink the mingled wine,
And add libations to the powers divine."*

But in those of the Latins the wine was unmixed. Hence Ovid – "Offer frankincense and unmixed wine to the great gods;" and hence Pliny: - "The Greek wines are excluded also from the sacred ministrations, because they contain portion of water."⁴⁶⁹

Although wine was extensively used as a beverage by the ancients, except by those ascetics who were called "water drinkers," the practice of drinking neat, pure, or *unmixed* wine was regarded as disreputable, and was condemned as conduct only befitting a drunkard. Aristophanes reproaches the woman "who slaughter a Thasian jar of wine, and swear over the cup – to pour no water in," – and says, "they like their wine *unmixed*, just as before." And in the Acharnians he relates "that, being entertained with hospitality, we drank against our will, from cups of glass and golden chalices, sweet unmixed wine.....For the barbarians esteem those only men who have the greatest power to eat and drink; while we consider wenches and debauchees as such." So generally was this practice censured that it became a proverbial saying concerning those who drank unmixed wine, that "they were Episcythising" – the reference being to the habits of the Scythians who were notorious for their intemperance. Hence Plato, in his first book of Laws, says, "but the Scythians and the Thracians, who indulge altogether in drinking unmixed wine, both the women and all the men, and who spill it all over their clothes, think that they are maintaining a very honourable practice, and one that tends to their happiness."⁴⁷⁰

In earlier times, however, the Greeks themselves appear to have used unmixed wine, like the Latins, for the art of mixing it with

⁴⁶⁹ Book xiv. 19

⁴⁷⁰ Athen., xi. 39

The Wines of the Bible

water is ascribed to Amphyction, King of the Athenians, who erected a temple to Bacchus under the name of Orthios, “the straight god,” because, says Philochorus, “having learnt of Bacchus the art of mixing wine,” he was “the first man who ever did mix it; and that it is owing to him that men who have been drinking on his system can walk *straight* afterwards, when before they used to blunder about after drinking *sheer* wine.”⁴⁷¹

Philonides, the physicians, gives a different account of the origin of the custom, for he says, “After the vine was introduced into Greece from the Red Sea, and when most people had become addicted to intemperate enjoyment, and had learned to drink *unmixed* wine, some of them became quite frantic and out of their minds, while others got so stupefied as to resemble the dead. And once, when some men were drinking on the sea-shore, a violent shower came on and broke up the party, and filled the goblet, which had a little wine left in it, with water. But when it became fine again, the men returned to the same spot, and tasting the new mixture, found that their enjoyment was now not only exquisite, but free from any subsequent pain. And on this account the Greeks invoke the Good Deity at the cup of *unmixed* wine, which is served round to them at dinner, paying honour to the deity who invented wine, and that was Bacchus. But when the first cup of *mixed* wine is handed round after dinner, they then invoke Jupiter the saviour, thinking him the cause of this mixture of wine, which is so unattended with pain, as being the author of rain.”⁴⁷²

That the *unmixed* wine, so frequently referred to by ancient writers, was no mere undiluted syrup, but a veritable intoxicating liquor, is evident from all the associated references in the above

⁴⁷¹ Ibid., ii. 7

⁴⁷² Ibid., xv. 17

The Wines of the Bible

quotations, and will be further shown as we proceed. Athenaeus says, "Most people, my friend Timocrates, call Bacchus frantic, because those who drink too much unmixed wine become violent."⁴⁷³ Ovid speaks of one who, "reels just as if he had been drinking *unmixed* wine."⁴⁷⁴ Alexis, in his Aesop, says, "That is a good idea of yours, O Solon, and cleverly imagined, which you have adopted in your city. S. What is that? A. You don't let men drink *neat* wine at their feasts. S. Why, if I did, it would not be very easy for men to get it, when the innkeepers water it ere it comes out of the wagon. No doubt, they do not do this to make money, but only out of prudent care for those who buy the liquor; so that they may have their heads free from every pang of headache! This now, as you see, is a Grecian drink; so that men, drinking cups of moderate strength, may chat and gossip cheerfully with each other. For too much water is more like a bath than a wine cup; and the wine cooler, mixed with the cask, my friend, is death itself."⁴⁷⁵ Phhilo says, "It is plain that *unmixed* wine is a poison, which is the cause, if not of death, at least of madness."⁴⁷⁶ Referring to the ancients, he says, "Knowing, therefore, that the use and enjoyment of wine require much care, they did not drink unmixed wine either in great quantities or at all times, but only in moderation and on fitting occasions."⁴⁷⁷ He speaks of the contrivances displayed in the examination of different kinds of wine "to produce some, the effects of which shall speedily go off, and which shall not produce headache, but, on the contrary, shall be devoid of any tendency to heat the blood, and shall be very fragrant, admitting either a copious or a

⁴⁷³ Xiv. 1

⁴⁷⁴ Meta., xv

⁴⁷⁵ Athen., x. 38

⁴⁷⁶ Planting, 36

⁴⁷⁷ Ibid., 39

The Wines of the Bible

scanty admixture with water, according as the object is to have a strong and powerful draught, or a gentle and imperceptible one.”⁴⁷⁸ He describes some men as “introducing immoderate and incessant food, and irrigating it with an abundance of pure [unmixed] wine, until the reason is overwhelmed and disappears.” And again, “such a description then as I have here given may be applied to the man who is made frantic by the influence of *unmixed* wines, that he is a drunken, and foolish, and irremediate evil.”⁴⁷⁹ “Others, again, who seem to be a more moderate kind of feasters, when they have drunk *unmixed* wine as if it were mandragora, boil over as it were, and lean on their left elbow, and turn their heads on one side, with their breath redolent of their wine, till at last they sink into profound slumber, neither seeing nor hearing anything, as if they had but one single sense, and that the most slavish of all, namely, taste.”⁴⁸⁰

It is evident from all these references that both classes of ancient wines, mixed and unmixed, were not mere diluted and undiluted syrups, but fermented and intoxicating beverages.

The custom of mixing wine as above was very general. The relative proportions of the mixture are variously given by different writers, from which we conclude that there was no definite standard of dilution, and that the proportions of wine to water were regulated solely by the particular tastes of the drinkers. Thus, according to Athenaeus, Aleaus, “who will be found to have been in the habit of drinking at every season, and in every imaginable conditions of affairs,” calls for “one cup of wine to be mixed with two of water.” Anacreon, who “likes his liquors stronger still, “demands “five measures of water with three of rosy wine.” Philetaerus” complains of “having drunk two

⁴⁷⁸ Drunkenness, 52

⁴⁷⁹ Ibid., ii. 31

⁴⁸⁰ Con. Life, 5.

The Wines of the Bible

measures of water, and only three of wine.” Pherecrates declares that “two measures of water to four of wine” is “such a watery mixture,” that he who gives it is “fit to serve as cup-bearer to the frogs!” Sophilus says, “And wine was given in unceasing flow, mixed half-and-half; and yet, unsatisfied, they ask for larger and for stronger cups.” Alexis says, “Don’t give him wine quite drowned in water now. Dost understand me? Half-and-half, or nearly so. That’s well; a noble drink.”

Ovid recommends a judicious mixture of wine and water, saying, - “Pray both to father Nyctilius and his nocturnal rites, that they will bid the wine not to take effect on your head.”⁴⁸¹ Evenus employs a similar poetic usage, - “The best measure for Bacchus is what is not much, nor very little, for he is the cause either of grief or madness. He rejoices in being mixed, himself the fourth, with three nymphs; and then he is most ready for the rites of wedlock. But if he breathes violently, he turns away the loves, and is drowned in sleep, the neighbour of death.”

*“Water your wine in moderation,
There’s grief or madness in a strong potations;
For ‘tis young Bacchus’ chiefest pleasure
To move with Naiads three in linked measure.
‘Tis then he is good company
For sorts, and loves, and decent jollity;
But when alone, avoid his breath –
He breathes not love, but sleep, a sleep like death.”*
(Greek Anthology)

A few additional extracts may be given, indicating at once the quality of the wine, the proportions of the mixture, and the quantities recommended to moderate drinkers. Panyasis prescribes moderation –

⁴⁸¹ Ars. Am., i

The Wines of the Bible

*"O'er the first glass the Graces three preside,
And with the smiling Hours the palm divide;
Next Bacchus, parent of the sacred vine,
And Venus, loveliest daughter of the brine,
Smile on the second cup, which cheers the heart,
And bids the drinker home in peace depart.
But the third cup is waste and sad excess,
Parent of wrongs, denier of redress;
Oh, who can tell what evils may befall,
When strife and insult rage throughout the hall!
Content thee, then, my friend with glasses twain;
Then to your home and tender wife again;
While your companions, with unaching heads,
By your example taught, will seek their beds.
But riot will be bred by too much wine,
A mournful ending for a feast divine;
While, then, you live, your thirst in bounds confine."*

Mensitheus recommends both dilution and moderation, -

*"Wine to our daily feasts brings cheerful laughter,
When mixed with proper quantities of water;
Men saucy get if one-third wine they quaff;
While downright madness flows from half-and-half;
And neat wine mind and body too destroys
While moderation wise secures our joys.
And well the oracle takes this position –
That Bacchus is all people's best physician."*

Eubulus introduces Bacchus as saying, -

*"Let them three parts of wine all duly season
With nine of water, who'd preserve their reason.
The first gives health, the second sweet desires;
The third tranquility and sleep inspires.
These are the wholesome draughts which wise men please,
Who, from the banquet, home return in peace."*

The Wines of the Bible

*From a fourth measure insolence proceeds;
Uproar a fifth, a sixth wild license breeds;
A seventh brings black eyes and livid bruises,
The eighth the constable next introduces;
Black gall and hatred lurk the ninth beneath,
The tenth is madness, arms, and fearful death;
For too much wine poured in one little vessel,
Trips up all those who seek with it to wrestle.” – (Athen., ii. 2,3)*

The reader will see from these extracts that the ancients largely diluted their wines with water, and that, not, as has been falsely alleged, because of the thickness of the supposed syrups, but really because of intoxicating strength of the fermented liquors. One writer limits the drinker to “glasses twain,” and another permits him to add a third glass, for these are “the wholesome draughts which wise men please.” But if those limits are exceeded, all sorts of domestic and social evils result. Now, if it was deemed a barbarous practice, fit only for drunkards, to drink wine undiluted, the wine must have been alcoholic. If the art of mingling wine with water was first devised with the object of enabling those who had been drinking to “walk straight afterwards,” or to save them from becoming “quite frantic,” or “so stupefied as to resemble the dead,” the wine must have been alcoholic. If the wine required to be diluted before use, to the extent indicated in the quotations, and for the reasons there assigned, it must have been strongly alcoholic. And if the drinker was warned not to exceed two or three glasses of wine, when thus diluted, if he would return sober to his “home and tender wife again,” the wine must have been pre-eminently alcoholic!

These conclusions cannot be evaded or set aside by the dogmatic assertion that all such wines must have been sophisticated or adulterated with stupefying drugs; for these drugged liquors, if used at all, or to any appreciable extent, were

The Wines of the Bible

resorted to only by inveterate drunkards. But here is no allusion to such a vicious practice, nor to such adulterated liquors. The only sophistication hinted at is that of the vintners, who watered the wine “before it came out of the wagon;” and the references throughout are merely to the mixed and unmixed wines commonly used as social beverages by the people. So far, therefore, as the dilution of ancient wines is concerned, there is here no evidence in favour of the unfermented theory.

5. The Sweetness of Ancient Wines

The extreme sweetness of some of the ancient wines is regarded as evidence of their inspissations and unfermented nature. Appeal is accordingly made to a statement of Athenaeus in which, speaking of the use of sweet wine before eating, he says, “Let him take sweet wine, either mixed with water or warmed, especially that which is called *protropos*, the sweet Lesbian wine, as being very good for the stomach.”⁴⁸² The specific quality of the Lesbian wine will engage our attention immediately. Meantime, what evidence does this passage afford that the wine referred to was either inspissated or unfermented? Not that it was “mixed with water,” or “warmed,” as we have seen. Not that it was a “*protropos*,” or a “Lesbian wine,” as we shall see. Not that it is recommended for use before eating, and “very good for the stomach,” unless it be assumed that fermented wine was not thus employed or regarded, and that diluted syrup, popularly supposed to be a productive of acidity and biliousness, was anciently used, and held in esteem, as fitted to aid digestion, and good for the stomach. There remains, therefore, only the sweetness of the

⁴⁸² li. 24

The Wines of the Bible

wine, of which we have to observe, that even Dr. Lees admits that “some of the ancient sweet wines were strong, and those of Sicily now reach 30 per cent of alcohol.”⁴⁸³ So that no argument can be based on that sweetness in favour of the unfermented theory.

The Rev. B. Parsons, however, says, “In the ninth book of the Odyssey we have a passage equally conclusive respecting the character of these early wines. Ulysses there tells us that he took into his boat, “a goatskin of sweet black wine, a divine drink, which Maron, the priest of Apollo, had given him.’ Describing this beverage he says, ‘that it was sweet as honey; that it was imperishable, or would keep forever; that when it was drunk, it was diluted with twenty parts of water, and that from it a sweet and divine odour exhaled.’” These facts, Mr. Parsons thinks, are very important, because, first the wine was sweet as honey, it was divine, or resembling nectar, and therefore could not have fermented, otherwise the sugar would have been destroyed, &c.⁴⁸⁴

This is an extraordinary specimen of mingled facts and fancies, not more surprising for the cool confidence of the utterance, or the boldness of the assertion, than for the recklessness or ignorance which it displays. Can the writer have read the Odyssey, from which the extract is taken? It is almost inconceivable, otherwise he must have known that this “sweet black wine,” with all its attributes of divinity, &c., and which, “therefore, could not have fermented,” was the identical liquor with which Ulysses intoxicated the huge one-eyed Cyclops, and made him drunk as a beast. After describing the pleasant black wine, the gift of Maron, son of Euanthes, priest of Apollo, Ulysses says, “Having filled a large skin with this, I carried it and provisions in a satchel;” and

⁴⁸³ Nott’s Lectures, p. 88

⁴⁸⁴ Anti-Bacchus, p. 79

The Wines of the Bible

after thrice filling the cup for Polyphemus, who still cried for more, exclaiming, "This is what comes of ambrosia and nectar," the wine inflamed the giants' brain, and "reeling he fell supine; and then he lay, slanting his fat neck; and all subduing sleep seized on him, and the wine and human goblets rushed out of his throat; and he, heavy with wine, belched," &c. When he awoke from his wine, he said to his ram, "Dost thou regret the eye of thy master, which an evil man has blinded with his troublesome companions, having subdued my mind with wine?" And, speaking to Ulysses, he says, "But now, one who is little, worth nothing, and weak, has bereft me of my sight, after he had subdued me with wine."⁴⁸⁵

Athenaeus, referring to this scene, attributes the intoxication of the giant to the largeness of the draught; "for if it had been a small one, he would not have been so overcome with drunkenness after drinking it three times only, when he was a man of monstrous size. There were, therefore, large cups at that time; unless any one chooses to impute it to the strength of the wine, which Homer himself has mentioned, or to the little practice which the Cyclops had in drinking, since his usual beverage was milk."⁴⁸⁶ Lucian represents the Cyclops as saying Ulysses gave him liquor to drink, "sweet indeed, and fragrant, but most insidious and turbulent; for all things seemed to me, after having drunk it, immediately to be carried round, and the cave itself was turned upside down, and I was altogether no longer in my senses."⁴⁸⁷ Euripides, also, has a play founded upon the incident, in which Ulysses says, "I carry not gold, but the cup of Bacchus.....And truly Maro, the son of the god, gave me the drink." Silenus drinks the wine, and exclaims, "O gods! Bacchus invites me to dance. Hah!

⁴⁸⁵ Od., Book ix.

⁴⁸⁶ Xi. 4

⁴⁸⁷ Polyphemus and Neptune

The Wines of the Bible

hah! hah!” Ulysses asks, “did it trickle down thy throat nicely for thee?” And he answers, “Ay, so that it came to the very tips of my nails. I would readily drain a single cup, giving the cattle of all the Cyclops in exchange, and cast myself off the white rock into the sea, having once got drunk, and bringing my eyelids down. For he who rejoices not when drinking, is mad.” Then follows a description of Maro, and the play appropriately concludes with the moral expressed by the chorus, - “Wine is terrible, and heavey to strive against.” And yet this “terrible” wine is the “divine drink,” which the Rev. B. Parson says “could not have fermented, otherwise the sugar would have been destroyed.”

Pliny, referring to the same wine, and noticing Homer’s description of its as being so strong as to be “mixed with water in the proportion of twenty measures of water to one of wine,” says, Mucianus was witness himself to the fact, that with one sextarians of this wine it was the custom to mix eight *sextarii* of water. And, says Pliny, “the wine that is still produced in the same district retains all its former strength, and a degree of vigour that is quite insuperable”- *vigorque indomitus*.⁴⁸⁸ The Pramnian wine eulogized by Homer, and which was sweet as “luscious nectar,” Pliny says “still retains its ancient fame;” and Athenaeus says “it is of extraordinary strength.” So that the mere sweetness of a wine is no evidence of its being a boiled syrup, or an unfermented liquor.

Antinous says to Ulysses, - “Sweet wine hurts thee, which harms others also – whoever takes it too abundantly, nor drinks properly. Wine also inspired the illustrious Centaur, Eurytiion, in the palace of magnanimous Pirithous, when he came to the Lepithae; but he, when he had injured his mind with wine, in madness did wicked deeds in the house of

⁴⁸⁸ Book xiv. 4

The Wines of the Bible

Pirithous.....Overcome with wine, he brought the evil upon himself.”⁴⁸⁹ Pindar also, speaking of the Centaurs, says, “After these monsters fierce learnt the invincible strength of luscious wine, then, with a sudden fury, with mighty hands, they threw the snow-white milk down from the board, and, of their own accord, drank away their senses in the silver-mounted horns,” &c.⁴⁹⁰

Virgil says, -

*“Wine urged to lawless lust the Centaurs’ train,
Thro’ wine they quarreled, and thro’ wine were slain.”* Geor. li

Horace, in like manner, says, -

*“Yet, that no one may pass
The freedom and mirth of a temperate glass,
Let us think on the Lepithae’s quarrels so dire,
And the Thracians, whom wine can to madness inspire;
Insatiate of liquor, when glow their full veins,
No distinction of vice or of virtue remains.”*

Many of the modern wines are also distinguished for their sweetness. Vizetelly describes some of the finest Rhine wines exhibited at Vienna, and which were priced at £150 the hogshead, as being “syrupy,” and of “almost too luscious character.”⁴⁹¹ He says of the Styrian samples, - “Their wines were rich and syrupy, of decreasing degrees of sweetness, but invariably of great volume, and with a fine spirituous and sub-acidulous flavour.”⁴⁹² He also says, “the grand specialty, however, of Gorz is its Picolit, a thick, sweet, spirituous straw wine, which acquires with great age

⁴⁸⁹ Od., xxi.

⁴⁹⁰ Athen., xi

⁴⁹¹ Wines of the World, p. 53

⁴⁹² Ibid., p. 69

The Wines of the Bible

a peculiar flavour, that cause it to be highly prized in the locality. Families treasure up this wine only to produce it on fete days, and even then it is partaken of but sparingly. One was not impressed by the samples of it tasted at Vienna, for it was a mere sugary syrup, spirituous, and slightly acidulated.”⁴⁹³

These several extracts show that a wine may be “thick” and “syrupy,” “luscious as nectar,” and yet be a “terrible,” “inflaming,” intoxicating wine of “extraordinary strength,” inciting to “fury” and “madness” when taken “too abundantly.” So that the sweetness of the ancient wines affords no support to the unfermented theory.

6. The Strength of Ancient Wines

Dr. Ritchie, referring to the expression, “drinking wine in bowls” (Amos vi. 6), says, “On this expression, then, we found an argument that a much greater quantity of it was drunk at a season of indulgence, than could be drunk of the brandied wines of Britain, and that, therefore, these latter possess a stronger intoxicating power.”⁴⁹⁴ Without entering into a discussion of the text on which this “argument” is founded, we might admit the conclusion of the writer, without, in any way, affecting the question at issue. But as the opinion expressed by Dr. Ritchie is somewhat generally entertained by advocates of the unfermented theory; and as it is thence concluded that, as the extensive dilution practiced by the ancients could not be employed with such weak liquors without reducing them to something akin to water, the wines so diluted must have been

⁴⁹³ Ibid., p. 76

⁴⁹⁴ Sc. Test., p. 140

The Wines of the Bible

inspissated and unfermented liquors, it is necessary that we should inquire into the facts as to the strength of ancient wines.

The wines of the ancients, like those of the moderns were no doubt both weak and strong. Sir Edward Barry says, - "As it was an usual custom among the ancients to dilute their wines with water in proportion to their strength, they distinguished them on that account into two general classes of the ολιγοφοροι and πολυφοροι, such as would bear a greater or less proportion of wine ["water," p-. 146], to make them more salutary and grateful."⁴⁹⁵ Some of the former class, the ολιγοφοροι, were so weak as to be little better than the washings of the wine vats. These were the *vinum operarium*, or "labourers' wines," which were allotted to slaves, harvest men, soldiers, and others of the poor. But many of the latter class, the πολυφοροι, designated "noble" or "generous" wines, were exceptionally strong, - perhaps stronger than any "brandied wines" used or known in this country.

Dr. Lees, however, objects that, "in fact, strength anciently, in reference to drinks, related rather to thickness and taste, than to intoxication;"⁴⁹⁶ and yet the same writer, in a paragraph already quoted, says, "Some of the ancient sweet wines were strong, and those of Sicily now reach thirty per cent of alcohol." And he further evidences the alcoholic strength of these wines by appealing to the testimony of Aristotle, to be cited immediately.

Pliny, referring to the Maronean wine, which was so strong as to subdue the Cyclops, says "It retains all its former strength, and a degree of vigour that is quite insuperable."⁴⁹⁷ He speaks, also, of a wine which was called by the extraordinary name of

⁴⁹⁵ Wines, p. 39

⁴⁹⁶ Works, ii. 64

⁴⁹⁷ Book xiv. 4

The Wines of the Bible

Hippodamantian,⁴⁹⁸ which Hardouin interprets as signifying, “strong enough to subdue a horse!” more than forty men were made drunk with a pint and a half of it, after it had been mixed with water.”⁴⁹⁹ Plutarch says, “Water, not only mingled with wine, but if it be drunk by itself, between wine and water together, it makes the mingled wine the less hurtful: we should accustom ourselves, therefore, in our daily diet, to drink two or three glasses of water, which will allay the strength of the wine.”⁵⁰⁰ Athenaeus, reproving those artists who represent Bacchus as if he were drunk, says, “By so doing, they show the beholders that wine is stronger than the god.”⁵⁰¹ Again, “Being afraid of the strength of the wine rising into their heads, men have introduced the fashion of anointing their heads.”⁵⁰² Again, “On your account we drank the whole night long, and right strong wine too, as it seems to me at least I got up with four heads, I think.”⁵⁰³ He also describes a reveler as saying, -

*....."At last well beaten,
I reach my home, and go to sleep on the ground,
And for a while forget my blows and bruises,
While the strong wine retains its sway and lulls me."
(B. vi. 28)*

This writer has collected a large amount of information as to the strength and other qualities of ancient wines. He speaks of the Pramnian as “known to be very strong and nutritious,” but “not at all good for inflammation.” He says, “The dark coloured wine is

⁴⁹⁸ Xiv. 7

⁴⁹⁹ Athen., x. 34

⁵⁰⁰ *Preservation of Heath*

⁵⁰¹ X. 33

⁵⁰² Xv. 45

⁵⁰³ X. 49

The Wines of the Bible

the strongest.....But white wine is weak and thin." "The Setine is a wine of the first class, like the Falernian wine, but lighter and no so apt to make a man drunk." The Gauran is "a scarce and very fine wine, and likewise very powerful and oily." The Alban is "rather sour, but it is a strong wine, and good for the stomach." "The Caecuban is a noble wine, full of strength, and easily affected the head." "The Fundan wine is strong and nutritious, and affects the head and stomach." The Trebellian wine "is of moderate strength." "The Taretine, and all the other wines of that district, are delicate wines, without very much strength or body." The *lotaline* is "a sweet wine and light, but there is some strength in it." The Pramnian "is of extraordinary strength." Amphis says of Acanthus, "Since you're a countryman of wine so strong, you must be fierce yourself." Aristotle describes the characteristics of wine and beer when he says, "that men who are drunk with wine show it in their faces; but that those who have drunk too much beer fall back and go to sleep; for wine is stimulating, but beer has a tendency to stupefy."⁵⁰⁴ Anacreon says of a drinking cup, "It will ten measures of water hold, and five of mighty Chian wine." Pindar speaks of "fierce monsters learning the invincible strength of luscious wine."⁵⁰⁵ Diphilius, describing the power of wine says, -

*"You make the lowly-hearted proud,
And bid the gloomy laugh aloud;
You fill the feeble man with daring,
And cowards strut and bray past bearing."*

And Panysias says of good wine, the gift of God, -

"Yet rule it with a tightened rein,

⁵⁰⁴ Athen., i.

⁵⁰⁵ Ibid., xi

The Wines of the Bible

*Nor moderate wisdom's rules disdain;
For when unchecked, there's nought runs faster, -
A useful slave, but cruel master." (Ibid. ii)*

Philo notices the strength of ancient wines in such references as the following: - "Let us not satiate ourselves with immoderate draughts of strong wine, and so give way to intoxication, which compels men to act like fools."⁵⁰⁶ He speaks of one "who is inflamed with strong wine, and raging in a drunken manner against virtue, and being absurdly excited to his own injury by wine."⁵⁰⁷ Again, "Like those who have drunk great quantities of strong wine, become intoxicated, and in their drunkenness they attack slaves and free men all alike."⁵⁰⁸ And again, "Others, when they drink strong wine, as if they had been drinking not wine but some agitating and maddening kind of liquor, or even the most formidable thing which can be imagined for driving a man out of his natural reason, rage about and tear things to pieces, like so many ferocious dogs."⁵⁰⁹

Pliny, also has a large variety of references to a similar purpose;⁵¹⁰ but further quotation on this point is unnecessary. The above will suffice to show that, when the ancients speak of the strength of their wines, they refer to the intoxicating property, and not, as alleged by Dr. Lees, to the mere thickness or taste of the liquors; that the ancient wines were largely diluted with water, not on account of their syrupy thickness, but because of their alcoholic power; and that here again, is neither evidence nor indication of the existence of use of unfermented wine.

⁵⁰⁶ *Allegories*, 53

⁵⁰⁷ *Drunkenness*, 8

⁵⁰⁸ *Humanity*, 22

⁵⁰⁹ *Con. Life*, 5

⁵¹⁰ *Book xiv*

The Wines of the Bible

7. Sober Wine

There are a few descriptions of ancient wines which figure prominently in the writings of the advocates of the unfermented wine theory, and which have received “honourable mention” as samples of unfermented wines. Among these is a wine described by Pliny as unintoxicating. Discoursing on the qualities of different kinds of grapes, he refers to one species, of which, he says, “It is called the *inerticula*, though it might with more propriety have been styled the *sobria*” – *sobriam dicturi*.⁵¹¹ Now, as every kind of grape, while in its grapehood, must be an innocent sober fruit, it is evident that this designation is used here proleptically of the wine made from that particular species of grape, as in those numerous instances in the Scriptures and other writings, in which the growing grapes, the juice in the grape, and the like, are designated as *yayin*, *oinos*, *vinum*. From this sober grape a wine was made, of which Pliny says, “The wine from it is remarkably good, and more particularly when it is old; but though strong it is productive of no ill effects, and, indeed, it is the only wine that will not cause intoxication “- *siquidem temulentiam sola non facit*.⁵¹²

If the qualities ascribed to this wine are to be interpreted absolutely, and not comparatively; and if it were possible to preserve a liquid wine without converting it into a syrup or jelly, the above statement must be accepted as evidence of the existence of an unfermented wine. But, (a) although, according to Pliny, the ancients possessed “eighty” different kinds of generous wines,” and of the various sorts of drinks “no less than one hundred and ninety,” and, “if all the varieties are reckoned they

⁵¹¹ Book xiv.

⁵¹² Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

will amount to nearly double that number,” this wine, made from that particular grape, was the “only wine” known to the historian, “that will not cause intoxication.” So that all other liquors, however prepared and preserved, must have been fermented and intoxicating beverages. (b) This non-intoxicating wine derived its innocuous qualities, not from the method of its preparation, or preservation, as an unfermented liquor, but from the nature of the grape from which it was made – the *inerticula* or *sobria*. (c) We must therefore conclude that the terms employed are not to be taken absolutely, but as indicating a fermented wine, which, as compared with other “heady,” “fiery,” “maddening” liquors, was non-injurious and non-intoxicating. Horace speaks of the Lesbian wine as being *innocent*, of which more anon. Dr. Lees alleges that Plutarch “refers to a wine often cleared and filtered – that ‘neither inflames the head nor infects the mind and passions’ – not a wine that rages, but one that is ‘mild and wholesome’; “Possibly this wine may have contained an infinitesimal amount of alcohol, but it was particularly weak, and therefore called by Theophrastus ‘moral’ - *ἡθικόν*.⁵¹³ But although Plutarch refers to a *sober* wine of this kind, is that sober wine an unfermented liquor? If not, it affords no evidence in favour of the unfermented theory. Admitting that the wine alluded to possessed all the qualities here ascribed to it – that it neither *raged* nor *inflamed*, but was “mild and wholesome,” “practically weak,” and even “moral,” was it nevertheless a “cursed drink,” – a fermented and alcoholic liquor? Undoubtedly it was, as even Dr. Lees acknowledges, for he admits that it may have contained some “alcohol.” But unfermented wine as such has no alcohol; and *every such wine in which alcohol is found is and must be a fermented liquor*. The references of Plutarch has been noticed

⁵¹³Works, ii. 27

The Wines of the Bible

already in a previous section, where we have seen that he is not speaking of a wine that has not been fermented, but of a wine that has been weakened in its alcoholic strength by the extraction of the lees; and even that “practically weak wine” is described as being a wine which has not, like a sword, “lost its edge,” but has merely been “purged of its dregs and filth.” While, therefore, the filtration may have lessened the potency of the liquor, it could not possibly have converted it in to an unfermented wine. Dr. Lees says further, - “As certainly, therefore, as Shakespeare meant to signify the quality of water, and to distinguish it from ‘hot and rebellious liquors’ and Horace and Theophrastus by the terms ‘innocent’ and ‘moral,’ the ‘comparative absence’ of the intoxicating principle; so certainly did Solomon intend, by the reference to mocking and raging, to designate the ‘positive presence’ of the evil spirit of wine.”⁵¹⁴ This being so, we also may, in like manner, conclude that, when Pliny speaks of a wine made from a sober grape, and describes it as a beverage that is “productive of no ill effects,” and that “will not cause intoxication,” he refers to a fermented wine which was “practically weak,” because of the “comparative absence of the intoxicating principle,” like the *innocent* wine of Horace, the *innocuous* wine of Plutarch, and the *moral* wine of Theophrastus.

The Hebrew *khometz* appears to have been a *sober* wine of this description, for Dr. Lees tells us it was a “fermented drink,” and was “like the Roman *posca*, something half-way between ginger beer and vin-ordinaire.”⁵¹⁵ And the vin-ordinaire itself, although fermented and alcoholic, is usually spoken of as wine “that will not cause intoxication.” Thus Mr. Darbin, in his *Observations on France, Germany, and Italy*, says, “The common wines which are

⁵¹⁴ Ibid., p. 28

⁵¹⁵ *Temp. Bib. Com.* pp. xxiv. 421

The Wines of the Bible

used on the soil that produce them *do not intoxicate*.....This vin-ordinaire makes a part of his (the peasant's) breakfast, of his dinner, and of his evening meal."⁵¹⁶ Dr. Duff, also, in the letter already referred to speaking of the wine used by the cottagers in France, describes it as the "pure juice of the grape," "pure, i.e., wholly undrugged or unadulterated with any extraneous matter of any kind" and, although certainly "fermented," yet containing "very little spirit," and "*utterly incapable of intoxicating a child.*"

Further illustrations of Pliny's meaning may be found in the following references: Aristotle says, "Sweet wine (*gleukus*) will not intoxicate;" from which it has been inferred that the wine spoken of must have been an *absolutely* unfermented liquor. But Hippocrates indicates the comparative sense of the statement, when he says, "Sweet wine is *less* calculated than any other wines to make the head heavy, and it takes less hold of the mind."⁵¹⁷ Sir Edward Barry, referring to the class of wines denominated αλεγοφοποι, says, "These would not admit of a strong or continued fermentation, and were apt to degenerate into an acid state; but when well prepared and defecated, they soon acquired a proper degree of maturity, and were light, sparkling, and agreeable, but not durable.....There was another celebrated species of a light, fragrant, and more generous wine, which was made from the pressure of the grapes on each other, by their own or a very *light additional* weight. These rich juices were only suffered to pass through a light fermentation; and the wine, when defecated and transparent, soon acquired, a very fine flavour, strength, and fragrantcy."⁵¹⁸ Again, - "These would not easily admit of any adulteration or mixture of stronger wines, which deprived

⁵¹⁶ *Temp. Cyclo.* P. 386

⁵¹⁷ Athen., ii. 24

⁵¹⁸ Wine, [p. 40, 41]

The Wines of the Bible

them of their peculiar delicacy and flavour, and their light but generous qualities, which animated the spirits, without affecting the head.”⁵¹⁹ Redding describes some French wines as being “very heady”; but the wines of Margaux “have strength without being heady;”⁵²⁰ and the wine of Medoc, when in perfection, is “strong without intoxicating:” it will “revive the stomach, and not affect the head.”⁵²¹ Vizetelly also describes the modern wine of Chateau Marguax as “generous without potency: it refreshes the stomach while *respecting the head*.”⁵²² He says, “The great specialty, in fact, of the Austrian and lighter German beers is their producing *neither intoxication nor drowsiness*, and which is due principally to the small quantity of alcohol they contain.”⁵²³ But all these wines and beers are fermented liquors.

Pliny’s *sober* wine may thus have been either one of the small wines, like *vin-ordinaire*, or one of the rich and more generous wines classed as *nobilia*, and described above. We incline to think it was one of the latter, and like the Lesbian *protopos*, which Horace terms “innocent.” But whichever it may have been, the above reference shows that a wine may be spoken of either as “strong, without intoxicating,” or as animating “the spirits without affecting the head,” and yet be a fermented liquor.

8. Fiery Wine

There is, among another species of wine described by Pliny, which has been appealed to as furnishing evidence that nearly all

⁵¹⁹ Ibid., p. 45

⁵²⁰ Wines p. 166

⁵²¹ Ibid., p. 164

⁵²² Wines p. 12

⁵²³ Ibid., p. 183

The Wines of the Bible

the wines of the ancients were either very slightly alcoholic or altogether unfermented. He says, "There is now no wine known that ranks higher than the Falernian; it is the only one, too, among all the wines that takes fire on the application of flame" – *solo vinorum flamma acceditur*. From this statement Mr. Parsons concludes that we have here "a striking proof that the other Roman wines were not charged with alcohol;" a most extraordinary conclusion, certainly, for if this be true, we must believe that of the endless variety of liquors in use among the Romans, there was only one species of alcoholic wine – the Falernian! But we have just seen, on the contrary, that, according to Pliny, there was only one kind of sober wine, so lightly charged with alcohol as to be comparatively unintoxicating.

The description here given of the fiery Falernian cannot be intended to intimate that all the other wines were absolutely unflammable, physiologically or chemically; for ancient authors have frequently taken notice of both phenomena, and speak of them as characteristics of wine in general. Indeed, Pliny himself exhibits a correct knowledge of the spirituous effects of wine, when he says, "It is the property of wine, when drunk, to cause a feeling of warmth in the interior of the viscera, and, when poured upon the exterior of the body, to be cool and refreshing." – Seneca says, "He that is naturally addicted to anger, let him use a moderate diet, and abstain from wine, for it is but adding fire to fire." Plutarch says that Homer brought in music at the banquets and revels of the ancients, as believing it to be of the greatest advantage "to repel and mitigate the inflaming power of the wine."⁵²⁴ He says, "Drink it allayed with very much mixture of water, for wine, being sharp and fiery, increases the disturbances

⁵²⁴ *On Music*

The Wines of the Bible

of the body.”⁵²⁵ “Wine carries a great force in it.”⁵²⁶ “Wine, like fire, softened and melted their tempers.”⁵²⁷ “The heat of the wine quickens its circulation to the heart.”⁵²⁸ Bacchus taught his drunken followers to wear garlands of ivy, “that by that means they might be secured against the violence of a debauch, the heat of the liquor being remitted by the coldness of the ivy.”⁵²⁹ “The coldness of their temper quencheth the heat of the strongest wine, and make it lose all its destructive force and fire.”⁵³⁰ “Epicurus, in his Banquet, hath a long discourse, the sum of which is that wine of itself is not hot, but that it contains the atoms that cause heat.”⁵³¹ “A great quantity being taken inflames the body.”⁵³² “Wine, after it has heated and disturbed, calms the mind again, and quiets the frenzy.”⁵³³ “When the vine is outwardly irrigated with wine, it is as fire to the vine, and destroys the nutritive faculty.”⁵³⁴ Lucretius, also, describing the effects of intoxication, ascribes them to the “violent power of wine,” and says, “Why do these effects happen, unless because the vehement force of the wine has exerted its customary power to disturb the soul as it is diffused through the body itself.”⁵³⁵ Plato, referring to juices of a “fiery nature,” assigns the first place to wine “which warms the soul as well as the body.”⁵³⁶ And he urges

⁵²⁵ *Preservation of Health*

⁵²⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵²⁷ *Banquet.*

⁵²⁸ *A Flatterer*

⁵²⁹ *Sympos.*

⁵³⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵³¹ *Ibid.*

⁵³² *Ibid.*

⁵³³ *Ibid.*

⁵³⁴ *Nat. Questions*

⁵³⁵ *Works, iii.*

⁵³⁶ *Jowett's Trans.*

The Wines of the Bible

that wine should be withheld from young persons, for that it is not well to heap fire on fire.” Homer, also, speaks of “inflaming wine pernicious to mankind,” and says –

“Pours the black wine, and sees the flames aspire.”

Athenaeus quotes the bard of Cyrene as saying –

*“Wine is like fire when ‘tis to man applied,
Or like the storm that sweeps the Libyan tide;
The furious wind the lowest depths can reach,
And wine robs man of knowledge, sense, and speech.”*

And Panyasis says –

*“Wine is like fire, an aid and sweet relief,
Wards off all ills, and comforts every grief.” (Book ii. 4)*

Euripides speaks of Hercules as quaffing the neat wine of the purple other, until “the fumes of the liquor, coming upon him, inflamed him” Virgil says –

*“Betwixt their horns the purple wine he sheds;
With the same generous juice the flame he feeds.”*

Ovid says, “The flame burns bright, just as it is wont to arise when wine is poured upon it.”⁵³⁷ Again, “often do I wish with wine to soothe my passions, but it increases, and drinking is flame upon flame.”⁵³⁸ Again, “See! My nurse is pouring wine upon the flames

⁵³⁷ Heroides, xiii.

⁵³⁸ Ibid., xvi

The Wines of the Bible

of favourable omen.”⁵³⁹ And again, “Venus amid wine has proved flames in flame.”⁵⁴⁰ And it is said of Cyrene offering a libation, “Thrice she poured the flowing wine on the sacred fire, and thrice it flashed to the arched roof.”⁵⁴¹

Vizetelly, in like manner speaks of the “fiery blood” of an American wine of the “fiery Rudesheimer,” and says, “Gunine Stein of a good vintage is a potent beverage of singular vigour and fire”; “Geneva produces the celebrated and fiery red wine known as Gringet;” and, speaking of the Albanello, he describes it as “rather fiery and with somewhat of a sherry flavour.”

From these varied references we conclude that, as it was common for ancient as well as modern wine to blaze up when thrown upon flame, Pliny cannot mean either to deny such a well-known fact or to limit the phenomenon to Falernian wine.

He probably means that the Falernian was a pre-eminently fiery liquor, like some of those modern wines referred to above, and was so highly charged with alcohol that it took fire when a lighted torch or lamp approached it – “on the application of flame.” But, however this may be, the evidence we have adduced shows conclusively that while some of the ancient wines may have been thin and weak, others were distinguished for their fiery quality or great alcoholic strength. So that here again is no evidence in favour of the unfermented theory.

⁵³⁹ Ibid., xix

⁵⁴⁰ Ars. Am., I

⁵⁴¹ Temp. Muses, p. 166

The Wines of the Bible

9. Innocent Wine.

The last witness we should have expected to meet on the unfermented platform is the poet who sings “the jovial monarchy of wine;” and yet, if not the first, Horace is one of the chief witnesses adduced to testify in behalf of the unfermented theory. Thus we are told that “Horace was evidently aware of the distinction between intoxicating and unintoxicating wine;” and in proof this recognized distinction, four lines are quoted from Sat. ii. 4, with the following translation, -

*“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.”*
Temp. Cyclo. p. 409

Now, to make this passage serve his purpose, the writer has mangled both the poet and his translator. He has transformed the poet’s mulsum, “honeyed wine,” into *mustum*, “must;” and instead of the translator’s (Francis) line –

“And smoother mend shall better scour the reins,”

he has substituted his own false rendering, -

“For lenient must will better cleanse the reins.”

As there is nothing in the passage, either in its original or modern shape, which can in any way determine the question at issue, we proceed to notice the lines which are chiefly relied on as evidence of an ancient unfermented wine; -

The Wines of the Bible

*"Far from the burning dog-star's rage;
Here shall you quaff our harmless wine;
Nor here shall Mars intemperate wage
Rude war with him who rules the jovial vine."*

Oder, i. 17

*"Hail, O Bacchus, ever dear,
You who from Lesbos drove dull care
With sparkling rosy wine." – i. 51*

Antiphanes speaks of a cup, -

*"Full of the luscious drops which o're the sea
Came from the isle of the delicious drinks,
The sea-girt Lesbos, full, and foaming up." – xi. 42*

Plato says, -

*....."Tell me, I pray you,
Did yo e'er see a grave philosopher
Drunk, or devoted to these joys you speak of?
Yes; all of them.*

*.....
The man who has a chance to pay his court
To a fair woman, and at eve to drink
Two bottles full of richest Lesbian vine,
Must be a wise man!" – vii. 9*

Archestratis says, -

*"but Lesbian is the true ambrosial juice,
And so the gods, whose home's Olympus, think it;
And if some rather the Phoenician choose,
Let them, so long as they don't make you drink it.*

*The Tasian isle, too, noble wine doth grow,
When passing years have made its flavour mellow,*

The Wines of the Bible

*And other places, too; still, all I know
Is that the Lesbian liquor has no fellow.” – i. 52*

If the wine of Lesbos was the favorite drink of the Lesbians, and if that wine was an unfermented liquor, the people would doubtless have been as remarkable for their sobriety as their wine was for innocence. But Pittacus, one of the sages of Greece, and chief ruler of Lesbos, enacted a law that crimes committed under intoxication should receive double punishment; and this he did with the object of destroying “the plea of ignorance in the excesses to which the love of wine hurried the Lesbians.”⁵⁴² So that the Lesbian wine of that age must have been an intoxicating liquor. Athenaeus, also, tells us that whenever Alcibiades went on a journey, “he used four of the allied cities as his maid-servants.” The Ephesians furnished his tent, the Chians food for his horses, the people of Cyzicus victims for sacrifice, and “the Lesbians gave him wine, and everything else which he wanted for his daily food.”⁵⁴³ Now, if we may judge of the quality of this Lesbian wine by the habits of the drinker, it must have been an intoxicating liquor; for we are informed that the general “out-drunk the Thracians themselves,” who were notorious for their drunkenness.⁵⁴⁴ The same writer, describing the convivial habits of the poet Aleaeus, who was immoderately addicted to wine, and accustomed to drink at all seasons and on all occasions, tells us that in his misfortunes he sang, -

*“Come to me, Bacchus; you are ever
The best of remedies, who bring us wine and joyous drunkenness.”*

⁵⁴² Anacharsis, ii. 55

⁵⁴³ Xii. 47

⁵⁴⁴ Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

And, in his hours of joy, he sang, -

*"Now is the time to get well drunk;
Come, the, my boy, and quickly pour
A cup of luscious Lesbian wine."*

"How then," says Athenaeus, "could a man who was so very devoted to drinking be a sober man, and be content with one or two cups of wine?"⁵⁴⁵ And we may add, how, also, could the Lesbian wine he drank be absolutely *innocent* and unfermented liquor, seeing that he used it as a means "to get well drunk?" And, finally, the same writer says, "Clearchus speaks of Lesbian wine which Maro himself appears to me to have been the maker of."⁵⁴⁶ From which it may be inferred that if the Lesbian in any way resembled the Maronean wine, it may have been a comparatively *innocent*, but it is certainly a fermented liquor.

There are some other wines which are usually associated with the innocent wine of Lesbos as unfermented liquors. Dr. Lees says, "Pliny's account of wines (B. xiv.) shows that some sorts in good repute were not fermented; and of *adunamoa* ('without strength'), one of the artificial *vina* (wines), he expressly declares that it was given to invalids when the ordinary wines were likely to be injurious."⁵⁴⁷ The wine so designated by Pliny was made by boiling down twenty parts of must with ten of water, until the amount of added water was boiled away. He makes no direct reference to the fermentation of the liquor, but he is equally silent as to the fermentation of the "almost innumerable varieties," which he classes together as "artificial preparations" (*facticii*). Now, it is evident, from the nature of the substances

⁵⁴⁵ X. 35

⁵⁴⁶ i. 51

⁵⁴⁷ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 374

The Wines of the Bible

employed, and the method of their preparation, that these artificial wines must have been fermented liquors, for they were made of grain dates, figs, pears, apples, mulberries, pine nuts, myrtle, garden plants, herbs, unguents, &c., &c. One of them was made of millet, in which the grain, along with its straw, was steeped in must for “six months,” and must have been a species of fermented beer. Another was made by steeping ripe dates in water, and then pressing the fruit. This, also, must have been a fermented liquor, or date wine, for it is elsewhere said to “affect the head.”⁵⁴⁸ A species of *adymamon* was made by mixing twenty parts of must with ten parts of sea water, and an equal quantity of rain water; and, instead of boiling the liquor, leaving it “to evaporate in the sun for forty days.” Now, the exposure of the liquor to the atmosphere for such a lengthened period must inevitably have induced fermentation. The wine, therefore, may, indeed, have been *adymamon*, feeble, weak, or “without strength,” and as such suitable for invalids “when the ordinary wines were deemed likely to be injurious,” and yet none the less a fermented beverage. Columella speaks of a grape called *amethystom*, which was so named because, says he, “the wine made from it is *iners*, ‘weak.’”

Dr. Lees further says, “Athenaeus also speaks of the ‘mild Chian,’ and the ‘sweet Bibline.’ He says, “The sweet wine (*gleukus*), which among the Sicilians is called Pollian, may be the same as the *biblinos oinos*’ (lib. i., chap. 56). Of the sweet Lesbian he says, ‘Let him take *gleukus*, either mixed with water or warmed, especially that called *protropos*, as being very good for the stomach.’ (lib. ii. Chap. 24).⁵⁴⁹ Here are more wines, to which the Thasian also may be added, as supposed unfermented wines. And, first, as to

⁵⁴⁸ Xiii. 4

⁵⁴⁹ Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

protropos, “the sweet Lesbian,” Pliny says, “Among these varieties I ought to place what is known as *protropum*, such being the name given by some to the must that runs spontaneously from the grapes before they are trodden out. Directly it flows it is put into flagons, and *allowed to ferment*; after which it is left to ripen for forty days in a summer sun, about the rising of the dogstar.”⁵⁵⁰ Thus the Lesbian *protropos*, which is “very good for the stomach,” is a fermented wine.

The Thasian wine required to be strained.⁵⁵¹ Theophrastus says, “The wine at Thasos, which is given in the prytaneum, is wonderfully delicious, for it is well seasoned, for they knead up dough with honey, and put that into earthen jars, so that the wine receives fragrance from itself, and sweetness from the honey.”⁵⁵² Clearly that wine was a fermented liquor. The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* quotes from the Geoponic authors a paragraph which explains another method of preparing Thasian wine, in which it is said, after pressing the grapes we put the wine into large vessels, “*where it has fermented* and cleared itself, we pour to it the twenty fifth part of *hepsema*, and after the vernal equinox we draw it off from the lees into moderate-sized vessels.”⁵⁵³ Here, again, even upon this author’s own showing, the Thasian wine was a fermented liquor. Aristophanes, as we have seen in a passage already quoted, testifies that the Thasian wine *abides in the head a long time*.⁵⁵⁴ Athenaeus, referring to the same passage, quotes as follows: -

“And other women, more advanced in age,

⁵⁵⁰ Xiv. 9

⁵⁵¹ Athen., i. 51

⁵⁵² Ibid., i. 58

⁵⁵³ Sec. 27

⁵⁵⁴ Ecclez

The Wines of the Bible

*Into their stomachs poured, without restraint.
From good-sized cotylae, dark Thasian wine,
The whole contents of a large earthen jar.
Urged by their mighty love for the dark wine.” - xi. 57*

Alexis says, -

*“A noble drink! Where was the land
That raised this noble Bacchus? By its flavour
I think he came from Thasos.” – x. 37*

Epilycus says, -

*“for all the ills that men endure,
Thasian is a certain cure:
For any head or stomach ache,
Thasian wine I always take,
And think it, as I home am reeling,
A present from the god of healing.” – i. 51*

It is evident from these references that the Thasian was a fermented and intoxicating wine. As to the “mild Chian” and the “sweet Bibline,” they are associated with the “sweet Lesbian,” and Thasian, in some of the following passages: - Athenaeus says “white wine is weak and thin,” but “the dark coloured wine is the strongest, and it remains in the system of the drinkers of it longer than any other. But Theopompus says that black wine was first made among the Chians.”⁵⁵⁵ Epilycus says “that the Chian and the Thasian wine must be strained.”⁵⁵⁶ Antiphanes says, -

*“Tell me, I pray you, how life define?
To drink full goblets of rich Chian wine.” – i. 41*

⁵⁵⁵ i. 47

⁵⁵⁶ i. 51

The Wines of the Bible

Eubulus says, -

*"In Thasian wine or Chian soak your throttle,
Or take of Lesbian and old cobwebbed bottle." – i. 51*

*"Shun, my boy, the pramnian cup,
Nor Thasian drink, nor Chian sup;
Nor let your glass with Peparethian brighten
For bachelors that liquor's too exciting." i. 52*

Hermippus says, -

*"Mendaeian wine, such as the gods distill,
And sweet magnesian, cures for every ill,
And Thasian, redolent of mild perfume,
But of them all the most inviting bloom
Mantles above old Homer's Chian glass;
That wine doth all its rivals far surpass." – i. 53*

Philyllius says, -

*"I'll give you Lesbian, Chian wine,
Thasian, Mendaen and Bibline;
Sweet wines, but none so strong and heady,
As that you shall next day feel seedy." – i. 56*

Horace, speaking of a convivial party for which a cask of Chian wine had been purchased, directs the cups to be mixed with water, in the proportion of three of water and nine of wine to the uses, and of nine of water and three of wine to the Graces; intimating thereby that the former proportion was suitable to the hard drinkers among the guests, among whom he classed the

The Wines of the Bible

poets, and that the latter was intended for the more temperate persons, who were friends to the Graces.⁵⁵⁷

Anacreon, calling for water with which to mix his wine, because “he calls the drinking of unmixed wine a Scythian draught,” says, -

.....*Pour in
Ten cyathi of water pure,
And five of richest Chian wine;
That I may drink, from fear removed,
And free from drunken insolence.*” – x. 29

Hedylus says, -

.....*Come,, soak me well
In cups of Chian wine, and say to me,
‘come sport and drink, good Hdylus;’ I hate
To live an empty life, debarred from wine.*” – xi. 45

Anacreon, referring to a wine-cup, says, -

*“It will ten measures of water hold,
And five of mighty Chian wine.”* – xvi. 50

Anaxylas speaks of –

.....*Drinking strong wine
From the island of Chios.*” – xii. 70

Aristophanes, referring to the luxury of the Sicilians, speaks of drinking and singing “loose songs at Syracusan feasts, and how to share in Sybaritic banquets, and to drink Chian wine in Spartan cups.”⁵⁵⁸

⁵⁵⁷ Odes, iii. 19

⁵⁵⁸ Xii. 34

The Wines of the Bible

It will be seen from the above extracts that all the wines referred to by Dr. Lees in the passage under consideration, are spoken of as fermented and intoxicating liquors. So that here, again, is no evidence in favour of the unfermented theory.

10. Frozen Wine.

In further evidence that some of the ancient wines were unfermented, Mr. Parsons quotes from Xenophon, who relates that, when in Anatolia, the wine “froze in their vessels,” – “a plain proof,” says Mr. Parsons, “that they were not charged with alcohol, because alcohol will not freeze.” *Mirabile dictum!* The writer must have been hard pushed to find firm footing for his favorite theory, when he thus rashly ventured to establish it on a thin crust of frozen wine. It might with equal justice be alleged that the frozen seas of the north are freshwater lakes, because salt will not freeze! Or that vinegar, “sour wine,” is an unfermented liquor because it has been frozen, and acetic acid will not freeze! Mr. Parsons should have made sure of his facts, and their correct interpretation before attempting to build his theory upon them: for it is certain that alcoholic wine, if not alcohol itself, may be, and has been frozen. Muspratt says “Alcohol of specific gravity 0.820 froze easily.”⁵⁵⁹ However this may be, and even admitting that “alcohol will not freeze,” it must be admitted that the strongest fermented wine contains water in sufficient quantity to make it liable to freeze; and Muspratt informs us that in some places in the north of Europe wine has

⁵⁵⁹ Chem. P. 52

The Wines of the Bible

been exposed to serve frost, under the idea of imparting strength to it, by drawing off the unfrozen portion.”⁵⁶⁰

If the wines of the ancients had been generally either unfermented or excessively weak and watery liquors, the freezing of such wines, especially in severe weather, would have been a natural and common phenomenon which would have occasioned little or no surprise. But, on the contrary, it seems to have been a very rare occurrence; and, accordingly, Pliny exclaims, “It is a singular thing to mention, but still it has occasionally been seen, that these vessels have burst asunder, and there has stood the wine in frozen masses, a miracle almost, *as it is not ordinarily the nature of wine to freeze*, cold having only the effect of benumbing it.”⁵⁶¹

The freezing of wine, though far from being a very common occurrence, has been noticed by both ancient and modern writers. Virgil describes it when he says, -

*“With axes first they cleave the wine, and thence
By weight, the solid portions they dispense.”*

Geo., iii 569

Ovid, in his banishment, writes of having seen “the vast sea frozen with ice, and a slippery crust covered over the unmoved waters;” and he says, “Liquid wine becomes solid, preserving the form of the vessel; they do not quaff draughts of liquor, but pieces which are presented.”⁵⁶² Huish, in his account of the last voyage of Sir John Ross, and referring to the exploring expedition of Captain James, says, “Fortunately for them, they were able to collect a sufficiency of driftwood, to enable them to keep up large

⁵⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 1130

⁵⁶¹ Book xiv.

⁵⁶² Trist

The Wines of the Bible

fives; but nevertheless, their wine, vinegar, oil, and in fact, everything that was liquid, was frozen so hard that they were obliged to cut it out with a hatchet.”⁵⁶³ Sir John Malcolm, in his *Sketches of Persia*, referring to the climate of Tebreez in January, says, “For at least a fortnight not an egg was to be had, all being split with the cold. Some bottles of wine froze, although covered with straw.”⁵⁶⁴ Mr. Robert Shaw, British Commissioner in Ladak, giving an account of visits to High Tartary, Yarkand, and Kashgar, relates that at Yarkand, on New Year’s Day, grapes were frozen on the table, and had to be thawed in hot water, but they soon froze again. He became acclimatized by the intense cold into taking his claret by breaking off a frozen piece, and his men went to fetch water with a hatchet and a rope. Redding also informs us that “new wine is sometime frozen.....The aqueous part of the wine is that which congeals. This has furnished wine-growers with the hint to expose their wine to a frost, that it may congeal a proportion of the watery part, and then rack off the residue, which is by some thought to be improve both in body and spirit.”⁵⁶⁵ Again, “Others, to obtain a stronger wine than usual, roll a run into the open air during a severe frost, and taking out the head, having set the cask on its end, it becomes frozen to a considerable depth in the upper part. The lower portion of the liquid is then racked off and bottled. This wine will keep long, and is very strong in quality.”⁵⁶⁶

Thus, then, the freezing of the wine of Anatola is no evidence of its having been an unfermented liquor, seeing that alcoholic wine not only has been frozen, but is intentionally frozen by some modern manufacturers, with the special object of thereby

⁵⁶³ p. 61

⁵⁶⁴ p. 240

⁵⁶⁵ Wines, p. 75

⁵⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 192 [page number unclear]

The Wines of the Bible

increasing its alcoholic strength, and producing a wine “very strong in quality.”

The Wines of the Bible

IV. ANCIENT WINES – ALLOWED TO WOMEN

We come not to a special class of liquors, which it is alleged were anciently allowed to women as unfermented wines. Dr. Lees says, “Women under thirty were debarred the use of even *defrutum*, *sapa*, *siraion*, and other unfermented wines; and were totally prohibited the use of strong wines at all ages.”⁵⁶⁷ Again, “The fact is, that by the Greek and Roman laws, wine generically was prohibited to women under thirty or thirty-five years, but after that age the unfermented wines were allowed.”⁵⁶⁸ And again, “Dionysius, Valerius, Maximus, Polybius, Aulus, Gellius, Pliny, and Article XVI of the *Leges Regiae*, show that intoxicating wine was prohibited to the Italian women in the earliest ages; as also to all young men under their thirteenth year; through the use of *passum*, *lora*, *murrina*, and *dulcia* was allowed.”⁵⁶⁹

Here, then, we have wines forbidden, and wines permitted to women; a total prohibition of “strong wine,” and “intoxicating wine,” at “all ages,” and temporary prohibition of “every *defrutum*, *sapa*, *siraion*, and other unfermented wines “under thirty,” and “under thirty or thirty-five years.” And “after that age the unfermented wines were allowed.” We could have wished that, instead of the general reference to the above authors, the doctor had furnished us with chapter and verse, or with the very words of the writers who testify to these alleged facts. When, where, and by whom were “women under thirty debarred the use of even *defrutum*, *sapa*, *siraion*,” which were not drinks at all, but grape syrups? And when, where, and by whom, were laws enacted to permit these women to use those syrups after they

⁵⁶⁷ Works, iii. Bibl. Temp., 48

⁵⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 95

⁵⁶⁹ Ibid., ii. 12

The Wines of the Bible

had reached the mature age of thirty or thirty-five years? Alas for the rarity of Christian charity under the sun, if the young ladies of the olden time were not permitted to use such an innocent delicacy as grape syrup or jelly? But our business is with those “other unfermented wines,” and not with these ancient laws.

Now these are named “*passum*, *lora*, *murrina*, and *dulcia*” in the last of the above extracts; but in another passage elsewhere they are designated “*vinum operarium*, along with *sapa*, *defrutum* and *passum*.”⁵⁷⁰ *Sapa*, *defrutum*, and *siraion*, were, as we have shown, identical in nature, and were syrups, not wines. *Lora* and *vinum operarium* were also identified liquors under different names. So that, excluding the jellies, this extensive list of “unfermented wines” dwindles down to three kinds of beverages – *murrina*, *lora*, and *passum*; but whether these were really unfermented remains to be seen.

1. Murrina

There can be no doubt, from the accounts we have received of its liquor, that it was simply perfumed wine - i.e., myrrhed wine – a preparation of “wine mingled with myrrh.” The nature of the wine itself, to which the myrrh was added, and the purpose for which this was done, may be learned from the following references: -

Pliny says, “the wines that were most esteemed among the ancient Romans were those perfumed with myrrh,”⁵⁷¹ or, as Dr. Lees puts it, “the ancients had sumptuous wines seasoned with the scent of myrrh.” From this it appears that the *murrina* was not

⁵⁷⁰ Ibid., 96

⁵⁷¹ Book xiv. 13

The Wines of the Bible

a special description of wine, with some distinguishing quality in itself, but merely the ordinary, or, according to Lees, “sumptuous” wines of the ancients, improved by the addition of myrrh as a flavouring agent. In another passage Pliny informs us that “all the luscious wines – *vinum omne dulce* – have but little aroma; the thinner the wine the more roma it has;⁵⁷² and again, “The sweet wines are inodorous, while the thinner ones have more aroma, and are much sooner fit for use than those of a thicker nature.”⁵⁷³ We must, therefore, infer that the wines flavoured with myrrh were “luscious wines,” and that the myrrh was added to supply the “aroma,” of which those sweet wines were deficient. Hence, says Pliny, “some persons are of opinion that they [‘their forefathers,’ Lees] were particularly fond of aromatic wines;”⁵⁷⁴ and this opinion is confirmed by Martial, who says, “Drink, luxurious man, if you thirst for perfumed wines.”⁵⁷⁵ Aristophanes, as we have seen, speaking of the Thasian wine drunk by women, and which *abides in the head a long time*, says, “Fill out pure wine: it will cheer the women the whole night, who select whatever has the most fragrance.”⁵⁷⁶ That fragrant wine was clearly an intoxicating liquor. Plutarch intimates that this luxury was not agreeable for the early Greeks, for he represents Thales as saying that a man when a youth, took some rich perfume, “and mixing it with a quantity of wine, drank it off, and was ever hated for it.”⁵⁷⁷ Diphilus says, if you ask a Rhodian to dinner, set a fine

⁵⁷² Book xiv. 9

⁵⁷³ Book xv. 28

⁵⁷⁴ Book. xiv. 13

⁵⁷⁵ Ep., xiv. 116

⁵⁷⁶ Eccles.

⁵⁷⁷ Sympose.

The Wines of the Bible

shad or *lebias* before him, “he will like it better so than if you add a cup of myrrhine wine.”⁵⁷⁸

From these facts we conclude – (1) that the *murrina* was simply a myrrhed wine; (2) that the myrrh was used in this case as a perfume, to give a pleasant aromatic flavour to the wine; (3) that this usage was not limited to one kind of wine, but was extended to different wines; (4) that the wines thus flavoured were all “sweet” or “luscious” wines, naturally deficient in aroma; (5) that these perfumed wines ranked as the “sumptuous” wines of the ancients; (6) that the “ancient Romans,” the Roman “forefathers,” the “luxurious” men, and the women of the olden times, were “particularly fond” of such aromatic wines; (7) and that these myrrhed wines were used by, and “most esteemed among the ancient Romans,” both men and women.

In all this there is not the remotest allusion to *murrina* as being a perfumed syrup (*sapa*); or that it was an inferior drink used by the lower classes; or that it was an unfermented liquor, limited or specially assigned to women above thirty years of age. On the contrary, it was a “sumptuous” wine, the favourite drink of the winebibbing ancients.

It is true, Plautus associates the *murrina* with *passum*, *defrutum*, and *mella*, in one of his plays (*Psuedolus*); and Pliny infers from the association that “it was not only named among the wines, but among the *dulcia* also.”⁵⁷⁹ But this is much too narrow a basis on which to found such a wide inference as that the associated *murrina* must have been an unfermented wine. *Defrutum* and *mella* were no doubt unfermented substances, but the nature of *passum* has yet to be ascertained. The association merely proves that the associated substances were *dulces*; and

⁵⁷⁸ Athen., iv. 9

⁵⁷⁹ Book xiv. 13

The Wines of the Bible

this is true, for *murrina*, as we have seen, was one of the “luscious” wines, *passum* was a sweet raisin wine, *defrutum* sweet syrup, and *mella* sweet honey. The first pair are ranked together as sweet liquors, the last pair as sweet solids; but whatever other properties they may possess, they are all distinguished by the one quality of *lusciousness*, and are properly enough associated together as *dulcia*.

It is said, however, that “Pliny and Varro speak of a wine called ‘*murrina*,’ a wine not mixed with myrrh, but a very sweet aromatic drink, much approved of by Roman ladies, and conceded to them because it would not inebriate. *Dulces nec inebrians* are the words of Varro. Of this wine, Pliny also says (lib. xiv. Chap. 3), that it would not intoxicate.”⁵⁸⁰ This is another of those strange mixtures of facts and fancies which are sometimes met with in this controversy. Where did the writer learn that *murrina* was “a wine not mixed with myrrh?” If it was an “aromatic drink” what aromatic substance was used in flavouring it? If it was “not mixed with myrrh,” but with some other flavouring agent, how could it be a *murrina*, or myrrhed wine? Where, also, does Pliny say that “it would not inebriate?” Not in “lib. xiv. Chap. 3” “for *murrina* is not spoken of there at all; and in the only place where he does speak of it,⁵⁸¹ he makes no reference either to its intoxicating or non-intoxicating property, as may be seen in the passage given above. And what evidence is furnished by the words of Varro, *dulces nec inebrians*, “sweets do not inebriate,” that *murrina* was an unfermented wine? Before accepting such a conclusion we must be satisfied that Varro refers to *murrina* at all; and when that has been made certain, we must then be assured that his words are to be taken absolutely, and not comparatively, as in

⁵⁸⁰ Temp. Cyclo., p. 409

⁵⁸¹ Xiv. 13

The Wines of the Bible

those cases of which we have given examples in a previous section from both ancient and modern their writers.

We find that myrrh was used by the ancients, not only as an aromatic to flavour their wines, as in those “perfumed wines” referred to by Martial and Pliny noticed above, but also, and probably in larger quantity, as a narcotic to counteract their inebriating effects. Accordingly, Aristotle, in his treatise on *Drunkenness*, is cited by Athenaeus as saying, “*Myrrh*, rushes, and other things of the same sort, are put into water and then boiled; and when this mixture is put into the wine, the drinkers are *less apt to become intoxicated*.” And in another place, he again refers to this use of *myrrh* and other things, and says, “when some of this compound is added to the wine, it has such effect in *preventing intoxication* that it even diminishes the amorous propensities, checking the breath in some degree, &c.”⁵⁸² This cure must have been as bad, if not worse, than the disease; for if myrrh was a narcotic, it could only prevent intoxication by inducing semi-stupefaction, unless on the homoeopathic principle, *similia similibus curantur*.

It thus appears that *myrrh* was added to wine in different proportions, and for different purposes. In one case it was used merely to flavour the liquor and make it a sweet aromatic wine. In another it was apparently intended to act as a counteractive to the alcohol, and make the wine a less intoxicating beverage. And in another it was employed in making the “wine mingled with myrrh,” which Dr. Lees designates a “drugged potion,” and which Christ refuse to drink when it was offered to Him at his crucifixion. In all this there is no evidence that *murrina* was an unfermented liquor.

⁵⁸² Athen., xi.

The Wines of the Bible

2. Lora

This wine is also designated *vinum operarium*, doubtless because it was specially prepared for the use of slaves and others, as the labourers' wine. Varro explains that it was called *lora*, because the husks of which it was chiefly made were *lota*, "watered," in the manufacture. Pliny's account of it is as follows: - "Those cannot properly be called wines which by the Greeks are known under the name of *deuteria*, and to which, in common with Cato, we in Italy give the name of *lora*, being made from the husks of grapes steeped in water. Still, however, this beverage is reckoned as making one of the labourers' wines. There are three varieties of it: the first is made in the following manner: - After the must is drawn off, one-tenth of its amount in water is added to the husks, which are then left to soak a day and a night, and then again are subjected to pressure. A second kind, that which the Greeks are in the habit of making, is prepared by adding one-third in water of the quantity of must that has been drawn off, and after submitting the pulp to pressure, the result is reduced by boiling to one-third of its original quantity. A third kind, again, is pressed out from the wine lees. Cato gives it the name of *faecatum*. None of these beverages, however, will keep the more than a single year."⁵⁸³

The differences noticed by Pliny in the preparation of these three varieties of *lora* are unimportant. There is a difference in quantities of water used; one is boiled; and one is made from wine-lees, instead of grape-husks. The first two species were made from husks, which were chopped up, or "cut round," before final pressure; and the wine was thence named *circumcidaneum* by Cato; *circumicvisum* by Columella, and *circucisitum* by Varro.

⁵⁸³ Book xiv.

The Wines of the Bible

The other species was made from lees, and thence named by Cato *facatum*, or “lees wine.” Although nothing is said here as to the particular properties of this beverage, it may be inferred from the quality of the juice, the mode of its preparation, the place it occupied in relation to wines, as *deuteria*, and the fact as to its being so short-lived, that it was one of the small wines of the ancients, like the modern *piquette*, or harvesters’ wine of the Continent.

Dr. Lees, as we have seen, includes it among the alleged unfermented wines allowed to women above thirty or thirty-five years of age, and yet he identifies it with the Hebrew *khometz*, which he says was a “fermented drink,”⁵⁸⁴ and was no doubt “the thin, sour drink made from the last pressure of the grapes, with water added, and was, like the Roman *posca*, something halfway between ginger-beer and French *vinorduaire*.”⁵⁸⁵ Professor Ramsay, whom the doctor quotes as testifying that *lora* was “the drink of elderly women,” in describing the process of ancient wine manufacture, says, that the fourth product of the press was also fermented, and the result was a thin acid beverage, known as *lora*.⁵⁸⁶ The translators of Pliny (Bohn’s Ed.) say, “We have no corresponding word for this beverage in the English language – a thin, poor liquor, made by pouring water on the husks and stalks after being fully pressed, allowing them to soak, pressing them again, and then fermenting the liquor.” And Holland, another translator of Pliny, describes the *lora* as “a small, thin wine of the second running.” Dr. Ritchie, under the head of “wines allowed to women,” says, “The wine last expressed from the grapes, which was always kept by itself, must have been thin and poor enough; but a still inferior beverage was made by pouring water upon the

⁵⁸⁴ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 421

⁵⁸⁵ Ibid., p. xxiv

⁵⁸⁶ Rom. Antiq.

The Wines of the Bible

husks and stalks after they had been fully pressed, and allowing them to soak, pressing again, and *fermenting the liquor* thus obtained. This was given to labourers in winter, and was, along with *sapa*, the drink of elder women.”⁵⁸⁷

Thus, then, Lees and Ritchie, advocates of the unfermented theory, agree with those other writers in testifying that the *lora*, which was allowed to “elderly women,” above “thirty or thirty-five years of age,” as an unfermented wine, was, after all, “a fermented drink!” But, apart from any testimony of that kind whatever, it is self-evident that a liquor such as the above could not have been preserved without fermentation, even for the brief period noticed by Pliny. It must, therefore, have been a fermented wine, whether used by laboring men, or “elderly women.”

The satirists appear to allude to this, or some other small wine, when they speak contemptuously of “vile libations” on a festal day,”⁵⁸⁸ “meager down-the-Tiber wine,” the “refuse of our country vats,”⁵⁸⁹ “such ropy wine, as wool, which takes all liquids, would decline.”⁵⁹⁰

*“Or stooping o’er the dregs of mothery wine
Touch, with suspicious nose, the sacred sign.” – (Persius).*

Martial complains that while his luxurious friends drink rich “Setine wine, cooled in the snow,” he has to content himself with “the black poison of Corsica out of the cask;”⁵⁹¹ and addressing Amminus, he says, “In drinking Vatican wine you drink poison.”⁵⁹²

⁵⁸⁷ Sc. Test, p. 92

⁵⁸⁸ Horace

⁵⁸⁹ Juvenal

⁵⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁵⁹¹ Ep., ix. 2

⁵⁹² Ibid., vi. 92

The Wines of the Bible

The elder Cato, who was distinguished for his abstemious habits, is commended by Plutarch, because “all the time he was in the army he drank nothing but water, except that when almost burnt up with thirst, he would ask for a little vinegar, or when he found his strength and spirits exhausted, he would take a little wine.” He was accustomed to work with his own labourers on his little farm, and “afterwards sit down with them, and eat the same kind of bread, and drink of the same wine;” and “even when praetor or consul, he drank the same wine with his slaves.”⁵⁹³

The beverages referred to above were obviously an inferior sort of wine, the usual drink of the peasantry, and, probably, the *lora* or *vinum operarium* under consideration. Modern writers refer to a similar description of wine still used by the labourers and others on the Continent. Sir Francis Head describes its manufacture in his Faggot of French Sticks, and intimates it is frequently sent to the distilleries for the extraction of its spirit in the manufacture of brandy.⁵⁹⁴ Redding refers to it under the name of piquette, given to the peasants in harvest time.”⁵⁹⁵ Vizetelly describes a species of wine called *mastas*, which is a “second wine, consisting of ordinary must which has profited by having the lees of Imperial Tokay steeped in it.”⁵⁹⁶ Miss Bremner, in *Greece and the Greeks*, tells us that the poor in that country “must satisfy themselves with a liquor which resembles vinegar rather than wine.”⁵⁹⁷ Conway describes the *vin-da-pays*, a French country wine, made and freely used by the peasants, which he pronounces bad, but

⁵⁹³ *Life of Cato*

⁵⁹⁴ i. 376, 377

⁵⁹⁵ *Wines* p. 76

⁵⁹⁶ *Wines* p. 83

⁵⁹⁷ i. 223

The Wines of the Bible

drinks “not because I like it, but because its very thinness and sourness render it the more refreshing in hot weather.”⁵⁹⁸

Further evidence as to the character of this small wine is unnecessary. Enough has been adduced to show that the *lora*, or *vinum operarium*, of the ancients was not an unfermented wine, the special drink of “elderly women,” nor an unfermented liquor of any description.

3. Passum.

This is the third and last of the alleged unfermented wines which were allowed to women as beverages. There can be no doubt that in the early times of Roman history *passum* was prescribed, either by law or usage, for ancient writers testify that while women were forbidden to drink wine, they were permitted to use sweet *passum*. This fact has accordingly been laid hold of by the advocates of the unfermented theory, and employed with an almost endless iteration, as if it were quite sufficient of itself to determine the whole controversy. So persistent, indeed, is their appeal to *passum*, that one is almost tempted to ignore all the facts of history, and believe that the ladies of the olden time, both above and below thirty years of age, were utter strangers to the taste of wine.

It may be argued that the very nature and purpose of the ancient prohibitory law evidence that the *passum* which was permitted must have been a non-alcoholic liquor. But, (a) However it may have been in the early times of Roman history, it is certain that, “at the time of our Saviour on earth, and for a long period after,” the use of *passum* as a beverage was not peculiar to

⁵⁹⁸ South of France, ii. 283

The Wines of the Bible

women of any age, for Martial describes it as the “wine of the poor man.”⁵⁹⁹ (b) If *passum* was the usual drink of women at any period, the facts as to female intemperance show that it was an alcoholic liquor. (c) *Passum* may or may not have been fermented, so far as the prohibition and permission in question are concerned, for neither of these indicators anything as to its specific properties. (d) The distinction made between the wine forbidden and the latter was not regarded as properly belonging to the former class of beverages. Accordingly, Athenaeus, quoting the law “it is forbidden to women to drink wine at all,” adds, “However, they drink what is called *passum* and that is made from raisins.” And Pliny says, “*Passum* has the peculiar flavour of the grape, and not that of wine,” – *passi genera sunt, suum saporcm, non vini referential*.⁶⁰⁰ (e) Wine may have been forbidden, and *passum* allowed, not because the latter was in an unfermented liquor, but because, although fermented, it was regarded as a sweet drink, of less potency than the stronger wines in common use. Thus, if a modern law were enacted in this country prohibiting the use of wine, but allowing the use of “what is called beer, and that is made from barley,” and was old designated “barley wine” as *passum* is now called “raisin wine,” we should certainly be under no obligation to conclude that the permitted beer was an unfermented liquor. When Dame Whitcraft was invited by Julian Peveril to drink a glass of ale, she replied, “I dare not pledge you, for our Gaffer says the ale is brewed too strong for women; so I only drink a glass of Canary at a time with a gossip, or any gentleman guest that is so minded.”⁶⁰¹ Here is a domestic law forbidding the women of a household to drink ale because it is “brewed too strong” for them, but permitting the use

⁵⁹⁹ Ep. xiii. 106

⁶⁰⁰ Book xiv.

⁶⁰¹ Peveril of the Peak

The Wines of the Bible

of Canary wine, and yet both the prohibited and permitted drinks were fermented liquors. If this be so, why should the conclusion be forced upon us, on the ground of that ancient law or usage, that *passum* was an unfermented wine? The inference is illogical, and the position untenable.

What, then, is *passum*? It was made from the wine *pasae*, sun-dried grapes or raisins, and was therefore a species of raisin wine. Dr. Lees furnishes us with a recipe for making an unfermented raisin wine, like the supposed *passum*, as follows: - "Take a quantity of the best bloom or Muscated raisins; cut them into small pieces; pour on them boiling water in the proportion of a pint to every pound; let the infusion stand over night; then press out the liquor from the fruit, adding two teaspoonfuls of burn sugar for colouring. After the whole has settled for a few hours, decant the clear wine by pouring slowly into the vessel to be used, leaving any sediment behind."⁶⁰² And this sweet raisin water is a "clear wine!" An equally valuable recipe may be given for the manufacture of home-brewed ale, by merely substituting good barley for the best bloom raisins in the prescription. And there can be no doubt that the *barley water*, thus prepared, will be as good barley wine in the morning, as the doctor's *raisin water* is a "clear wine" in any way resembling the ancient *passum*!

What, then, is *passum*? The Englishwoman in Egypt informs us: There is a kind of wine which Muslims are permitted to drink. It is properly called *nebeedh*, a name which is now given to prohibited kinds of wine, and is generally prepared by putting dry grapes or dry dates in water, to extract their sweetness, and suffering the liquor to ferment slightly, until it acquires a little sharpness or pungency. The prophet himself was in the habit of drinking wine of this kind, which was prepared for him in the first part of the

⁶⁰² Temp. Bib. Com. p. 286

The Wines of the Bible

night; he drank it on the first and second days following; but if any remained on the morning of the third day, he either gave it to his servants, or ordered it to be poured out on the ground. Such beverages have therefore been drunk the strictest of his followers.”⁶⁰³ Niebuhr also says, “At Loyeha we bought a sort of wine, prepared from an infusion of dry grapes in water in a pot, which is buried in the ground to make the liquor ferment.”⁶⁰⁴ The ancient *passum*, allowed to women who were forbidden to drink wine, may have been a liquor prepared from dried grapes, like that “which Muslims are permitted to drink,” who are otherwise forbidden to drink wine; and yet both species of *passum*, ancient and modern, be fermented liquors.

What again is *passum*? The mode of preparing the ancient *passum* is given by Pliny, Mago, and Columella. The prescription of Pliny has reference chiefly to the treatment of the fruit, and gives no indication of the specific nature of the liquor. Mago gives directions for treatment of the grapes, and says, “When they are dry (sufficiently shriveled), pluck the grapes from the stalks, throw them into a cask, and make the first must. If they are well drained, put them, at the end of six days, into a vessel, and press them for the first wine. A second time let them be pounded (or trodden) and pressed, adding cold must to the pressing. This second wine is to be placed in a pitched vessel, let it become sour. After it has remained twenty or thirty days, and fermented, rack it into another vessel, and, stopping it close, immediately cover it with a skin.”⁶⁰⁵ Columella,, prefacing his prescription with the remark, “Mago gives directions for making the best sort of wine, I myself have done,” proceeds to say, “When you shall have made one layer, sprinkle it thoroughly with old wine; after that tread it again

⁶⁰³ lii. 219

⁶⁰⁴ Travels, ii. 186

⁶⁰⁵ Redding, p. 17

The Wines of the Bible

lightly, and a second time sprinkle it thoroughly with wine; after a third treading and infusion of wine in the same way, heap it up so that it [the mass of grapes] may float on the top, and [so] leave it for five days. Last of all, tread out the grapes with the feet, and press them in a new frail.”⁶⁰⁶

Now these prescriptions for making the best sort of *passum* – *passum optimum* – clearly demonstrates that it was a fermented liquor. In Mago’s directions we notice two species, a first and second wine. The former was made from the droppings of the grapes, without pressure; and the exposure of the juice to the atmosphere during the six days while they were being drained, must have necessitated fermentation. The latter was made from the juice extracted by pounding and pressure from the previously drained grapes, and was racked into another vessel, “after it has remained twenty or thirty days, and fermented.” In the directions given by Columella, while there is no direct mention of fermentation, as in the previous case, the entire process described by him manifestly implies it. Thus the successive treadings of the fruit, the repeated infusion of “old wine,” the floating of the mass of crushed grapes on the top of the liquor, and its consequent exposure to the air for five days, before the final pressure and racking, inevitably necessitate the conclusion that the liquor thus prepared was a fermented wine.

Redding’s account of the manufacture of Muscadine wine is almost identical with the descriptions given above. The fruit is “dried or shriveled up” by exposure to the sun’s rays for several days; and he says, “The must produced by the treading and pressing is very thick. It is put into barrels to ferment.”⁶⁰⁷ Taking all these facts into consideration, it seems to us sufficiently

⁶⁰⁶ Nott’s Lectures, p. 217

⁶⁰⁷ Wines, p. 150

The Wines of the Bible

evident that the ancient *passum* was a thick, sweet wine, resembling the modern Muscadine, and, like all the other wines of the ancients, a fermented liquor. So far, therefore, as our investigation has gone, unfermented wine is a myth.

The Wines of the Bible

V. – ANCIENT WINES – OLD AND NEW.

It is almost unnecessary to observe that the words “old” and “new,” in their application to wine, are relative terms, which, like others of their class, are difficult exactly to define. Exact definition, however, of this kind is not required in an inquiry into the social customs or usages of a people. It is enough that we find such terms in common use, and that they are employed to designate the relative value and popular estimate of different kind of wine. Of course, the mere age of a liquor determines nothing by itself as to the specific nature and properties of the beverage, for it may be more or less weak or strong, sweet or sour, thick or thin, good or bad at all ages. We must therefore have regard to the surroundings and references of the respective terms, if we would form a true judgment of their significance in this controversy.

Now, on examining the sacred Scriptures and other ancient writings, we find that, in the olden time, new wine was not held in popular estimation, and that old wine was the favorite beverage of the people. Thus our Lord says, “No man putteth new wine (οἶνον νέον) into old bottles; else the new wine will burst the bottles, and be spilled, and the bottles shall perish. But new wine must be put into new bottles; and both are preserved. No man, also, having drunk old wine, straightway desireth new: for he saith the old is better” (Luke v. 37-39). In this Christ expresses no judgment of his own; favourable or unfavorable, of the preference referred to; but in the broad statement, “no man,” &c., he certainly announces the common, prevailing, and popular opinion of His contemporaries. It is equally certain, from the reference to the bursting of the bottles, that both the old and new wine spoken of by our Lord must have been fermented liquors. Dr. Lees, however, says, “It cannot have been customary

The Wines of the Bible

to put wine during fermentation, to put wine into any kind of bottles, either new or old, since fermentation, when permitted, was carried on in the wine vat.”⁶⁰⁸ The doctor is here both mistaken and forgetful. Mistaken, because, while the fermentation was generally begun in the vat, it was completed in the bottles or other vessels. And forgetful, because he has himself quoted from Cato these words; “Throw a manipulum of black hellebore into new wine in the *amphora*. When it shall have fermented sufficiently, throw the manipulus out of the wine,” &c.⁶⁰⁹ Again, “And after a day and a night have passed we tread them, and put (the wine) into *large vessels*. When it has fermented and cleared itself, we pour to it the twenty-fifth part of *hepsema*.”⁶¹⁰

The doctor further asserts that “to render these precautions (against fermentation) effectual, the wine-bags themselves must have been free from ferment; and there was no other way of securing the absence of ferment save by using perfectly new skin bags.”⁶¹¹ But (a) It is not proved that there was any intention taken for such a purpose. (b) The alleged precautions imply a greater slaughter of previously used wine-skins at every successive vintage, than Aristophanes ascribes to his feminine conspirators, and must have been a rather costly proceeding. (c) The statement also implies that all the old wine preserved in skin bags must have been fermented, otherwise it could not have deposited a ferment, and rendered it necessary to provide “perfectly new skin bags” at every succeeding vintage. (d) Plutarch informs us that it was customary to “rack wine out of an old and leaky vessel into a new one,” and he says that “a fresh

⁶⁰⁸ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 266

⁶⁰⁹ Nott, p. 213

⁶¹⁰ *Tirosh lo Yayin*, p. 85

⁶¹¹ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 266

The Wines of the Bible

cask may both contain and recover wine that age hath decayed.”⁶¹² The recovery of that wine in a new vessel could only be effected by a renewed fermentation. (e) Pliny, on the other hand, informs us that used wine vessels were employed for receiving new wine, without any reference to the alleged precautions against fermentation: “The old wine was poured out of its vessels to make room for new liquor of a very doubtful quality.”⁶¹³ He also explains that a particular season of the year was employed in “repairing such *dolia* as may have been broken, and rubbing up and cleaning their staves,” but still makes no references to any such precautions against fermentation as here alleged, nor any allusions to the use of “perfectly new skin bags.” (f) Our Lord has no references to skin bags encrusted with old ferment, His reference being to old bottles which have become unfit for use by reason of age. He speaks not of vessels which had merely been previously used for holding wine, nor of vessels which contained the dregs of a former vintage, and which could as easily have been rubbed up and cleaned as Pliny’s *dolia*. His purpose, evidently, is to illustrate the truth, “In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.” (Heb. Xiii. 13). The old economy had served its purpose in preserving the old wine of the kingdom, but it had now become effete, and must vanish away. The old bottles were worn out in the service, and were too weak to endure the expansive force of the new wine, - for “the kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven” (Matt. Xiii. 13). Elihu uses a kindred illustration when, in allusion to the suppressed feelings which were fermenting within him and seeking an outlet, he says, “Behold, my belly is as wine which hath

⁶¹² Epicurus

⁶¹³ Book xviii.

The Wines of the Bible

no vent; it is ready to burst like new bottles” (Job xxxii. 19). Christ’s “old bottles” – the ancient economy – were so frail as to be unable to endure the expanding force of His new wine, even when open to the air of heaven. Elihu’s “new bottles” were too weak to endure the might force of the suppressed emotion that was fermenting within him, closed up, and denied expression; it is “as wine which hath no vent.” There is thus no contradiction between the utterance of the ancient patriarch and the saying of our Lord. Both, undoubtedly, refer to the phenomena of the fermenting process; but Elihu’s main thought is the mighty power of the suppressed spirit, whereas Christ refers to the excessive weakness, through age, of the old bottles. Martial has a somewhat similar allusion when he speaks of a wine cup being so fragile that “it would be broken by the least quantity of wine poured into it.”⁶¹⁴ And a modern writer uses the same illustration: “As when ye pour rich wine into a cup too frail to hold it, and the wine is spilled.”⁶¹⁵

Dr. Ritchie, discoursing also on this text, quotes from Moses Stuart to the effect; “That reference is here made by the speaker to a very common method of preparing wine is obvious enough. Indeed, the very nature of the case makes it probable that the much easier and more obvious method of curing wine by fermentation, so as to preserve it, would be more commonly resorted to by many, perhaps by the mass. Yet custom, arising from a factitious taste for alcohol, can establish nothing in the way of what is right and proper.”⁶¹⁶

Be it so. We have no concern, in this investigation, with “what is right and proper,” but only with what was *customary* in ancient times. Now the writer admits (a) that the wine referred to by

⁶¹⁴ Ep. viii. 33

⁶¹⁵ Gent. Maga., Jan. 1876

⁶¹⁶ Sc. Test., p. 200

The Wines of the Bible

Christ was a fermented liquor. (b) That it is “much easier” to cure wine by fermentation than by any other process. (c) That it is also a “more obvious method.” (d) That this method “was more commonly resorted to by many, perhaps by the mass.” (e) And that this method was a popular “custom,” arising from “a factitious taste for alcohol” among the many, perhaps the mass of people. If, then, there was any ancient method of preserving wine without fermentation, or if there was any custom of using wine without alcohol, such method and custom are here declared to have been limited to a fragmentary part of the population, seeing that neither of them was favoured by the “mass” of people.

Additional evidence of this popular taste is furnished by the narrative of the marriage in Cana of Galilee, when the ruler of the feast said, “Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse” (John ii. 10). Without entering into the question as to the nature of the wine of Cana, it is to be observed, that the statement of the ruler intimates a common social, and a general recognized preference for the “good wine” as compared with “that which is worse.” Now, which was the *good* wine, and which the *worse* in the estimation of the many, or the mass of the people? Was the former unfermented, and the latter a fermented liquor? So it is assumed by some of the advocates of the unfermented theory. Dr. Ritchie says, “And what, in this case, is the standard of goodness? It is not, surely, that it is highly intoxicating.”⁶¹⁷ But with all deference, that is not the question at issue. We have no concern here with the degree of its strength, whether highly or moderately intoxicating. The only question to be determined is whether it was fermented or unfermented. He says, “We must revert to Jewish society in the time of our Lord, and what was

⁶¹⁷ Ibid., p. 188

The Wines of the Bible

then reckoned as good wine." Be it so. To Jewish society let us go. But he does not go. He merely says, "judging by this standard there can be no doubt it was what was agreeable to the taste." A most sapient conclusion, truly! "It was what was agreeable to the taste." Of course it was; but that "taste" is precisely what we want to know. What kind of wine, then, was most agreeable to the taste of ancient Jewish society? He answers, "It was mild, cool, refreshing, adapted to the natural wants of the body, and cheering as a beverage to man. Can any reason be assigned why this ancient test shall not be here applied, and why the words of the governor shall not be interpreted by the common usage of speech among his own people?" "Ancient test!" "common usage of speech!" Where are they? We can discern nothing but the modern test and speech of the writer himself. "It was mild, cool," &c. How does he know? Who told him so? Was this the taste of Jewish society, and was that the kind of wine which was reckoned "good" in the time of our Lord? If so, where is the evidence? There is not even the shadow of a shade of evidence of any kind forthcoming, beyond his own dogmatic assertion, "it was mild," &c. he is evidently judging of the popular tastes of the ancients by his own special preferences; and interpreting the common usage of speech of the people of that age by the *usus loquendi* of the advocates of the unfermented theory of his own time.

After assuming all this without evidence, and contrary, to evidence, Dr. Ritchie arrives at the conclusion that "if his words are thus taken, they have declared for an unintoxicating wine." Possibly they may, "if his words are thus taken!" But that hypothetical "if" is rather too large an offering to be thrust upon us without rhyme or reason. We want to know *why* his words should be thus taken, that being precisely the question to be determined; but the writer gives us neither why nor the

The Wines of the Bible

wherefore. The whole argument set forth on this point is a baseless assumption, and may be compressed within the limits of a nut-shell – “If you admit that the ‘good wine’ was unfermented, then, it was unfermented!” But we cannot anything of the kind without some evidence, however trifling, being adduced in its favour. The writer appeals to the usages of Jewish society, and proposes to determine the quality of the “good wine” by that standard. Be it so. Here is the “test” cited by himself from Moses Stuart – the fermentation of wine “would be more commonly resorted to by many, perhaps by the mass” of the people; and this practice of the multitude was an ancient “custom, arising from a factitious taste for alcohol.” “Judging by this standard,” says Dr. Ritchie, there can be no doubt that the “good wine” was “what was agreeable to the taste;” and, says Moses Stuart, that was a taste for alcohol.” Echoing our author’s words, but with a difference, we conclude – “If his words are thus taken, they here declare for a fermented wine!”

Dr. Nott substantially agrees with Moses Stuart, and testifies as follows: - “We know that then, as now, inebriety existed; and then, as now, the taste for inebriating wines may have been the prevalent taste, and intoxicating wines the popular wines. Still unintoxicating wines existed and there were men who preferred such wines and who have left on record the avowal of that preference. That these men were comparatively few in number, and that the wines they recommended were not generally in request, does not surely render it the less probable that they were wines deserving of commendation?”⁶¹⁸ Here, again, we have no concern with what the wines may have deserved, whether commendation or condemnation: we want to know whether there were any such unfermented wines to be either commended

⁶¹⁸ Lectures, p.85

The Wines of the Bible

or condemned. The doctor assumes and asserts that such wines did exist, and that they were used by some of the ancients; but the men who preferred them must have been, indeed, “few in number,” for we have not been able to find any trace of them even in the doctor’s Lectures; and the evidence of the existence or use of absolutely unintoxicating wines is equally undiscoverable. But, apart from this, it is here admitted that “the prevalent taste” of the ancients was a “taste for inebriating wines,” and that the “popular wines” of the olden time were fermented liquors! If, then, there were both fermented and unfermented wines in use, the fermented must have been the generally recognized “good wine,” and the unfermented “that which is worse.”

Dr. Lees says, “As to what was esteemed ‘the good wine,’ there is ample evidence that the stronger (unmixed) wines were not preferred or drunk except by vicious or intemperate men, and that the sweetest and lightest wines, almost, if not altogether incapable of intoxicating, were deemed the best by all sober persons. Indeed, the governor’s language implies that ‘the good wine’ usually provided at feasts was of a kind that could be abundantly used without inebriation.”⁶¹⁹ This writer, also, raises a false issue here, and he conceals his position under an ambiguity. He speaks of *quantity*, when the question has particularly to do with *quality*. The “good wine” may have been, as alleged, sweet and light, and “almost, if not altogether incapable of intoxicating,” and of a “kind that could be abundantly used without inebriation,” like some of those modern light wines already noticed; but if it was intoxicating *in any degree*, it must have been a fermented liquor. It is quite true that the stronger wines were not preferred when “unmixed,” except by vicious persons, as we

⁶¹⁹ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 303

The Wines of the Bible

have shown in a previous section; but it is equally certain that the same wines were preferred, even by sober persons, when duly mixed with certain proportions of water, as we have also shown in the same section. If “the good wine” was altogether incapable of intoxication,” which Dr. Lees does not assert, it must have been unfermented; but that is the point he has to prove. If, however, it was only “almost,” and “not altogether incapable of intoxicating,” which he apparently admits, it must have been fermented, and, in that case, the unfermented theory is overthrown.

The doctor appeals to the evidence of Philo, as to the ancient Jewish preferences referred to, who “describes the votaries of wine proceeding from one kind to another, till they furnish up with great draughts of the unmixed and stronger sorts.”⁶²⁰ It might be inferred from this reference that these votaries began their drinking bout with an innocent, unfermented liquor, and ended with the strongest sorts of fermented wines. But, on turning to another page,⁶²¹ and verifying it by a reference to Philo,⁶²² we find that the only gradation in drinking spoken of in the passage is from “small cups” to “bowls and goblets of all the largest sizes they can get,” and from moderate doses to “huge draughts” of unmixed wine. From the beginning to the end of the potations the wine was fermented and alcoholic; for it is expressly said, that “when they are pretty full and getting riotous, being no longer able to restrain themselves” *over their first cups*, then “they take bowls and goblets of all the largest sizes that they can get, and drink the wine unmixed, in huge draughts, until they are either overcome by deep sleep, being no longer able to govern themselves, or till what they have poured into themselves is vomited out again through repletion. But even then, nevertheless,

⁶²⁰ Ibid.,

⁶²¹ Ibid., p. 350

⁶²² On Drunkenness, sec. 53

The Wines of the Bible

the insatiable desire which exists within them continues to rage as though it were still under the influence of hunger." Thus there is not even the shadow of a reference in the whole passage to the existence or use of an unfermented wine.

We have shown that all the wines of the ancients, so far as known to us, were more or less alcoholic; that the use of these wines, especially such as were ranked as nobilia, without dilution, was a vicious practice, usually ascribed to hard drinkers; that the same wines, diluted, were preferred by all sober persons, and that this dilution was rendered necessary in consequence of the strength of the liquor. We have found, also, that the small wines were not held in popular estimation, were hardly reckoned to be wines, and were used chiefly by poor people who could not procure "good wine," and had to content themselves with "that which is worse," that while sweet wines were generally preferred above sour wine, flat wine, and rough wine, some of the most famous of these sweet wines were so highly intoxicating that they could not be safely used without an exceptionally large admixture of water. And all these findings go to prove that the recognized "good wine" of the ancients was a fermented liquor.

If "the good wine" was thus an alcoholic beverage, it must also have been an "old wine," for the "new wine" was regarded and used as an inferior liquor. Pliny says, "The method that is adopted by the most economical managers is to use the produce supplied by each year, and this, too, is found in the end the most lucrative mode of proceeding."⁶²³ The writer means that wine was stored up for some years that it might acquire increased value by age, and be disposed of at last with greater profit to the maker; and that in order to preserve the stored-up wine for that purpose, the new wine of the last vintage – an inferior, and less valuable liquor,

⁶²³ Book xviii

The Wines of the Bible

- was used for immediate domestic consumption, and this was “the most lucrative mode of proceeding.” A different but less economical practice is indicated by Longus, in his *Daphnis and Chloe*, in which, describing a vintage in Lesbos, instead of representing the vintages as solacing themselves with the juice of the grapes they were pressing, he tells us that Chloe “prepared their meals for the grape-gathers, *brought old wine for their drink*, and plucked off the lowest bunches.”⁶²⁴ Plutarch speaks of one “Chius, who, when he had sold abundance of his best and most generous wine to others, called for some that was pricked and vapid to taste at supper: and one of the servants asking another what he left his master doing, he answered that he was calling for bad when the good was before him.”⁶²⁵

The economical practice referred to by Pliny implies that *new wine* was esteemed an inferior and less valuable liquor than *old wine*; and further confirmation of this testimony is furnished by other writers. The so-called Apocrypha, or uncanonical books of Scripture, may be of no dogmatical authority on questions of theology, but their antiquity and Oriental authorship render them valuable as side lights on ancient Jewish customs and manners. Here, then, we read, “Forsake not an old friend; for the new is not comparable to him: a new friend is as new wine; when it is old, thou shalt drink it with pleasure” (Ecclus. Xxi. 6, 7). According to this author, the “good wine” was an *old wine*, and the *new wine* “that which is worse.” Exclusive water drinking was not repute in that age, any more than the use of unmixed wine, and both usages were considered injurious; for it is said, “It is hurtful to drink wine or water alone; and as wine mingled with water is pleasant, and delighteth the taste,” &c. (2 Macc. Xx. 39). And this

⁶²⁴ Book ii.

⁶²⁵ *Tranquillity*.

The Wines of the Bible

popular beverage, diluted wine, was evidently alcoholic liquor; for it is said, "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" (Ecclus. Xxxi. 28). So that, according to these authors, good old wine, fermented, and diluted with water in the use, was the favorite drink of their day; and neither simple water, nor unmixed wine, nor unfermented wine, if any such liquor existed, was recognized as a common or popular beverage.

Profane writers bear similar testimony. Pliny says, - "It is not with olive oil as it with wine, for by age it acquires a bad flavour, and at the end of a year it is already old. This, if rightly understood, is a wise provision on the part of Nature; wine, which is only produced for the drunkard, she has seen no necessity for us to use when new, - *quipped temulentiae nascentibur vinis vi necess non est* – indeed, by the fine flavour which it acquires with age, she rather invites us to keep it; but, on the other hand, she has not willed that we should be thus sparing of oil, and so has rendered its use common and universal by the very necessity there is of using it while fresh."⁶²⁶ Martial refers to the superior value of old wine, when, in addressing a father on the birth of his daughter, he says, "Spare not too much, however, the old Falernian, and leave behind you casks filled with money rather than with wine. May thy daughter be affectionate and rich, but let her drink new wine; and let the wine jar, now new, grow old along with its mistress."⁶²⁷ Elsewhere he recommends his friend, who was accustomed to drain "the glorious jar of the long departed Opimius," to "get dregs of Laetine wine from a tavern-keeper, Sextilanius, if you drink more than ten cups."⁶²⁸ Here the "good

⁶²⁶ Book. xv. 2

⁶²⁷ Ep., vi. 27

⁶²⁸ Ep., Li. 26

The Wines of the Bible

wine” is “Old Falernian,” and “that which is worse” is *Fax Laletan* – the *facatum* of Cato; and here is the custom alluded to by the governor of the feast, of drinking “the good wine” at the beginning, and “when men have well drunk then that which is worse.”

Athenaeus indicates the nature of the favourite old wine when he says, “And ⁶²⁹old wine will allow of more water being added to it, because its very age has added heat to it.” Pliny also speaks of wines being kept “till they are mellowed with age,” and of the practice of “men, too, however prolonged their lives, never drinking any but a wine that is still older than themselves.”⁶³⁰ The most famous of these old wines was that of the celebrated Opimian vintage, which in Pliny’s time was nearly two hundred years of age; and we have shown in a previous section that it was a fermented and alcoholic liquor. The equally famous Maronean wine, a “divine drink,” to which we have also previously referred as a strongly alcoholic liquor, is said by Pliny to have been esteemed “all the richer for being old.”⁶³¹ The fiery Falernian is said to be injurious to the health, either too new or too old.” At “fifteen years it begins to be of medium age, when it “quickens the action of the venous system,” acts “astringently on the bowels, and is feeding to the body.”⁶³² Further quotation on this point from the same author is unnecessary. The references throughout his work show that, in his day, the old fermented wine of medium age was the recognized popular “good wine;” that unfermented grape juice, *mustum*, was not esteemed, if used at all, as a beverage, being regarded as injurious in certain cases, and even fatal in others: and that new wine of a recent vintage was

⁶²⁹ i. 47

⁶³⁰ Book xix. 4

⁶³¹ Book xiv.

⁶³² Book xxiii.

The Wines of the Bible

deemed an inferior liquor, and was only used for domestic consumption, that the good wine might be preserved for future use. Plutarch says; "As for new wine, those that drink it soonest forbear till February, which is after winter.....for whilst wine is working, we see that even common labourers will not venture on it."⁶³³

Athenaeus, like Pliny, gives a somewhat detailed account of the different descriptions of wine of his own and earlier times, and describes their distinguishing qualities and characteristics. He says, "Old wine is not only more pleasant, but also better for health; for it aids digestion more, and being thinner it is itself more digestible; it also invigorates the body, and makes the blood red and fluid, and produces untroubled sleep." The Falernian wine is fit to drink from the time that it is ten or fifteen years old, till it is twenty; but after that time it falls off, and is apt to give headaches, and effects the nervous system. The Alban wine is of two kinds, "one sweet and one sour," both are in their prime after they are fifteen years old. The wine of Surrentum" begins to be drinkable when five-and-twenty years old; for, as it has no oil of any sort in it, and is very thin, it is a long time ripening; and when it is old it is nearly the only wine that is wholesome to be drunk for a continuance. But the Rhegian wine, being richer than the Surrentine, may be used as soon as it is fifteen years old. The wine of Privernum, too, is very good, being thinner than the Rhegian wine, and one which does not take much effect off the head. And the Formian wine is like it, and is a wine which soon comes to its prime; it is, however, a richer wine than the other. But the Trifoline wine is slower ripening, and has more earthly taste than the Surrentine. The Setine is a wine of the first class, like the Falernian wine, but lighter, and not so apt to make a man drunk.

⁶³³ Sympos.

The Wines of the Bible

The wine of Tibur is thin, and evaporates easily, being at its best as soon as it is ten years old. Still, it is better as it gets older. The Labican wine is sweet and oily to the taste, being something between the Falernian and the Alban; and you may drink that when it is ten years old. There is the Gauran wine, too, a scarce and very fine wine, and likewise very powerful and oily – more so, indeed, than the wine of Praeneste or Tibur. The Massic is a very dry wine, and very good for the stomach. Around Cumae in Campania there is a wine made which is called Ulban, a light wine, fit to be drunk when five years old.....The Cacuban is a noble wine, full of strength, and easily affecting the head; but it does not come to its prime till after many years.....But the Sabine wine is lighter than any of these, and is fit to be drunk from the time that it is seven years old till it is fifteen; and the Signine wine is available at six years old, but as it gets older it is far more valuable. The wine of Nomentum gets in season very early, and can be drunk as soon as it is five years old: it is not very sweet, and not very thin.....The wine of Veuafrum is good for the stomach, and light. The Trebellian wine, which is made round Naples, is of moderate strength, good for the stomach, and pleasant to the taste. The Erbulian wine is at first dark coloured, but in a few years it becomes white, and it is a very light and delicate wine. That of Marseilles is a fine wine, but it is scarce, and thick, with a good deal of body. Tarentine, and all the other wines of that district, are delicate wines without very much strength or body, sweet, and good for the stomach. The Mamertine is a foreign wine, made out of Italy. There is also another wine made in Sicily, and called Iotaline: it is a sweet wine, and light, but there is some strength in it.⁶³⁴

⁶³⁴ Book. i.

The Wines of the Bible

Here are wines of almost every description – old and young, thick and thin, sweet and sour, light and strong, white and dark, home and foreign, more or less wholesome, and more or less capable of affecting the head, and making a man drunk; - every kind of wine but the unfermented. In almost every instance, whatever may be its other qualities, “there is some strength in it.” It is also observable from these references to wines ripening, being in season, at their best; and to their being available, fit for use, drinkable after so many years, ranging from five to twenty-five, that, whether sweet or sour, thick or thin, light or strong, *new* wine was regarded as inferior, undrinkable liquor, and that the *old* wine was the “good wine,” held in highest estimation, and, in fact, the favourite beverage of the ancients.

The superiority of the old as compared with the new wine is expressed in the lines –

*“Man’s nature doth in much resemble wine;
For young men and new wine do both need age,
To ripen their too warm unseasoned strength,
And let their violence evaporate.
But when the grosser portions are worked off,
And all the froth is skimmed, then both are good;
The wine is drinkable, the man is wise,
And both in future pleasant while they last.” – Athen., ii*

The above description of new wine may serve to correct the notion of some writers, that “new wine,” so called, is to be understood as an unfermented wine; and the intoxicating power even of that new wine is further exhibited in the reference to men getting drunk with it (Acts ii. 15).

Dr. Lees admits that the *gleukos* of this text is “sometimes applied to the juice of grapes in an initial state of

The Wines of the Bible

fermentation;”⁶³⁵ and he assures us that “it is impossible to procure a partly and slightly fermented wine that will stop at a given point;”⁶³⁶ – but he alleges that the term was used in this passage “in a spirit of mockery, - just as the French papers called Proudhomme ‘a water-drinker,’ meaning the contrary.”⁶³⁷ But if *gleukos* denotes a fermented, as well as an unfermented wine, it is difficult to see the *irony* of the accusation against the apostles. Peter does not appear to think there is any such ironical reference in the words when he replies, “These are not drunken, *as ye suppose.*”

The following passages afford further evidence of the intoxicating quality of the new wine: - It is the custom of us Thebans to sacrifice to our good genius upon the 6th February, and “to taste our new wine after the south-west wind hath done blowing, for that wind makes wine ferment more than any other, and the liquor that can bear this fermentation is of strong body, and will keep well.”⁶³⁸ Athenaeus also says, -

*“But as for Bacchus, he knows nothing more,
Than how to get well drunk; and nothing cares
Whether ‘tis new wine that he drinks or old.” – Book ix.*

Milton, in like manner, says, -

*“As with new wine intoxicated both,
They swim in myrth and fancy that they feel
Divinity within them, breeding wings
Wherewith to scorn the earth.”*

⁶³⁵ Temp. Bib. Com. p. xxiii.

⁶³⁶ Nott’s *Lectures*, p. 88 Note

⁶³⁷ *Answer to the unanswerable*, p. 113

⁶³⁸ Plutarch’s *Sympos*

The Wines of the Bible

The ancient poets, who celebrated the virtues of old wine, indicate also its intoxicating quality. Apulcius describes Lucius as receiving the gift of “a jar of choice old wine,” and exclaiming, “Bacchus, the exciter and armour-bearer of Venus, has come here of his own accord. Let us quaff all this wine today, in order that it may extinguish in us all bashful hesitation, and stimulate our lusty vigour.”⁶³⁹ Horace says, -

*“No mean delights possess his soul,
With good old wine who crowns his bowl;
Whose early revels are begun,
Ere half the course of day be run - Odice, i. 1*

*“Bring down the vintage four years old.
Whose mellowed heat can mirth inspire.” Ibid., ii*

Anaceon says, -

*“Bring me, then, my gentle page,
Wine that glows with strength and age.” – Carm., xxxviii*

Pindar says, - “Praise wine for being old, but the flower of song for being new.”⁶⁴⁰

Dr. Lees so far admits the fact of the superiority of the old wine, but he accounts for it by alleging that besides sweetness, the ancients sought a fine flavour in their wines. He says, Commentators are puzzled with the passage of Scripture “where the drinker of old wine affirms its superiority over new” – an extraordinary cause of perplexity; and he explains the difficulty, - “We may, perhaps, find the link of connection in the idea that ‘new wine,’ preserved by close confinement in new bottles till it is

⁶³⁹ Works, p. 30

⁶⁴⁰ Olymp. xi

The Wines of the Bible

old, retains in perfection all its original properties, and acquires a lusciousness that enhances its value to the user.”⁶⁴¹ To this we might reply that, admitting all that is here alleged as to the tastes of the ancients, and the qualities sought in their wines, these in no way affect the question at issue, unless it can be proved that the new wine preserved “till it is old” is an unfermented wine, and that the desired qualities are not obtainable in fermented wines, and can only be found in unfermented liquors. But no such statement is made, and no such evidence is forthcoming. He appends a note to the above, as follows: - “Mr. Wright’s Passover wine is found to improve in flavour by keeping, though no chemical change, and certainly no fermentation occurs. An explanation may be found in the fact that the original aromas of the grape, fine and subtle particles, being, by the act of crushing, mingled with the saccharine and albuminous matters, become less perceptible to the palate; but, by being kept, they mechanically separate again, and so impart a fuller and distincter flavour by first touching the nerves of taste.”⁶⁴²

We agree with the author in thinking that flavour was one of the qualities sought by the ancients, and which gave special value to their favourite wines; but whatever may be the properties of Mr. Wright’s wine, it can determine nothing as to the point in question, unless it can be proved that such wine existed among the ancients. But we have shown that the only unfermented grape juice discoverable was a boiled syrup or jelly. Now, the boiling of the juice, in an open cauldron, to the consistence of a solid, must have overpowered or dissipated those “fine and subtle particles” which gave the desired flavour to their wines. Hence Pliny says, “All the luscious wines have but little aroma; the

⁶⁴¹ Temp. Bibl. Com., p. 294

⁶⁴² Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

thinner the wine the more aroma it has;" and hence the practice of adding some aromatic substance to these sweet wines, as in the preparation of *murrina*. If, therefore, this aroma was so eagerly coveted by ancient wine drinkers, and if that delicate flavour was destroyed, partly by their concentrated sweetness of the boiled juice, and partly by the boiling process, it is clear that the said boiled juice, whether new or old, could never have been a common or popular beverage with the ancients.

We have now examined all the alleged unfermented wines of the ancients, Greek and Roman, and have found that, with the exception of *sapa* and *defrutum*, which were not wines at all, but grape syrup and jellies, every description of vinous beverage we have met with was a fermented liquor. So far, therefore, as the present investigation has gone, unfermented wine is a myth.

The Wines of the Bible

VI. ANCIENT WINES – EGYPTIAN.

Herodotus, in describing the country and people of Egypt, intimates, that “they have no vines in the country, but they drink a liquor prepared from barley.”⁶⁴³ From this it has been inferred that the vine was not cultivated in Egypt, and that, if the ancient inhabitants of the country were not absolutely strangers to the taste of wine, whatever wine may have been used must have been a foreign import, limited in its use to the wealthier classes. But this is a mistake, founded upon a misapprehension of the historian’s reference. He is not speaking of the whole land of Egypt, but, as he expressly informs us in the opening paragraph of the section, of “those Egyptians who live in the cultivated parts of the country.” These “cultivated parts” were, doubtless, those districts appropriated to the growth of cereals, for which Egypt has ever been famous as the granary of the world; and here it may, indeed, be true that there were “no vines” in the time of Herodotus. But that the vine was cultivated in other districts of Egypt is as certain as any other well-accredited fact of history. The sacred writers of the Jews speak of “a vine out of Egypt;” they represent the chief butler of Pharaoh as pressing the grapes into the king’s cup; they record the complaint of the people of the Exodus that they had been brought out of Egypt into a land “which is no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines;” and they say that in the judgments executed by God upon the Egyptians, He destroyed their vines with hailstones. Herodotus himself frequently refers to the use of wine in Egypt, both native and imported; and he attributes the gift of the vine to Osiris, whom he identifies with the Grecian Bacchus. Athenaeus, a native of Naucratis in Egypt, testifies that “there are vines near the Nile in

⁶⁴³ ii. 77

The Wines of the Bible

great quantities as far as the river extends; and there are many peculiarities in their vines, both as to their colour and as to their use.” He also cites Hellenicus as saying that “the vine was first discovered in Plinthina, a city of Egypt, on which account Dion, the Academic philosopher, calls the Egyptians fond of wine and fond of drinking.”⁶⁴⁴ Strabo, referring to Egypt, says, “The whole of this country produces no wine of a good quality, and the earthen jars contain more sea water than wine, which is called Libyan; this and beer are the principal beverages of the common people of Alexandria. Antiphræ, in particular, was a subject of ridicule (on account of its bad wine).”⁶⁴⁵ Of the Lake Mareia, he says, “Good wine also is produced here, and in such quantity that the Mareotic wine is racked in order that it may be kept to be old.”⁶⁴⁶ Of the Arsinoite Nome, he says, “It produces wine in abundance.” The crocodile is worshipped here, and “it is fed with bread, flesh, and wine, which strangers who come to see it always present.”⁶⁴⁷ Of the first Oasis, he says, “It is an inhabited place, well supplied with good water and wine.”⁶⁴⁸ Pliny notices the palm wine, barley wine, and a species of wine made from the *myxo*, or plum in Egypt; and he says, “The Sebennys wine is grown in Egypt, being the produce of three varieties of grape of the very highest quality, known as the Thasian, The AEthalus, and the Peuce.”⁶⁴⁹ And Virgil says, -

*“The Thasian ‘vines in richer soils abound,
The Marotic grow in barren ground.” – Georg, ii. 91*

⁶⁴⁴ Book i.

⁶⁴⁵ Book xvii. 1-14

⁶⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁴⁷ Ibid., 35, 38

⁶⁴⁸ Meta., v. 4

⁶⁴⁹ Book xiv. 9

The Wines of the Bible

The wall pictures of Egypt confirm the fact as to the cultivation of the vine, for they exhibit the growth of the fruit in the vineyard, the gathering of the grapes, and the other operations of the vintage. In the papyrus in the British Museum, written by Aunana the Scribe, an Egyptian is described as setting out on his travels, and it said, "He took a vessel with barley water, which he closed with pitch, and another with wine, which he closed with clay." Strabo, also, relates that Eudoxus on voyaging to India, carried with him from Egypt necessary provisions, and being thrown on certain regions, "he conciliated the inhabitants by presents of grain, wine, and cakes of pressed figs, articles which they were without."⁶⁵⁰ We find, also, that some descriptions of wine were both exported and imported by the Egyptians. According to Maillet one of the Egyptians wines which was carried to Rome was the third in esteem of the wines used there. Strabo says that Charaxus, the brother of Sappho, "traded to the port of Naucratis with wine of Lesbos."⁶⁵¹ And Herodotus says, "Twice in every year there are exported from different parts of Greece into Egypt, and from Phoenicia in particular, wine secure in earthen jars."⁶⁵² From these varied testimonies sufficient evidence has been adduced to prove (a) that the vine was cultivated in Egypt; (b) that wine was prepared and preserved by the Egyptians; (c) that the wines of different districts varied in quality and public estimation; (d) and that wine was extensively used as a beverage by the people. Excluding from present considerations the foreign wines, which have been already examined, there are three descriptions of native liquor to be inquired into – viz., barley wine, palm win, and grape wine. Were any or all of these unfermented liquors? We shall see.

⁶⁵⁰ ii. 3, 4

⁶⁵¹ Xvii. 1, 33

⁶⁵² iii. 6

The Wines of the Bible

1. Barley Wine

This liquor, variously designated οἶνος κριθίνος,⁶⁵³ *zythum*, *cervesia*,⁶⁵⁴ &c., appears to have been a species of beer, which was extensively used as a beverage by many ancient nations. It was, undoubtedly, a fermented drink, but the particular mode of preparing it is unknown. There seems to have employed different methods. Accordingly, Strabo says, “Barley beer is a preparation peculiar to the Egyptians. It is common among many tribes, but the mode of preparing it differs in each.”⁶⁵⁵ Ovid represents Ceres as asking an old woman for water, who gave her instead “a sweet drink, which she had lately prepared from parched barley.”⁶⁵⁶ Orphens calls this drink κύκεων, “a mingled draught” and Arnobius says it was made of parched pearled barely, honey, and wine, with flowers and various herbs floating in it. Xenophon describes a species of this beer made in Armenia, which Niebuhr found was made there still, and which is “prepared from meal mixed with water, and brought into a state of fermentation.” Bishop Steere, in his *Travels in Central Africa*, says, “Mataka sent us presents of food and *pombe*, or *ukana*, the native beer – perhaps barley water, slightly fermented, would best represent it to an English mind.” Lepsius was entertained in Upper Egypt to a “refreshing beverage, *abreq*, fermented sourish Durra water;” and he notices as a peculiar burial custom that by the side of the dead “they placed a bowl with *merisa*, fermented Durra water.”⁶⁵⁷

Pliny has several references to the barley wines of the ancients, which leave no doubt that they were fermented liquors. Thus he

⁶⁵³ Herodotus

⁶⁵⁴ Pliny

⁶⁵⁵ Xvii. 2, 5

⁶⁵⁶ Meta., v. 4

⁶⁵⁷ *Letters from Egypt*, p. 188

The Wines of the Bible

says, "The people of the Western world have also their intoxicating drinks, made from corn steeped in water. These beverages are prepared in different ways throughout Gaul and the provinces of Spain; under different names too, though in their results they are the same. The Spanish provinces have even taught us the fact that these liquors are capable of being kept till they have attained a considerable age. Egypt, too, has invented for its use a very similar beverage made from corn; indeed, in no part of the world is drunkenness ever at a loss. And then, besides, they take these drinks unmixed, and do not dilute them with water, the way that wine is modified; and yet, by Hercules! one really might have supposed that there the earth produced nothing but corn for the people's use. Alas! what wondrous skill, and yet how misplaced! Means have absolutely been discovered for getting drunk upon water even."⁶⁵⁸ Again, "In Gaul and Spain, where they make a drink by steeping corn in the way that has been already described, they employ the *foam* which thickens upon the surface as a leaven: hence it is that the bread in those countries is lighter than that made elsewhere."⁶⁵⁹ And again, "Different beverages, too, are made from the cereals, *zythum* in Egypt, *caelia* and *cerea* in Spain, *cervesia* and numerous liquors in Gaul and other provinces. The *yeast* of all of these is used by women as a cosmetic for the face."⁶⁶⁰

These references to the foam or yeast being used for leavening bread, show that the ancient beer was not a mere barley water, rendered intoxicating by the addition of stupefying drugs, but that it was a veritable fermented liquor. "Diodorus Siculus says, that the Egyptian beer was nearly equal to wine in strength and

⁶⁵⁸ Book xiv. 22

⁶⁵⁹ Book xviii. 7

⁶⁶⁰ Book xxii. 25

The Wines of the Bible

flavour.”⁶⁶¹ Aristotle describes the different effects produced by wine and beer when these are taken in excess. “Men who are drunk with wine show it in their faces;” but “those who have drunk too much beer fall back and go to sleep; for wine is stimulating, but beer has a tendency to stupefy.”⁶⁶² Athenaeus also says, “that, as subsidiary to wine, in the case of those who, on account of their poverty, could not get wine, there was introduced a custom of drinking beer made of barley; and, moreover, that those who drank this beer were so pleased with it that they sung and danced, and did everything like men drunk with wine.”⁶⁶³ Plutarch also says, “Lovers of wine, when they have not any juice of the grape ready, drink ale, mead, cider, or the like.”⁶⁶⁴ And “a man may be drunk without wine, by drinking the decoctions of figs or barley.”⁶⁶⁵ Thus there can be no doubt that the barley wine of Egypt was a fermented and alcoholic liquor.

2. Palm Wine

The wine of the palm, like that of the vine, was made from the fruit of the tree, and may be designated indifferently palm wine, or date wine, as the latter is indifferently termed grape wine, or wine of the vine. The modern practice of making an incision in the tree, and extracting the juice therefrom, appears to have been unknown to the ancients, for only palm wine as we have met with was made from dates. It is true, Herodotus speaks of the palm producing wine; Strabo says, the palm tree furnishes wine, and

⁶⁶¹ Bohn’s Pliny, iii. 274 note

⁶⁶² Athen., ii. 61

⁶⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁶⁴ Sympos

⁶⁶⁵ On Love.

The Wines of the Bible

“wine is made from the palm;” Josephus says, the palm trees yield honey; and Pliny says, a wine is made from these trees. But these writers also say that the same trees furnish bread and meal, as well as wine and honey. And as the former were, undoubtedly the products of the fruit of the tree, we infer that the latter were the same. Accordingly, Ammianus says, the wine and honey are “made from the fruit of the palm.” Xenophon says, wine and vinegar are “made of the dates.” And Pliny, in describing the manufacture of the wine, says it was made by soaking “fresh dates” in water, &c.

Thus the palm wine of the Egyptians was neither the mere sap of the tree, nor the simply expressed juice of the fruit, but a “made” or manufactured date wine, carefully prepared and preserved for home consumption and foreign exportation. Cambyses sent “a cask of palm wine” to the King of Ethiopia, whose favour he sought.⁶⁶⁶ And Herodotus says of the Assyrians, “the principle article of their commerce is palm wine, which they carry in casks.”⁶⁶⁷ It is obvious from these references that this preserved wine must either have been boiled or fermented, or both boiled and fermented, for otherwise it could not have been “preserved at all.” It must also be admitted that the Egyptians *did* boil their palm juice, as the Greeks and Romans boiled their grape juice; but the mere boiled juice of the former is as certainly distinguished from their *wine*, as the boiled juice of the latter is so distinguished. Accordingly Ammianus says that vine, as well as honey is made from the fruit of the palm. Xenophon also speaks of “*wine* made of the dates, and also *vinegar*.” Herodotus says, the palm “produces them bread, *wine*, and *honey*.”⁶⁶⁸ Strabo says, “the palm tree furnishes everything else – bread, *wine*, vinegar,

⁶⁶⁶ Herod., iii. 22

⁶⁶⁷ Ibid., i. 194

⁶⁶⁸ i. 193

The Wines of the Bible

and meal;”⁶⁶⁹ and he says of Arabia Felix, “the greater part of their *wine* is made from the palm.”⁶⁷⁰ Josephus says, the palm tree around Jericho “yield an excellent kind of honey, not much inferior in sweetness to other honey.”⁶⁷¹ And Pliny says, “From these trees a wine is made, and bread by some nations, and they afford an aliment for numerous quadrupeds.”⁶⁷²

In all these references the *wine* of the palm is as expressly distinguished from its so-called *honey* as from its “bread,” or “meal,” or “vinegar.” What, then, was this palm *honey*? Not *wine*, for it is distinguished from that. What then? Dr. Lees will inform us. He says, “But inasmuch as the modern Arabs and others also apply the word *dispse* or *dibs* to palm honey, and *sakar* to palm wine, it would seem that *debash* (or *devash*) denoted thick syrup or honey in general, whether obtained from the grape, the date, or the bee.”⁶⁷³ Here, again, the *wine* is distinguished from the *honey*; the former is called *sakar* (Heb. *shechar*), and the latter *dispse* or *dibs* (Heb. *debash*); and the wine is a liquor, whereas the *honey* is a “thick syrup.”

Seeing, then, that the palm juice was boiled into a “thick syrup,” or honey, and not a wine, the preserved palm wine used as a beverage must have been a fermented liquor. Dr. Lees, however, appeals to Pliny as describing “the mode in which the wine was made,” and saying, “By soaking a modius of fresh dates in three gallons of water, and afterwards expressing the juice;” from which it is inferred that the wine thus prepared must have been unfermented. But while the historian’s description is doubtless correct, as far as it goes, it, unfortunately, does not go far enough

⁶⁶⁹ Book xvi. 1, 14

⁶⁷⁰ Ibid., iv. 25

⁶⁷¹ Wars, iv. 8, 3.

⁶⁷² Book xiii. 4

⁶⁷³ Works, pp. 68, 69

The Wines of the Bible

to serve either the doctor's purpose or our own. No doubt the dates were soaked, and the juice expressed, but Pliny does not say what was done with the juice *after* it had been expressed. It could not be preserved without either boiling or fermentation, or both. If it were merely boiled, it became honey, and not wine. If it was only fermented, it certainly became a fermented wine, but liable to degenerate into the "vinegar" spoken of by Xenophon as the produce dates. But if it was both boiled and fermented, the concentration of the juice before fermentation would give a good-keeping wine, though probably not so long-lived as the old wines of the Romans. The modern Nubians, according to Burchardt, adopt this double practice. He says, "When the date fruit has arrived at its full maturity it is thrown into large earthen boilers, and let to boil without interruption for three or four days. It is then strained, and the clear juice put into earthen jars, which are well shut up, and then buried in the ground, *where it ferments*. It is left for ten or twelve days under ground, at the expiration of which time it is fit to drink. It keeps a twelvemonth, and then turns sour." Now, it is self-evident that if even that boiled and fermented juice turned sour, and thereby degenerated into Xenophon's date "vinegar" in little more than a year, it must have been simply impossible for the ancients to have preserved their date juice unfermented in any other way than by converting it into a "thick syrup" or honey, and not wine.

That the Egyptian palm or date wine was a fermented liquor is further proved by the combined testimony of Xenophon and Pliny. The former intimates that "the wine made from the date is sweet, but it produces headache;" and the latter says, "The dates known as 'Caryotae' are the most esteemed, affording not only plenty of nutriment, but a great abundance of juice; it is from these the principal wines are made in the East; these wines are apt to affect the head, a circumstance from which the fruit derives

The Wines of the Bible

its name.”⁶⁷⁴ The peculiar name of the fruit alluded to here by Pliny is interpreted by the translator⁶⁷⁵ as follows: - “Said to have been so called from the Greek *καρη*, ‘the head,’ and *υωδια*, ‘stupidity,’ owing to the heady nature of the wine extracted from the fruit.” However this may be, the conclusion is inevitable that, if the only unfermented palm juice was a “thick syrup” or *honey*, the palm or date *wine* must have been a fermented liquor.

3. Grape Wine

The grape wine of Egypt, as we have seen, ranked as third in value among the wines used at Rome; and as we have shown that all these wines were fermented liquors, it follows that this highly esteemed Egyptian wine was of the same nature. Appeal, however, is made to a dream recorded in the history of the patriarch Joseph, which is regarded as affording indubitable evidence of the early use of unfermented wine. The narrative is as follows: - “And the chief butler told his dream to Joseph, and said to him, In my dream, behold, a vine was before me; and in the vine were three branches: and it was as though it budded, and her blossoms shot forth; and the clusters thereof brought forth ripe grapes: and Pharaoh’s cup was in my hand: and I took the grapes, and pressed them into Pharaoh’s cup, and I gave the cup into Pharaoh’s hand. And Joseph said unto him, This is the interpretation of it: The three branches are three days: yet within three days shall Pharaoh lift up thine head, and restore thee unto

⁶⁷⁴ Book xiii. 4

⁶⁷⁵ Bohn’s Ed.

The Wines of the Bible

thy place: and thou shalt deliver Pharaoh's cup into his hand, after the former manner when thou was his butler" (Gen. xl. 9-13).

The argument founded on this incident is substantially, that we have here a true picture of the ancient method of pressing grapes into the wine cup, and a correct description of the sort of wine which was used in the royal palace of Egypt in Bible times. Some collateral points, relating to certain usages of the kings and priests, are noticed elsewhere.

Observe, then –

(1) Even although we should grant all that is contended for in respect to this butler and his grape pressing, and this Pharaoh and his wine drinking, it would merely prove that, at that particular period, the method of extracting the juice of grapes was by hand pressing, and that the liquor of grapes thus derived was an unfermented juice, which was used as a beverage by the Pharaoh of the text. But unless it can be shown that this singular primitive usage was generally practiced and perpetuated in Egypt or elsewhere, the admitted facts will be of little value in this controversy. In the earliest ages of the world the original diet of men may have been limited to roots and fruits; but civilization has taught the arts of boiling and baking, grinding and roasting, since then: and so, in like manner, the hand squeezing of grapes, if it ever was practiced, has been give place to the winepress, and the simple juice of the grape, if it ever was used as a beverage, has "blushed into wine."

(2) We deny, however, that the narrative exhibits a true picture of the actual proceedings of the chief butler in his office, or that it gives a description of the specific kind of wine used by the Egyptian king. The advocates of the unfermented theory have not merely subjected the text to a gentle hand squeezing, by which they might have extracted the simple truth from the ideal vision, but they have put it into a logical press, and have applied the

The Wines of the Bible

torturing screw with such violence that lees and liquor are mingled together in a confused mess. In other words, they have treated the butler's dream as if it were not a dream, but a bald narrative, or scientific description of actual events; and they have failed to perceive that it is merely a vision – an ideal and pictorial representation of the man's speedy restoration to office as the king's cup-bearer. This latter is the one only point of significance, both in the dream itself and in the interpretation of it. Accordingly while Joseph notices and explains the meaning of the branches of the vine, and the presentation of the cup to Pharaoh, he takes no notice, and makes no reference to the pressing of the grapes, or the quality of the liquor, as if he regarded that part of the vision as being merely a tropical representation of the butler's office as cup-bearer. The unreality of the vision is evidenced throughout all its subordinate features. Thus the vine appeared, and budded, and blossomed, and brought forth grapes in their maturity, during the time the butler stood in its presence, with Pharaoh's cup ready in his hand. Then, when he had pressed the grapes into the royal cup with his own naked hands, he presented it forthwith to the king, lees, liquor, and all. Without making any attempt at straining or filtering the mixed compound!

Dr. Lees says, "that as the events were in themselves natural, the proper conclusion is that it was the custom of the chief cup-bearer to prepare the king's wine by pressing the juice of the grapes into a receiver, and offering it, not perhaps instantly, but after straining it, while it was yet fresh and free from fermentation, to the royal hands."⁶⁷⁶ But if, notwithstanding the naturalness of the events, time must be given for the successive stages of growth, budding, blossoming, and ripening, and then for pressing and straining, before offering the cup to the king, we

⁶⁷⁶ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 18

The Wines of the Bible

merely claim the liberty of adding to the doctor's straining the equally "natural" time for fermentation, whereby the grape juice might become wine.

Moreover, Joseph's interpretation of the dream almost expressly dispels the illusion of this literal exposition; for he says, "the three branches are," not as the proposed realism requires, *branches of grapes*, but "three days." Now, if the three branches of the fruit-bearing vine in the butler's dream denoted simply three days before restoration to office in Joseph's interpretation, why should the pressing of the grapes into the cup not designate, in like manner, the simple restoration of the butler to his office, not of pressing grapes, but of "delivering Pharaoh's cup into his hand after the former manner when thou was his butler?" Both are ideal representations, and should be interpreted in the same principle.

(3) If it be maintained that the hand-pressing of the dream is a true picture of an actual event, it must be confessed that so far as our reading of ancient history goes, it was a unique practice peculiar to the reign of this monarch, and unknown to, or at least unrecorded of any other court or people among ancient nations. We read often enough of the cultivation of the vine, of the uses to which the grapes were applied, of different methods adopted for extracting the juice, of various preparations made from the expressed liquor, of the several kinds of vessels used for containing the juice, both when newly expressed and when made into wine, of the various descriptions of cups used, and of the different customs of nations in their drinking usages, but where shall we find another instance among the ancients of this mode of pressing the grapes into the wine-cup of the drinker? In all the references to public and private wine drinking which we meet with in the Scriptures and other ancient writings, the wine is uniformly spoken of as having been previously prepared, and

The Wines of the Bible

never, so far as we can discover, as being pressed from the grapes into the wine cup on the occasion. Even at the vintage season, when the labourers might have been expected to fill their cups out of the vat, and regale themselves with draughts of the newly expressed juice, previously prepared old wine was served out for their refreshment. Accordingly, Longus, referring to the vintage at Lesbos, says: - "Daphnis and Chloe neglected for a time their flocks, and mutually assisted one another. He carried the clusters in baskets, threw them into the wine-presses, trod them, and drew off the wine into casks....She prepared their meals for the grape-gatherers, brought old wine for their drink, and plucked off the lowest branches."⁶⁷⁷

The only other references to such a practice adduced by Dr. Lees, are contained in a supposed letter of one of the popes, and in an account of certain "heretics," who are said to have "used no other wine but what they pressed out of the cluster of grapes, which were then presented at the table of the Lord."⁶⁷⁸ But the ascetic usage of that pope, and of these "heretics," is so obviously an innovation and novelty in Christian practice, and comes so late in the world's history, that it is no value as evidence of the customs and manners of the ancient Egyptians or other nations. And yet, in the absence of all such evidence, the author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* boldly asserts that "it was *the common practice* to bring the bunches of grapes to the table, and then and there to squeeze them into a drinking vessel."⁶⁷⁹ The "common practice!" When and where? Let us have evidence, and not mere assertion.

If this hand-pressing was an actual occurrence, and a common practice in Bible times, it is strange that in all the numerous references to wine in the Scriptures there is not a solitary instance

⁶⁷⁷ Dophuis and Chole, ii.

⁶⁷⁸ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 280

⁶⁷⁹ Sec. cxxi.

The Wines of the Bible

of such a usage recorded, or even alluded to, except in the account of the butler's dream. In Egypt itself, instead of being common, the practice seems to have been wholly unknown; for Dr. Lees, referring to the paintings on the tombs at Thebes, says, - "They strikingly show that the vine was extensively and scientifically cultivated by the ancient Egyptians."⁶⁸⁰ Now, is it conceivable that, with that extensive and scientific culture, they should have followed such a rude and uncultivated method as this hand-squeezing? Nor is that all: the very pictures referred to negative the supposition, for they exhibit the processes in actual use as the "common practice" of the people. "In one painting," says Dr. Lees, "boys are represented guarding the ripened clusters from the depredations of birds, and men are depicted plucking the grapes and carrying them away in wicker baskets. For wine making the Egyptians sometimes used bags filled with grapes, which were squeezed by the turning of two poles in opposite directions. They also build raised platforms where men trod the clusters, whose juice flowed into a lower receptacle, and thence into vessels ready to receive it."⁶⁸¹ If, then, the hand-pressing of the dream was an actual event, it must have been limited to that solitary occasion of the butler's term of office, for, the Bible and the wall pictures being witnesses, it was not "the common practice" in Bible times.

(4) The designation of the butler's office indicates the nature of his official duties. He is called *sar ham mashkim*, "chief of the cup-bearers." Philo designates him ἀρχιοινοχῶς, "chief wine-pourer;" and, in describing his restoration to office, says, The king "will pardon thee, and will permit thee to resume thy former rank, and thou shalt again pour him out wine for confirmation of thy

⁶⁸⁰ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 17

⁶⁸¹ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 17

The Wines of the Bible

authority, and shalt give the cup into thy master's hand."⁶⁸² Thus the butler was not a *grape-presser*; or *wine-maker* but a "wine-pourer," or "cup-bearer," and the duty of his office was not to press grapes, but to pour out wine and convey it to the king. Nehemiah filled the same office at the court of Artaxerxes, for he says, "I was the king's cup-bearer" (*mashkeh*); and, in describing the duties of his office, he speaks of the already prepared wine that was before the king, and says, "I took up the wine and gave it unto the king." It is true, different usages may have obtained at different courts, among different nations, and at different periods; but where the official duties are so much alike, and the designation of the office are so evidently identical, as in the case of these two butlers, we are justified in concluding that the cup-bearer of an Eastern monarch, was not a grape-presser, but a wine-pourer, and therefore the wine was a previously prepared liquor.

(5) Josephus indicates his estimate of the quality of the wine presented to Pharaoh by the butler, when he says, Joseph "let him know that God bestows the fruit of the vine upon men for good; which wine is poured out to him, and is the pledge of fidelity and mutual confidence among men; and puts an end to their quarrels, takes away passion and grief out of the minds of them that use it, and makes them cheerful."⁶⁸³ The effects here ascribed to the moderate use of wine are such as were commonly attributed to the moderate use of fermented wine by the ancients, innumerable illustrations of which are before us ready for transcription, if necessary, and are inconsistent with the unfermented theory. Philo, in like manner, gives unmistakable indication of his view of the matter when, pursuing his favourite

⁶⁸² Joseph, xvii.

⁶⁸³ Antiq., ii. 5, 2.

The Wines of the Bible

method of allegorizing history, he describes Pharaoh as “the king of the Egyptian country, that is of the body,” and the butler as “the minister of drunkenness, his cup-bearer.”⁶⁸⁴ He terms “the cup of Pharaoh” the “vessel which is the receptacle of folly and drunkenness, and of the ceaseless intoxication of life.”⁶⁸⁵ He says, “The matters relating to excessive drinking are referred to the chief butler, and those which belong to luxurious eating to the chief baker.”⁶⁸⁶ Referring to the butler’s communication of his dream to Joseph, he says, “Would it not have been better to have confessed at all that he was a teacher of intemperance, and not to admit that he increased the excitement of the passions by wine in the case of the intemperate man, as being an inventor, producer of a luxurious, and debauched, and most disgraceful way of life. Such, however, is the case. Folly boasts of those things which ought to be concealed, and in this present case it prides itself, not only on holding in its hands the receptacle of the intemperate soul, that is to say, the cup of wine, and in showing it to all men, but also in pressing out the grapes into it; that is to say, in making that which satisfies the passion, and bringing what is concealed to light. For as children which require food, when they are about to receive the milk squeeze and press out the breast of the nurse that feeds them, so likewise does the workman and cause of intemperance vigorously press the fountain from which the evil of abundance of wine pours forth, that he may derive food in a most agreeable manner from the drops which are squeezed out. Such a description, then, as I have here given, may be applied to the man who is made frantic by the influence of unmixed wines, that he is a drunken, and foolish, and irremediable evil.”⁶⁸⁷ These

⁶⁸⁴ *Drunkenness*, 50

⁶⁸⁵ *Dreams*, ii. 30

⁶⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 23

⁶⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 30, 31

The Wines of the Bible

references show that the royal butler was regarded not as a mere grape-presser, but as a wine-pourer and minister of drunkenness; that the Egyptian king was not a drinker of mere grape juice, but as intemperate drinker of strong unmixed wine; and that the wine poured out by the butler for his master's use was no unfermented liquor, but a veritable intoxicating wine.

(6) Further corroboration of this view is furnished by the evidence already advanced as to the nature of the other Egyptian wines, and by the evidence supplied in a previous section as to the drinking habits of the Egyptians. In all these cases the wine used is a fermented and alcoholic liquor. Athenaeus is cited by Dr. Lees as testifying that among the "various kinds of Egyptian wine" some were fermented. Of these, one was the Mareotic, which "does not affect the head;" another, the Taeniotic, "that when mixed with water it seems gradually to be diluted, much in the same way as Attic honey well mixed;" and another, which is "so thin and digestable that it can be given without harm to those "suffering from fever."⁶⁸⁸ But what evidence do all these facts afford that the wines referred to were unfermented? Fermented wine, used in moderation, "does not affect the head;" thick wines, though fermented, may be "gradually diluted" with water; and thin wines, fermented, are still prescribed to fever patients "without harm." The worthlessness of such an appeal is shown in the reference to Mareotic wine as an unfermented liquor; for Horace, speaking of Cleopatra, describes the tipsy queen as –

*"Her with Mareotic wine inspired,
With the full draught to madness fired." – Odes, i. 37*

⁶⁸⁸ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 17

The Wines of the Bible

And Lucan, speaking of Caesar at an Egyptian banquet, refers to the same description of wine, and associates it with another species –

....."Studded with gems that shine,
Their bowls contain no Marotic wine,
But strong and sparkling wines of Meroe,
To which few years give full maturity." – (Phars., Book x)

(7) If the butler's dream is interpreted a correct representation of the actual method of preparing Pharaoh's wine, why should the other dreams of Scripture not be interpreted on the same principle? Thus, the king dreamed that "seven ill-favoured and lean-fleshed kine" came up from the river, and "did eat up the seven well-favoured and fat kine." (Gen. xli. 4). Is that, also, a true picture of an actual event? Are lean oxen in the habit of devouring their fat brethren? Pharaoh dreamed again that "seven thin ears" of corn rose up and "devoured the seven rank and full ears" (v. 7). Is that, also, a correct representation of a common occurrence? St. Peter also had a vision. He "saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill and eat" (Acts x. 11-13). Is this also another picture, true to nature, of how beasts, birds, and creeping things were associated together, and let down from heaven to earth in great sheets, in the olden time; and how apostles arose, and killed their own meat, and ate the raw flesh, unbaked and unbroiled? Common justice demands that ideal visions should be treated as *ideal*, and be interpreted on the same general principle.

Ideal representations of this kind are found in all ages. Thus, in ancient and modern times an extinguished torch, a sleeping child, a broken column, a mural vase, are employed in painting and

The Wines of the Bible

sculpture as emblematic representations of death. These figures are quite as “natural” as those of the butler’s dream, but they are certainly not exhibited as actual pictures of deceased. We have also seen representations of a barley-sheaf over an ale-house door, and a gilded sheep, with the “golden fleece” on its back, over the door of a hosier or woolen draper. But the publican is neither a farmer nor a corn merchant; nor is the hosier or draper either a shepherd or a wool-stapler. The suspended “signs” are merely pictorial representations of the staple articles from which the products of their respective trades are derived.

A curiously interesting illustration of this use of symbolism among the ancients is found in an emblematic picture of Bacchus, which was discovered in the ruins of Pompeii, and is said to have been the sign-board of an ancient wine-seller. The deity is represented as standing erect, leaning slightly on a pillar or altar, on which there is a wine-cup. His head is wreathed with the usual festive chaplet, and he has the thyrsus within his arms. In his hands there is a cluster of grapes, which, as in the butler’s dream, he is pressing into the wine cup. At the foot of the pillar or altar there is a rampant beast, with open mouth, as if waiting to receive the liquor, and which is supposed to represent a tiger or leopard of diminutive size. Excluding one or two of the accessories, the picture might be taken for a portrait of the Egyptian butler, pressing the grapes into the king’s cup, as related in his dream. Strangely enough, this Bacchanalian sign of an ancient publican is made to do duty, as a pictorial illustration, in the modern works of Drs. Nott and Lees, on the unfermented theory; and is, no doubt, quite appropriate there as the barley-sheaf over the ale-house door, or the gilded sheep over the door of the hosier or draper.

Martial seems to allude to and give some explanations of this allegorical picture, in an epigram on wine-cups, in which he says,

The Wines of the Bible

“The Satyr loves us; Bacchus loves us; and so, too, the intoxicated tigress, whom we have taught to lick the feet of her master.”⁶⁸⁹ Ovid represents Bacchus as “having his head encircled with bunches of grapes, and brandishing a lance covered with vine leaves. Around him, tigers and visionary forms of lynxes, and savage bodies of spotted panthers, were extended.”⁶⁹⁰ Athenaeus, also, appears to refer to the animal portrait in the picture, when he says that, “on account of the look which habitual drunkards get, they liken Bacchus to a bull, and to a leopard, because he excites drunkards to acts of violence.” And, again, “Some men, from their quarrelsome disposition when drunk, are like wild beasts, on which account it is that Bacchus is likened to a leopard.”⁶⁹¹

Judging from the numerous references in ancient writers to Bacchus as the god of wine, the patron of banquets, the jolly god, the god of drunkenness, and the like, there can be little doubt as to the meaning of the picture. The wine vessel is “the cup of Bacchus;” the juice pressed from the grapes is the “blood of Bacchus,” and the rampant beast, or “intoxicated tigress.” Is the inebriated votary of Bacchus, worshipping at the shrine of Bacchus, and taught by the wine cup “to lick the feet of her master.” The allusion throughout is to an intoxicating liquor.

The poets abound in references to Bacchus, and the language they employ evidences that the juice pressed from the cluster in this ancient picture is a tropical representation of fermented wine. Cicero says, “The name of the deity was applied to that which the deity produced, as when we call corn Ceres, and wine Bacchus; whence the saying of Terence, ‘Without Ceres and

⁶⁸⁹ Book xiv. 107

⁶⁹⁰ Meta., iii. 665

⁶⁹¹ ii. 7

The Wines of the Bible

Bacchus Venus starves.”⁶⁹² The usage referred to here is so common and well known that quotation is unnecessary. One extract, however, may be given. Archilles Tattius, describing a feast of Bacchus, says, “As the feast went on, and the good wine did its office, I began to cast bold, lawless glances at Leucippe; for love and Bacchus are two very potent deities; they take possession of the soul, and so enflame it that it forgets every restraint of modesty: the one kindles in it a flame, and the other supplies fuel for the fire; for wine may be truly called the meat and drink of love.”⁶⁹³ Thus, then, the wine which takes the name of the deity which produced it, and was anciently called Bacchus, is not a mere grape juice, but a potent deity, an inflaming liquor, the fuel of the fire of love.

Achilles Tattius transcribes a legend of Cadmus, in which the Tyrians give an account of “the origin of wine.” We have given the paragraph in a previous section, and merely notice here that when the neat-herd had taken a “heartly draught” of the liquor given him by Bacchus, and had become “very *jovial*” under its influence, he inquired of the deity whence he had obtained “this purple water, this delicious blood.” Bacchus, in reply, conducted him “to a vine, and squeezing a bunch of grapes, said, ‘Here is the water, and this is the fountain from whence it flows.’”⁶⁹⁴ Thus this old legend exhibits Bacchus, as he is represented in the ancient picture, and as the Egyptian butler dreamed, squeezing the grapes into the wine cup; but the juice expressed – “this purple water, this delicious blood,” – was clearly a fermented wine, as shown by the effects produced on the “*jovial*” neat-herd. Here, also, is an epigram for a deceased toper: - “Me, by name Myrtas, who used, nearer the holy winepress of Bacchus, to draw without stint a

⁶⁹² Nat. Gods, ii. 23

⁶⁹³ Book ii.

⁶⁹⁴ Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

flask of unmixed wine, a little dust does not conceal; but over me is a delightful tomb, flagon-like, as the symbol of jollity.”⁶⁹⁵ And yet that toper, who found a means of jollity in the flagon, drew his liquor from “near the holy winepress of Bacchus.” Plato the younger, referring to a figure of Bacchus engraved on an amethyst, which, from the signification of the word was supposed to be a charm against inebriety, says, “The stone is an amethyst, but I, the tippler Bacchus, say, let it either persuade me to be sober, or let it learn to get drunk.”⁶⁹⁶ Martial speaks of the “wine-bibbing Bacchus.”⁶⁹⁷ Virgil also says, -

“The branching vine the jolly Bacchus love.” - (Past., vii.P)

*“Daphnis did rites to Bacchus first ordain,
And holy revels for his reeling train.” - (Ibid., v.)*

Euripides describes the “wine-complexioned cheek” of Bacchus, and speaks of the deity having “given mortals the vine, which puts an end to grief.” He represents Silenus as saying, “go as quickly as possible from the cave, having given me in return the juice of *Bacchic* clusters.” Ulysses, having intoxicated the giant, says, “O Cyclops, son of the ocean god, look at this, how divine a draught Greece obtains from the vine, the juice of Bacchus.” The wine referred to in all these passages, to which many others of a like kind might be added, is obviously no mere grape juice, but a fermented and intoxicating beverage; and yet it is “the *vine* which puts an end to grief;” it is the “juice of Bacchic clusters,” in which drunken old Silenus indulges; and it is a “divine draught,” obtained from the *vine*, “the juice of Bacchus,” which intoxicated

⁶⁹⁵ Anthology, p. 365

⁶⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 369

⁶⁹⁷ Ep. i. 70

The Wines of the Bible

the Cyclops. Now, what is all this but an undersigned reproduction of the ancient picture, with a sidelight glancing towards the image in the butler's dream. Here are the "Bacchic clusters" in the hands of the god of wine; and there is the "juice of Bacchus," pressed from the grapes; and here is the drunken giant, like an "intoxicated tigress," ready "to lick the feet of her master."

Thus, neither in the pictorial illustration of Bacchus and the wine cup, nor in the dream of Pharaoh's butler, is there the slightest evidence in favour of the unfermented theory. So far as the wines of Egypt are concerned, unfermented wine is a myth.

VII. ANCIENT WINES – HEBREW

The wines of the Hebrews are variously designated *yayin*, *sheckar*, *tirosh*, *soveh*, *ahsis*, *khemer*, *khometz*, *mesech*, *shemakrim*; and, therefore, each of these will require separate investigation. Dr. Ritchie says, "We put it to common reason, is it likely, is it probable, that all these words were used to designate wine of the same nature, or having the same qualities? On the contrary, is it not morally certain, that each term denoted a distinct species of wine, whose quality was defined by its name."⁶⁹⁸ The indefinite and ambiguous way in which these questions are put render it impossible to give a definite answer in the negative or affirmative. If the writer means to intimate a probability, if not "moral certainty," that some of these Hebrew wines were fermented, and others unfermented liquors, it is difficult to see how the mere fact of their, having different names, or that these names designated different species, can determine the fermented or unfermented nature of the wines so designated. There may have been a score or more of Greek and Roman wines, having different names, and differing from each, other in some particular, and yet all fermented; just as there are, at least, as many modern alcoholic wines with similar distinctions and differences. There is, therefore nothing unlikely or improbable in the opinion that the wines of the Hebrews were like these others – one in nature, but differing in their specific qualities, or in the mode of their preparation, or in the juices from which they were made. These questions, however, will be most satisfactorily determined by a careful examination of the Biblical use of the several Hebrew terms for wine.

⁶⁹⁸ Sc. Test. pp. 10-11

The Wines of the Bible

1. Yayin

This is the most common name for wine in the Hebrew Scriptures. It occurs in one hundred and forty-one passages, and the first reference to it contains a special notice of its inebriating quality (Gen. ix. 20, 21). Now, it is admitted on both sides of this controversy, that *yayin* is a generic term; but generic of what? The advocates of the unfermented theory contend that it is a generic term for all sorts of grape juice, fermented and unfermented. We, on the contrary, maintain that it is a generic term for all sorts of fermented wine only. Dr. Lees says, "Wine means, for example, 'the juice of the grapes,' quite irrespective of the change that comes over it in fermentation; just as the word 'doctor' means, in common usage, 'a learned man,' quite irrespective of his special diploma as physician, surgeon, apothecary, or divine."⁶⁹⁹ But the word "doctor" does not mean "a man," irrespective of whether he is learned or unlearned. Neither does it mean, in common usage, "a learned man," quite irrespective of whether he has received a diploma or not. The Biblical usage of *yayin* shows that throughout all the one hundred and forty-one references to *yayin* as a vinous beverage, the wine is never, in any circumstances, designated a fermented or an unfermented liquor; neither is any distinction of this kind ever made in the use of the term, as if to discriminate between two different kinds of wine. This fact might not have been of any special significance, the nature of the liquor being otherwise indicated, were it not that the Bible is a book of such "minute precepts" that it carefully distinguishes between beasts, fowls, flesh, garments, places, and persons that are clean, and those that are unclean; and between cakes that are leavened or fermented, and those that are unleavened or unfermented.

⁶⁹⁹ Temp. Bib. Com. p. xxxi

The Wines of the Bible

Moreover, according to Dr. Lees, the Scriptures are equally precise in distinguishing the generic term *yayin*, “grape wine,” from the generic *shechar*, “palm or date wine;” in distinguishing the specific *ahsis*, “grape juice purely,” and *soreh*, “boiled wine,” *khometz*, “sour wine,” and *mesech*, “mixed wine: and in distinguishing all the wines from *tirosh*, “vine fruit,” and *shemahrim*, “grape jelly.” Now if *yayin* had been of two kinds, fermented and unfermented; and if the one had been an innocent and safe beverage; while the other was a pernicious and dangerous drink; and if the one was so good as to be pronounced a blessing, and the other so bad as to be branded with a curse; and if the use of the one was divinely sanctioned, while the use of the other was divinely prohibited, surely the alleged difference between the two kinds of liquor was as great, and important, and as much in need of special distinction, as the differences between grape wine and date wine, boiled wine and sour wine; or as between animals clean and unclean, and bread leavened and unleavened. But no similar distinction is ever made, as between fermented and unfermented wine; and, therefore, we infer that no such distinction existed, or was recognized among the Hebrews.

Dr. Lees says, “New names, when first imposed, are always, expressive of some *simple* and *obvious appearance*, never of latent properties or scientific relations; and hence, while the ‘foaming’ appearance of grape juice accounts for the original application of the term *yayin* to it, it would be absurd to suppose that the idea of ‘fermentation,’ the nature of which has only been understood during the last century as a scientific process, formed any part of the *original* connotation of the word.”⁷⁰⁰ But why should the supposition be deemed absurd? It is true, that the

⁷⁰⁰ Ibid., p. xxi.

The Wines of the Bible

nature of fermentation, as a “scientific process,” is a discovery of only recent date, but the fact of fermentation as “a simple and obvious appearance,” was as well known by the ancients as by the moderns; and the “foaming” of the fermenting liquor must have been as apparent as the foaming of the newly expressed juice. If, then, *yayin* was originally employed to designate a liquor whose distinguishing feature was its *foaming* quality, and which was to be known among the people as “the foaming liquor,” it is reasonable to infer that the reference, in that designation, was to the boiling, spuming, foaming appearance of fermenting wine, rather than to the mere frothing of the expressed juice, which is common to all fluids when disturbed or agitated.

Dr. Lees further says, - “A word, however, like *yayin*, originally applied to foaming grape juice, would gradually become significant of the juice in the subsequent conditions in which it was found.....*Yayin*, then, being accepted as a general term, it would follow that we should expect, as time went on, that *specific* terms would be adopted to designate special kinds or states of wine; and this is exactly what we find to be the case in the later books.”⁷⁰¹ Precisely! That is, indeed, what we should expect to find, if *yayin* be, as alleged, a generic term for all sorts of grape juice, fermented and unfermented; but, unfortunately for the unfermented theory, that is exactly what we do *not* find, either in the later or earlier books of the Bible, or even in the *Temperance Bible Commentary* itself. On the contrary, we get from the latter *khamar*, as “the Chaldee equivalent of *yayin*,” and, therefore a generic term; but no specific *khamar* is given. We get *shechar* as “a generic term for ‘drinks,’ including fresh juices and inebriating liquors, other than those coming from the grape,” but no specific *shechar* is given. We get *ahsis* as denoting “grape juice purely;”

⁷⁰¹ Ibid., p. xxiii.

The Wines of the Bible

but if this is the specific term for unfermented wine, how is it that, in the case of such a supposed common and popular beverage, we meet only five references to it in all the Bible? And if this *ahsis* was the specific term for “grape juice purely,” what was the corresponding term for grape juice “in the subsequent condition in which it was found” as a fermented liquor? We get none. *Khometz*, indeed, is said to be a “fermented drink,” and is thus, in some degree, a specific term for fermented liquor; but, unfortunately, the drink thus designated is described as “wine gone sour” - i.e., wine of the second or acetous fermentation, and is applied to both *yayin* and *shechar*. Here, then strangely enough, we find the ancient Hebrews, in their ignorance of the “scientific process,” passing by the wine in its primary and ordinary fermentation, and employing no specific term to describe it, and fixing upon the liquor in its secondary fermentation, when it has “gone sour,” and applying a proper name to it! They have devised names, either generic or specific, for every description of grape juice and palm juice, sweet and sour, drugged and diluted, boiled and unboiled; and they have described, in varying but expressive language, the habits of drinkers, the moderate and excessive use of liquor, and the consequent effects of these potations; but they have absolutely no word in their language for fermented wine; or, as Dr. Lees puts it, “there is no word for fermented wine in the Bible, no word meaning that only.”⁷⁰² Now, if this be so, as it certainly is in respect to a specific term, it would be utterly incredible were it not that *yayin* itself is the “word for fermented wine in the Bible” - i.e., it is a generic term for all sorts of fermented wine. If *yayin* had been, as alleged by Dr. Lees, a general term for grape juice, fermented and unfermented, we should certainly have expected,

⁷⁰² Ibid., xxxii

The Wines of the Bible

“as time went on, that specific terms would be adopted to designate” both species; but it is undeniable that there is no specific term in the Hebrew language for fermented as distinguished from unfermented wine. And as there must have been different species of fermented wine among the Hebrews, as among other nations; and as *yayin* is not a specific, but a general, term it must be generic of fermented wines only.

The Biblical usage of *yayin*, wherever the reference is to a vinous beverage, confirms this conclusion. For the same word is employed to designate the wine Noah drank when he became drunken; which Melchizedek brought forth to Abraham; which was disallowed to the priests, and prescribed in the drink offerings; which was forbidden to the Nazarite under his vow, and allowed him after his time of separation was completed; which is declared to be a “mockery,” and yet “maketh glad the heart of man;” which brings “woe” to the drunkard, and yet “maketh merry,” and of which it is said, “Drink thy wine with a merry heart.” *Yayin* is also used as a general or universal term in such connections as naturally involve the conclusion that it is the designation of a fermented beverage. Thus the priests are forbidden to drink it when they go into the “inner court” of the tabernacle of the congregation where liquid wine was laid up for use in the sacrifices.

The prohibition here is evidently universal, extending to every species of *yayin* used in the temple service. So that unless the term be generic of fermented wines only, we must infer that grape juice, and boiled syrup or jelly, were stored in the temple, used in the sacrifices, and included in the prohibitory enactment; and that the use of such innocent delicacies was forbidden on pain of death – “lest ye die.”

The Wines of the Bible

A. *Ayin* in the Drink Offerings

The law regulating the drink offerings of *yayin* prescribes the quantities to be employed, and the manner of its use, but makes no difference to the nature of the wine admissible for this purpose. Now, if *yayin* had been of two kinds, fermented and unfermented, is it not highly probable, if not “morally certain,” that the lawgiver would have been as careful in distinguishing between lawful and the unlawful wines, and the leavened and unleavened bread? It is alleged, in reply to this, that the law referred to makes no exception against the use of “mixed wine,” and yet the latter is confessedly unlawful. But the objector overlooks the fact that the law prescribes the use of *yayin*, and not of *mesech*, which was a cup of mixture – a mixture of *yayin* and drugs. Accordingly, a libation of *yayin* was lawful, as being in accordance with the law, but a libation of *yayin* and drugs would have been unlawful, as being a manifest contravention of the law. In like manner, the law prescribes the “fourth part of an hin” of *yayin* in one case, the “third part of an hin” in another, and the “half of an hin” in another (Num. xv. 5, 7, 10). A departure from these quantities would have been unlawful, whether less or more wine had been employed. The Jewish worshipper had no more liberty to add drugs to the *yayin* of the drink offering, than he had to diminish the quantities imposed, or to substitute milk, oil, or vinegar, for the *yayin* required by the law. But if *yayin* had been of two kinds, fermented and unfermented, the one lawful and the other unlawful, how could the worshipper know what description of liquor to offer as a libation, seeing that no indication is given of any such difference, nor is any distinction made by the law as between a lawful and an unlawful *yayin*. Without such a reference he must have inferred that the one species was as lawful as the other.

The Wines of the Bible

It may be argued that while *yayin* was prescribed by the law, *khometz* might have been offered, seeing that the latter was a fermented drink, “sour wine,” and as such a species of *yayin*? Possibly it might, unless we suppose it to have been prescribed by another law, which required that the best of everything should be offered to the Lord, whereas *khometz* was the worst, or, at least, the poorest species of *yayin* made. It may also be alleged that although *yayin* was prescribed by the law, *shechar* was used as a libation (Num. xxviii. 7). This is true, but the offering was perfectly lawful, seeing that *shechar* was the particular description of wine prescribed on the occasion referred to.

B. Yayin gathered from the Fields

All these considerations serve to show that *yayin* was a generic term for fermented wines, and not for grape juice, fermented and unfermented. It is, however, said that the word is used in such connections, and with such references, that it cannot possibly designate a fermented wine, and must, in those cases denote unfermented grape juice. Thus “it is used sometimes in the sense of the *vinum pendens* of the Latins,” as “a thing to be gathered by men or eaten by worms;” to be “trodden in the vat,” as the “wine in the grapes,” &c. We have discussed this usage in a previous second section, and need only repeat here that if *yayin* cannot mean a fermented wine in such cases, neither can it mean a “foaming” grape juice, as defined by Dr. Lees,⁷⁰³ seeing that *yayin* in the grape, hanging in the cluster, gathered by men, and eaten by worms, is as far from being a boiling or foaming liquor as it is from being a fermented wine. It must be evident to every

⁷⁰³ Temp. Bib. Com., p. xxi

The Wines of the Bible

unprejudiced reader that the metonymical and proleptical usage in these texts no more requires us to believe that *yayin* was either a solid produce or simple juice, then as formerly observed, that the domestic butter or cheese of kine was sweet milk in the udder of the cow. When, therefore, Dr. Lees quotes the words of Mymphodorus, who speaks of Drimacus as *taking wine from the fields*, and says, “No one, we suppose, can carry prejudice so far as to impose upon himself the belief that fermented and bottled wine was thus ‘taken from the fields,’”⁷⁰⁴ we reply, why should we not so believe, and that without any prejudice or self-imposition? Humboldt speaks of “*vines producing potable wine*.”⁷⁰⁵ Taylor speaks of “good butter, which the soil of Salop yields.” Homer, also, speaks of “genial wine, the produce of the *soil*, in goatskin flasks.”⁷⁰⁶ But if Nymphodorus had intended to intimate that Drimacus gathered *grapes* from the fields, why should he not have said so, instead of saying that he gathered *wine*? Any why should wine not have been taken from the fields, even although it were “fermented and bottled,” like Homer’s “genial wine in goatskin flasks,” if the said wine had both made and stored in those fields from which it was taken? Sir J. Chardin tells us “that the Eastern people, in many places, hide their corn” and “bury their wine” in the fields. “This is done in the neighborhood of the villiages, and is designed both to prevent their enemies finding these things, and also their great people that might pass that way, who would not pay them for what they took.”⁷⁰⁷ And Redding informs us that “the vine-grower of Cyprus hides from his neighbor the amount of his vintage, and always buries part of his produce for concealment; the exactions of the government are so

⁷⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 198

⁷⁰⁵ Cosmos, i. 331

⁷⁰⁶ Illiad, iii

⁷⁰⁷ Harmer’s Obs., ix. 381

The Wines of the Bible

great,” &c.⁷⁰⁸ Whether, therefore, the people referred to by Nymphordorus had concealed their wine by burying it in the fields, or had stored it up in suitable places there, he merely informs us that Drimacus, in his freebooting raid had fallen upon the stored-up wine and carried it off. Longus supplies us with two illustrations of this kind of pillage. He tells us that some pirates of Tyre landed on the island of Lesbos, and “carried off fragrant wine (οἶνος ἀνθοσμίας), corn in great plenty, honey in the comb,” &c.⁷⁰⁹ And the Methymaeans, to avenge an alleged injury, landed on the shores of Mitylene, where they “seized numbers of cattle, a great quantity of corn and wine, the vintage being lately ended, together with the labourers who were still at work there.”⁷¹⁰ There is, therefore, nothing in the story of Drimacus, nor in the Biblical usage appealed to, which in any way necessitates the conclusion that the Hebrew *yayin* was not a generic term for fermented wines only.

C. Yayin, Good and Evil.

It is further argued that *yayin* must be a designation of two kinds of liquor, fermented and unfermented, because in one class of texts it is spoken of as a curse, and in another as a blessing. “It appears manifest,” says Dr. Ritchie, “that this diversity of expression in Scriptures proves, beyond all reasonable doubt, a diversity of character in these wines. The conclusion seems irresistible, that it is an innocent, unintoxicating wine which the Spirit of God in His Word commends; while it is a deleterious,

⁷⁰⁸ Wines, p. 36

⁷⁰⁹ i.

⁷¹⁰ li.

The Wines of the Bible

inebriating wine which He condemns.”⁷¹¹ With all deference to the writer, we maintain on the contrary, that the “diversity of expression” referred to proves nothing of the sort, and that the inference he has drawn from it “seems irresistible” only to such minds as have adopted a foregone conclusion to welcome it. Why should the same thing not be, and be described as, both a curse and blessing, the reference being not to any supposed difference in the nature of the thing itself, but to the way in which it is used, and the purpose for which it is employed? There are, undoubtedly, differences of qualities in many things allowed and forbidden, at particular times, and in special circumstances; but these differences are carefully noted and exhibited in the “minute precepts” which regulate their usage. Thus a distinction is made between clean and unclean meats, leavened and unleavened bread. If, therefore, there had been a similar difference between two kinds of yayin, it is only reasonable to believe that there would have been a similar distinction made in the law which permitted the use of the one beverage, and prohibited the use of the other. But no such distinction is made, and we infer from that that no such difference existed, or was recognized.

Nor is there any reason why different, and even opposite, effects and qualities should not be attributed to the same substance. Ovid says, “That thing is of no use which is not able to hurt as well. What is there more useful than fire? Yet, if any one endeavors to burn a house, it is with fire that he provides his rash hands. The healing art sometimes takes away health, at other times bestows it; and it shows what herb is wholesome, and what is injurious. Both the cut-throat and the wary traveler is ready girt with the sword; by the one plans treachery, the other carries a protection for himself. Eloquence is taught to plead the cause of

⁷¹¹ Sc. Test., p. 9

The Wines of the Bible

the innocent; yet it protects the guilty, and presses hard on the guiltless.”⁷¹² It is the same with wine. Pliny, in one passage somewhat doubtfully says, “It is extremely difficult to pronounce whether wine is more generally injurious in its effects or beneficial. And then, in addition to this, how very uncertain is it whether, the moment we have drunk it, it will be productive of salutary results, or turn out no better than so much poison.” Shortly afterwards, however, he indicates that these differing results are due to the manner of its use, and not any difference in the nature of the liquor: - “By the use of wine in *moderation* the sinews are strengthened, but taken in *excess* it proves injurious to them; the same, too, with the eyes. Wine refreshes the stomach, sharpens the appetite, takes off the keen edge of sorrows, and anxieties, warms the body, acts beneficially, as a diuretic, and invites sleep.....According to Asclepiades, the virtues possessed by wine are hardly equaled by the majestic attributes of the gods themselves.”⁷¹³ Thus the *same wine*, and obviously, from its effects, a fermented liquor, may be productive of the most “salutary results,” and yet, by immoderate use, “turn out no better than so much poison” – i.e., it will be a curse or a blessing, according as it is used.

Panycias, in Athenaeus, has some lines to the same effect: -

*“Good wine’s the gift which God has given
To man alone beneath the heaven;
Of dance and song, the genial sire,
Of friendship gay, and soft desire:
Yet rule it with a tightened rein,
Nor moderate wisdom’s rule disdain;
For when unchecked there’s nought runs faster-
A useful slave, but cruel master.” – (Athen., ii. 4)*

⁷¹² Trist., 283

⁷¹³ Book xxiii. 1

The Wines of the Bible

Euripides, in like manner, describes Bacchus as being “at once the most terrible, and the mildest of deities.” The son of Sirach says, “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 quarreling” (Ecclus. Xxxi. 27). Theognis says –

*“Thee, wine! I partly land, I partly blame;
Thee, wholly, neither can I hate nor love;
Thou art both good and evil; no wise man
Hath ever thee reproached or freely praised,”*

(Maxims, 871)

Hesiod says, the gifts of Bacchus are “given to men as matter of joy and grief.”⁷¹⁴ Scripture says of *tirosh*, the alleged vine fruit, “a blessing is in it” (Isa. Lxv. 8); and yet the same *tirosh* is exhibited as taking away the heart from God (Hos. iv. 11).

In the same way money is good, for it “answereth all things,” and yet it is bad, when “the love of money is the root of all evil.” Learning is a valuable acquisition, and yet “much study is a weariness of the flesh.” Food is a necessary of existence, but overfeeding is pernicious gluttony. The simple juice of the grape is an innocent thing, and yet “Juvenal draws a disgusting picture of the zest with which” the ladies of ancient Rome “made even innocent must to pander to their debauched and morbid tastes”⁷¹⁵ “My son,” says Solomon, “eat thou honey, because it is good” (Prov. xxiv 13); but the same wise king also says, “It is not good to eat much honey” (Prov. xxv. 27). “The sleep of a laboring man is sweet” (Eccles. v. 12), but “love not sleep, lest thou come to poverty” (Prov. xx. 13). Pleasure is a desirable enjoyment, but

⁷¹⁴ Shield of Hercules, 399

⁷¹⁵ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 369

The Wines of the Bible

“he that loveth pleasure shall be a poor man” (Prov. xxi. 17). Wine and oil are good things, but he that loveth them “shall not be rich.” (Prov. xxi.77). Exercise is essential to health, but too much of it is injurious. The air in gentle motion is pleasant and invigorating, but the same air as a tornado or tempest is destructive to life and property. Sunshine and frost are agreeable in their season, but men have suffered sunstroke from the one, and have been frozen to death by the other. Fire and water are proverbially good servants, but bad masters. And so on through the whole realm of nature; we may have too much even of a good thing; and the same thing may be both salutary and injurious in its effects, according to the measure or manner of its use.

Let it be observed that no attempt is being made here to ignore or deny the essential distinctions which obtain between things of different nature. All that is aimed at is to show that different, and even opposite effects, may be ascribed to the same things; that these things may be good or evil, according to the manner or purpose of their use; and that, therefore, the mere fact of *yayin* being spoken of both as a curse and a blessing, affords no evidence of the existence of two kinds of wine, fermented and unfermented. The Biblical usage on which this argument is found is much akin to that which is employed in reference to money. Thus, in one class of texts, we find that the Lord “maketh rich” (1 Sam. ii. 7); giveth Solomon “both riches and honours” (1 Kings iii. 13); prospers Abraham until he becomes “very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold (Gen. xiii. 2); and blesses the latter end of Job more than his beginning, “so that he also became very rich” (Job xlii. 12). And, in another class of texts, these very God-given riches are exhibited as eminently dangerous and deceitful in their influence on men. Thus, “Woe unto you that are rich” (Luke vi. 24). “Wilt thou set thine eyes upon that which is not? For riches certainly make themselves wings; they fly away as an eagle

The Wines of the Bible

toward heaven” (Prov. xxiii. 5). “The cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word, and he becomes unfruitful” (Matt. Xiii. 22). “Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high minded nor trust in uncertain riches” (1 Tim. vi. 17). “But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil; which, while some coveted after they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows” (1 Tim. vi. 9, 10).

Here we have riches, like the “good creature,” the gift of God, and yet, like the same creature, the destruction of men. It is, however, alleged by Dr. Lees that “excess of money is no more a ‘mockery,’ or evil than the least quantity.”⁷¹⁶ Certainly not in its physical effects, but in its moral influence on the mind and character it is both. It brings “*woe*,” it is an *illusion* – “that which is not,” it is *evanescent* – “they fly away as an eagle,” it is a *mockery* – “the deceitfulness of riches,” it is *untrustworthy* – “trust not in uncertain riches,” it is a “*temptation and a snare*,” it leads into “*many foolish and hurtful lusts*,” it causes to “*err from the faith*,” it brings upon men “*many sorrows*,” and its painful issues through the tortuous paths of evil are “*destruction and perdition*.” Could more be said of the “cursed drink,” or of any other evil under the sun?

Heathen writers speak the same language, and utter the same hard sayings against this “filthy lucre.” Plutarch speaks of the “corrupting influence of money,” and says, that silver and gold were banished out of Sparta “as evils destructive in the proportion that they were alluring.” Virgil speaks of “cursed

⁷¹⁶ Letter in *Aberdeen Free Press*.

The Wines of the Bible

gold,”⁷¹⁷ “impious lucre,” “pernicious gold.”⁷¹⁸ Ovid describes riches as “the incentives to vice.”⁷¹⁹ Perseus speaks of “deceitful money.”⁷²⁰ Juvenal, also, speaks of baleful money” – *funesta pecunia*;⁷²¹ “filthy money” – *obscene pecunia*;⁷²² and, enumerating things hurtful and fatal to men, he says, -

*“Not any vice that taints the human soul,
More frequent points the sword or drugs the bowl,
Than the dire lust of an untamed estate –
Since he who covets wealth disdains to wait;
Law threatens, conscience calls, yet on he hies,
And this he silences, and that defies;
Fear, shame, he bears down all, and with loose rein
Sweeps headlong o’er the alluring paths of gain.” – Sat. xiv.*

Sophocles says, -

*.....“God is the worst of ills
That ever plagued mankind; this wastes our cities,
Drives forth their natives to a foreign soil,
Taints the pure heart, and turns the vicious mind
To basest deeds; artificer of fraud
Supreme, and source of every wickedness.” – Antiq., 295*

Phocylides – “Gold and silver have always been a snare to men. O gold! Chief source of ills, corrupter of life, that turneth all things upside down.” Menander – “Riches are blind, and they make those who look upon them blind also.” Max Tyrius – “Riches, the

⁷¹⁷ AEn., i. 479

⁷¹⁸ Ibid., iii. 56

⁷¹⁹ Meta., i. 4

⁷²⁰ Sat., i. 12

⁷²¹ Sat. i. 113

⁷²² Vi. 297

The Wines of the Bible

worst of all things,.....Gold, the most insolent of all things.”
Sallust – “As if poisoned with some baneful magic, it enervates the once vigorous mind and body, is ever unreasonable and insatiable, is abated neither by abundance nor by want.” Horace says, -

*“O! let us consecrate to Jove
(Rome shall with shouts the pious deed approve)
Our gems, our gold, pernicious store!
Or plunge into the deep the baleful ore.” – Carm., iii. 24*

Plato says, “Monty has been the cause of many impious deeds.”⁷²³
Lucian, in his *Timon*, says, “O gold, thou sweetest boon of mortal men;” and in *Mercury and Charon*, he exhibits the other side of the picture; “Then, don’t you know how many wars proceed from it, and treacheries, robberies, perjuries, murders, imprisonments, distant voyages, traffies, and slaveries?” Anacreon says, -

*“O may he sleep in endless night
Who brought the shining plague to light,
Who first gave worth to useless ore,
And taught mankind to sigh for more.
Gold breaks through every sacred tie,
And bids a friend or brother die;
The fruitful source of kindred strife,
Gold would not spare a parent’s life,
Long wars and murders, crimes untold,
All spring from cursed thirst for gold.” – Carm., 46*

Hood only echoes the sentiments of ancient poets, philosophers, and moralists when he writes, -

⁷²³ Rep. iii. 22

The Wines of the Bible

Thus secular and sacred writers agree in describing the same thing as being both good and bad, a curse and a blessing. So that this argument as to wine, founded on the “diversity of expression in Scripture,” is not a whit more “irresistible” in establishing the existence of two kinds of *yayin*, fermented and unfermented, then the diversities of expression given above are irresistible proofs of two kinds of gold.

D. Yayin, a Symbol of Wrath and Blessing

It is further argued that *yayin* must be the designation of two kinds of wine, because it is employed as a metaphor both of divine wrath and divine blessing. Hence it is inferred that the *yayin* referred to as a figure of wrath must be alcoholic, and therefore evil; while that spoken of as a symbol of blessing must be unfermented and good. The argument on this point is substantially the same as that we have already discussed, and the answer given to the former is sufficient reply to the latter. A few additional remarks, however, may be made here. Why, then, should the same thing not be used, metaphorically, both as a symbol of wrath and as a symbol of blessing? Philo says, - “Moses looks upon an unmixed wine as a symbol, not of one thing only but of many – namely, of trifling and playing the fool, and of all kinds of insensibility and insatiable greediness, and of a covetousness which is heard to be pleased, and of a cheerfulness which comprehends many other objects,” &c.⁷²⁴ Here is the same wine is exhibited as a symbol of both good and evil. The Psalmist says of the wicked, - “Let their table become a snare before them.” (Psalm lxi. 22). Must we from this conclude that two

⁷²⁴ Drunkenness, ii

The Wines of the Bible

different kinds of tables are alluded to, the one good and the other bad? No; for he adds, - "And that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap." So that the same table is exhibited as being "for their welfare," and yet as becoming a "snare" or "trap." In like manner, we read, "thou hast made us to drink the wine of astonishment" (Ezek. iv. 16). Here innocent "water" is put on a level with the "wine of astonishment," and both are used as figures of divine judgments. The same usage is followed in a number of other instances. Thus, innocent *water* is again employed as a symbol of wrath, - "Waters of a full cup are wrung out to them" (Psalm lxxiii. 10). "I will pour out of my wrath upon them like water" (Hosea v. 10). *Bread* and *water* are also associated together in this way, - "The bread of adversity and the water of affliction" (Isaiah xxx. 20). "Thou feedest them with the bread of tears, and givest them tears to drink in great measure" (Psalm lxxx. 5). Sleep is used as a symbol of blessing - "He givest his beloved sleep" (Psalm cxxvii. 2); and it is employed as a figure of wrath - "The Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep" (Isaiah xxx. 10). The *rain* is used as a symbol of blessing - "He shall come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain, as the latter and former rain unto the earth" (Hosea vi. 3); "I will cause the shower to come down in his season, there shall be showers of blessing" (Ezekiel xxxiv. 26). And the same *rain* is employed as a figure of wrath - "I will even rend it with a stormy wind in my fury, and there shall be an overflowing shower in mine anger" (Ezek. xiii. 13). Thus the same thing is used as a symbol of both of wrath and blessing, so that the argument for two kinds of *yayin*, founded on this usage, is vain.

The Wines of the Bible

E. Biblical Usage of Yayin

If the mere frequency of the usage of the term in a particular sense be accepted as indicating the nature of the liquor which *yayin* is employed to denote, Dr. Ritchie admits that, “on examining the list, it is found that *thirty-one* of the texts are marked doubtful or neutral, *twenty-six* are marked out a promised or permitted enjoyment, while *seventy-one* texts of the Divine Word are marked as branding it with notes of warning, either by admonition or example, of its intoxicating power. The rest of the passages merely refer to it as used in religious observances.”⁷²⁵ The *thirty-one* “doubtful or neutral” texts, with the *thirteen* references to “religious observances,” are excluded from the argument, as indicating nothing as to the nature of *yayin*. The *twenty-six* passages which describe it as “a promised or permitted enjoyment” determine nothing as to its quality, except on the supposition that the mere fact of promise or permission marks it out as an unfermented wine, which is, of course, an assumption of the whole question at issue. Thus out of the *one hundred and forty-one* texts in which *yayin* is spoken of in Scripture, seventy give no deliverance, nor afford any indication of the nature of the liquor thus designated; but all the remaining texts, which are the only passages that evidence its quality, uniformly and unitedly agree in “*branding it with notes of warning, either by admonition or example, of its intoxicating power.*”

On examining the list for ourselves we find *seventy-two* texts with the doctor’s brand of “intoxicating power” on them. The remaining *sixty-nine* passages are as follows: - *Four* texts of persons giving wine to others, e.g., Melchizedek to Abraham,

⁷²⁵ Sc. Test., p. 73

The Wines of the Bible

Jacob to Isaac, and Nehemiah to the king. *Two* of the blood of the grape, and eyes red with wine. *Nine* of libations or drink-offerings. *Six* of wine not obtainable by reason of the enemy, failure of vintage, &c. *Six* of bottles of wine. *Eight* of wine associated with other provisions. *Two* of a wine-cellar and banqueting house, or "house of wine." *Two* of wine as an article of merchandise. *Six* of wine used in feasting and banquets. *Four* of wine mixed by wisdom and associated with milk. *Four* of making merry with wine. *Five* of wine compared to love, &c. *One* of spiced wine. *Two* of wine collected with summer fruits. *One* of wine sought for with corn. *One* abstained from during mourning. *Two* as the wine of the vineyard. *Two* permitted to Nazerites and people. *Two* of wine given as a restoration to the faint.

Some of these texts seem to indicate a fermented liquor, but taking the whole sixty-nine passages as either doubtful or indeterminate, there is not a single text in the Bible in which *yayin* bears the mark of an unfermented beverage. On the contrary, there are seventy-two passages, and these the only texts which indicate the nature of the liquor, that bear unmistakable evidence the Hebrew *yayin* is a generic term for fermented wines only.

F. Yayin, a Poison

Appeal is made by some advocates of the unfermented theory to Deut. xxxii., 33, in which it is said, "*Their wine is the poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps,*" from which it is inferred that this is a description and condemnation of one species of *yayin* containing alcoholic "poison;" and that, therefore, the *yayin* elsewhere commended must have been an innocent, unfermented liquor. If this be so, then (a) The vine and its fruit must fail under the same condemnation, for they are pernicious

The Wines of the Bible

sources of this poisonous *yayin*; - “Their vine is of *the vine of Sodom*, and of the fields of Gomorah: their grapes are *grapes of gall*, their clusters are *bitter*” (ver. 32). (b) If the wine was a poisonous liquor, the grapes were poisonous fruit; for the Hebrew *rosh* translated “gall” designates a poison. (c) If the vine and its fruit were thus equally condemned as poisonous substances, yielding a poisonous liquor, how will this fact agree with the theory of those who maintain that *tirosh* is a designation of “vine fruit,” and that “there is no Divine warning uttered respecting it, no caution, no admonition of its dangerous character found in the whole Bible.”⁷²⁶ If the advocates of this theory exclude these poisonous grapes from the vine fruit covered by *tirosh*, they must, in all fairness, exclude also that poisonous liquor from the wine covered by *yayin*.

A reference to the context will show that the passage contains a description of the morally depraved character of the people, and not of any species of actually existing wine. The figure employed is similar to that of the prophet, “Yet I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed: how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me?” (Jer. ii. 21). It is probable that, as the “apples of Sodom” were a worthless species of fruit, the “vine of Sodom” may have been, as Michaelis thinks, the *solanum* or deadly night-shade, which bears some resemblance to the *vitis*, or true vine, in its leaves and fruit, which are said to be vinous but poisonous, and which the Arabs call “fox grapes.” However this may be, there is no reference in the text to alcohol or alcoholic “poison;” and those who quote it as a description and denunciation of fermented wine are ignorantly, or intentionally, wresting the Scripture to serve a purpose.

⁷²⁶ Sc. Test., p. 26

The Wines of the Bible

Appeal is also made in this connection to the words of the prophet, "*Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and maketh him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness*" (Hab. ii. 15). Dr. Lees alleges that the word *khamah*, rendered "bottle," is "the Hebrew term for 'poison' in general, connoting that inflaming property common to so many intoxicants."⁷²⁷ But (a) the appeal to this passage is wholly irrelevant to the present issue, because the denunciation of the text has no reference to any actual wine-drinking at all. The context shows that the prophet has in view the selfish and cruel policy pursued towards Israel by her neighbors, and of which she had become the victim. Intoxicated with blood and conquest, they had inspired the Jews with the same spirit, whereby they were made "drunken also." And having engaged them in their unholy alliance, and involved them in war with a powerful enemy, they secured their own safety, and abandoned Israel to become the prey of the spoiler, whereby she was left in her "nakedness." The metaphors employed by the prophet are certainly borrowed from some shameful drinking usages; but they are used here to describe and denounce the conduct of the heathen in seducing the people of God into the unholy alliance referred to, and not to exhibit and condemn the drinking of wine or the giving of wine to drink. (b) The appeal to this passage is also irrelevant, because *yayin* is not spoken of in the text at all; neither is there any reference directly or by allusion, to simple fermented wine as a "poison." The prophet speaks of a "drink;" and if the word "bottle" must be rendered "poison," the only poisonous drink referred to in Scripture is the artificial *mesech*, a "drugged potion," like the "wine mingled with myrrh" given to our Lord at his crucifixion, or the bowl into which Helen put a narcotic drug

⁷²⁷ Temp. Bib. Com. p. xlii

The Wines of the Bible

for her guests, oppressed with grief. The alleged poisonous drink, therefore, may have been drugged *yayin* or *shechar*, but it must not be assumed without evidence that it was either simple fermented *yayin* or *shechar*. (c) The metaphors employed negative the supposed reference to a poisonous drink of any kind. The prophet describes the conduct of the heathen towards Israel under the figure of an inebriated man giving drink to his neighbor, not in neighborly kindness, festivity, or hospitality; nor with the intention of drugging or poisoning him, but with the deliberate purpose of bringing him into the same inebriated condition of himself; or, as the prophet says, “making him drunken also.” No, is this all. The final purpose for which this is done is set forth in the declared intention of the drunken heathen, “and makest him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness.” Here is no allusion to the social custom of merely giving fermented wine to a neighbor, out of neighborly hospitality, or the like. The one only evil described and denounced by the prophet in these metaphors, and against which he utters the solemn “woe,” is *the deliberate design of a drunken man to debauch his innocent neighbor, by making him “drunken also” for a grossly immoral and obscene purpose*. The allusion of the text may probably be to the curse pronounced against Ham, when Noah awoke from his wine and learned that his son had culpably looked upon his nakedness; or the conduct of David when he deliberately made uriah drunk for a guilty purpose (2 Samuel xi. 13); or to the act of Lot’s daughters, who made their father drunk for an equally improper purpose (Gen. xix. 33). (d) The word *khamah*, rendered “bottle” in our version, and “poison” in the translation proposed by Dr. Lees, is used three times of the skin bottle which Hagar filled with water on leaving Abraham (Gen. xxi. 14,15,19). But the doctor says, - “It may be objected that the skin bottle Hagar carried with her is called *khameth*, and that is the same word. Even granting that (of

The Wines of the Bible

which there is no proof), no example occurs of the use of *khameth* for 'bottle' from the time of Moses to that of the minor prophets. It was, then, quite obsolete in the days of the latter – had been so, apparently, for eight centuries, - and, moreover, there were four other words for 'bottle,' and four or five for cup, in regular use by the later Hebrews. To depart from the current and continuous meaning of *khamah* as 'poison,' and identify it with a long obsolete word for skin 'bottle,' is simple whim."⁷²⁸

When the doctor alleges "there is no proof" that Hagar's *khamath* is the same word as the prophet's *khameth*, he may be right or wrong, for absolute "proof" in such a case is simply impossible either way. But the two words, as our readers may perceive, are, at least, identical in form, if they are not so also in meaning. When he argues from the translation of *khamah* as "poison," in five or six of the texts referred to, that it is a "poison" also in the passage under consideration, he might on the same principle contend that ob, one of the "four other words" for bottle, means an evil spirit in Job xxxii. 19, - "Behold my belly.....is ready to burst like new bottles," because that word is rendered "familiar spirit" in fifteen out of the sixteen passages in which it occurs! Even *khamah*, "the Hebrew term for 'poison' in general," and which the doctor says has "a figurative' use as well," occurs only five times as "poison," whereas its figurative use seems to have swallowed up its literal application, for it is found in one hundred and fourteen passages as "*fury, anger, wrath, displeasure*. Nay, it must have become obsolete as a term for "poison" long before the days of the minor prophets, for no example of that usage is found later than Psalm cxi. – "a Psalm of David" – except in one text, which is as much in question as the passage under consideration. Therefore, as the doctor says, "to

⁷²⁸ Temp. Bib. Com. p. xliii

The Wines of the Bible

depart from the current and continuous meaning of *khamah* [as anger, wrath, or fury], and identify it with a long obsolete word for [poison] is a simple whim!"

View on every side there is not a shadow of reference in the text either to the custom of merely giving fermented wine to others, or to simple *yayin* as a poisonous liquor.

G. Yayin, a Mocker

Although the Bible never expressly intimates that the *yayin* of the Hebrews, was either a fermented or an unfermented beverage, there are some texts in which the nature of the liquor is unmistakably indicated, and in a way which may go far to settle this controversy. Thus, Solomon says, "*Yayin is a mocker, shechar is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise*" (Prov. xx. 1). Leaving *shechar* to be considered elsewhere, it is to be observed here that the form of expression employed in the text that the king is speaking of the genus, not of a species. He says "*Yayin is a mocker;*" not *a yayin*, or *some yayin* is so. This mocking power must, therefore, be a distinguishing property of the entire species of *yayin*, and not of some only. If we say "man is mortal," mortality is thereby attributed to the whole race of man. If we say with Dr. Lees, "the word 'doctor' means, in common usage, 'a learned man,'" learning is thereby ascribed to every *doctor*, "quite irrespective of his special diploma as physician, surgeon, apothecary, or divine." And if we say "sin is the transgression of the law," transgression is thereby attributed to all sins, and not to some only. In like manner, when Solomon, using a confessedly generic term, says "*Yayin is a mocker,*" he thereby ascribes this quality to every species of the genus, and not to some only. And if

The Wines of the Bible

this be so, *yayin* must be a generic term for all sorts of fermented wine only.

But if the text refers to the species, and not to the genus, it merely teaches that some sorts of *yayin* are distinguished by this quality. If this be so, what are the names of those bad wines? There are, as we have seen, nine different Hebrew terms employed in the Bible to designate wine, viz: - *Yayin*, *shechar*, *tirosh*, *soveh*, *ahsis*, *khemer* or *khamar*, *khometz*, *messech*, and *shemahrim*. Which, or how many of these does Solomon include among the species of *yayin* to which he refers? *Shechar* is already provided for as being separately described in the text. Now, taking Dr. Lees for our guide, *tirosh* must be excluded, as being an innocent solid. *Soveh*, is excluded as being an innocent syrup or jelly. *Ahsis* is excluded as being vinegar. *Shemakrim* is excluded as being a grape preserve or jelly. *Mesech*, either as an innocent mixed wine, or as a drugged potion, may be good or bad, but not distinguished as a mocker or defrauder. *Khemer*, or *khamar*, either as an innocent, foaming grape juice, or as grape juice mingled with stupefying ingredients, follows suite. So that there is not a single species of the genus *yayin* of which it can be said "it is a mocker!" Or if there be a species of that character, it can only be drugged *khemer*, or the poisonous *mesech*! When, therefore, Solomon says, "*Yayin* is a mocker," we must interpret his words as a descriptive and denunciation, not of *yayin* generally, nor of any of its species particularly, save only and exclusively the drugged liquor! The absurdity of the conclusion is a sufficient refutation of the theory which gives its birth.

Dr. Ritchie says, "It is not excess here that is pronounced a mocker, it is the intoxicant itself, and it is just by virtue of its inebriating quality that it deceives the unwise soul."⁷²⁹ And again,

⁷²⁹ Sc. Test. p. 114

The Wines of the Bible

“We do not require an inspired word to tell us that excess in intoxicating drink is raging.”⁷³⁰ But is it not self-evident that the mockery ascribed to *yayin* is exhibited as the property of the wine in relation to use? As Dr. Lees says, we do not argue “that alcohol is evil in itself. In the barrel and the bottle it is as harmless as a stone, but *in the body and the brain* ‘wine is a mocker,’” &c. The same *yayin* which, *in excess*, is inebriating (Gen. ix. 21), inflaming (Isa. v. 11), overcoming (Isa. xxviii. 1), erring (Isa. xxviii. 7) destroying (Isa. Xxviii. 7), is also, *in moderation*, rejoicing (Zech. x. 7), inspiriting (2 Sam. xvi. 2), reviving (Lam. ii. 12) making merry (Eccl. x. 19). Even Dr. Ritchie himself recognizes the necessity of associating quantity with quality in another case. Thus, while maintaining that the Hebrew *tirosh* is the designation of innocent grapes, and when brought to face to face with the allegation of the prophet, that the said *tirosh* is not merely “a mocker,” but morally depraving – “*yayin* and *tirosh* take away the heart” (Hos. iv. 11) – he is constrained to say, “*Tirosh*, regarded in itself is harmless enjoyment, bears on man’s sentient nature, his physical sensibilities and desires. This last is of itself an innocent medium of pleasurable sensations, but it is liable to abuse, according as it is indulged; and when abused it takes away the heart.”⁷³¹ These innocent grapes with that bad character must have been “grapes of gall” from the “vine of Sodom,” for vine fruit is not usually morally depraving! But more of this anon. Meantime, if *tirosh* is depraving only “when abused,” why should not the mocking of *yayin* be attributed to its abuse also?

That Solomon refers to immoderate indulgences is evident from the nature of the effects which he describes. Dr. Lees says of the first of these, “This word symbolizes the effects of such wine upon

⁷³⁰ Ibid., p. 139

⁷³¹ Sc. Test., p. 10

The Wines of the Bible

the drinker, either in inclining him to mock at serious things, or in the mockery it may (by a figure) be said to make of the good resolutions he forms before partaking of it.” And of the other effect he says, “The statement that ‘strong drink is raging’ teaches that it causes disturbance internally to those who drink it – this is, to the letter, physically true – and, through them, externally to their families and society at large.”⁷³² Dr. Ritchie says, “‘Strong drink is raging:’ the word properly signifies ‘turbulence,’ ‘wild commotion’ of mind or of action.”⁷³³ And the author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* says, “The Hebrew for ‘mock’ implies impertinent and tiresome ‘babbling’ and jeering,’.....while the term for ‘raging’ implies ‘heat of animal appetite,’ such as might arise from over-pampering the body with luxurious diet.”⁷³⁴ The same term, in its verbal form, is used by the prophet in describing the effects of wine upon the king – “he stretched out his hand with *scorners*” (Hos. vii. 5). Now, it is evident, from these definitions of the terms, that when wine makes a man “mock at serious things,” and causes a raging disturbance in himself and “society at large;” or when it creates “turbulence” and “wild commotion” in mind or action, or excites “babbling and jeering,” and the “heat” of an over pampered body, it must have been used in excess, for these are not the effects of moderate use.

Appeal is made in this connection to Eph. v. 18, - “Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess.” Dr. Ritchie asks, “What is the plain meaning of this phrase? Does it simply mean that there is excess in being drunk with wine? This is a manifest truism, and surely none will suppose that an inspired man would give utterance to so needless a sentiment. The phrase in question clearly applies to the wine spoken of, and is designed to give warning of it as

⁷³² Temp. Bib. Com. p. 133

⁷³³ Sc. Test., p. 134

⁷³⁴ Sec. xli.

The Wines of the Bible

tending to excess.”⁷³⁵ If the writer had examined the text before commenting on it, he would probably have discovered more in it than a “manifest truism,” or a “needless sentiment,” or a tendency to excess. By “excess” he evidently understands excessive use, “immoderate indulgences.” But excessive use cannot be in the wine (εν ὧ), for it is the *act* of the drinker, and the *cause* of the state of drunkenness warned against. This being so, the words “wherein is excess” must either apply to the “wine,” or to the being “drunk with wine.” In the former case the test will read, “Be not drunk with wine, in the use or abuse of which is excess.” In the latter case it will read, “Be not drunk with wine, in which drunkenness with wine there is excess.”

Dr. Lees, however, interposes here with the remark, “Unless St. Paul wrote bad Greek, εν ὧ, ‘in which thing,’ must be referred to the οἶνος, ‘wine’”⁷³⁶ Assuming it to be so, what then? Then, says the doctor, “read the text in the fatuous fashion of the day, - “*In drunkenness is excess,*’ (i.e., in excess is excess!) – and what, after all, is there in the truism?” &c.⁷³⁷ We can’t see the joke. Suppose that the state or condition of “drunkenness” is not “excess,” – i.e., excessive use, but the *effect* of such use – is there anything “fatuous” in saying, “In drunkenness, as the effect, there is excessive use as the cause or occasion?” On the other hand, would there not be something really “fatuous” in saying that the act of the drinker, “excessive use” is in the wine, as if the liquor had become drunk by its own immoderate indulgence? But is there no other excess possible or conceivable except this excessive use of wine? If there be, why may not one excess be found in another – i.e., “in excess of excess” May there not

⁷³⁵ Sc. Test., p. 216

⁷³⁶ Works, iii. xlvi

⁷³⁷ Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

indeed be a score of bantling excesses in that one prolific mother excess of the text? So obvious is this that, in defiance of bad Greek, fatuous fashion, and mere truism, the doctor himself finds in that “state of vinous intemperance “the excess (*asotia*), “a state of hopeless, moral disintegration and ruin.”⁷³⁸ Here is a state in a state, excess in excess, and no joke discoverable! Not only so, “the bad Greek” has improved since the former criticism was published, and is now pronounced to be quite good Greek, even although the *ἐν ᾧ* is referred to the drunkenness and not to the wine, for the doctor says, “En ho, ‘in which.’” The subject of this ‘which’ may be the previous word ‘wine,’ or the whole of the preceding clause; that is, may signify ‘in which wine,’ or “in which state of vinous intemperance”⁷³⁹

It is evident, from the nature of the “excess” referred to by the apostle, that this evil is exhibited as the resultant of that drunkenness against which he warns his readers, “Be not drunk with wine, in which is *asotia*.” Dr. Lees interprets it as literally signifying “the absence of salvation – a state of hopeless moral disintegration and ruin.” If we take the world to mean “the absence of salvation,” or unsavableness, the warning of the text will agree substantially with those passages in which it is said the drunkard “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (1 or. vi. 10); for “they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. v. 21). But if we interpret it as signifying “moral disintegration and ruin,” or “utter depravity and dissoluteness”⁷⁴⁰ the text will be in harmony with those other passages in which the term occurs, and is rendered “riot” and “riotous living” (Tit. i. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 4; Luke xv. 13). Conybeare and Howson translate the text,

⁷³⁸ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 352

⁷³⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁴⁰ Lees

The Wines of the Bible

“Be not drunk with wine, like those who live riotously;” and say in a note, “Literally, in doing which is riotous living.” Titman says, “It is not spoken of every kind of wicked impurity of which drunkenness is the fountain, but of ruinous debauchery particularly.” Robinson gives “dissoluteness, debauchery, revelry.” Calvin, “all kinds of impurities and dissipations.” Alford, “dissoluteness, debauchery, profligacy.” Eadie gives “profligacy,” and says, “The adjective *asotos* is used by the Classics to signify one who is, as we say, ‘past redemption,’” Bloomfield says “The apostle, however, may have intended a paronomasia on the etymology of the word, and meant to represent *asotia* as the state of a person whom (to use a classical saying, which I remember to have read in Athenaeus), ‘even the goddess of salvation herself could not save’..... The apostle means to admonish them not to imitate the revels of the heathens, nor seek exhilaration from intemperate drinking (which would lead to the ruin of both soul and body); but rather to endeavor to be filled with the Spirit, and seek for the abundantly satisfying consolations of his holy influences.” Hammond understands the apostle to refer to the intemperance and impurities practiced by the heathen in their Bacchanalian orgies. Thus the text is warning against drunkenness, as being evil in itself, and the fountain of other evils, and proceeding from immoderate indulgence in wine.

In this case, as in that of the prophet, the evil is not found *in the wine*, but in the drinker, and only in such as have drunk until they were drunken. From excessive drinking of fermented wine, drunkenness inevitably proceeds; and from drunkenness, as a general rule, *asotia*, mockery, and violence issue. Hence, the warnings of both prophet and apostle: “Wine is a mocker;” “Be not drunk with wine.”

Further confirmation of the reference to excess in the former passage is furnished in the appended words, “and whoever is

The Wines of the Bible

deceived thereby is not wise.” The deception here ascribed to *yayin* is a moral, not physical effect. Dr. Lees interprets the word as signifying to *wander* or *go astray*; and we find the same term applied to the drunkards of Ephraim, who are said to “have *erred* through wine, and through strong drink” to have “gone out of the way” (Isa. Xxviii. 7). Moreover, the deceitfulness thus ascribed to immoderate indulgences in *yayin* is similarly applied to a variety of other things. Thus, the tongue which, rightly used, is the “glory of man,” may, by improper use, become an organ of “deceit” (Ps. 1.19). Self-respect is a proper feeling to cultivate, but it may degenerate into inordinate self-conceit, and become a deceiver (Jer. xlix. 16). Dainties are lawful and enjoyable, but they are “deceitful meats” (Prov. xxlii. 3). The kisses of a friend are desirable, but “the kisses of an enemy are deceitful” (Prov. xxvii. 6). Beauty and grace in a woman are delightful charms, but “favour is deceitful, and beauty vain.” (Prov. xxxi. 30). The sweetly murmuring rivulet is a pleasant little stream, but Job complained that his friends had “dealt deceitfully” with him “as a brook” (Job vi. 15). “Money answereth all things,” and is a lawful possession, but Christ warned His disciples against “the deceitfulness or riches” (Matt. Xiii. 22).

Old Francis Quarles, not more quaintly than truly, says: -

*“A world of dangers, and a world of snares.
The close pursuer’s busy hands to plant.
Snares in thy substance; snares attend thy want;
Snares in thy credit; snares in thy disgrace;
Snares in thy high estate; snares in thy base;
Snares tuck by bed; and snares surround thy board;
Snares watch thy thoughts; and snares attack thy word;
Snares in thy quiet; snares in thy commotion;
Snares in thy diet; snares in thy devotion;
Snares lurk in thy resolve; snares in thy doubt;
Snares lie within thy heart, and snares without;*

The Wines of the Bible

*Snares are above thy head, and snares beneath
Snares in thy sickness; snares in thy death.” –*

(Emblems, iii. 9)

Yayin, then, is a generic term for all sorts of wine that deceive and ensnare the intemperate drinker, - i.e., it is a generic term for fermented wines.

H. Yayin, when it is Red.

It is argued that the description and warning given by Solomon, in another passage, of an intoxicating *yayin*, implies the existence and lawful use of an innocent and unfermented wine. The sacred writer says, “Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his colour in the cup, when it moveth itself upright,” (Prov. xxiii. 31). Now, it is evident that the language employed here is in contrast with that of the text noticed above. In the former case reference is made to certain properties which distinguish all sorts of *yayin*; while, in the present case the reference is to the characteristics of one particular species of the *yayin*. Solomon, in the one passage, says “*Yayin* is a mocker,” for this is the property of all kinds of *yayin*; but in the other, he does not say, “*Yayin* is read,” &c., for that is not the characteristic of every species. There is no *yayin* which is not “a mocker,” but there is some *yayin* which is not “red,” &c. Accordingly the *yayin* of the one text is obviously generic, including every species; while the *yayin* of the other is as certainly specific. The use which is made of the text by some advocates of the unfermented theory would lead to the inference, (a) That *yayin* is a generic term for both fermented and unfermented wines. (b) That Solomon prohibits the use of that kind of *yayin* which exhibits the particular features he has

The Wines of the Bible

described. (c) And that these characteristics clearly designate a species of simple fermented and alcoholic *yayin*. Are these things so? We shall see.

1. The whole paragraph from which the words quoted above are taken is manifestly a portraiture of, and warning against, two evils – viz., *intemperate indulgence*, and the use of *drugged liquor*. Accordingly, it opens with the variously repeated question, “Who hath woe?” And the answer given is “They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine.” Dr. Lees says, “to whom to what men – to what class of men – belong this cry of lament, this load of sorrow, this train of strife, this brawling din, these needless wounds, these eyes encircled with livid marks? And the answer at hand (v. 30), ‘These are the men, those who are sitting long and late over the wine; those who are hurrying to and fro to seek wine mixed with drugs to make it more pungent to the palate, and more burning to the brain.’ To such slaves of drink the royal preacher points his hearers,” &c.⁷⁴¹ Thus, these writers being witnesses, the text refers exclusively to two associated evils, excessive indulgences, on the one hand, and the use of drugged liquor on the other. And yet, in the very face of that acknowledgment, Dr. Lees avers, - “The plea that Solomon here warns against drunkenness only, or the excessive use of intoxicating drunkenness only, or the excessive use of intoxicating drink, is contrary to the terms and spirit of the passage. Drinking, in the senses of intoxication, is not necessarily implied at all; and it is not intoxication, but wine, that is described in ver. 31; nor can intoxication be said to bite *at the last*. It is manifestly the design of the wise man to point out the PHYSICAL CAUSE of all the misery and mischief he portrays.”⁷⁴² It may be admitted that Solomon

⁷⁴¹ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 138

⁷⁴² Temp. Bib. Com. p. 139

The Wines of the Bible

does not warn “against drunkenness only,” for we have shown from the very terms of the passage, and in his both the doctors agree with us, that the warning is directed against drunkenness, *and* the use of drugged liquor. Consequently it is the manifest design of the wise man to point out, not merely one “physical cause,” but two associated causes of the mischief he has described, viz. excessive indulgence – *tarrying long at the wine*, - and the use of drugged liquor – *hurrying to seek mixed wine*. It is difficult, in view of these facts, to understand how Dr. Lees can allege that “drinking, in the sense of intoxication, is not necessarily implied at all.” If intoxication is not implied either in tarrying long at the wine, or in hurrying to seek mixed wine, then “who hath woe,” and sorrow, and all the other associated sufferings? If it be not the intemperate, it must be either the moderate drinker, or the drinker of alleged unfermented wine; for we know of no other drinkers to whom the language can apply. But Dr. Ritchie says it is the “*intemperate*,” the man who “bleeds from the falls of *inebriety*,” and even Dr. Lees himself says, it is “to such *slaves of drink* the royal preacher points his hearers.” Dr. Lees denies that intoxication can be said “to bite at the last.” By why not, if the “last” refers to the *end of the debauch*, and the “bite” to the *effects of intemperance*, as exhibited in woes and sorrows, “after a night of excess?”

2. The species of drink against which Solomon warns his hearers is not as frequently and falsely alleged, simple fermented wine, but, as expressly intimated by the sacred writer himself, “mixed wine.” What, then, was the nature of the wine so called? Dr. Ritchie says, “It was customary for the ancients to mix their wine with *myrrh*, *mandragora*, *opiates*, and other strong drugs, to create or increase its intoxicating quality.” He describes this practice a “a mixing of the liquor with drugs, to form a strong drink that was raging, and of which God declares, at the last ‘it

The Wines of the Bible

biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder.” He says, this “mixed wine, in Prov. xxiii. 30, is undoubtedly the same, or so little different as to be undistinguishable.” And he says, “We turn again to Prov. xxiii. 30, and find this ‘mixed wine’ at which they tarry long ‘have sorrow and wounds without cause.’”⁷⁴³ Dr. Lees describes it as “wine mixed with drugs, to make it more pungent to the palate, and more burning to the brain.”⁷⁴⁴ He also says, “It so happens that, in this country, where brandied wines are sufficiently potent for almost any appetite, people are not accustomed to drink drugged or mixed wines. Even the old practice of mixing water with it has died out. Thus, no appetite preventing, commentators of every sect have agreed as to the nature of ‘mixed wines.’ It was wine made strong, they say, by the admixture of stimulating spices and narcotics, such as opium, myrrh. Mandragora, &c. It was probably a modified form of that mixture referred to under the symbol of the ‘cup of fury’ – which moved men even to madness when drank in its most concentrated state.”⁷⁴⁵ Dr. Nott, in like manner says, “It is hot mixed wine, the wine that giveth it colour in the cup, that sparkles like the serpents eye, and stingeth like the adder’s fang – it is the poisoned *mesech*, the mixed *shechar*.”⁷⁴⁶ The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* also testifies, “the redness of the mixture would arise from the ingredients mingled. The word *geynow* signifies its ‘eye, bell, or bubble,’ such as appears on fixed air disengaging itself from liquor. A second reference to the colour does not seem necessary. If two motions be intended, the first might arise from the act of mingling the ingredients, the second from the natural process of combination. The two first clauses may be treated as incipient

⁷⁴³ Sc. Test., pp. 169, 170

⁷⁴⁴ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 138

⁷⁴⁵ Works, ii., pp. 29, 30

⁷⁴⁶ Lectures, p. 11

The Wines of the Bible

stages of the mixture, the third its completion when the cup was in full ferment. The full force of the verse might be given thus, - 'Look not upon the wine when it is reddening, when it is darting its eye in the cup, when it is moving itself upright' – unaided by the hand of the mingler."⁷⁴⁷

Thus, then, all these writers, the chief advocates of the unfermented theory, agree in testifying that the wine forbidden by Solomon in this oft-repeated text was not a simple fermented or alcoholic beverage, but a poisonous *mixture*, a *drugged* liquor. Some of them may, and do, allege that fermented wine is as bad as mixed wine, and that alcohol is as pernicious, if not more so, than any kind of drug which might be introduced into the liquor. But with that opinion we have no concern here. Our only object is to discover the nature of the wines of the Bible; and, the above writers being witnesses, the wine described by Solomon in the passage under consideration is a mixed or drugged liquor.

3. The sacred writers, as if desirous of guarding against any misapprehension of his meaning, not only expressly describes the forbidden liquor of which he is speaking as a "mixed wine," but he also adds to this a particular specification of some of its most noticeable characteristics. Accordingly, he says, "Look not thou upon *the wine when it is red*, when it *giveth its colour* in the cup, when it *moveth itself aright*." This was the "mixed wine," which the "slaves of drink" eagerly sought after, and at which they tarried long and late; and these, therefore, are the phenomena of a drugged liquor. We may not, indeed, be able at this distant period of time, and without fuller information, to determine with anything approaching to certainty, the precise nature of the mixture, or the specific causes of all the peculiar features of the forbidden wine; but there can hardly be any room for hesitancy or

⁷⁴⁷ Sec. xxxvii.

The Wines of the Bible

doubt that it is a *drugged* liquor, the coveted beverage of “slaves of drink.”

4. “When it is red.” – This description must be intended to exhibit either the natural or the *artificial* colour of the forbidden wine. But the former cannot be intended, for the mere redness of the liquor is not distinctive either of fermented or unfermented *yayin*, seeing that there are white as well as red wines. Coleman, speaking of the wines of Palestine, says, “The colour of the wine was not considered essential, but the red wines were generally preferred to the white.”⁷⁴⁸ Dr. Lees, referring to the alleged unfermented wine used at the Passover and the Lord’s Supper, says, “The wine was often made of that species of grape which the juice was red; though boiling would extract the colouring matter of the husk of the common grape.”⁷⁴⁹ And again, “Perhaps the claret grape, which has red juice, suggested the metaphor, ‘He washed his garments in *yayin*, his clothes in the blood of grapes.’”⁷⁵⁰

Thus, then, as fermented wine may be white as well as red, and as unfermented and boiled grape juice may be *red* as well as *white*, the warning prohibition, “Look not thou upon the *yayin* when it is *red*,” cannot be intended to describe the natural colour of the forbidden wine; otherwise it would only apply to the fermented *red* wines, and not to the *white*; and it would prohibit the use of unfermented *red* wine, but not *white*, whether boiled or unboiled. This being so, we must conclude that Solomon refers not to the natural, but to the artificial colour of the liquor. And this conclusion is confirmed by the fact that the word which he employs for this purpose is commonly used to designate the artificial red or purple dye. Thus it is employed for “rams’ skins

⁷⁴⁸ Antiq., xvi. 9

⁷⁴⁹ Works, ii. P. 171

⁷⁵⁰ Temp. Bib. Com. p. xxii.

The Wines of the Bible

dyed *red*" (Exod. xxv. 5; xxvi. 14; xxxv. 7; xxxvi. 19; xxxix. 34); "*red* skins of rams" (Exod. xxxv. 23); "*shields made red*" (Nah. ii. 3); sins "*red like crimson*" (Isa. i. 18). Beckman informs us that *tola*, the term employed by the Syrian translator of this last text, was the ancient Phoenician name for the scarlet or *kermes* dye; that it signifies always red *dye*; and that this artificial colour was known in the East in the earliest ages, before Moses, and was a discovery of the Phoenicians in Palestine.⁷⁵¹ In modern as well as ancient times, "the colour of wine is frequently artificial: a *deep red* is almost always the effect of artificial additions."⁷⁵² And Harmer says, "*Red* wine, in particular, is more esteemed in the East than white. And we are told, in the *Travels* of Olearius, that it is customary with the Armenian Christians in Persia to put Brazil-wood or saffron into their wine, to give it a higher colour, when the wine is not so red as they like, they making no account of white wine. He mentions the same thing also in another place. These accounts of their putting Brazil-wood or saffron into their wines, to give them a deeper red, seem to discover an energy in the Hebrew word *adam*, which is used Prov. xxiii. 31, that I never remarked anywhere. It is of the conjugation called Hithpahel, *yithaddam*, which, according to grammarians, denotes an action that turns upon the agent itself: it is not always, it may be, accurately observed; but in this case it should seem that it ought to be taken according to the strictness of grammar, and that it intimates the win's making itself redder by something put into it: 'Look not on the wine when it maketh itself red.'"⁷⁵³

Further confirmation of the artificial colour of the forbidden wine is furnished by Psalm lxxv. 8, where the *red* wine is exhibited as a species of drugged *khemer* (the Hebrew form of the Chaldee

⁷⁵¹ Hist. Invents. ii

⁷⁵² Ency. Brit.

⁷⁵³ Obs. ii. 142

The Wines of the Bible

Khamar, and the “equivalent of the Hebrew *yayin*”), and is expressly said to be a cup “full of mixture.” Dr. Lees says of this passage, “‘And the wine foams’ from the presence of some fermenting agent and potent drugs.”⁷⁵⁴ And in another place he explains that the Hebrew *khemer*, used by the Psalmist in this text, “‘had merged into a new and pregnant significance, from the practice of adding to the juice of the grape an artificial form and depth of colour, the outward sign of qualities ‘holding fierce enmity with the blood of man,’ yet capable of exercising a fatal witchery over his nervous system.’”⁷⁵⁵ The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin*, as we have seen, also attributes the redness of the forbidden wine to the presence of some drug, saying, “The redness of the mixture would arise from the ingredients mingled.”⁷⁵⁶ From all these varied considerations, we may unhesitatingly conclude that *the red wine* forbidden in the text was a cup “full of mixture,” a drugged liquor.

5. “When it giveth his colour in the cup.” – This is the second distinguishing mark or “outward sign” of the forbidden wine. The reference is somewhat obscure. If the present translation is retained, the allusion may be to the artificial substance introduced into the wine, the presence of which is indicated by the colouring matter adhering to the wine-cup, and thereby evidencing the drugged character of the liquor. Dr. Lees, however, proposes to amend the translation by rendering the clause, “when it gives in the vessel its eye,” and says, “By its ‘eye’ is meant the bubble or sparkling point, which modern science has traced to the passing off of the carbonic acid gas generated by fermentation.” Viewed in this light the description is simply identical with that which follows.

⁷⁵⁴ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 122

⁷⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 214

⁷⁵⁶ Sec.. xxxvii.

The Wines of the Bible

6. “When it moveth itself upright.” – This is the third distinguishing mark of the forbidden wine. Dr. Lees amends the translation here also, and renders the clause, “When it moves in straight lines,” and says, as before, “the gas ascending is another indication of fermentation.” He thus identifies these two outward signs as distinctive characteristics of fermenting wine. But (a) All the four advocates of the unfermented theory, including himself, have unitedly testified that the wine described by Solomon is a “mixed wine,” and that the features exhibited by the liquor are due to the presence of some kind of drugs; so that, on their own showing, it is not a merely *fermenting* wine, but a drugged liquor. (b) If the reference had been to a fermenting wine, these features could only have been exhibited during the process of fermentation in the vat, and not “in the cup;” and, in that case, the warning prohibition would have to be limited to “vat wine.” (c) Dr. Lees defines *yayin* as signifying “the fresh expressed and foaming blood of the grape,” and *khemer* as “froth or foam, which is applied equally to the froth of the sea, to boiling bitumen, and to red fluids.”⁷⁵⁷ Here, then, are all the three marks given by Solomon, not in fermenting wine, but in unfermented juices. The colour in the “red fluids,” including the “blood of the grape;” the “eye,” and the movement “in straight line” – i.e., the ascending of the escaping air bubbles, in the “*foaming* blood of the grape,” and the *frothing* or *foaming khemer*. So that, upon his own showing, these marks cannot have been intended to describe the outside signs of fermenting wine, seeing that they are all equally characteristic of unfermented grape juice. (d) The agitation “in the cup” must have been uncommonly significant and demonstrative, when it is pointed to by the sacred writer as a distinguishing feature of the forbidden wine; for the same agitation, but

⁷⁵⁷ Temp. Bib. Com. p. xxi

The Wines of the Bible

probably of a less marked character, must have been exhibited by the *pouring into the cup* of any or every fluid, whether fermented or not.

Taking all these facts into consideration, and associating them with the reference to “mixed wine,” we are shut up to the conclusion that the artificial colour of the liquor, with its accompanying characteristics of sparkling eye and motion in the cup, are exhibited as the peculiar effects produced by the introduction of some foreign ingredients into the wine, whereby it was converted into a cup “full of mixture,” like that of the Psalmist, and thus a drugged liquor. So that here again is no evidence that *yayin* is a generic term for both fermented and unfermented wines.

If *yayin* be a generic term for fermented wines only, as we have endeavoured to show, it will follow that all the sorts or species, however named, were fermented liquors. But if the evidence already adduced is deemed insufficient to establish our main position, an examination of all the other Hebrew terms for wine will show that they are designations of fermented wine, and thereby confirm the conclusion at which we have arrived.

2. Khemer and Khamar

The radical forms of these words show that, if not identical, they are, at least, very intimately related to each other. They occur in eight different passages, and are employed, the former by Moses and Isaiah, and the latter by Ezra and Daniel. Dr. Lees says, “*Khamar* is the Chaldee equivalent of the Hebrew *yayin*,” in which he is followed by Professor Douglas and Dr. Ritchie. In that case *khamar* must be a generic term for all sorts of Chaldee wines. But if this be so, what are the specific terms? None is given, and,

The Wines of the Bible

therefore, we must suppose either that our information is insufficient, or the Chaldeans only manufactured one description of wine, which they designated by this common term. If, however, *khamar* be, as alleged, the “equivalent” of a Hebrew word, it seems more natural to regard it as the “Chaldee equivalent” of the Hebrew *khemer*, from which it is derived, according to Dr. Lees, than of the Hebrew *yayin*, with which it has no apparent connection. It appears to us that *khemer* is merely the Hebrew form of the Chaldee *khamar*, and that both are common designations of a foreign wine, which had obtained some repute for its excellence among the Jews. However this may be, the question which specially concerns us at present is as to the nature of the wine thus designated.

Dr. Lees defines *khemer* as signifying “foaming or turbid, or, as we say in English, ‘yesty,’ barmy, scummy.”⁷⁵⁸ It is “connected with the very *khamar*, ‘to foam, boil up, froth, ferment’ (the latter term signifying no more originally than the former).” And “is used in reference to waters and to the waves, as well as to leaven, wine, “ &c.⁷⁵⁹ It denotes “fresh or ‘foaming’ wine in its first sense.”⁷⁶⁰ Now these definitions of a term employed to designate a vinous liquor, prepared and preserved for use, and actually drank as a festive beverage, are strongly indicative of the fermented character of the wine. *Khemer*, as used in Scripture, is not the designation of a mere grape juice, but of that grape juice in a particular condition; not of grape juice *frothing* in the vat, but of grape juicing *foaming* in the wine cup of the drinker. Accordingly, Gesenius, in his Lexicon, says, the wine is “so called as being fermented.” Alexander also says, “*Khemer* strictly denotes fermentation, then fermented liquor, and is used as a

⁷⁵⁸ Temp. Bib. Com. p. xxiv.

⁷⁵⁹ Works, ii. 145

⁷⁶⁰ Text Book, p. 128

The Wines of the Bible

poetical equivalent to *yayin*.”⁷⁶¹ The Hebrew and Chaldee forms of the word have a close family relation to the Syriac and Arabic terms for wine, and have as their common root *hamr*, which signifies to ferment. Thus the missionaries, Shedd and Labaree, say, “The Syriac word for wine, by its very etymology, signifies fermented;” and “the very nature of wine, a word from the root *hamr*, to ferment, means fermented.” Even, Dr. Lees admits this signification, but alleges that the term *ferment* originally signified no more than to froth or foam. This may be true, and therefore we speak of foaming milk, frothing juice, foaming waters, and the like; but when the same term is used to describe the character of a wine in the cask, or in the cup, we naturally infer that the foaming liquor there is a fermented beverage.

Moses uses the term in Deuter. Xxxii. 14, rendered in our translation, “Thou didst drink the *pure* blood of the grape,” the translators probably meaning that the wine was drank “pure” – i.e., unmixed or undiluted. Dr. Lees, however, translates the passage, “And the blood of the grape cluster thou shalt drink *khemer* (foaming);” and says, “*Khamer* in this passage describes the foaming appearance of the juice as it rushes before fermentation from the trodden clusters.”⁷⁶² But this is a mere assumption, for which the text furnishes no justification. The “blood of the grape” may, indeed, have been a *foaming* liquor, and yet none the less a fermented wine. Modern writers speak of a foaming tankard of ale is a fermented liquor. Ancient authors abound in references to “sprightly juice,” “mantling cups,” cups “crowned with rosy wine,” &c. Athenaeus has numerous references, such as, he filled one cup “with dark ambrosial drops of foaming wine,” and “with the blood Bacchus mingled fresh

⁷⁶¹ Com. Isa. xxvii. 2

⁷⁶² Temp. Bib. Com. p.. 61

The Wines of the Bible

tears;" "others drain with eager lips the cup full of juice of ancient wine, o'er shadowed with sparkling *foam*;" "to each a portion of the feast he bore, and held the golden goblet *foaming* o're;" "he drank a Thereclean cup of unmixed wine, right full, and *foaming* o're the brim;" "he raise aloft a mighty cup *brimful* of wine," &c., &c.

The above interpretation of *khamer*, as foaming juice "before fermentation," implies that this was to be one of the special blessings of the promised land, and that it would be the drink of the people after they had taken possession of the country. But (a) we have no Biblical evidence that the Jews ever drank the foaming juice, "as it rushes before fermentation from the trodden clusters;" and (b) we are informed by Pliny that foaming juice of that kind was regarded by the ancients as an injurious rather than as a desirable beverage, for he says, "Every kind of must is unwholesome to the stomach."⁷⁶³

The phrase, "blood of the grape," as we have shown elsewhere, is, like its kindred expression, "fruit of the vine," a mere periphrase for *wine*, and by itself determines nothing as to the nature of the wine so designated. The addition of the term *khemer* is certainly intended to qualify the preceding phrase, and thus describe the kind or quality of the wine, referred to. It is either a foreign wine, made in Chaldea, and of good repute, or it was a native wine, possessing the same distinctive character as the Babylonian *khamar*, and designated by the Hebrews *khemer*.

The only other text in which the Hebrew term occurs is Isaiah xxvii. 2, - "A vineyard of *red* wine:" but as there is some uncertainty as to the true reading of the passage, some MSS. Giving *khemed* instead of *khemer*, the text may be omitted as indeterminate.

⁷⁶³ Book xxiii. 1

The Wines of the Bible

The Chaldee form of the word *khamar* is employed on two occasions by Ezra (vi. 9; vii, 22), but without any reference to the nature of the wine. It is, however, used by Daniel in four passages (Dan. v. 1, 2, 4, 23), in each of which it is employed to designate the description of wine consumed by the guests at the great feast which Belshazzar made for his lords and ladies, and which the gay company drank on that night of revelry when the city was taken, and the King of the Chaldeans was slain. Thus, in the only texts in which the character of the wine is particularly and unmistakably indicated *khamar*, and by consequence *khemer*, are manifestly shown to have designated, (a) A highly valuable wine, inasmuch as it is the subject of special promise, "thou shalt drink *khemer*;" and is exhibited as a royal wine, the beverage selected for a king's table. (b) A fermented and intoxicating liquor as appears from its effects on the Chaldean revelers. (c) And as *khamar* is given as "the Chaldee equivalent of the Hebrew *yayin*," both terms must be regarded as designations of a fermented liquor. So that here again is no evidence of the unfermented theory.

3. *Khometz*

This word occurs five times in Scripture as the designation of a liquor, and is uniformly rendered "vinegar" in our English translation. The verb is used in eight passages, in three of which it is employed metaphorically of (1) a *cruel* man; (2) *dyed* garments; (3) a *grievous* heart; and in the other five texts it is used of *leavened* bread. &c. The noun *khametz* occurs in eleven passages, in each of which it is applied to leaven; and thus *khometz*, as a designation of wine, is clearly descriptive of a leavened or fermented drink. On examining its Biblical usage, we find it employed to designate "vinegar" of *yayin*, and "vinegar" of

The Wines of the Bible

shechar, forbidden to the Nazarite under his vow; the “vinegar” drink used by Boaz and his reapers; the “vinegar” given to and received by the Messiah, according to prophecy; and in the illustrative references, “vinegar to the teeth,” and “vinegar upon nitre.” It is to be observed, however, that the “vinegar” of these texts is merely a thin sour wine, or a rich wine “gone sour,” such as that alluded to by Plutarch when he speaks of one “who has sour wine which he can sell neither for vinegar nor wine.”⁷⁶⁴ This acidulous drink was used as a beverage, especially in the hot season, by the poorer classes of the people – soldiers, slaves, and labourers. Hence, the indignity to which Christ was subjected in being served with the drink of a slave, instead of the royal wine of a king.

Curiously enough, Dr. Ritchie takes no notice of this liquor, and does not even give it a place among the wines of the Bible. How is this? Was he really ignorant of its nature or existence as an ancient wine? Or, knowing it to be a lawful, although fermented drink, did he deliberately ignore it as antagonistic to his unfermented theory, and inconsistent with his repudiation and reprobation of all fermented liquors? The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* designates *khometz*, “soured drink,” as contrasted with “the sweet;”⁷⁶⁵ says, the term “was for the most part applied to a beverage – a thin, acidulated drink,” and “it is noticed as the drink of the reapers of Boaz in the harvest field, and probably resembled the *posca* commonly used by the Roman soldiery.”⁷⁶⁶ Dr. Lees also describes it as “fermented drink, probably sour wine (*vin-aigre* = vinegar), similar to the *posca* served out to the Roman legionaries.”⁷⁶⁷ Referring to the Nazaritic prohibition of *khometz*;

⁷⁶⁴ Contra Stoics.

⁷⁶⁵ Sec. xlii

⁷⁶⁶ Sec. iv.

⁷⁶⁷ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 77

The Wines of the Bible

he renders the passage, - "Fermented liquor of wine, and fermented liquor of *shaker* he shall not drink."⁷⁶⁸ He quotes Dr. A. Clarke as saying, - "*Khometz* signifies fermented wine, and is probably used here to signify wine of a strong body, or any highly intoxicating liquor."⁷⁶⁹ According to this novel interpretation, the "soured drink" was not a "thin, acidulated drink," resembling the Roman *posca*; and the beverage which Boaz gave to his reapers, and with which Christ assuaged his thirst on the cross, was not a poor thin wine, but "wine of a strong body, or any highly intoxicating liquor!" We know not where this ingenious commentator obtained the "strong body" for the poor thin *khometz*, unless he had been drawing upon his imagination; for there is neither direct reference, nor remote allusion, in the Biblical usage of the term, to any such fancies. It is true, the verb is employed to designate a "cruel man.," "dyed garments," and a "grievous heart;" but it is evident from the reference to a dye, and the further use of the verb and its descriptive noun to describe leaven and leavened bread, that the underlying thought in the metaphors is neither that of fierceness nor strength, but rather a severe, tart, or soured spirit.

Dr. Lees says, - "As the ancients did not scientifically distinguish between the alcoholic actions fermentations, the generic word signifying 'fermented' was used to describe both."⁷⁷⁰ But in this the writer is mistaken. *Khometz* is never employed to designate any description of liquor but one – sour wine; and, although the ancients may not have "scientifically" distinguished between the two fermentations, or have known anything of alcohol, as such, we have shown in another section that they did make a distinction between the two processes, and that this distinction

⁷⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 41

⁷⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 42

⁷⁷⁰ Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

was as clearly apprehended and stated by them as by the moderns. Thus, Pliny expressly distinguishes between the first and the proper fermentation of grape juice, and the second “spontaneous fermentation” of the previously fermented wine. Nor does the doctor himself carefully “distinguish between the alcoholic and acetous fermentations,” when in his definition of *khometz*, he says, - “It was no doubt chiefly applied to the *thin* sour drink made from the last pressure of the grapes, with water added, and was, like the Roman *posca*, something halfway between ginger-beer and French *vin-ordinair*.” But why “chiefly applied” to this drink? The only information we possess shows that, when employed in Scripture as a designation of wine, it is uniformly and exclusively thus employed. And what means this “halfway” likeness? If we understand the reference, it very distinctly implies that there was some spirit in the “thin, sour drink;” and, if so, it could not have been a mere vinegar, but most have been a *bona fide* fermented and spirituous wine. We suspect that the writer’s “halfway” house, like his unfermented theory, is only a castle in the air. We may imagine fifty things, ranging from the “something halfway between ginger-beer and French vin-ordinaire” of Dr. Lees, up to the “wine of strong body, or an highly intoxicating liquor” of Dr. Clarke; but we really know, and can know, nothing of its precise alcoholic strength, or even of its nature, beyond the admitted fact that it was a sour wine, ordinarily used by labourers in the harvest field, and others of the poorer classes of the people. Its identification by the evangelists with the *oxos oinos* given by the soldiers to Christ on the cross, leads to the conclusion that it was one of the labourers’ wines, designated by Pliny and other writers as *vinum operarium*, and of which the Roman *posca* was a species. And, as these were comparatively thin, weak liquors, although none the less really fermented and alcoholic, the Hebrew *khometz* may have been a

The Wines of the Bible

wine like the French vin-ordinaire, without any nearer approach to the ginger beer. However this may be, it was confessedly a “fermented drink,” and as such gives no countenance to the unfermented theory.

4. Mesech

This word occurs only once in Scripture in this particular form, and is rendered “mixture.” “In the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red; it is full of *mixture*” (Ps. Lxxv. 8). Dr. Lees intimates that this “mixture” consisted of “some fermenting agent and potent drugs;” and, in that case, it is simply a drugged, fermented liquor, a stupefying potion, the symbol of divine judgments. In its verbal form, the word occurs in five different passages. Thus, “I have *mingled* my drink with weeping” (Ps. cii. 9). “She hath *mingled* her wine” (Prov. ix. 2). “Drink of the wine which I have *mingled*” (Prov. ix. 5). “The Lord hath *mingled* a perverse spirit in the midst thereof” (Isa. xix. 14). “Men of strength to *mingle* strong drink” (Isa. v. 22). A kindred word, *mimasch*, occurs in two passages, “they that go to seek *mixed* wine” (Prov. xxiii. 30); “the *drink offering*” (Isa. Lxv. 11).

It is evident from these references that, in those passages where *mesech* and its kindred terms occur in connection with wine, they designate not a distinct species, but merely a wine, whether *yayin* or *shechar*, diluted with water, or to which some foreign ingredient has been added, whether fragrant spices – a promise enjoyment, or noxious drugs – a forbidden indulgence. We have no definite information as to the quality of the *yayin* or *shechar* thus treated, but we have abundant evidence of the practice referred to. Bishop Lowth says, “It is remarkable that whereas the Greeks and Latins by mixed wine always understood wine diluted

The Wines of the Bible

or lowered with water, the Hebrews, on the contrary, generally mean by it wine made stronger and more inebriating by the addition of higher and more powerful ingredients, such as honey spices, *defrutum* (or wine inspissated by boiling it down to two-thirds or one-half of the quantity) *myrrh*, *mandragora*, *opiates*, and other strong drugs.”⁷⁷¹ The bishop is not quite accurate in his statement. The Greeks and Latins generally, but not “always,” understood by mixed wine a diluted liquor, for he furnishes evidence to the contrary in his reference to the mixed wine prepared by Helen “for her guests oppressed with grief.” The Hebrews, as we have seen, understood by the term, wine made weaker with water, or more fragrant with spices, as well as wine made stronger by other ingredients. Moreover, honey and *defrutum* were employed to sweeten or modify the harshness of the wine, as well as to make it more inebriating. Spices and myrrh were used to flavour the wine, although the latter was something employed, in large quantity, to make a highly narcotic liquor; and drugs were added to the wine to hasten and intensify its exhilarating and inebriating effects.

The Rev. B. Parsons says, “Hence we learn that the strong wines of the ancients were mixed or drugged to render them inebriating, and to those mixtures, rather than to alcohol, they owed their intoxicating power.” Of course, we don’t “learn” anything of the sort, except from the statement of the writer himself, and others who have repeated the unproved assertion. The only description of wine known to, or used by, the ancients as a beverage was a fermented and alcoholic liquor, as we have in part shown elsewhere; and although “opiate and other strong drugs” were undoubtedly employed, these were used, not to make the wine “inebriating,” but to quicken and intensify its

⁷⁷¹ Com. Isa. i. 22

The Wines of the Bible

inebriating power; and these mixtures were resorted to, not by the sober wine drinkers, but by those confirmed toppers who are described as “men of strength to mingle strong drink.”

The writer proceeds to say, “We learn from Homer, Columella, Pliny, and others, that the ingredients used were very various, and sometimes very potent;” and, after quoting a long catalogue of such “potent drugs,” he says, “Numerous as are the ingredients just mentioned, I believe that they might be doubled from the writings of Pliny alone.”⁷⁷² The gentleman must either have an extraordinary power of *belief*, or he must have been seeing more than double, when he thus wrote; for he has evidently confounded the *medicated* wines use by the ancients as medicinal preparations, with the obnoxious *drugged* wines used by toppers as beverages. In so doing, he has committed the same mistake as if he classed among the favourite drinks of modern toppers such *drugged* liquors as the wine and barks, *quinine* wine, *pepsine* wine, *ipecacuaha* wine, *antimonial* wine, and other medicated wines of the apothecary, which, though used by invalids as stomachics, and other medicinal purposes, are not exactly the sort of liquors patronized by wine-bibbers as their beverages. The ancient practice of using “poisonous mixtures to promote drinking”⁷⁷³ is detestable enough in itself, without having recourse to such unjustifiable exaggerations, which only tend to awaken suspicion of the trustworthiness of the exaggerator.

The practice of adulterating wines with different substances, and for different purposes, appears to have already become an art in the time of Pliny, and to have been resorted to at all stages of their manufacture. Accordingly, he cautions his readers that “the most wholesome wine of all is that to which no ingredient

⁷⁷² Anti-Bacchus, p. 78

⁷⁷³ Pliny

The Wines of the Bible

has been added when in a state of must; indeed, it is still better if the vessels even in which it is kept have never been pitched. As to wines which have been treated with gypsum, marble, or lime, where is the man, however robust he may be, that has not stood in dread of them?.....New wines seasoned with resin are good for no one, being productive of vertigo and headache.”⁷⁷⁴ “Even the rich never drink it in an unsophisticated state; the morals of the age being such, that it is the name only of a vintage that is sold, the wines being adulterated the very moment they enter the vat.”⁷⁷⁵ “The growers of that country (Gallia Narboneusis), have absolutely established manufactories for the purposes of adulteration, where they give a dark hue to their wines by the agency of smoke; I only wish that I could say, too, that they do not employ various herbs and noxious drugs for the same purpose; indeed, these dealers are even known to use aloes for the purpose of heightening the flavour and improving the colour of their wines.”⁷⁷⁶ “For the purpose of colouring wine we also add certain substances as a pigment, and these have a tendency to give it a body as well. By such poisonous sophistications is this beverage compelled to suit our tastes, and then we are surprised that it is injurious in its effects.”⁷⁷⁷

It is observable that the “poisonous sophistications” described and denounced by the writer were resorted to, not for the purpose of making the wines inebriating, or even with the object of increasing their potency, and chiefly for heightening their colour; and the means employed for this latter purpose were the “agency of smoke,” the use of “various herds and noxious drugs,” and the employment for this latter purpose were the “agency of

⁷⁷⁴ Book xxiii.

⁷⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁷⁶ Book xiv.

⁷⁷⁷ Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

smoke,” the use of “various herds and noxious drugs,” and the employment of “certain substances as a pigment.” These facts confirm and give special significance to Solomon’s warning, - “Look not thou upon the wine when it is red; when it giveth his colour in the cup.” &c.

Homer describes some of the “mixed wines” of the ancients, which may be regarded as truly drugged liquors. Thus, he tells us that Circe, who was “skilled in many drugs,” when entertaining Ulysses and his companions, mingled grievous drugs in their wine, “that they might altogether forget their paternal land;” and the wine thus mingled was Pramnian, and the drug used a “pernicious poison.”⁷⁷⁸ Helen, also, when entertaining Telemachus and his companions, “straightway cast a drug into the wine from whence they were drinking, that frees men from grief and from anger, and causes oblivion of all ills. Whoever should drink down this, when it is mixed in a cup, would not shed a tear down his cheeks for a whole day, not even if both his father and mother should die, not if they should slay with the steel a brother or a beloved son before him, and he should behold it with his eyes. Such a cunning and excellent drugs the daughter of Jove possessed, which Polydamna, the wife of Thone, gave her, an Egyptian; where the bounteous land produces many drugs, many excellent when mingled, and many fatal; and each physician is skilled above all men, for truly they are of the race of Paeon.”⁷⁷⁹ This Egyptian practice, learned by the Greeks, may also have been imported into Palestine, and hence the references in Scripture to those drugged wines. However this may be, it is certain that the “mixed wines” of the Hebrews were of three different kinds, - diluted, spiced, and drugged liquors; but neither the water, nor the spices,

⁷⁷⁸ Odys., x.

⁷⁷⁹ Il., iv. 256

The Wines of the Bible

nor the drugs, with which the wine was mingled, afford any evidence in favour of the unfermented theory.

5. Ahis

This word occurs in five texts of Scripture as a designation of wine, and is variously rendered "juice," "sweet wine," and "new wine." Dr. Lees says, "The word is plainly connected with *Ahsas*, 'to tread,' and denotes 'something trodden out.'"⁷⁸⁰ That is, doubtless correct, the verb, which occurs only once in Scripture, being employed to describe the *treading down* of the wicked (Mal. iv. 3). But when he adds, "It is grape juice purely, and never seems to have acquired the ambiguous meaning of the Greek *gleukos* and the Latin *mustum*, which undoubtedly sometimes applied to the juice of grapes in an initial state of fermentation,"⁷⁸¹ he is draw of thing upon his fancy, and not from any evidence supplied by the sacred record. The mere fact that the word means "something trodden out," determines nothing as to the quality of the liquor, seeing that trodden-out juice was sometimes boiled into a syrup or jelly, sometimes fermented into a wine. If fancy is allowed to direct our interpretation, we might with equal justice allege that *ahis* was employed to designate the wine prepared from juice which had been expressed by foot-treading, in distinction from wines whose juices had been extracted by the press! But if *ahsis* denotes "something trodden out," and "grape juice purely," why are we told that it "is first applied to the juice of pomegranates, and seems to be a poetical expression for the juice of fruit newly expressed, and doubtless

⁷⁸⁰ Temp. Bib. Com., p. xxiii

⁷⁸¹ Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

unfermented, but not distinguished as such by the name bestowed on it.”⁷⁸²

The word occurs in one passage of Scripture where it is associated with *yayin*, and is rendered “the spiced wine of the juice of my pomegranate” (Cant. viii. 2). Dr. Lees says, “It is doubtful whether the ‘juice of my pomegranate’ is identical with ‘the spiced wine;’ or whether the *yayin* was mixed with ‘the juice of the pomegranate,’ and so was rendered ‘spiced;’ or whether the *yayin* was otherwise spiced, and drunk along with the pomegranate juice.”⁷⁸³ But “Rabbi Tanchum, in his Rabbinical Dictionary, called Morshed, saith that it may there be understood not of the juice of pomegranates but of red wine, in colour like the pomegranate (or grains of pomegranates), this word being so understood of some such precious liquor.”⁷⁸⁴ It seems to us that the parallelism requires us to understand the *ahsis* as a species of the generic *yayin*; and thus the “spiced *yayin*” will be identical with the “pomegranate *ahsis*” – i.e., the species of *yayin* which was “spiced” was *ahsis*, flavoured with pomegranates. However this may be, the text throws no light on the specific nature of *ahsis* itself. It is the same also with Joel iii. 18, and Amos ix. 13, where the mountains are said to drop down *ahsis*, the reference being merely to the abundance of the supply, without any allusion to the specific quality of the wine. This usage is common in ancient and modern authors, and is in no way limited to unfermented juices. Thus Androcydes calls wine “the blood of the earth,” and yet says, it is “a poison to man.” Sir John Maundeville, referring to a place near Ephesus, speaks of a wine *growing* there, which he describes as “very good and *strong* wine, which they call

⁷⁸² Ibid., p. 431

⁷⁸³ Ibid. p. 154

⁷⁸⁴ Pococke on Joel, iii. 18

The Wines of the Bible

wine of Myra.”⁷⁸⁵ And speaking of another place, he says, “And there grows very good wine, which they call *bigon*, which is very *strong* and mild in drinking.”⁷⁸⁶ De La Brocquiere speaks of a “territory fertile in all sorts of provisions, especially in white wines; but they are somewhat *fiery*.”⁷⁸⁷ And Maundrell, referring to the productiveness of Palestine, speaks of “vines and olive trees which delight to extract the one its fatness, the other its *sprightly juice*, chiefly out of such dry and flinty places.”⁷⁸⁸ Additional illustrations of this usage will be found in another section.

Excluding, then, these three texts which give no certain indication of the specific nature of *ahsis*, there are only two other passages in which the word occurs, and in both of these it is used with such references as demonstrably prove that it designates a fermented and alcoholic wine. Thus, “Awake, ye drunkards, and weep, and howl, all ye drinkers of *yayin*, because of *ahsis*, for it is cut off from your mouth” (Joel i. 5). Dr. Lees defines the *ahsis* here as a designation of “fresh juice – the juice as it flows from the treaders’ feet;” and elsewhere he identifies it with the Greek *gleukos*, which he says “corresponded to the Hebrew *ahsis*; and in a Hebrew translation of the Greek New Testament it is here rendered by that term.”⁷⁸⁹ It may be so in the translation, he refers to, but it certainly is not so in our copy of Bagster’s translation, for *tirosh*, not *ahsis*, is the word used in Acts ii. 13. But however this may be, the writer must know that “fresh juice” of that description is the “Passover” beverage specially prepared for modern abstainers, and is not the “drunkard’s” drink. It is too

⁷⁸⁵ Travels, iv.

⁷⁸⁶ Ibid., xix.

⁷⁸⁷ Travels.

⁷⁸⁸ Travels.

⁷⁸⁹ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 313

The Wines of the Bible

insipid for the “depraved taste” of a confirmed toper, and is not a drink for loss of which he would either “weep” or “howl.” Dr. Ritchie, on the other hand, appears to have been in the throes of a severe and protracted labour when writing upon *ahsis*, for the entire section of his Testimony on this point is to us simply unintelligible. He says, “There is no evidence that it possessed an *intoxicating* quality, though it appears, in certain cases, it might cause *stupefaction*.” Now, how, in the name of common sense, can fresh grape juice, in any case, produce stupefaction? Is this innocent beverage, after all, a noxious stupefiant? He says again, “It would seem, however, that it might be used in a state or in a preparation in which it was not healthful, when, although it did not intoxicate as a narcotic stimulant, it yet stupefied.” And this, he says, “is not mere theory, it is the voice of facts.” What, then, are the facts? He gives us a symbol – “*Ahsis* is referred to as a symbol of judgment,” &c., and he calls this “the voice of facts!” But what kind of “state,” or “preparation” is that in which the fresh juice is “not so healthful?” How can such fresh juice be found in any state in which “it yet stupefied?” And how could it stupefy, if it was not “a narcotic stimulant?” We intentionally say “fresh juice,” because it is the specific *ahsis* which is under consideration; it is *ahsis* of which these effects are predicated; and it is this *ahsis*, with these pernicious qualities, which is defined as “fresh juice.” Grape juice cannot inebriate except in the state of a fermented and alcoholic beverage; but then it is no longer *ahsis*, as above defined. It cannot stupefy except in the state of a narcotic stupefiant, either simply alcoholic, or mixed with stupefying drugs; but then it is no longer *ahsis*, as defined above. In the one case it may be *yayin* or *khemer*, and, in the other, *mesech* or *mimsach*; but in either case it has ceased to be *ahsis*, “fresh juice.”

The Wines of the Bible

He says further, "Does it not appear here to be something different from the wine which these drunkards indulged in to produce intoxication – something that yielded their inebriating beverage rather than the potation itself, just as grape juice yields fermented wine, - and, therefore, are these persons called to weep because, this being cut off, the source would be dried up from which they drew what became to them an intoxicating or stupefying drink?" In the former paragraph it was the *ahsis* itself – i.e., "fresh juice," in a state or preparation "not so healthful," but still *ahsis*, which caused stupefaction; but in this paragraph the *ahsis* which caused stupefaction, is "something different" from the drunkards "stupefying drink." He asks, "Does it not appear here to be something different than the wine which these drunkards indulged in to produce intoxication?" We answer, that, if language has any certain meaning, the text expressly declares that it is the identical wine which the drunkards indulged in, and for the want of which, and not of "something different," they are called to weep and howl. And finally, he says, the text apparently points to *ahsis* as "yielding a specific kind of intoxicating wine, else why not say of this latter that it was cut off?" Why, indeed? Because the text is ignorant of the existence of any kind of *ahsis* that yields an intoxicating wine. *Ahsis* is not a generic term denoting a liquor which yields a specific *yayin*. It is a specific term, designating a particular species of the generic *yayin*. Hence the words, "Awake, ye drunkards, and weep; and howl, all ye drinkers of *yayin*, because of *ahsis*, for it is cut off from your mouth." The drunkards were "drinkers of *yayin*;" but *yayin* is a generic term for all sorts of wine, and the specific kind of *yayin* in which these persons indulged, and because of which they were to weep and howl, is expressly said to be *ahsis*. Accordingly, the prophet announces, not only that it "is cut off," but that "it is cut off from your mouth;" thereby intimating, as clearly and expressly as

The Wines of the Bible

language can convey, that the wine cut off from their mouth was the identical wine which they had been accustomed to put into their mouth!

The only other passage in which the word occurs is Isa. xlix. 26, "They shall be drunken with their own blood as with *ahsis*." Here drunkenness is expressly associated with the use of wine; otherwise there is neither force nor meaning in comparison. The advocates of the unfermented theory, as might have been expected, deny that there is any allusion to inebriation, although they are not agreed among themselves as to what kind of drunkenness is actually referred to by the prophet. Dr. Ritchie, for example, says, "Comparisons to be natural must be drawn between things which exhibit a resemblance to the points in which they are compared. There is no appropriate resemblance between persons drunken with blood, and those drunken with intoxicating wine – the effects on both body and mind are wholly different. From this comparison, therefore, we conclude that it is a stupefying power in *ahsis* that is here indicated, and not any intoxicating quality."⁷⁹⁰ Dr. Lees, on the other hand, observes, "Professor Douglas rightly says that the passage, 'they shall be drunken with their own blood as with sweet wine,' is no proof that *must*, which is unintoxicating, cannot here be meant; for neither is blood intoxicating; but all the meaning that the verb conveys is to drink one is satiated or cloyed." Thus the one writer makes *ahsis* an unintoxicating, but stupefying drink, while the others regard it as an unintoxicating, but satiating liquor. They are all agreed in emasculating the intoxication, that they may establish their unfermented theory; but they differ as to the nature of the effect produced by *ahsis*, the one making it *drinking to stupefaction*, and the others *drinking to satiation* – i.e. the one

⁷⁹⁰ Sc. Test., pp. 161,162

The Wines of the Bible

regards it as a drugged liquor, and the others as innocent must, "grape juice purely." When Greek meets Greek on their own favorite ground, they may be left to finish their own tug of war at their leisure; and meantime we shall survey the field for ourselves. Before doing so, however, a passing observation may be made. It is argued, as we have seen, that the Hebrew wines must have been of two different kinds, fermented and unfermented, because among other things, wine is used a symbol both of good and evil; and now we find that the exigencies of the theory have constrained Dr. Ritchie to allege the same of this innocent *ahsis*. It is fresh juice, "an innocent beverage," a "harmless enjoyment in which it was not so healthful." It is both an innocent of good, and also as a symbol of evil. Hence he says, "How else can plain common sense account for the same thing being employed as an emblem of God's love and a symbol of his wrath?"⁷⁹¹ We do not enter upon this point further, having discussed it in another section; but it is instructive to know that there are two kinds of *ahsis*, the one innocent and good, *fresh juice*, and the other pernicious and evil, *fermented or drugged wine*; and yet both kinds are designated by the one specific name of *ahsis*!

Returning to the text, we observe that drunkenness, as here, is frequently employed in Scripture as an emblem of the effects of divine judgments; and the following passages will show what kind of drunkenness is referred to: "he maketh them to stagger like a drunken man" (Job xii. 25). "The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard" (Isa. xxiv. 20). "They are drunken, but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink" (Isa. xxix. 9). "I am like a drunken man, and like a man whom wine has overcome" (Jer. xxiii. 9). "Drink ye and be drunken, and spue, and fall, and rise no

⁷⁹¹ Sc. Test., p. 161

The Wines of the Bible

more, because of the sword which I will send among you" (Jer. xxv. 27). Make ye him drunken; for he magnified himself against the Lord: Moab also shall wallow in his vomit, and he also shall be a derision" (Jer. xlviii. 26). "Babylon hath been a golden cup in the Lord's hand, that made all the earth drunken: the nations have drunken of her wine; therefore the nations are mad" (Jer. Li. 7). "I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep, and not awake, saith the Lord" (Jer. Li. 39). "Thou shalt be drunken, and shalt make thyself naked." (Lam. Iv. 21).

It will be observed, from the above references, that, in employing drunkenness as an emblem of divine judgments, the sacred writers use one or more of the most common and distinguishing outward manifestations of inebriation in each particular case. The idea of fulness – filled with drink – no doubt pervades them all. It is, however, not the fulness of satiation, which satisfies and cloyes the drinker, but rather the fullness of intoxication, which exhibits an insatiable craving that is never satisfied or can have enough, and whose effects are reeling, staggering, falling, vomiting, stupor, nakedness, derision, and madness. Some of the metaphors of this kind, from the nature of the figures employed, fail to exhibit the distinctive features of inebriation, such as "arrows filled with blood," &c., although even there the insatiable craving is not obscurely indicated. But "drinking till one is satiated or cloyed," as given by Dr. Lees, is certainly not one of the characteristics of drunkenness, either in figure or in fact; for the drunkard's craving is truly insatiable. Moreover, the idea of being satiated or cloyed with drink implies not only a pleasing sense of satisfaction with the liquor, which cries "Hold! Enough," but of such cloyed satisfaction as induces the drinker to turn away from the cup, without any desire to "seek it yet again." Accordingly, when it is said, "The inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her

The Wines of the Bible

fornication,” and “I saw the woman drunk with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus (Rev. xvii. 2,6), neither of these references justify the conclusion that, as blood is not intoxicating, these persons must have been so fully satiated or cloyed with their drink that they turned away from it with disgust, and craved no more. On the contrary, they were excited, inflamed, maddened with wine of fornication, and the blood of the martyrs, and in the very intensity of their intoxication, eagerly sought yet them again. Here, the symbol of being drunk with blood has a very decided reference to maddening intoxication, but not the remotest allusion to anything like mere stupefaction or cloyed satisfaction. Illustrations of this metaphorical usage by ancient and modern writers will be found in another section. Among these we have the very image of the text, as “Red-eyed massacre reels heavily, intoxicate with blood.” “She, reeled, intoxicate of soul.” “She that reeled heavily, whose wine was blood.” “A dizzy drunken spirit possesses the whole town,” &c. Here again, is no mere satiation or stupefaction, but a veritable reeling, dizzy drunkenness – true intoxication.

Dr. Lees affirms that in the drunkenness spoken of by Isaiah, *shah-kar* is used instead of *rah-vah*, “because *ahsis* connects the idea of sweetness with the draught.”⁷⁹² But this is both a hasty and unfounded inference; for whatever may be the sweetness of a blood-draught, of which we are ignorant, it is certain that *shah-kar* has much more to do with drunkenness than with sweetness, as we shall see; and this very word, *rah-vah*, is employed in similar connection with blood in Isa. xxxiv.7; Jer. xlv. 10, 50, so that the doctor’s ingenious idea of sweetness is another of his fancies.

The drinking of blood itself is frequently met with in ancient writers. It is spoken of by Flour in his account of the Cataline

⁷⁹² Temp. Bib. Com., p. 176

The Wines of the Bible

conspiracy;⁷⁹³ and by Plutarch, who says, the conspirators “all agreed to take a great and horrible oath, by drinking together of the blood,” &c.⁷⁹⁴ Josephus intimate that during the siege of Jerusalem “they drank the blood of the populace to one another.”⁷⁹⁵ When Cambyses invaded Egypt, under the guidance of the renegade Phanes, the Greeks and Carians were so incensed at the latter for introducing a foreign army into the country of their confederates, that they brought out his children, whom he had left behind on his flight to the Persians, and, after killing them in the sight of their father, they filled a vessel with the blood of the children, and, mingling it with wine and water, drank off the contents, and then engaged the enemy.⁷⁹⁶ Posidonius says that, “when the Carmanians at their banquets wish to testify their friendship for each other, they cut the veins on their faces, and mingle the blood which flows down with the liquor, and then drink it, thinking it the very extremest proof of friendship to taste one another’s blood.”⁷⁹⁷ And that the liquor used in this way was an alcoholic beverage in this manner, they anoint their heads.....in order to ward off the effects of the drink, and in order also to avoid being injured by the evaporation of the wine.”⁷⁹⁸ Michaelis says, “Eating of blood, or rather drinking it, was quite customary among the pagan nations of Asia in their sacrifices to idols and in the taking of oaths.” Hence, perhaps, the reference of the Psalmist, “their drink offerings of blood will I not offer” (Psalm xvi. 4). And Roberts, in his *Oriental Illustrations*, referring to the expression, “arrows drunk with blood,” says, “This

⁷⁹³ Hist., iv. 1

⁷⁹⁴ *Publicola*.

⁷⁹⁵ Wars, v. 10. 4

⁷⁹⁶ Herod., iii. 1

⁷⁹⁷ Athen., ii. 24

⁷⁹⁸ Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

figure of speech is often used in Hindoo books, and heroes are made to say of the foe, 'My sword shall soon be *mathan* (i.e., drunk or made) with his blood.'" ⁷⁹⁹ Horace apparently alludes to this custom when he says, -

*"Nor he who joyous quaffs the bowl,
Streaming with horses' blood, shall shake my dauntless soul."*

Carm., iii. 4

Martial, also, speaks of "the Sarmatian nourished by the blood drawn from his steed."⁸⁰⁰ Peter Heylin, describing the customs of the Tartars, says that when they get their enemies into their hands, "first letting out their blood, which they receive into cups, and use it as wine unto their feast."⁸⁰¹ And the ancient Germans are said to have been "very savage and barbarous, living upon raw flesh, and drinking the blood of horses at their feasts, according to Stella, even to intoxication."⁸⁰²

It is probable, however, that the references of Scripture to the drinking of blood as a divine judgment may be in illusion to a form of capital punishment which was somewhat common among the ancients of remote times, when eminent culprits were condemned to die by drinking blood. Thus, when Psammenitus, King of Egypt, was overcome by Cambyses, "he was made to drink a quantity of bullock's blood, which immediately occasioned his death."⁸⁰³ Themistocles, not knowing how to extricate himself from the necessity of making war upon his native country, invited all his friends together, and having sacrificed a bull, he drank a

⁷⁹⁹ p. 130

⁸⁰⁰ Public Shows, iii

⁸⁰¹ Cosmog. P. 840

⁸⁰² Ency. Brit. (third edition), Art. "Prussia"

⁸⁰³ Herod., iii. 15

The Wines of the Bible

large draught of its blood and so died. This usage is so well known to students of ancient history that further quotation is unnecessary.

Taking, then, *ahsas* as signifying to tread down the wicked, and *ahsis* as denoting the trodden out wine, the text may probably mean that the wicked, trodden down and crushed and bleeding, would metaphorically, drink “their own blood,” instead of the “blood of grapes,” and, inflamed and maddened thereby, as with *ahsis*, they should utterly perish; for “whom the gods would destroy they first made mad.” But however this may be, the references in the only texts which afford any indication of the nature of *ahsis* show that it was an inebriating beverage, the drink of drunkards, and, therefore, a fermented and alcoholic wine. Here, again, is no evidence in favour of the unfermented theory.

G. Soveh

This word occurs only in three passages of Scriptures as a designation of wine, and is, variously rendered, “drink,” “wine,” and “drunken.” Dr. Lees says, it is “identical with the Greek *hepsema*, the Latin *sapa*, and the modern Italian and French *sabe*, ‘boiled grape juice.’”⁸⁰⁴ Strangely enough, however, he finds this identity in an altogether different substance elsewhere, - “It is the opinion of not a few scholars that the Hebrew *devash*, or *debash*, was commonly, if not exclusively, used to represent the luscious substances formed by boiling down grape juice to a jelly-like state.” He then quotes Dr. Adam Clarke to this effect, and thereafter extracts from Gesenius the following paragraph; - “Honey of grapes – i.e., must or new wine – boiled down to a third

⁸⁰⁴ Temp. Bib. Com., p. xxiii

The Wines of the Bible

or half (Greek, *hepsema*; Latin, *sapa*, *defrutum*; Italian, *musto cotto*), which is now commonly carried into Egypt out of Palestine, especially out of the district of Hebron.”⁸⁰⁵ By this double identification the doctor converts *soveh* into *devash*, the vinous liquor into grape honey or jelly, and confounds the one with the other. In this way, also, *soveh* and *devash*, being descriptive of the same substance must be alike identified as terms with each other, and with the Greek *hepsema*, the Latin *sapa*, and the modern Italian and French *sabe*.

We have discussed the general question of boiled grape juice in a previous section, and shall therefore confine our attention here to the specific nature of the two substances, *soveh* and *devash*. The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin*, after showing from Pliny and Galen that “*siraeum* was a Greek wine,” and “was called *hesema* by Asiatic Greeks,” intimates that “possibly it might have been brought into Italy through the Tyrians, or by some of the Canaanites,” and he explains the origin of the name, *siraeum*, thus, - “Might not the principal article in its manufacture – the *syr*, caldron, or great seething pot of the Jews, spoken of in Nahum i. 10, be rationally regarded as having conferred its name upon it? The orthography does not favour the supposition that it was called *sir* from being brought from Syria. While the word *sapa* appears to have been derived from the Hebrew *sobhe*, entire, at a remote period, the *siraeum* was probably introduced into Greece in some later age.”⁸⁰⁶ Dr. Lees reproduces the same idea, saying, “*Syraeum* singularly suggests the instrument in which it was prepared – the *syr* or caldron – Nahum i. 10.”⁸⁰⁷

Fancies all! Mere etymological fancies, without a particle of evidence to support them. Is it not quite as probable that *syraeum*

⁸⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 20

⁸⁰⁶ Sec. xvii.

⁸⁰⁷ Temp. Bib. Com. p. xxiii.

The Wines of the Bible

derived its name from Syria, with which it had some connection, as from *syr*, a caldron, with which, as we shall see, it had no connection whatever? Is it at all probable that either the Greeks or Latins, instead of boiling their own juice, imported the boiled juice, or learned the art of boiling it from the Jews? Is it probable that the Greeks would name their jelly after a Hebrew caldron, rather than after their own jelly pan? If the Latins had no appropriate name for a boiled preserve, and had recourse to the Hebrews for the assistance of their *soveh*, why should not the Greeks, in a like emergency, have adopted the same Hebrew name as descriptive of the imported jelly itself, rather than a word which merely designates “the principle article in its manufacture?” If the Greeks had to borrow the Hebrew *pot* for a designation of the boiled juice, why should not the Jews themselves have used their own caldron, *syr*, to designate their boiled juice? If the Latins incorporated “the Hebrew *sobhe* entire,” merely transforming it into *sapa*, what evidence is there of any such incorporation beyond the misleading form and sound of the two terms? But if *soveh* was a boiled liquor; prepared in the caldron, *syr*, why should it not have been a species of beer rather than of jelly? Is not the Hebrew *sheba*, or *seba*, a form of *soveh*, as well as the Latin *sapa*, or the modern *sabe*? And will not *Beer-sheba* be a designation of the place of *beer* – the great brewing place of the Jews? Nor is this original discovery of ours so extravagant as it may at first appear; for Jerome, referring to the “barley wine” of ancient Egypt, says, “This was much used also in Dalmatia and Pannonia, and was commonly called *sabaium*.” Now, we submit that, as Sheba was probably the manufacturing place of *soveh*, beer, and as the Sabeans of the wilderness were noted drinkers of *soveh*, *sapa* and *sabe*, and as drunkards were popularly said to be overcome with *soveh*, and as barley wine was commonly called *sabaium*, it is highly probable that this *soveh*-

The Wines of the Bible

sabe-sabaium was a species of fermented beer, which the Jews had learned the art of brewing from the Egyptians during their captivity. And as the fame of this Hebrew-Egyptian drink spread into other nations, "possibly it might have been brought into Italy through the Tyrians, or by some of the Canaanites," at an early period, and thus have supplied the Greeks and Latins both with a name and a beverage, which modern writers have ignorantly confounded with grape honey or jelly!

Our theory may possibly be an unproved and ridiculous fancy, as we suspect it is, but it is not a whit more so than that of the alleged caldron-*syraeum*; for *soveh* has no more to do, either as a name or a substance, with boiling in a "great seething pot," than it has to do with the brewing of malt liquor. In fact, there is neither a caldron nor any allusion to such a vessel in the passage referred to (Nah. i. 10). It is true, the word *syr* occurs in the first clause of the verse, but it is the *syr* of "thorns," and not of a "seething pot." There are two Hebrew words of the same form, *syr*, but of different derivations,⁸⁰⁸ one of which designates a *pot*, and the other, as in the text, *thorns*. Both are found together in Eccles. vii. 6, "the crackling of *thorns* under a *pot*." The latter occurs by itself in Isaiah xxxiv. 13 "*thorns* shall come up in her palaces;" Hosea ii. 6, "I will hedge up thy way with *thorns*;" Amos iv. 2, "he will take you away with hooks, and your posterity with *fish hooks*;" and in the text, Nah. i. 10, "*For while they be folden together as thorns, and while they are drunken as drunkards, they shall be devoured as stubble fully dry.*"

The *saveh*-drinkers are here described by the prophet as drunkards, and are threatened with sudden destruction "while they are drunken;" but there is neither direct reference nor remote allusion to any caldron, or to the boiling of grape juice in a

⁸⁰⁸ Fuerst.

The Wines of the Bible

caldron. When, therefore, these writers force a pot into the text that they may get a boiled *soveh*, it is not surprising that Dr. Ritchie should have to say, - "It must be allowed on all hands that the passage is obscure." The obscurity, however, is of their own making, and is wholly caused by the confusion arising from their having failed to distinguish between *pots* and *thorns*. Dr. Lees, in his *Commentary*, makes no attempt to explain the text, beyond amending the translation to the middle clause of the verse, and giving *soveh* the character of a "rich wine," with which the drinkers were "soaked." The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin*, finding the same "difficulties" in its interpretation, proposes the following translation: - *"For while the thorns are folded together (or entangled and in confusion – so the pots), and as the sobhe thereof (the sapa evaporating therein, so) the drunkards: they shall be devoured as stubble fully dry,'* – as if it were intended to draw a metaphor from the process of making *sapa*."⁸⁰⁹ Extruding the author's explanatory clauses, the text of the prophet is here made to read, - "For while the thorns are folded together, and as the *sobhe* thereof the drunkards: they shall be devoured as stubble fully dry!" By this rendering "the *sobhe* thereof" must be the *sobhe*, not of the caldron or of the grape juice, but of the folded thorns! And he draws a metaphor in the following fashion: - "Entangled and in confusion – so the pots," as if the caldrons had in some mysterious way got "entangled and in confusion!" Then we have "the *sapa* evaporating therein – so the drunkards," as if the drunkards had been "evaporating" in pots! The author has converted the one *syr* of the text into two, and has thus got both *pots* and *thorns* for the exhibition of the above curious medley. We fear he has got "entangled and in confusion" among his imported pots.

⁸⁰⁹ Sec. 35

The Wines of the Bible

Dr. Ritchie, finding that “the passage is obscure,” attempts to disentangle the pots by a different rendering. He says, - “we should read as follows: - ‘Like thorns they are enlarged, and like *sobhe* the drunkard shall be devoured as stubble fully dry’ – the first metaphor referring to thorns heaped up together for fuel, the second to the burning of the *sobhe* in the caldron from neglect, and the third to the combustion of stubble.”⁸¹⁰ Here again, the one *syr* of the text is converted into two in the interpretation – “thorns or fuel,” and “*sobhe* in the caldron.” If the first metaphor has got a *syr* of thorns, where does the second metaphor get its caldron? The prophet gives us *thorns* for fuel, and Dr. Ritchie gratuitously supplies the *kettle*; for, like the other writers, he is determined that *soveh* be a boiled juice, and he will have it boiled in that caldron.

Instead of all this obscure rubbish of pots and pans in entanglement and confusion, caused by the unauthorized importation of a foreign caldron into the text, where neither pot nor pan of any description is found, the prophet clearly and simply intimates that judgment shall overtake the wicked in their sins “while they are drunken as drunkards,” and are thus by their own misconduct “folden together as thorns” – i.e. prepared as fuel for the fire; and this divine judgment shall be terrible in its destruction and swift in its execution, for “they shall be devoured as stubble fully dry.”

Henderson thinks that the judgment threatened in the prophecy was directed against the army of Sennacherib, while others regard it as referring to the overthrow of the Assyrian empire under Surdanapalus. If this latter be the correct view, the history of the event records the exact fulfillment of the prophecy, and justifies the interpretation we have given of the text; for the Assyrians,

⁸¹⁰ Sc. Test., pp. 164,165

The Wines of the Bible

who are threatened with this visitation, were ruled over by Sardanapalus, who wrote his own epitaph, - "Eat, drink, be merry; everything else is not worth that" – a snap of the fingers; of which Aristotle said, "the inscription was fitter for an ox than a king." And the following is the account given of the taking of Nineveh by Arbaces: - "It happened that the King of Assyria, not knowing anything of the revolt of the Bectrians, and elated by his former successes, was indulging in idleness and reveling, and had prepared wine and other things necessary for feasting his soldiers. While this whole army was now feasting and reveling, Arbaces, receiving intelligence from some deserters of the carelessness and intemperance of the enemy, fell upon them, easily broke into their camp, slew great numbers of them, and drove the remainder back into the city."⁸¹¹ Thus, as the Lord had threatened, *while they were drunken as drunkards, and folded together as thorns, prepared as fuel for the fire, they were suddenly destroyed as stubble fully dry.*

Now, as these "drunkards" were slain while indulging in wine, and as the wine which they indulged in induced "reveling" and "intemperance," and as the drunkards are expressly designated in the Hebrew "drinkers of soveh," it is clear that soveh which produced these results may, indeed, have been a "rich wine," as described by Dr. Lees, but it was certainly no grape honey or jelly, but a veritable fermented and intoxicating liquor.

The second of the three texts in which soveh occurs is Isaiah i. 22, "*Thy silver is become dross, they soveh mixed with water.*" In appealing to this passage in favour of the unfermented theory, one writer after another echoes the conclusion at which his brother had arrived, and apparently without any independent examination of the grounds on which that conclusion rests. Thus,

⁸¹¹ Dio. Sic., ii. 26

The Wines of the Bible

Ritchie echoes Lees, saying, - "Dr. Lees has produced a passage from Varro which speaks of such a coarse, poor, watered wine, *lora*, as bearing this very name circumcised."⁸¹² And Lees tells us that "the erudite author of *Tirosh lo Yayin*," by an apt quotation from Varro (lib. i. cap. 54), shows how the figure of circumcision might come to be applied to wine unduly diluted with water." And the doctor further informs us that this term circumcised "is a figure for the dilution commonly practiced by the lower class of liquor venders, who tried to pass off a thin, watery article for the superior and genuine *soveh*."⁸¹³ Now, granting all this, what conceivable bearing can it possibly have on the question at issue in this controversy? No one, we presume, denies that the *soveh* of the prophet was diluted, or capable of dilution; but how does that dilution prove that *soveh* was either a grape jelly, or an unfermented drink? Were these the only vinous substances capable of dilution, or commonly mixed with water? See, on the contrary, the evidence adduced on this point in a previous section. Are we also to conclude that because the Latin terms *circumcisitum*,⁸¹⁴ *circumcidaneum*,⁸¹⁵ *circumcisvum*,⁸¹⁶ signify "cut around," and the Hebrew word in the text, *mahal*, means also "cut around," that, therefore, the Hebrew prophet and the heathen writers alike refer to the Jewish rite of circumcision, and that this reference proves that the circumcised *soveh* was boiled grape juice? And how does the fact that "the lower class of liquor venders" diluted their wines prove that the "thin watery article" which they attempted "to pass off for the superior and genuine

⁸¹² Sc. Test., p. 164

⁸¹³ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 157

⁸¹⁴ Varro

⁸¹⁵ Cato

⁸¹⁶ Columella

The Wines of the Bible

soveh" was a boiled syrup? The logic of the argument is on a par with the "watery article."

Our readers will find abundant evidence elsewhere in this investigation that water was used by three different parties, and for three different purposes: - (1) By the wine merchants in watering the wines they sold; (2) by the wine drinkers in diluting the wines they drank; (3) by the wine manufacturers in making the lower class of wines. Dr. Lees confounds the watering practice of the "liquor venders" with that of the wine manufacturers, and all the three writers confound the latter with the former. The prophet obviously alludes to a wine deteriorated in quality and value by dilution with water, and, therefore, he must be supposed to refer to the practice of the merchant. The line quoted by Dr. Lees from Martial *jugulare etat Falernum*, shows that the strongest wines of the ancients were thus treated, whether by the seller or the drinker. But the wine spoken of by Varro, *lora*, was not thus deteriorated, seeing that the water was used not by the merchant or his customer, but by the maker; and that not to water the manufactured wine, but to dilute the mass of crushed grapes in the last pressure, so as to extract any juice that might still remain in the pulp. The class of liquors designated by Varro, Cato, and Columella "circumcised" wines, were so called, not with any reference to the Hebrew rite, or even to the dilution of the wines, but, as the first of these authors expressly says, to the manner of treating the crushed grapes themselves. It was "the extremities of the grape mass," not the *wine*, which he says, "some persons circumcise." Nor does the prophet in any way allude to the ancient rite when he says that *soveh* was circumcised; for, although he uses the word *mahal*, from *mool*, which is commonly applied to the religious ordinance, the same word is employed without any such allusion by the Psalmist in several passages. Thus, he says, the grass "is cut down and

The Wines of the Bible

withereth" (Psalm xc. 6). Speaking of the nations, he says "In the name of the Lord will I *destroy* them" (Psalm cxviii. 10, 11,13) And referring to the wicked, he says, "Let them be *cut in pieces*" (Psalm Lviii. 7) So that this usage is not peculiar to *soveh*, and though it were, it would determine nothing as to the nature of the liquor thus *cut down* or *circumcised*.

If the text is to be interpreted in the light of Varro's reference, we must conclude that the Hebrew *soveh* was not, as alleged, "some luscious preparation, probably of boiled grape juice,"⁸¹⁷ but a species of *lora*, one of the lowest and poorest of the wines made by the ancients, and, as we have shown elsewhere, a fermented liquor. But as the prophet speaks of a valuable wine deteriorated in quality, like the "silver" which has "become dross," we must infer that *soveh* was a rich wine, resembling Martial's, when "'he forbids the Falernian to have its throat cut' – to have its strength diminished."⁸¹⁸

The last of the three passages in which *soveh* occurs is Hosea iv. 18, "Their *soveh* is sour." From this it is concluded not only that the wine was naturally a sweet liquor – a legitimate inference – but that it was a boiled and unfermented liquor – an unwarrantable assumption, as if no sort of sweet liquor could become *sour* unless it had been previously boiled and unfermented! The ancients found that their best wines, which had never seen the fire, were liable to acidity, in particular circumstances, and a special seasons, when the wine would not keep, and a *second* spontaneous fermentation set in, which spoiled the liquor. And modern wine makers, merchants, and drinkers, have frequently to complain of the same fault in their

⁸¹⁷ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 157

⁸¹⁸ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 157

The Wines of the Bible

fermented wines, although these may be altogether innocent of the boiling process.

The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* sums up the distinctive properties of *soveh*, which he identifies, not, as before, with the circumcised *lora*, but with *sapa*, a boiled syrup or jelly. He says, "*Sapa* was made by the boiling down of must; *soveh* is connected in Nah. i. 10 with the *syr*, the great evaporating kettle, or cauldron, for the same purpose." We have shown, on the contrary, that there is neither a kettle nor a caldron in the text referred to. He says, "*Sapa* was sweet and luscious; so was *soveh*, for it is threatened to be made sour." But all "sweet and luscious" wines, are not, therefore, unfermented boiled juices; and we have shown elsewhere, that some of the strongest wines of the ancients were sweet and luscious, and liable to acidity. He adds, "*Sapa*, as a sweet drink, naturally manifested its corruption by acidity; so did *soveh*." But so, in fact, do all sweet wines, even when they are fermented and alcoholic; and we have shown elsewhere that *sapa* is not a "drink" at all, but a syrup or jelly. He concludes, "The mode of adulterating *sapa* was with water; it was the same with *soveh*." But he gives no evidence that *sapa* was ever adulterated, or that, being a jelly, it was ever adulterated with water; and, even if he did, the evidence would be worthless, seeing that the mere dilution of a substance can determine nothing as to whether it is fermented or unfermented.

Thus far we have found nothing in the Biblical usage of the term to prove that *soveh* was either a boiled syrup, or an unfermented liquor. We must, therefore, proceed in another direction. It may be assumed, as at least highly probably, that in a land of vineyards like ancient Palestine, the boiling of grape juice would be a common practice, and the boiled juice a common article of diet. If this were so, and if *soveh* was the term which designated that popular substance, it is passing strange that the word should

The Wines of the Bible

occur only three times in the whole Bible! If this grape juice was boiled down to the consistence of a syrup or jelly; it must have been an article of food rather than a beverage; and if *soveh* was the designation of that substance, it is equally strange that such a word should have been chosen for its designation, which is derived from, or gives birth, to, a verb that denotes drinking rather than eating. And if *soveh* was a designation of boiled grape juice, it is also strange that a word for drinking rather than boiling should have been selected as its representative. We have been to That “new names, when first imposed, are always expressive of some simple and obvious appearance, never of latent properties or scientific relations.”⁸¹⁹ Accordingly, *yayin* is said to denote the foaming appearance of the expressed juice. *Khomer* does the same. *Khometz* designates its sourness; *shechar* its sweetness; *ahsis* its being trodden out; and *mesech* its mixture. We should, therefore, have expected that if *soveh* had been a boiled juice, the boiling process in like manner, would have been indicated by a suitable and appropriate term, having that signification, instead of by a word which is either the root or stem of *drunkenness*.

We find, indeed, that this boiling was resorted to by the Jews, and that the boiled juice was a common article of diet among the people; but that *devash*, “so called, as being glutinous, like a kneaded mass,” and not *soveh*, was the term employed to designate the glutinous jelly. And as this grape jelly or honey was so similar in its luscious property to the honey of bees, *devash* is employed as a common term for both substances. Hence we meet with it in *fifty five* different passages of Scripture, which, unlike the three solitary texts of *soveh*, is quite in accordance with the common and popular use of the sweet preserve.

⁸¹⁹ Lees

The Wines of the Bible

Gesenius, as we have seen, is quoted by Dr. Lees as identifying the Hebrew *devash* with the Greek *hepsema*, the Latin *sapa* and *defrutum*, and the Italian *musto cotto*, and as saying, it “is now commonly carried into Egypt out of Palestine, especially out of the district of Hebron.” Dr. Lees himself says, “It is the opinion of not a few scholars that the Hebrew *devash*, or *debash*, was commonly, if not exclusively, used to represent the luscious substance formed by boiling down grape juice to a jelly-like state.”⁸²⁰ The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* says, “Paxton, who had an opportunity of witnessing the vintage in Lebanon, describes it, and observes (p. 215) that ‘the juice that was extracted when I visited the press was not made into wine, but into what is called dibs. It resembles molasses. They take the juice from the troughs, put it into large boilers, reduce it to one-half, possibly one third, of the original quantity. It is then removed to large earthen jars, and subjected to a process not unlike churning, which is repeated for a few days until it thickens. When properly churned or beaten, but little separation of the particles taken place. It forms a pleasant article for table use, and is decidedly preferable to molasses.’”⁸²¹

Here we have an exact description of the ancient *sapa*, *defrutum*, or *hepsema*, boiled down to “one-half, possibly one-third, of the original quantity;” and here we have the grape juice boiled in caldrons or “large boilers.” But this boiled juice is the Hebrew *devash*, not *soveh*. It “resembles molasses,” and is “decidedly preferable to molasses;” but it is “an article for table use,” and “is not made into wine.” Hence it is that Columella distinguishes between the boiled juice and wine, when he says, “*Defrutum*, however carefully made, is accustomed to grow acid,

⁸²⁰820 Temp. Bib. Com., p. 20

⁸²¹821 Sec. xiv.

The Wines of the Bible

just as wine does." Hence, also, the reference of Pliny to *sapa* as "a product of art, and not of nature;" his saying that "*sapa* has a close affinity with wine; and his explanation of one of the purposes for which it is used – "all these mixtures have been devised for the adulteration of honey." &c.

Dr. Lees says, "This species of wine is still called honey in the East;"⁸²² and he quotes Kaempfer as saying, "A great part of the grapes is reduced by boiling to a syrup, which, upon the table of the poor, supplies the place of butter, and with abstemious persons, of wine, being mixed with water."⁸²³ This, then, is the so-called "unfermented wine" of the Bible, for the existence and use of which the advocates of the unfermented theory contend! But (a) It is "still called *honey* in the East," and is "reduced by boiling to a *syrup*," but it is not *wine*. It "supplies the place of butter," just as "with *abstemious* persons" it supplies the place of wine; but it is not identical with the substance whose place it supplies, and is as certainly *butter* as it is *wine*! (b) If, however, *dibs* or *devash*, the honey of the East, be truly a "species of wine," the honey of bees, as well as the honey of grapes, must also be a wine, seeing that *devash* designates both substances. (c) And if this be admitted, our modern honey must be regarded as being a true unfermented wine, and an exact counterpart of the unfermented wine of the ancients – Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans!

Among other authorities appealed to in behalf of this honey of the East, Dr. Lees quotes the testimony of Robinson to the effect that "the finest grapes are dried as raisins; and the rest being trodden out and pressed, the juice is boiled down to a syrup, which, under the name of *dibs*, is much used by all classes

⁸²² Works, ii. 141

⁸²³ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 20

The Wines of the Bible

wherever vineyards are found, as a condiment with their food. It resembles thin molasses, but is more pleasant to the taste.”⁸²⁴ “Molasses” again! A “condiment” with food, not a beverage! A “syrup,” not a wine! Dr. Thomson, also says, “As the Moslems do not make wine, the grapes not disposed of in the market, are dried into raisins, or the juice is boiled down into *dibs*, a kind of thick grape molasses frequently mentioned in the Bible under the kindred name of *debash*, in some places translated ‘honey,’ and in others ‘manna.’”⁸²⁵ “Molasses” again! “Honey,” or “manna;” but “the Moslems do not make wine!” See further on this point in another section on the boiled grape juice of the ancients.

Thus, then, the boiled grape juice of the Jews was a syrup, a honey, a kind of thick grape molasses, used as a condiment with food, a substitute for wine and butter, but not a wine; and the term which designated the boiled juice was *devash*, not *soveh*. So that whatever may have been the nature of the latter substance, it certainly was not a grape jelly or honey. What, then, was *soveh*? It was, says the author of *Tirosh lo Yayin*, “an artificial wine, inspissated, entirely free from alcohol, and therefore incapable of producing intoxication; from its luscious nature likely to induce persons inclined towards drinking to indulge in it beyond what was seemly and proper, in fact to that extent which a temperate people might call inebriation, and that it might by turning on the stomach produce sickness, and some of the symptoms of intoxication.”⁸²⁶ But (a) we have shown that there is not a particle of evidence of its having been inspissated, unless we convert the prophet’s bundle of thorns into a “great evaporating kettle or caldron;” (b) it could not have been “entirely free from alcohol,” or “incapable of producing intoxication,” seeing that it was the

⁸²⁴ Works, ii. 144

⁸²⁵ *The Land and the Book*, p. 583

⁸²⁶ Sec. xxxvi.

The Wines of the Bible

drink of the “drunkards,” who were to be “destroyed as stubble fully dry;” (c) it may have been very “luscious” in its nature, and have been used in excess for anything we know to the contrary; but was that excess limited to the use of the honey of grapes, or did these ancient toppers indulge in the honey of bees in the same manner? (d) Is it credible, or even conceivable, that “persons inclined towards drinking” would have selected either the honey of bees, or the honey of grapes, to make a drink of, instead of wine; or that they would have indulged in that sort of drink until it turned upon their stomachs, and produced “symptoms of intoxication?” And is it either credible or conceivable that any people, ancient or modern, temperate or intemperate, could ever have identified such excess with “inebriation,” or have confounded the sickness arising from a full stomach of jelly with “inebriation” or “symptoms of intoxication?” The Jews of that age were neither so “temperate,” nor so inexperienced in these “symptoms,” as the author assumes; and they were quite as unlikely to speak of a man being inebriated with grape jelly, as we are to speak of a glutton being drunk on roast beef and plum pudding.

What, then, was *soveh*? It was, says Dawson Burns, in a paragraph already quoted, “a rich thick, and probably boiled wine, greatly relished, not for any alcoholic property, but for its luscious quality, being more of a jelly than a liquid.”⁸²⁷ Boiled again? And yet, without a shred of evidence in support of the assumption. A “boiled wine,” too, and yet not a liquor at all, “being more of a jelly than a liquid!” And a *jelly* “greatly relished” by the “drunkards” of Nineveh, “not for any alcoholic property “but for its luscious quality;” and who reveled in that intemperance on jelly until the enemy fell upon and destroyed them! What next?

⁸²⁷ Basis, pp. 91, 92

The Wines of the Bible

What, then, was *soveh*? “This word,” says Dr. Ritchie, “denotes inspissated wine, or the boiled juice of the grape.” Here we have that irrepressible inspissations, or boiling, cropping up once more, and, as usual, without a particle of evidence in its favour. He says, “It is fullness or excessive indulgence, in that which was in itself harmless, that is indicated in this last passage (Nah. i. 10), rather than inebriety, as we know from its nature that *sobhe* did not in itself possess an intoxicating quality.” Here, at last, we have arrived at the point of discovery. Dr. Ritchie assures us that he has acquired a knowledge of the nature of this substance.

What, then was *soveh*? “The word,” says he, “denotes inspissated wine, or the boiled juice of the grape.” How does the writer know this? Because “‘the term,’ says Dr. Lees, occurs but thrice,” &c. And how does Dr. Lees know? “The erudite author of *Tirosh lo Yayin*, by an apt quotation,” &c. And how does that “erudite” person know? He says, “It was boiled in the *syr*, caldron, or great seething pot of the Jews,” &c. And how does he know all this? “It is spoken of in Nah. i. 10,” &c. Thus we have arrived, by a series of descending steps, at the root of this discovery, and find that the knowledge of the nature of *soveh*, as a boiled juice, possessed by these several writers, springs out of their interpretation of the text referred to. But on examining the passage for ourselves, we fail to discover the remotest allusion to any boiled juice, or boiling process, or seething pot for such a purpose. The prophet appears to be totally oblivious of anything of this sort; and the only *syr* of which he speaks is a bundle of thorns, the apt image of a drunken people, ripe for judgment, prepared as fuel for the fire. So that we are once more thrown back into chaos and old night, so far as information from these writers is concerned, and must, therefore, proceed in our investigation without their assistance.

Of the three texts in which *soveh* occurs, two determine nothing as to its specific nature – the one merely referring to its dilution

The Wines of the Bible

with water, and the other to its deterioration by acidity, both of which features being common characteristics of fermented wines. The remaining text is the passage in Nahum, so frequently referred to, which is rendered “drunken as drunkards,” in which both the noun and the verb are employed, and convey the idea that the “drunkards” were inebriated with *soveh*, and that drink was an inebriating wine. Dr. Ritchie, however says, “It must be understood that *sobhe* is, in this case, mixed with some intoxicating ingredients, since this boiled juice of the grape itself cannot possibly cause inebriety.”⁸²⁸ But before we can understand this, we must first have evidence that it was a boiled juice, not a fragment of which is forthcoming. We are supplied with unbounded assertion by these writers, and our ears are dinned with the reverberating echoes of that irrepressible inspissations, but no evidence is given to clothe the naked assumption. On the contrary, even where the truth is shining full in their eyes, luminous in its own light, as in the above text, Dr. Ritchie darkens counsel with words, and then exclaims, “the passage is obscure.” He alleges, as here, that “*sobhe* is in this case mixed, with some intoxicating ingredient,” which is true enough, if the “ingredient” referred to be alcohol, and in that case the *soveh* is a fermented wine; but if the reference be to some other ingredient, the “mixed wine” would cease to be *soveh*, and become the obnoxious *mesech*, a drugged liquor. Now it was *soveh*, and not *mesech*, which inebriated these drunkards, for they are called “drinkers of *soveh*,” and it would, therefore, be quite as justifiable to allege that in every case of recorded drunkenness among the Jews, the liquor used must have been a species of *mesech*, as that the *soveh* of these inebriates was “mixed with some intoxicating ingredient.”

⁸²⁸ Sc. Test., p. 165

The Wines of the Bible

The only passage in which the term occurs as a noun, with any reference to the specific nature of the liquor so designated, shows that it denoted an inebriating wine; and this conclusion is confirmed by the almost uniform usage of the word in its verbal form in the Scriptures. The verb *savah* is employed in six different passages, in all of which, with one doubtful exception, it designates inebriation. The doubtful text is in Ezek. xxiii. 42, "And with the men of the common sort were brought Sabeans from the wilderness," where the margin adds, "or drunkards." Excluding this text as at least doubtful in its reference, we have the following usage in the remaining passages. In Isa. Lvi. 12, we have a description of "some greedy dogs which can never have enough," saying, "Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine, and we will *fill ourselves* with strong drink; and to-morrow shall be as this day, and much more abundance." In Deut. xxi. 20 the parents of a profligate son are directed to bring him to the elders of the city, and say, "This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton and a *drunkard*." In Prov. xxiii. 20, 21, the wise king says, "Be not among *wine-bibbers*; among riotous eaters of flesh; for the *drunkard* and the glutton shall come poverty." And Nah. i. 10 the noun and verb are both conjoined in the words, "*drunken as drunkards*."

In these passages the verb is employed as a general term for drunkenness, whether the wine consumed be *yayin*, *shechar*, or *soveh*, and therefore the latter must have been, with the others, an inebriating beverage. The word is distinguished from, but associated with *gluttony* and *riotous eating*, and, therefore, must have been designated actual drunkenness. If *savah* had been "more of a jelly than a liquid,"⁸²⁹ like *devash* or *dibs*, it would have been, as we have seen, an article of food rather than a beverage;

⁸²⁹ Burns

The Wines of the Bible

and its excessive use would have been included in the condemned gluttony. We never read of dissolute persons getting drunk on *devash*, or *dibs*, or syrup, or molasses, or jelly; but we do read of such persons becoming intoxicated with *soveh*, and therefore the latter must have been an inebriating beverage. The intemperance designated by *soveh* must have been a much more aggravated evil than merely repletion, or the excessive use of a harmless jelly; for “all the men of the city” were required to stone the wicked son who was a “drunkard” as well as “glutton.” It is true, the man was “stubborn and rebellious;” he would “not obey the voice of his father or the voice of his mother;” and when they chastened him, he would not “hearken unto them.” But the association of this disobedience with that of gluttony and drunkenness shows that stubborn and persistent drunkenness was the master passion of evil for which he had been remonstrated with and chastened, and concerning which he obeyed not their voice. The gluttony, or excessive use of food, was, no doubt, an evil to be corrected with the rod of chastisement, but surely not with the excessive severity of a public and cruel death, unless, it had been united with a willful and irreclaimable drunkenness, which the stern regime of ancient law may have imposed. And, finally, the association of “wine-bibbers,” – i.e., bibbers of *soveh*, who are pointed out as *drunkards*, with “riotous eaters of flesh,” indicates a unity of dissolution and riotousness, which could not have proceeded from the mere use of flesh and jelly, and must have been induced by the inebriating potations partaken of at the riotous feast. All these considerations, taken together, lead to the inevitable conclusion that when the drinkers of *soveh* are described as being “drunken as drunkards,” the *soveh* must have been inebriating beverage, and not a mere boiled juice or grape jelly, which is appropriately designated *devash* or *dibs*.

The Wines of the Bible

Moreover, if *soveh* is the designation of boiled grape juice, and if this juice was boiled in a caldron, the boiled juice must have been either a grape wine, or a grape jelly. If it was a *jelly*, it has not right to a place among the wines of the Bible. But if it was a *wine*, and if it was boiled with the object of destroying the “alcoholic ferment” – unavoidably present in the expressed juice, and thereby preserving it unfermented – the boiled liquor must either have been left to cool in the caldron before bottling, or it must have been poured into the goatskin bottles while hot. In the former case, the exposure to the air during the cooling process inevitably reintroduce into the exposed liquor the germs, or oxygen, which necessitate fermentation. In the latter case, the boiling juice would inevitably dissolve the pitch with which the goatskin bottles were lined to exclude the air, and thereby render its preservation as an unfermented liquor impossible. So that here, again, is no evidence in favour of the unfermented theory.

7. Shechar

This word occurs as a designation of wine in twenty-three passages of Scripture, and is uniformly translated in our version “strong drink,” except in two cases, where it is rendered, in the one instance, “strong wine,” and in the other, “drunkards,” with “drinkers of strong drink,” as an alternative marginal rendering. It is usually associated with, but distinguished from, *yayin*, in the oft-repeated phrase, “wine and strong drink;” and it is represented by *siker* or *sicera* in the New Testament. Dr. Lees regards it as primitively denoting “sweetness – drink that is saccharine,”⁸³⁰ and he says it is “related to the word for sugar in

⁸³⁰ Works, ii. 19

The Wines of the Bible

all the Indo-Germanic and Semitic languages, and is still applied throughout the East, from India to Abyssinia, to the palm sap, the *zhaggery* made from it, to the date juice and syrup, as well as to sugar and to the fermented palm wine.”⁸³¹ All this may be true. But (a) These old etymologies and relations are not safe grounds on which to build a theory; for we have shown in a previous section that the Scotch and Irish *whisky*, the English *perry*, the Swiss *kirchwasser*, primitively denoted, or were related to the word for water, and yet they are all spirituous liquors. *Rum*, in like manner, is taken from *saccharum*, and may therefore be said to be related to the word for *sugar* in all languages into which the Latin term has been introduced; and yet it is a spirituous liquor. The Greek $\mu\epsilon\theta\upsilon$, from which comes the old English *mead* and *methyglin*, denoted *saccharine*, but none the less fermented wine; and the verb $\mu\epsilon\theta\upsilon\omega$ was the common Greek term for drunkenness. *Sakar* is a word related to *shaker*, and yet is the designation of a species of arrack, a spirituous liquor.⁸³² And *sakaran*, another term related *shaker*, is the name of a plant which “produces intoxication, as the name imports, and even death.”⁸³³

(b) The fact that *shechar* primitively denoted sweetness, and was, or is related to other words having the same signification, mere proves what no one denies, that it is the designation of a *saccharine drink*. But whether that *sweet drink* was a fermented or an unfermented beverage, is not determined either by the primitive signification, or the widely extended relation of the word, and can only be ascertained from the usage of the term itself. We have shown elsewhere that many of the ancient wines

⁸³¹ Temp. Bib. Com., p. xxvii

⁸³² Dunn’s Bib. Science, ii., 477

⁸³³ Bayle *St. John’s Villiage Life in Egypt*, ii. 48

The Wines of the Bible

were distinguished for their saccharine quality, and yet were strongly alcoholic; and some of the modern wines are equally saccharine and alcoholic. So that *shechar* may, indeed, have been a *sweet drink*; and yet none the less a fermented and alcoholic beverage.

Dr. Lees says, - "Whether the noun was derived from the verb, which signifies 'to drink freely of the sweet' or whether the verb was formed from the noun (the name of the thing 'sweet juice' being borrowed to describe its copious consumption - i.e., to *shakarize*, to drink largely of *shaker*), there is nothing that necessarily connects the word, as verb or noun, with intoxicating qualities."⁸³⁴ It might as truly be said that as whisky primitively denoted water, and rum is derived from *saccharum*, "sweet juice," the man who has drunk largely of either of these liquors is not *intoxicated*, but merely *fou* - filled, there being nothing in the verb "to be filled," or in the noun "water" and "sweet juice" that necessarily connects them with intoxicating qualities. The statement of Dr. Lees may be admitted if he can show that *shechar* was an *unfermented* "sweet juice." But that is the point to be proved and not assumed; for the juice may have been saccharine and yet alcoholic, like Homer's "divine nectar," which was "sweet as honey," but so potent in its strength that a draught of it subdued the Cyclops. If it can be shown that whatever may have been the primitive signification and relations of *shechar*, it is employed in Scripture to designate a sweet fermented drink, then "to drink largely" of that sweet liquor will certainly denote intoxication. Or, if it can be shown that whatever the verb *shaker* or its related terms may originally have signified, and however otherwise or elsewhere they may have been employed, they are uniformly, or all but uniformly, used in Scripture as designations

⁸³⁴ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 36

The Wines of the Bible

of intoxication, then the *shechar* or “sweet drink which has been thus largely consumed must be regarded as an intoxicating liquor. This being so, we find that *shikku* and *shikkui*, from *shakah*, are used for drink, without reference to the nature the liquor. *Mashkeh*, from the same root, designates drink, drinking-vessel, cup-bearer, &c. *Mishtah*, from *shathah*, is used for a drinking feast, a banquet of wine. *Soveh* denotes wine, and *savah* signifies to be in wine, or under the influence of *soveh*. *Gamah* is used twice, once of the war-horse swallowing the ground, and once of drinking water. *Ravah* occurs in fourteen passages, and is used of watering and being watered, filled with love, satiated with fatness, drunk with blood and with wormwood; a sword bathed in heaven, a land soaked with blood, drunkenness added to thirst. *Shakar* occurs in seventy-four texts, and is variously used for drowning, moistening, watering, giving to drink, &c., but never for drunkenness. *Shathah* is found in two hundred and twenty-three passages, where it is employed once for drinking milk, seven times drinking blood, twenty-four times of judgments, forty times indefinitely of drinking, without reference to the nature of the drink, sixty-eight times of drinking wine, and eighty-three times of drinking water. It is uniformly employed to describe *the act of drinking*, whatever may have been the liquor used, but it is never used to designate *a state of drunkenness*. On the contrary, when this latter thought has to be expressed, the very shaker has to be united with it for that purpose. Thus, Genesis ix. 21, - “And he drank (*vay-yasht*) of the wine, and was drunken (*vay-yishkar*). 1 Kings xvi. 9, “Drinking (*shotheh*) himself drunk (*shikkor*). 1 Kings xx. 16, “Drinking himself drunk” (*shotheh shikkor*). Psalm Lxix 12, “The drunkards” – i.e., drinkers of *shekar* (*shothai shakar*). Jer. xxv. 27, “Drink ye (*shethu*) and be drunken” (*vay-shikru*). The verb *shakar* occurs in nineteen passages, in thirteen of which it is employed metaphorically, and in six literally. The metaphorical

The Wines of the Bible

usage is as follows: - "They are *drunken*, but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink." (Isaiah xxiv. 9); "Drink, yea, drink abundantly" (marg., or, "and be drunken") (Cant. v. 1); "Drink ye, and *be drunken*, and spue, and fall, and rise no more" (Jer. xxv. 27); "And *they shall be drunken* with their own blood as with sweet wine" (Isaiah xlix. 26); "*Thou shalt be drunken*, and shalt make thyself naked" (Lam. iv. 21); "Thou also *shalt be drunken*" (Nah. iii. 11); "Thou afflicted and *drunken*, but not with wine" (Isaiah Li. 21); I will "*make them drunk* in my fury" (Isaiah Lxiii. 6); Babylon hath "*made* all the earth *drunken*; the nations have drunk of her wine; therefore the nations are mad" (Jer. li. 7); "*I will make them drunken*, that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep" (Jer. li. 39). "And I *will make drunk* her princes.....and they shall sleep a perpetual sleep (Jer. li. 57); "Make ye him drunken.....Moab also shall wallow in his vomit, and he also shall be in derision." (Jer. xlviii. 26); "I will *make* mine arrows *drunk* with blood" (Deut. xxxii. 42).

The literal usage of *shakar* is as follows: - "Ye drink, but are not *filled with drink*" (Hag. i. 6); Noah "drank of the wine, and *was drunken*" (Gen. ix. 21); Joseph's brethren "drank, and *were merry* with him" (Gen. xliii. 34). "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and *makest him drunken* also" (2 Sam. xi. 13). And Eli said unto Hannah, "How long *wilt thou be drunken*? Put away thy wine from thee" (1 Sam. i. 14).

The substantive *shikkaron* is found in three passages: - "Behold I will fill all the inhabitants of the land.....and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem with *drunkenness*" (Jer. xiii. 13); "Thou shalt be filled with *drunkenness* and sorrow" (Ezek. xxiii. 33); "And ye shall eat fat till ye be full, and drink blood *till ye be drunk*" (Ezek. xxxix. 19). The adjective *shikoor* occurs in thirteen passages, as follows: - "Eli thought she *had been drunken*" (1 Samuel i. 13); "And Nabal's heart was merry within him, for he was very *drunken*" (1 Samuel

The Wines of the Bible

xxv. 36); “He was drinking himself drunk in the house of Arza” (1 Kings xvi. 9); “Benhadad was drinking himself *drunk* in the pavilions, he and the kings” (1 Kings xx. 16); “He makes them to stagger *like a drunken man*” (Job xii. 25); “They reel to and fro and stagger *like a drunken man*” (Psalm cvii. 27); “As a thorn goeth up into the hand of a *drunkard*” (Prov. xxvi. 9); “As a *drunken man* staggereth in his vomit” (Isaiah xix. 14). “The earth shall reel to and fro *like a drunkard*” (Isaiah xxiv. 20); “Woe to the crown of pride, to the *drunkards* of Ephraim” (Isaiah xxviii. 1); “I am like a *drunken man*, and like a man whom wine hath overcome” (Jer. xxiii. 9); “Awake, ye *drunkards*, and weep; and howl, all ye drinkers of wine” (Joel i. 5).

The reader will now be able to judge for himself as to the real significance of these various terms for drink, drinking, and drunkenness. The references show that *shathah* is uniformly employed in two hundred and twenty-three texts to designate *the act of drinking*, whether the quantity of liquor consumed be large or little; but it is never used for *a state of drunkenness*. *Shakar* and its derivatives, *shikkaron* and *shikkoor*, verb, noun, and adjective, are uniformly employed in all the thirty-five passages in which they occur to designate *the effects of drink*; but they are never used for the act of drinking whether the quantity of liquor consumed be large or small. The references further show that while other terms are used to denote fulness, satisfaction, satiation, *shaker* and its derivatives are uniformly employed to designate the intoxicating effects of drink – *a state of drunkenness*, whether metaphorical or literal. Hence, “a drunken man” is paralleled with “a man whom wine hath overcome.” The inhabitants are “*filled with drunkenness*.” Certain persons were *drinking themselves drunk*. Hence, also, the associated references to staggering, reeling, vomiting, falling, derision, stupor, madness. All which clearly demonstrates that *shaker* does not mean to drink

The Wines of the Bible

freely, or largely, or to satisfaction, or to satiation, or even *to drink at all*. But that our English words drunk, drunken, intoxicated, it designates the effects of drink – *a condition or state of drunkenness*.

If this be so, then the *shechar*, which uniformly produced these effects when indulged in to excess, could never have been a mere sweet juice, but must always have been an intoxicating liquor. If it had ever been an unfermented beverage, it could never have acquired the uniformly bad character which even Dr. Ritchie acknowledges when he says, - “In every case in the Bible where drink is referred to as a common beverage, it is spoken of with admonition and warning against it.”⁸³⁵ And again, - “I have observed that the warnings against this strong drink are uniform. There is not a single text in the Bible that approves it as a common beverage. In every instance where God mentions it in His book, He lifts up a distinct and solemn warning against it.” And yet again, - “I ask here, what is it about this drink that the Almighty utters a warning against” and once more, I reply, it is its inebriating power.”⁸³⁶

These statements are sufficiently broad and explicit. How, then in the face of his own and oft repeated testimony, does this writer arrive at the discovery that the universally and uniformly condemned *shechar* is, after all, merely a “sweet drink or sweet syrup?” And how is it that he says, “strong drink” is “not a happy rendering of the original term. The epithet ‘strong,’ for which there is nothing equivalent in the Hebrew, conveys the idea that the drink is highly intoxicating. But *shechar* of itself conveys no such idea.”⁸³⁷ Indeed! And yet the thing “about this drink that the Almighty utters a warning against” is “its inebriating power!”

⁸³⁵ Sc. Test., p. 133

⁸³⁶ Ibid., p. 138

⁸³⁷ Ibid., p. 133

The Wines of the Bible

Referring to Num. xxviii. 7 where *shechar* is rendered "strong wine," Dr. Ritchie says, "As we know that all fermented things were excluded from sacrifices to God (Lev. ii), the conclusion is forced on us that fermented drink can, on no account be meant in this text."⁸³⁸ This statement is a fair illustration of that bold assertion and hasty generalization which pre-eminently distinguish the Scripture testimony of this writer. Where do we learn that "all fermented things were excluded from sacrifices to God?" We know that *khamatz*, fermented bread, *seor*, ferment, and *devash*, honey of grapes and of bees, were forbidden in one class of sacrifices; but the prohibition in this case extends to Dr. Ritchie's *unfermented grape juice*, as well as to his universally condemned *shechar*, the one being as unlawful, in that particular description of offerings, as the other. Nor is he ignorant of the fact, while fermented things were excluded from these offerings, they were expressly enjoined in other "sacrifices to God." Accordingly, he quote, on page 97, the following texts, without giving the words: - Amos iv 5, "Offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with *leaven*:" Lev. vii. 13 "Beside the cakes, he shall offer for his offering *leavened* bread, with the sacrifice of thanksgiving of his peace offerings; " Lev. xxiii. 17, 18, "Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loafs of two-tenth deals: they shall be of fine flour; they shall be baked with *leaven*; they are the firstfruits unto the Lord. And ye shall offer with the bread seven lambs without blemish of the first year, and one young bullock, and two rams; they shall be for a burnt offering unto the Lord with their meat offering, and their drink offerings, even an offering made by fire, of sweet savour unto the Lord." Excluding the first of these texts, as of doubtful reference, the other two passages show that leavened bread, "fermented things," formed part of the sacrifices,

⁸³⁸ Ibid., p. 137

The Wines of the Bible

the peace offerings, the wave offerings, the firstfruits, the burnt offerings, and even the meat offerings; so that the argument, founded on the alleged exclusion of “all fermented things” from “sacrifices to God,” as to the nature of *shechar*, is absolutely worthless.

This writer, as we have seen, is very explicit in his testimony as to the uniformity of the condemnations pronounced in the Bible against the use of *shechar*, as a common beverage, and solely on account of its “inebriating power.” Hence he repeats and re-repeats the fact, saying, “In *every case* in the Bible where this drink is referred to as a common beverage, it is spoken of with admonition and warning against it.” In the “remarkable contrast between *tirosh* and *shechar*,” “*every passage* that refers to the latter points to it with warning, as an evil to be shunned. Let persons who use intoxicating liquors explain this as best they can, there is the fact standing out before them in the Book of God.” “I have observed that the warnings against this strong drink are *uniform*. There is not a *single text* in the Bible that approves it as a common beverage. In *every instance* where God mentions it in His book, He lifts up a distinct and solemn warning against it.” “The liquor possessed an intoxicating power, and it is the drinkers of this who are marked with this note of disapprobation. The *thing itself* is branded with a divine stigma.” “We observe, then, here is the testimony of other *twenty-three witnesses*; and what is its import? There is still in it not a syllable of sanction for the use of intoxicating liquor. God, in *all these passages* of His Word, utters solemn warnings against this.”

One would naturally conclude from all this that the Hebrew *shechar* was not only a fermented wine, but that it must have been a very “strong drink,” to observe such a universal and uniform condemnation as it apparently has received. And yet we are told, “there is nothing equivalent in the Hebrew” for “the

The Wines of the Bible

epithet strong,” and “*shechar* of itself conveys no such idea” as that it was “highly intoxicating!” We should have thought, from this formidable array of condemnatory evidence given against its use, that “the liquor,” “the thing itself,” as evil, and only evil, uniformly evil; but notwithstanding all that condemnation, “*shechar* of itself” was merely a “sweet drink or sweet syrup” of sugar or honey, &c.! As the word occurs in all in twenty-three passages of Scripture, and these are adduced by Dr. Ritchie as “other *twenty-three* witnesses,” not “a syllable,” in favour of it; as the admonitory warnings against its use are “uniform;” and as in “every instance,” in “every case,” in “every passage,” and in “all these passages” of the whole “twenty-three witnesses,” the “liquor,” the “thing itself,” is “branded with a divine stigma,” as a liquor which “possessed intoxicating power;” and as “the thing about this drink that the Almighty utters a warning against” is “its inebriating power,” there surely cannot be a doubt that *shechar* was indeed, a “strong drink,” and not merely an innocent sweet syrup! But, notwithstanding all this iteration and strong assertion, the alleged uniformity of the condemnation is not uniform. The writer, quoting from Moses Stuart, says, “We should not be surprised, then, in case we find both [*yayin* and *shechar*] spoken of in such a way that in one passage it is regarded as a blessing or an allowable comfort, while in another it is spoken of as a means of intoxication and a curse.” Well, perhaps, we should not be surprised at this; but we are really more than surprised to find *shechar* “the thing itself,” and not something else, “branded with a divine stigma” on account of its “intoxicating power” in *all* the passages of the “twenty-three” in which it occurs in Scripture, and yet spoken of in one passage “as a blessing or an allowable comfort,” and in another “as a means of intoxication and a curse.”

After the wide sweeping condemnation we have noticed, Dr. Ritchie says, “For the use of *shechar* as a mere comfort, there is

The Wines of the Bible

but one passage in the Bible (Deut. xiv. 26), and here nothing decides it to be fermented, but the evidence is all on the other side." We shall see presently on which side the evidence lies; but, in the meantime, it is to be observed that the writer has found *shechar*, "the thing itself," spoken of as a "comfort" in the Bible; that although *all* the passages condemn it, "one passage" favours it; and that, although the whole "twenty-three witnesses" have risen up against its use, one of these twenty-three condemnatory witnesses has actually smiled upon the *cursed* thing as an "allowable comfort!" What is the explanation of these contradictory assertions? Evidently a slipshod inaccuracy of statement, combined with a little finessing in argument. The inaccuracy is exhibited in the unqualified language employed as to the "twenty-three witnesses;" and the finessing is shown in the flimsy distinction between *shechar* used as "a common beverage," and employed as an "allowable comfort." Now, as our present inquiry has specially to do with the common beverages of the Jews, Dr. Ritchie acknowledges that the liquor designated *shechar* possessed an "inebriating power." "True," says our author, "but I mean that it was so only when used as 'a common beverage.'" Be it so. Uncommon beverages may have been used by uncommon people, for uncommon purposes; but these in no way concern us. Our specific object is to discover the true nature of every description of wine used by the ancients as a "common beverage;" and, Dr. Ritchie being witness, the *shechar* thus used was an inebriating liquor.

If *shechar* was allowed "as a mere comfort," it must have been a lawful drink when so employed – i.e., for comfort, and could only have become unlawful when used intemperately, to "add drunkenness to thirst." Was this, then, the common purpose for which it was used as a "common beverage" by the Jews; and did they reserve it as an uncommon beverage, to be used only as "a

The Wines of the Bible

comfort” on such uncommon occasions as when suffering from heartaches, and other infirmities of the flesh and of the mind? It must have been so if we accept this distinction between common and uncommon usage. And as our author insists that, in the former case, the *shechar* was an inebriating liquor, and, in the latter case, a sweet syrup, we must conclude that the Hebrew, in his hours of ease, drank fermented *shechar* as his “common beverage,” and, in his seasons of sore distress, *sweet syrup*, as his uncommon beverage and “allowable comfort!” We are quite aware that tastes differ, and that the habits of the ancients are not to be judged by the standard of modern customs; but we find it difficult to believe that an afflicted and sorrowful Jew would have recourse to a syrup of sugar, or honey, when he needed and craved “comfort.” The moderns find in tea a “cup that cheers, but not inebriates,” because, if there be no spirit, there is, at least, an exhilarating stimulant in the beverage. But we are not aware that sweet syrup possesses, or was ever supposed to possess, a special consolatory power, fitted to elevate the depressed spirits, or to enliven the heavy hearts of the sorrowful ones. Dr. Ritchie has manifestly reversed the order of Nature, as well as of Scripture. The Bible says, “Give strong drink (*shechar*) unto him that is ready to perish, and wine (*yayin*) unto those that be of heavy hearts” (Prov. xxxi. 6). The doctor admits “that *shechar* here denotes what is intoxicating,” but his theory would transform the text into something like the following: - “Give sweet syrup, as an allowable comfort, unto him that is ready to perish, and to those that be of heavy hearts; and leave happy and healthy men to regale themselves with ‘a common’ intoxicating ‘beverage.’”

If *shechar* was a “sweet syrup,” as alleged, it is strange that Dr. Ritchie excludes it from the common beverages of the Jews, and assigns it a place among the uncommon and allowable comforts. One would have thought that a sweet substance of that kind

The Wines of the Bible

would have been among the most common articles of use on all domestic and social occasions, instead of being “a mere comfort,” reserved for seasons of sorrow and distress. And, in fact, sweet syrup was a common and favourite preparation among the Jews, but they named it, as we have seen, *devash*, not *shechar*.

The “one passage in the Bible” in which *shechar* is said to occur as the designation of “a mere comfort,” and where it is alleged “nothing decides it to be fermented, but the evidence is all on the other side,” is as follows: - “*And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul listeth after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for wine (yayin), or for strong drink (shechar), or for whatever thy soul desireth: and thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household*” (Deut. xiv. 26). Now, if in this divine permission to buy *shechar*, and to use it with rejoicing, “nothing decides it to be fermented,” it is obvious, from the whole structure of the text, that there is quite as little to evidence that it as unfermented. We are therefore bound, by all the laws of sound exegesis, to interpret the obscure and indeterminate utterance of one text by the admittedly clear and certain evidence of all the other passages in which the same word occurs. Seeing, then, that Dr. Ritchie admits that in twenty-two, if not twenty-three, texts *shechar* is undoubtedly an inebriating liquor, it will require to be made very clear that “the evidence is all on the other side,” ere we can believe that this “one passage in the Bible” is an exception to the general rule, which he has acknowledged. What, then, is the nature of that opposing evidence to which he appeals?

Curiously enough, he defines the *oil*, which was to be tithed, as “*yitshar*, or olive fruit,” and then designates the *shechar* as “the liquor made from *yitshar*, specified above, or like fruit” – an interpretation which converts the *shechar*, not into sweet syrup, but into olive oil! He next alleges that “as the whole passage is a

The Wines of the Bible

directory for a religious ordinance," "we may be well assured from this, that the *shechar* to be there freely enjoyed was not intoxicating drink. For who would not recoil at the thought of a holy God appointing free potations of intoxicating liquors to be indulged in His temple, and as an expression of devotion to Him? Who could think for a moment of a divine appointment to drink freely of our brandy and whisky, or brandied wines, in a religious observance?" And to all this we may be permitted to add, and who can think that all that declamation is sober reasoning, intended to prove that "all the evidence is on the other side?" What, in the name of common sense, has the drinking of brandy or whisky, or brandied wines, to do either with the nature of *shechar*, or its use by the Jews? Is the writer not aware that he has already said, "It is to be especially noted that the inebriating power of this liquor, as well as of mixed wine, then in common use, does not appear to have been so great as that of the alcoholic beverages now drunk by professing Christians in this country;" that he has shown from the prophet Amos that "the careless, luxurious religionists of his time" drank wine "in bowls;" that this expression "conveys to an ordinary reader," and is "designed to indicate the measure or 'quantity of wine drunk;" and that "on this expression" he has founded "an argument, that a much greater quantity of it was drunk at a season of indulgence than could be drunk of the brandied wines of Britain, and that, therefore, these latter possess a stronger intoxicating power." Now, if this be the case, the Israelites might, indeed, have indulged "freely" in *shechar*, drinking it even "in bowls," like their co-religionists of the prophet's time, and that without inebriation, although a fermented liquor.

We are under no obligation, however, to make even that concession, seeing that the text furnishes no evidence of anything approaching to excess, either in the divine permission, or in the

The Wines of the Bible

actual use of the people and their households on the occasion referred to. Where, then, did the writer find this unrestrained liberty of use, or learn that the *shechar* was to be “freely enjoyed,” or that God appointed it to be indulged in “free potations?” Not in the text, but in his own imagination; for there is not the remotest allusion to any such freedom or excess in the passage. The divine permission to use “wine and strong drink” is co-extensive with the permission to use oxen and sheep, and both grants were obviously given under the natural and well understood limitations of moderation in eating and drinking, without the shadow of liberty for either gluttony or drunkenness.

As this is “all the evidence” adduced by Dr. Ritchie “on the other side,” and as it logically amounts to no evidence at all, being founded on his own fanciful importation of “free potations” into the text, as in the previous case of “caldron,” it cannot possibly invalidate the uniform and unbroken testimony of the *other twenty-two witnesses*, that *shechar* was not a mere “sweet syrup,” but a veritable “inebriating” liquor.

Writers who are committed to the unfermented theory are hard pressed to find a satisfactory explanation of the Biblical recommendation, “Give strong drink (*shechar*) unto him that is ready to perish, and wine (*yayin*) unto those that be of heavy hearts. Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more” (Prov. xxxi. 6, 7). The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* candidly acknowledges that he “does not profess to understand this passage.” He would, doubtless have understood it better if he had not been trammelled by the exigencies of his unfermented theory; and, in that case, he would been under no necessity of charging the wise king with want of wisdom, as when he says of Hannah, “She sought the true remedy, which Solomon might more wisely have recommended.” Dr. Lees does not believe that, in the text, there is any allusion to “the practice and of giving

The Wines of the Bible

intoxicating and stupefying potions to criminals before execution,” nor to “the moderate use of intoxicating liquor as a cordial in time of trouble.” He asserts that if the passage is to be construed as a *serious* recommendation, it is nothing short of a direct injunction to get intoxicated,” and says, “So far as the words go, we have here a plain prescription to ‘drown sorrow in drink.’” He maintains that the verb “give thou,” “may be regarded as logical, and not mandatory; not as ‘do give,’ but ‘should you give,’ then such and such will be the result;” or “the imperative *tnu*, ‘give thou’ may be regarded as a term of conditional comparison. Kings and princes (verses 4 and 5) are not to use wine and strong drink.....’Give them – if at all – to the perishing and careworn, who will find in them oblivion from the very memory of their sorrows.”⁸³⁹ Dr. Ritchie admits “that the *shechar* here denotes what is intoxicating.” But he says, “the persons to whom strong drink is to be given” are “the wretched and sorrowful, the down-trodden, and the drawn unto death.” By this, however, “the speaker does not utter a command to give strong drink as according to the will of God, but merely states a fact as to a common practice among men; and alone with this is coupled a counsel to the king, to have no fellowship with the unhappy in this delusion.” If Solomon merely intended to state a fact as to a common practice among men, he takes a strange way of stating his fact, when he tells the king to “give strong drink to him that is ready to perish!” And even according to this explanation, intoxicating *shechar* is not, as before stated,, the “common beverage” of the people, but the uncommon beverage, specially reserved as “an allowable comfort” for “the wretched and sorrowful.” And the comforting cordial given to these

⁸³⁹ Temp. Bib. Com., pp. 144, 145

The Wines of the Bible

sufferers is not, as formerly alleged, a “sweet syrup,” but an intoxicating drink.

It will be observed that in this text, Dr. Lees and Dr. Ritchie both admit that *shechar* is a fermented and intoxicating liquor. How have they arrived at this conclusion? If it was a “sweet syrup” when allowed “as a mere comfort” to the Jews travelling up to Jerusalem to keep the feast, why should it not be a sweet syrup, also, when given as a cordial to “the wretched and the sorrowful, the down-trodden, and the drawn unto death?” If a syrup was capable of affording comfort to the former, it was surely quite as capable of giving comfort to the latter. But we suspect that neither the doctors has much faith in the comforting qualities of the alleged syrup! Dr. Lees assumes that, for the perishing and careworn to “forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more,” he must fill himself drunk, and so attain to a “complete oblivion of earthly care.” Some wretched and sorrowful people, who are addicted to intemperance, may believe in this gospel of drunkenness; but “so far as the words go,” there is absolutely nothing in the text to justify such a practice, or to warrant the assertion that it is a “direct injunction to get intoxicated,” or “a plain prescription to down sorrow in drink.” These are mere fancies imported into, or fathered upon the passage. The object contemplated in the recommendation of the text is not an utter and eternal oblivion of sense and misery, but merely a present and temporary mitigation of suffering, and alleviation of sorrow, such as we find in the following reference: - “Thou shalt bestow that money” for “wine or for strong drink,” and “thou shalt *rejoice*, thou and thine household” (Deut. xiv. 26). Ziba brought David a bottle of wine, “that such as be *faint* in the wilderness may drink” (2 Sam. xvi. 2). “Wine maketh *glad* the heart of man” (Ps. civ. 15). “Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a *merry* heart; for God now accepteth thy works” (Eccl.

The Wines of the Bible

ix 7). “A feast is made for laughter, and wine maketh *merry*” (Eccl. X. 19). And the prophet speaks of hearts “that *rejoice* as through wine” (Zech. X. 7).

All these passages indicate the cheering and enlivening effects of wine, but they neither permit, nor prescribe, nor even allude to excessive indulgences. Innumerable references of a similar kind might be quoted from ancient authors of which the following are examples: Pliny, speaking, not of drunkenness, but of “the use of wine in moderation,” says, “it takes off the edge of sorrows.”⁸⁴⁰ Athenaeus quotes the lines, -

*“No better remedies than wine there are,
O king, to drive away soul-eating care.”*

Bacchylides says, “it drives dull care away.” Sophocles, “it is a cure for woe.” Homer, “rising spirits flow from sprightly juice.” Euripides, it “every grief dispels.” Simoides, it is “the brave router of all melancholy.” Ion, “the sole remedy for care, and common cause of joy and cheerfulness.”

This ancient usage, sacred and profane, of Hebrews and heathens, shows that in early times alcoholic wine was popularly regarded “as allowable for comfort” for “those that be of heavy hearts;” and, although it may have been indulged in to excess by some persons who sought to “drown sorrow in drink,” it was used also by others, in moderation, to mitigate suffering and alleviate sorrow. It was an ancient custom among the Jews to celebrate the obsequies of the dead by a funeral festival; and, accordingly, the prophet in denouncing the wickedness of the people, and threatening them with divine judgments, whereby “the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness” should be made to cease out of the land, enumerates among their impending afflictions, that

⁸⁴⁰ Book xxiii.

The Wines of the Bible

“neither shall men give them the cup of consolation to drink for their father or for their mother” (Jer. xvi. 7). So that wine might be lawfully used as a “cup of consolation,” an allowable comfort, by the wretched and sorrowful, without any liberty being thereby afforded to any one to drink away his senses in the oblivion of intoxication. It is in the light of these usages we must read the text, “Give strong drink to him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of a heavy heart.” &c.

What, then, was the Hebrew *shechar*? It was, says Dr. Ritchie, “sweet drink or sweet syrup, especially of sugar or honey, of dates, or of the palm tree.” It may, indeed, have been a “sweet drink” – fermented, as the evidence adduced shows – but it could not have been a “sweet syrup,” for that was designated *devash* or *dibs*. It was, says Dr. Lees, “a generic term for ‘drinks,’ including fresh juices and inebriating liquors, other than those coming from the grape.” The word certainly designated an inebriating beverage, as twenty-two at least out of twenty-three witnesses testified; and if it also included fresh juices, there is but “one passage in the Bible” from which this can be inferred, and even that solitary text is no exception to the general rule. So that, in point of fact, there is not a shred of evidence in the Hebrew Scriptures which warrants us to conclude otherwise than that *shechar*, as used by the Jews was, everywhere and always an inebriating liquor. It may have been a drink made from other juices “than those coming from the grape;” and, in that case, it was either a species of date wine, or of barley wine, or the term may have included both descriptions of liquor. But we have seen in our examination of the Egyptian wines that both were fermented and alcoholic beverages. So far, therefore, as *shechar* is concerned, there is no evidence in favour of the unfermented theory.

The Wines of the Bible

8. Shemaheim.

This word occurs in four passages of Scripture, and is variously rendered *dregs*, *lees*, and *wines on the lees*. Dr. Lees and Dr. Ritchie are at issue as to the meaning of the word in the text, "A feast of wines on the lees well refined." (Isa. xxv. 6). The former alleges that it designates a preserve or grape jelly, and not a vinous liquor or beverage; and the latter says, "this view of the term under consideration does not satisfy" him. The verb *shahmar*, from which the noun is derived, is used in a large number of passages, signifying to keep, guard, preserve; and three other terms related to it are employed in the sense of watching or observing. The root idea which pervades this usage is obviously that of keeping or preserving persons and things. Accordingly, when it is said, "*And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees (shemahrim), of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees (shemahrim) well refined,*" a rich preserved substance is, undoubtedly, referred to, but whether that substance was a solid or a liquid remains to be seen.

There is, in this text, a beautiful double comparison and antithesis, both of things and words, which may be exhibited thus

English

*"A feast of fat things, of fat things full of marrow;
A feast of wines on the lees, of wines on the lees well refined."*

Hebrew

*"Mishteh shemahnim, shemahuim memukhayim;
Mishteh shemahrim, shemahuim memukkayim;*

The Wines of the Bible

Dr. Lees excludes all kinds of liquor from this metaphorical banquet, and converts it into a feast of *prime flesh and confections well clarified*! He says, by the *feast of fat things*, “we are not to understand fat meat as distinguished from lean, but well-fed, prime flesh, with the best quality of food, including the oily ingredients, which were highly prized.” By *fat things full of marrow*, we are to understand, “fatnesses marrowed out – taken from the marrow bone.” And by *wines on the lees*, we are to understand neither wine nor lees, but “things specially cared for, or, as we say, preserves – dainties, confections.”⁸⁴¹ The author of Tirosh lo Yayin, in like manner, suggests that shemahrim “may here have meant some rich preserves of fruits, of preserves ‘well refined.’” And in this way the double comparison and antithesis will stand thus –

A feast of prime flesh, of prime flesh taken from the marrow bone
A feast of confections, of confections well clarified!

If these writers had wickedly intended to put a fool’s cup on the prophet’s head, or to turn his sacred oracle into ridicule, they could hardly have fallen upon a more effectual method for accomplishing their purpose than by means of this *outré* interpretation. Accordingly, we are not surprised to find that even Dr. Ritchie is shocked at the travesty, and says, “I confess this view of the term under consideration does not satisfy me. It does not, I think, meet either the style of thought or the form of expression in this passage. It does not harmonize with the majesty of the thought. The glorious blessings of redemption are here set forth under the metaphor of a great feast, - a feast we are led to expect composed of the choicest of food and drink. But if *shemahrim*

⁸⁴¹ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 167

The Wines of the Bible

signifies 'preserves,' the latter is altogether wanting in the feast; and I cannot help feeling there is a descent and incongruity in the thought, supposing the prophet to speak of 'fat things' in the first clause, and of 'preserves' or 'jellies' in the last."⁸⁴²

If we appeal to Hebrew thought and Biblical usage, we shall find that the absence of wine at a banquet was regarded as a deprivation, a punishment; and that a wineless feast was, among the Jews, a sign of sorrow and calamity. Wine is associated in the Scriptures with the fat things which God provides for the enjoyment of men, and is spoken of as the gift of God that "maketh glad the heart of man." It was employed as a libation or "drink offering" in the service of God, and as a means of enjoyment in all the social and religious festivals of the Jews, except on some occasions of affliction, when a more or less general fast was held. It is frequently used as a metaphor of spiritual blessings, and particularly of the blessings of redemption. Thus, Wisdom "hath mingled her wine; she hath also furnished her table." She saith, "Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled" (Prov. ix 1-5). "He brought me to the banqueting house (*beth-yayin*, 'house of wine'), and his banner over me was love" (Cant. ii. 4). "I have drunk my wine with my milk: Eat, O friends, drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved" (Cant. v. 1). "I would cause thee to drink of spiced wine, of the juice of my pomegranate" (Cant. viii. 2). "Come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price" (Isa. lv. 1).

This usage, of which additional examples might be given, justifies Dr. Ritchie's expectation, that, when "the glorious blessings of redemption are here set forth under the metaphor of a great feast," the banquet will be "composed of the choicest of

⁸⁴² Sc. Test., p. 171

The Wines of the Bible

food and drink;" and this expectation is strengthened, when it is remembered that these blessings are, in fact set forth in the Christian festival of the Lord's Supper under the emblems of bread and wine. A wineless banquet, even although it should be composed of prime flesh, and clarified confections, would be incongruous with the Hebrew idea of festivity, and would be more suitable for a mournful fast, under affliction or calamity, than for a joyous festival under the reign of grace.

Dr. Ritchie, after rejecting the interpretation of Dr. Lees, gives his own view of the text, as follows: - "On the whole, then, I am disposed to regard the word as meaning wine on the lees, generous and pure wine. The lees are the refuse of the wine, which lies at the bottom of the vessel, and preserves the wine in its freshness and flavour.....This expression suggest the idea of the winepress has been run off, and the remaining portion settling down on the lees.....This, of course, could be preserved from fermentation by any of the ordinary processes in use, and appears to have been highly prized for its taste and flavour."⁸⁴³ In this the writer has made a sad muddle of the Hebrew wine and its lees! He intimates that the settling process takes place in the "wine-press" or vat, not perceiving that, if the "fresh juice" is allowed to settle there, it must inevitably undergo fermentation by exposure to the air. He represents "part of the contents of the winepress" as being run off, leaving us to guess whether the part so run off was the "pure wine," or the "refuse of the wine;" and then he explains that the juice remains in the vat, *after* that running off, settles down on the lees, and becomes, we presume, "the generous and pure wine." He alleges that the refuse "which lies at the bottom of the vessel" has the effect of preserving "the wine in its freshness and flavour," not perceiving that, if it does so, it must be at the

⁸⁴³ Sc. Test., pp. 172, 173

The Wines of the Bible

expense of the wine as an unfermented “fresh juice;” and he forgets that the ancients strained out the lees from their wine with the avowed object of thereby lessening the alcoholic strength of the liquor. He asserts that “this of course could be preserved from fermentation by any of the ordinary processes in use,” not being apparently aware that the only process in use of that kind was the inspissation of the juice; and, “of course, “ if the grape juice was boiled down to *debash*, it could not have been *shemahrim*, unless the latter was a *preserved jelly*, as alleged by Dr. Lees, but which our author rejects as “a descent and incongruity in the thought.”

These notions of Lees and Ritchie, as to the nature of *shemahrim*, are totally incompatible with the use of the word in all other passages in which it occurs. Thus, “Moab hath been at ease from his youth, and he hath settled on his lees, and hath not empties from vessel to vessel, neither hath he gone into captivity: therefore, his taste remained in him, and his scent is not changed. Therefore, behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will send unto him wanderers, that shall cause him to wander, and shall empty his vessel, and break their bottles” (Jer. xlviii. 11, 12). Here is no reference to a fresh juice, or to a preserved jelly. The people of Moab are represented as living undisturbed in their false security, with the dregs of their wickedness unremoved, like wine which after passing through the disturbing process of fermentation, settles down on its lees; and God threatens to visit them, not with the object of now refining them from their dregs, by emptying them “from vessel to vessel,” but utterly destroying them by emptying their vessels and breaking their bottles.

The image employed by the prophet here finds an apt illustration in a passage from Columella quoted in *Tirosh lo Yayin*: - “On the third day after you have trodden out [the grapes], pour in your *condituram* [seasoning], but before you spice it draw off a

The Wines of the Bible

little of the must from one *seria* into another, lest in the process of spicing it should effervesce with the *medicamentum* [preparations], and flow over. But so thoroughly mingle *medicamentum* in a *labellum* [a small tub or vat] as shall be necessary for each of the jars, and dilute that *medicamentum* with must, and add it to the jars, and mix it up thoroughly; when it shall have ceased working, fill it up again forthwith, and pitch it over. Whenever you would season any kind of wine, do not rack it off immediately, but let it settle in the casks; afterwards, when you wish to rack it off from the casks or jars, in the spring time, when the rose is in bloom, having got it as clear as possible from the dregs, pour it off into vessels well pitched and clean. If you wish to preserve it to grow old, add to every *cadus* of two *urnae* [about seven gals.] one *sextarius* [say a pint] of the very best wine, or three *sextarii* of fresh and generous lees; of if you have vessels from which wine has been recently taken, mix it up with them. Anything of this kind will make the wine better and fuller bodied; also, if you add good scents, you will prevent all bad scent and flavour; for nothing attracts to itself a strange odour of other things sooner than wine.”⁸⁴⁴

This good old wine, strengthened by the addition of lees, is totally different description of wine from the kind of liquor referred to by Cato and Pliny under the name of *dreg* wine. The former was a generous full-bodied “wine on the lees well refined;” such as that referred to in the ancient oracle: -

*“Drink wine on lees, which at Anthedon don’t dwell,
Not sacra Hypera, where thou drank’st wine purged well.”
Plutarch’s Greek Questions.*

⁸⁴⁴ Sec. xxxviii.

The Wines of the Bible

The latter was a poor, thin liquor, made from the husks of grapes, or the dregs of wine, with water added. Both were fermented liquors. The fermentation of the former is evidenced in almost every sentence of the paragraph quoted. Thus the grape juice was exposed to the action of the atmosphere for three days after it had been expressed. The wine was not racked off “immediately,” but allowed “to settle in the casks,” and was only racked “in the spring time, when the rose is in bloom.” The jars were to be pitched when the liquor had “ceased working.” The “very best wine,” or “fresh and generous lees,” was to be added to the liquor, in order to ensure its keeping to a good old age, and to “make the wine better and fuller bodies.” And these additions to a wine already prepared, and “cleared of its dregs,” must have necessitated a new fermentative action, and have thereby increased the potency of the liquor. Consequently this wine on the lees was no mere dreg wine, or grape juice, nor grape jelly, but a “generous and pure wine,” both fermented and alcoholic.

The other two passages in which *shemahrim* occurs are these: “I will search Jerusalem with candles, and punish the men that are settled on their *lees*: that say in their heart, the Lord will not do good neither will he do evil” (Zeph. i. 12). “For in the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red; it is full of mixture; and he poureth out of the same; but the *dregs* thereof, all the wicked of the earth shall wring out; and drink them” (Ps. lxxv. 8). In these texts the term is closely associated with wines, and not with jellies. In the first the usage is similar to that employed by Jeremiah, already quoted. In the other the reference is to the lees of wine, saturated with stupefying drugs, in the cup of mixture. We may, therefore, reasonably conclude that *shemahrim* designates, not confections, but lees-wine; and that the text in Isaiah describes not a feast of preserved jellies, but a feast of

The Wines of the Bible

preserved wines – i.e., wines made richer, and better for keeping by the action of the lees.

Dr. Lees, however, thinks it “absurd to suppose that the dregs or lees are put, by way of figure, for the wine itself, which had been purified *from them*.”⁸⁴⁵ But the writer overlooks the fact, that the *purification* did not take place until after the wine had been kept for some time on the lees. Hence, the objection of Nicrus: - “Wine ought not to be brought to the table strained, but, observing Hesiod’s rule, we ought to drink it new out of the vessel. Moreover, he added that this way of purging wine takes the strength from it, and robs it of its natural heat, which, by being poured out of one vessel into another, evaporates and dies.”⁸⁴⁶ Hence, also Columella’s directions: - “Do not rack it off immediately, but let it settle in the casks: afterwards, when you wish to rack it off the casks or jars, in the spring time, when the rose is in the bloom, having got it as clear as possible from the dregs, pour it off into vessels well pitched and clean.” Dr. Lees further objects to his interpretation that it involves the absurd rendering of “a feast of dregs.”⁸⁴⁷ But the absurdity is the creation of his own fancy. Even if we adopt his view of the text, we can only render it “a feast of preserves,” without any added dainties, confections, or jellies; and must leave it undetermined whether the substance referred to was a preserved meat, a preserved fresh juice, a preserved jelly, or a preserved wine. If the writer will interject a jelly into his “preserves,” he cannot equitably object to our interjection of wine; especially seeing that his *preserves* (lees) are never associated with *jelly* in Scripture, whereas our lees are associated with *wine* in every instance in which the word occurs in the Bible. Indeed, this very word “dregs” is used by Cato and Pliny

⁸⁴⁵ Works, ii. 153

⁸⁴⁶ Plutarch’s Sympos.

⁸⁴⁷ Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

as the designation of one description of wine “preserved out from the wine lees.” The latter says, “Cato gives it the name *faecatium*.”⁸⁴⁸ And “lees” is one of the oldest designations of the best wine; for Plutarch says, “The ancients for very good reason, called wine *lees*, as we use to signify a man by his head or soul as the principle part of him.”⁸⁴⁹ Moreover, suppose that the prophet had substituted another term for wine, instead of *shemahrim*, Dr. Lees might still have found an exhibition of absurdity in that usage. Thus, let it be *yayin*, and the banquet will become, on his principle, a feast of *spumings*, because, he says the word denotes “boiling, foaming, spuming;” or *ahsis*, and it will be a feast of *treadings*; or *soveh*, and it will be a feast of *boiling*; or *khemer*, and it will be a feast of *barmy-scum*; or *mesech*, and it will be a feast of *mixtures*.

Referring to the use of the term by Jeremiah, Moab “hath settled on the lees,” Dr Lees appeals to “a fact which,” he says, “does not seem reconcilable with the idea that Jeremiah was referring to *fermented wine*.” The alleged fact is found in a paragraph quoted from a Dictionary to the effect, - “Certain experience convinces that it is the lees that spoils wines; and that they are never better, nor more lively, than when they have been well drawn off. It ought always to be drawn off (at least twice) out of one vessel into another, well washed, leaving the lee in the former.”⁸⁵⁰ It is difficult to understand how this “fact” can be irreconcilable with the idea of *fermented* win, seeing that it is fermented wine of which the writer is speaking. His experience convinces him that the lee spoils the wine, and that the liquor is “never better, nor more lively,” than when the lee is removed. But a “lively” wine is surely a wine with some *life* or *spirit* in it, and not

⁸⁴⁸ Book xiv.

⁸⁴⁹ Sympos.

⁸⁵⁰ Works, ii. 155, Note

The Wines of the Bible

a mere unfermented juice. And if the wine becomes “more lively” when the lee has been “well drawn off,” it must become more *spirituous* thereby; so that in this writer’s opinion a “wine on the lees” will be a less lively, and, therefore, a weaker wine, than if the lees had been removed, but none the less a fermented wine. Moreover, the conclusion arrived at by this writer, as to the effect of lees on the wine, may be quite true, as a modern experience, founded on an improved practice in wine manufacture, but it cannot in any way affect the question as to ancient usage. It may be, and is alleged by travelers, that the use of *resin* spoils the taste and flavour of Greek wines, and yet it is admitted that the use of resin is almost universal with the Greek makers. Columella may have been mistaken in opinion as to the value of lees in wine, for he had not the benefit of the clearer light of modern science; but there can be no doubt that when he recommends the use of “fresh generous lees,” he represents the opinion and practice of the age in which he lived, and is thus a much better illustrator of the old Hebrew prophet than any modern writer on wine manufacture can possibly be. There is, therefore, nothing in the “fact” appealed to by Dr. Lees which invalidates the evidence that *shemahrim* was “wine on the lees,” and that this wine was a fermented and alcoholic liquor.

Moreover, the alleged “fact,” on which the objection is based, is contradicted by opposing facts equally well established. Sir Edward Barry says, “All recent wines, after the fermentation has ceased, ought to be kept on their lees for a certain time, which greatly contributes to increase their strength and flavour.” Henderson says, that when the lees fall to the bottom the wine becomes clear; “but as the fermentation does not then cease, it increases in the excellence of its qualities, by being suffered still to continue for a time on the lees.” Butler says –

The Wines of the Bible

....."Generous wine
Ferments and frets until 'tis time;
For when 'tis settled on the lee,
And from the impurer matters free,
Becomes the richer still the older,
And proves the pleasanter the colder."

Harmer says, "Thevenot tells us the wine of Schiraz, in Persia, 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."⁸⁵¹ And yet this filtration is apt to injure the wine; for Lowth says, "Thevenot observes particularly of the Schiraz wine that, after it is refined from the lees, it is apt to grow sour."

Redding informs us that in making the red and white wines of the Haut Rhin, which keep, the former twenty, and the latter a hundred years, "Some growers leave the wine on the lees, closed up in the cask, for three years together, when not wanted for immediate sale."⁸⁵² "In Cyprus the wine is kept on the lees to the last. In France, racking is indispensable; such is the difference arising from climate and soil." "The necessity for racking more than once a year depends upon the nature of the wine. Some wines, of a generous quality, will remain on the lees for three or four years, but, in general, they should be racked before the first vernal equinox. There are some who, instead of racking, by troubling the wine and re-mixing it with the lees, establish, a second time, a species of fermentation, which is intended to ameliorate its quality; but this must be executed with great care to avoid acescency."⁸⁵³ In making the famous Cyprus wine, "the wine remains upon the lees until it has attained its last degree of limpidity. When the wine is brought from the country into the

⁸⁵¹ Obs., ii. 143

⁸⁵² Wines, p. 183

⁸⁵³ Ibid., pp. 68, 69

The Wines of the Bible

towns it is placed in casks where there are dregs, for it must always remain on them a year at least after it is made, to acquire perfection.” And “one very remarkable circumstance attached to the wines of Cyprus is the value of the lees: they are always exported with the wine if possible.....Casks with the lees sell for four times the price of those without, and hence wines that are adulterated by colouring, or with any other object, do not produce lees, and lose their strength.”⁸⁵⁴

It may be safely concluded from all these varied considerations, that the feast of shemahrim, spoken of by the prophet, was indeed “a feast of wines on the lees;” that these wines, after having been allowed to settle on their lees until they had acquired a richer flavour and greater strength, were then “well refined” for use, and made “free from fumes;” and that this refined wine was a fermented and alcoholic liquor.

9. Tirosh

This word occurs in thirty-eight passages of Scripture, and is variously rendered *wine*, *new wine*, and *sweet wine*. It is usually found associated in a triad of blessings, *dahgan*, *tirosh*, *yitshar*, “corn, wine, and oil;” and is derived by interpreters from *yarash*, “to possess;” but whether it designates a *possession*, in the sense of an inheritance, or is so called “because it gets *possession* of the brain, inebriates,” is a matter of opinion. Dr. Lees and Ritchie, and the author of *Tirosh lo Yayin*, deny that it signifies a liquor of any kind, and maintain that it denotes the solid produce of the vineyard. Dr. Nott, however, regards the word as designating both

⁸⁵⁴ Lees

The Wines of the Bible

vintage fruit and vat wine, and is taken to task by his editor⁸⁵⁵ for maintaining such a heresy. The point in dispute is not of very great importance in this controversy. If the alleged fact can be established, we shall merely have to withdraw *tirosh* from the list of Hebrew wines. If it cannot be established, we shall retain it in the list until further evidence is forth coming.

What, then, is *Tirosh*? Dr. Lees says, it “is not ‘wine’ at all, but ‘the fruit of the vineyard’ in its natural condition.”⁸⁵⁶ Dr. Ritchie says, “We hold, however, that the word does not denote any liquor at all. It means vine fruit, the produce of the vine, in the solid form of grapes, raisins, &c.”⁸⁵⁷ The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* says, it is “a collective term signifying the produce of the vine in general, from the kernel even to the husk – and perhaps the young shoots and tendrils – but always in its solid form.”⁸⁵⁸

These writers agree that *tirosh* is not a “wine,” or “any liquor at all;” that it is a “solid,” the “fruit of the vineyard,” “vine fruit,” the “produce of the vine in general;” but they slightly differ as to the extent of the produce included in the word. Dr. Lees limits it to the fruit “in its natural condition.” Dr. Ritchie extends it to the fruit in an artificial condition “raisins, &c.” And the author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* adds “perhaps, the young shoots and tendrils.” But as *tirosh* is included among the tithes and firstfruits, is found the clusters, overflows in the vats, is trodden out of the press, is to be gathered in its season, is dried up in the vineyard, and is to be drunk, the raisins and young shoots and tendrils must be extruded from the definition, as incompatible with these usages.

This being so, what is *tirosh*? It must be, according to these writers, the “fruit of the vineyard,” “vine fruit,” the “produce in

⁸⁵⁵ Lees

⁸⁵⁶ Temp. Bib. Com., p. xxiv

⁸⁵⁷ Sc. Test., p. 27

⁸⁵⁸ See iii.

The Wines of the Bible

general, from the kernel even to the husk.” Assuming it be so, what is the solid *fruit* or *produce*? Can it be anything more, or less, than “vine fruit” – i.e., *grapes*? Dr. Lees says, “*Tirosh* denotes the raw produce of the vine *before* the grapes have undergone the process of treading.”⁸⁵⁹ If so, what is the difference? If not, and if the two expressions are identical, the definition amounts simply to this, that “*tirosh* denotes the raw produce of the vine before the raw produce of the vine has been trodden;” or it “denotes grapes before the grapes have been trodden.” Generalise *tirosh* as you may; say it “denotes the raw produce of the vine,”⁸⁶⁰ or it denotes “the fruit of the vine taken collectively,”⁸⁶¹ or it is “a collective term,”⁸⁶² or it signifies “the produce of the vine in general,”⁸⁶³ the plain English of “those long and round-about periphrases amounts to nothing more than that *tirosh* is a designation of “vine fruit” – i.e., *grapes*. Now, Dr. Lees says, - “The notion that *tirosh* signifies the same as *ahsis*, or the alternative suppositions, that this latter should have been invented when the former was in constant use for the same idea, is simply incredible.”⁸⁶⁴ But is it not equally *incredible* that if *tirosh* designates grapes, this term “should have been invented” when another word (*anab-im*) “was in constant use for the same idea,” from the time of Joseph down to that time of Amos?

It may be said that *tirosh* is a more comprehensive term than *anabim*, for the latter only designates the smaller bunches of grapes, whereas the former includes the whole produce of the vine. Be it so. But if *anabim* denotes small bunches, *Eshkol*

⁸⁵⁹ Answer to the Unanswerable.

⁸⁶⁰ Lees.

⁸⁶¹ Ibid.

⁸⁶² *Tirosh lo Yayin*

⁸⁶³ Ibid.

⁸⁶⁴ Temp. Bib. Com., p. xxv.

The Wines of the Bible

designates a cluster, i.e., an accumulation of small bunches, and *eshkoloth* embraces all the clusters. So that the latter term covers the whole produce of the vine. Dr. Lees says, "In the order of quantity came the single berries, *gargarim*; the grape-bunches, *anabim*; the grape clusters (composed of bunches), *eshkoloth*; and the collective of the vine, *tirosh*."⁸⁶⁵ But if *eshkoloth* embraces all the clusters of bunches of berries of the vine, what is that but "the collective produce of the fine?" Is there any produce not included in that term which is embraced by *tirosh*? If so, what is it? If not, is it not *incredible* that the latter term "should have been invented when the former was in constant use for the same idea?" *It is simply incredible!*

A. Tirosh in the Cluster

Isaiah uses the term in one of his prophecies: - "*Thus saith the Lord, As the new wine (tirosh) is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it; so will I do for my servants' sakes, that I may not destroy them all*" (Isaiah lxxv. 8). There is here a manifest distinction between the *tirosh* and the "cluster" (*Eshkol*) in which it is found. And as the latter term, confessedly, denotes a *cluster of grapes*, it is incredible that the former can have the meaning assigned to it by the writers referred to above. Dr. Lees says, "Is not the grape, found in the cluster?"⁸⁶⁶ Doubtless it is; but what then? *Tirosh*, as he has defined it, is not a "grape," whether little or large, new or tender. It is not even a bunch of grapes (*anab*), nor a number of bunches (*anabim*), nor an accumulation of bunches (*Eshkol*), or a collection

⁸⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 420

⁸⁶⁶ Works, ii. 115

The Wines of the Bible

of clusters (*eshkoloth*). It is “the fruit of the vine taken collectively,” whatever that may be. Now, while single berries, or little bunches, may be found in a cluster of grapes, even though the bunches be “half an ell long,” and one of them should be, “a sufficient burden for one man,”⁸⁶⁷ it is difficult to see how a whole collection of clusters of bunches,, to say nothing of raisins, shoots, and tendrils, can also be found in that single cluster of the text.

He says, - “The Hebrew expression is peculiar, and apparently implies a paucity of produce, the entire fruit on a vine being represented by a single cluster, instead of by many cluster of grapes.”⁸⁶⁸ Thus, then, *tirosh* is not a “little grape,” new, tender, and promising, but it is “the entire fruit on the vine,” and this “entire fruit” consists of “many clusters of grapes.” So that *tirosh* is, after all, identical with *eshkoloth*. But the alleged “paucity of produce” is a mere fancy of the writer, for which there is no real foundation in the text. If the prophet had referred to such an occurrence, he would, certainly, have exhibited it as an exceptional and extraordinary event; whereas he speaks of it as a common and natural thing, - “As the *tirosh* is found in the cluster, and one saith, destroy it not, for a blessing is in it.”

The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* says, - “What is more simple and natural than to speak of the fruit of the vine, the grape, as just coming into the cluster, as the blossom sets into fruit?” There could be nothing more simple and natural; but in that case, the simplicity of the expression would upset the theories of the three writers. For, (a) If this be the meaning of the text, it must be regarded as indicating the “use and wont” of the vine, and not such an exceptional occurrence as the implied “paucity of produce” alleged by Dr. Lees. (b) If this be the meaning of *tirosh*,

⁸⁶⁷ *Tirosh lo Yayin*, pp. 31, 32

⁸⁶⁸ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 182

The Wines of the Bible

there will be no place for Dr. Ritchie's "raisins," or the author's own "shoots and tendrils," either in the grape "just coming into the cluster," or in the cluster itself. (c) And if *tirosh* thus designate the growing grape coming into cluster, it cannot, at the same time, mean the "fruit of the vine taken collectively," the "produce of the vine in general," &c.

The author further says, "*Tirosh* appears in this text to indicate the produce of the vine, either in the state of *bowser*, a bunch of grapes full formed and just beginning to ripen, or as the simple *gneenabh*, or grape, only just sufficiently formed to be called such."⁸⁶⁹ But how can "the collective produce of the vine" be narrowed down either to a single "grape," or a "bunch of grapes?" And if the prophet had referred to a newly formed grape, or to a bunch of unripe grapes, why should he have used *tirosh* as the designation of either of these, when their own proper names were "in constant use for the same idea?" Moreover, how can *tirosh* signify the simple grape "only just sufficiently formed to be called such," or a bunch of grapes "just beginning to ripen," if *tirosh* be a thing to be eaten, drunk, tithed, trodden, and the like?" *It is simply incredible.*

The prophet's reference is manifestly neither to a "paucity of produce," nor to unripe grapes, but to the preciousness of the *tirosh*, which furnishes him with an illustration suitable for his prophecy. The ungodly are like "the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah: their grapes are grapes of gall, their clusters are bitter: their wine is the poison of dragons, and the cruel venom of asps." Therefore, "the day of their calamity is at hand (Deut. xxxii. 32-35). But the righteous Israelites are the precious "*tirosh* found in the cluster, of which one saith, destroy it not, for a blessing is in it." Therefore, when God arises to inflict judgment

⁸⁶⁹ Sec. xxvi.

The Wines of the Bible

upon the wicked, He will spare His righteous and precious people in that day for the blessing that is in them. “So will I do for my servants’ sakes, that I may not destroy them all” – i.e. all the nation.

The fact, then, that *tirosh* is found in the cluster determines nothing as to its specific nature. It may have been a veritable wine, notwithstanding this reference, for we have shown in another section that a proleptical usage of this kind is common in all languages, ancient and modern. The Hebrew *yayin*, the Latin *vinum* and *merum*, and the English wine, are occasionally applied thus proleptically to growing grapes, &c., as when Cato speaks of “the pendent wine;” Ovid of “the grapes which scarce contain the unmixed wine they have within;” and modern writers of “the growing wines,” &c. But as this usage is discussed elsewhere, the argument need not be repeated here.

B. Tirosh in the Triad Blessings

It is alleged that the frequent association of *tirosh* with the solid products of the earth, *daghan*, “corn,” and *yitshar*, “orchard fruit,” leads to the conclusion that it must have been a solid also. Without pausing here to examine the definition given of *yitshar*, we ask, does it not seem equally natural to conclude that when we read of “a land of corn and wine” (*tirosh*) and similar expressions, the corn embodies the chief solids, and the *tirosh*, the chief liquid products of the plentiful land? The mere association of *tirosh* with solids proves nothing as to its nature, for corn is also joined with wine (*yayin*) in Lam. ii. 12. The same usage is found in the following passages of Scripture, in which solids are associated with liquids – water, oil (*shemen*), and wine, *yayin* and *oinos*. “Bread and water” (Ezek. iv. 17): “wine, grapes,

The Wines of the Bible

and figs" (Neh. xiii. 15); "flour, wine, and oil" (1 Chr. ix. 29); "bread, meal,.....wine and oil" (1 Chr. xii. 40); "wheat, barley, wine, and oil" (2 Chr. ii. 10, 15); "victual, oil, and wine" (2 Chr. xi. 11); "meat, and drink, and oil" (Ezra iii. 7); "wheat, salt, wine, and oil" (Ezra vi. 9); "wheat, wine, oil, and salt" (Ezra vii. 22); "wine, oil, and bread" (Ps. civ. 15); "bread and water, woold and flax, oil and drink" (Hos. ii. 5); "bread, pottage, oil, wine" (Hag. ii. 12); "barley, oil, and wine" (Rev. vi. 6); "wine, oil, and flour" (Rev. xviii. 13).

The same usage is common also in other writings. Cicero speaks of "the tenths of wine, and oil and pulse."⁸⁷⁰ Again, "He sends him presents, liberal enough for all domestic uses; as much wine and oil as he thought fit, and as much wheat as he could want."⁸⁷¹ Plutarch says, "They buy their debtors' corn before it is ready for harvest; bargain for the oil before the olives are ripe, and in like manner for their wines."⁸⁷² He speaks of "five hundred measures of corn, wine, and oil"⁸⁷³ Pliny, also, speaks of "cereals, oil, and wine"⁸⁷⁴ Xenophon, "Corn, oil, and wine;"⁸⁷⁵ "plenty of corn, and ordinary wine, and wine of the sweetest kind, and olive oil."⁸⁷⁶ Euboea, "produces a great quantity of corn, wine, oil, and fruits."⁸⁷⁷ Sicyon "produces corn, wine, and oil in abundance."⁸⁷⁸ A Greek matron takes account "of the storing and distribution of the corn, wine, oil, and fruits, which are delivered to her care."⁸⁷⁹

⁸⁷⁰ *Against Verres.*

⁸⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷² *Against Usury.*

⁸⁷³ *Life of Aristides*

⁸⁷⁴ *Book xv.*

⁸⁷⁵ *Memor.*, ii. 9, 4

⁸⁷⁶ *Revenues of Athens*, v. 3

⁸⁷⁷ *Anacharsis*, ii. 70

⁸⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, iii. 388

⁸⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, v. 9

The Wines of the Bible

Aristophanes, “Barley meal, oil, and wine”⁸⁸⁰ Lucretius, “Corn, and wine, and oil.”⁸⁸¹ Strabo says, “Large quantities of corn and wine are exported from Turdelania, besides much oil, which is of the first quality;”⁸⁸² Cyprus “produces good wine and oil, and sufficient corn to supply the wants of the inhabitants.”⁸⁸³ Josephus says, “Herod sent to his friends to bring down corn and wine, and oil and cattle;”⁸⁸⁴ and again, “corn, wine, oil, and cattle.”⁸⁸⁵ Philo also speaks of “the firstfruits of the corn, and wine, and oil;”⁸⁸⁶ “when any persons offer the firstfruits from any portion of their possessions – wheat or barley, or oil, or wine, or the best of their fruits;”⁸⁸⁷ He commanded men to offer firstfruits of corn, and wine, and oil, and cattle, and other things;”⁸⁸⁸ “The laws command that the people should offer to the priests firstfruits of corn, and wine, and oil, and of their domestic flocks, and of wools;”⁸⁸⁹ “the abundant production of all necessary things, such as corn, and wine, and oil, and all other productions which conduce to a comfortable and easy life;”⁸⁹⁰ “A tenth of the fruits of the earth, of corn, or wine, or oil.”⁸⁹¹

It is evident, from the above references, that the association of “corn, wine, and oil” is a very common and ancient usage; and,

⁸⁸⁰ Thesmoph. 419

⁸⁸¹ *De. Rer. Nat.* ii. 1156

⁸⁸² lli. 2,6

⁸⁸³ Xiv. 6, 5

⁸⁸⁴ *Antiq.* xiv. 15, 3

⁸⁸⁵ *Wars*, i. 156

⁸⁸⁶ *Rewards of the Priests*, 2

⁸⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 12

⁸⁸⁸ *Special Laws*, 3

⁸⁸⁹ *Humanity*, 10

⁸⁹⁰ *Rewards and Punishments*, 18

⁸⁹¹ *Questions*, 56

The Wines of the Bible

instead of proving that *tirosh* in the Hebrew triad was a solid, goes far to show that it was a liquid wine, as in other cases.

C. Tirosh to be Eaten

It is further argued that *tirosh* is spoken of as a thing to be eaten, and therefore it could not have been a liquor. Thus, "Thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine (*tirosh*), and of thine oil" (Deut. xii. 17); and, "Thou shalt eat.....the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine (*tirosh*), and of thine oil" (Deut. xiv. 23). The usage appealed to is admitted, but the argument founded on it is worthless. The *tirosh* to be eaten was one of the tithes; and we have seen from Philo that liquid wine and oil, as well as "the best of their fruits," were included among the Jewish tithes and "firstfruits." The sacred writer employs the general term, "to eat," because it has to cover the consumption of the corn, as well as of the wine and oil, just as we speak of *eating* breakfast, dinner, or supper, although liquids may form no inconsiderable part of each meal. We read elsewhere of princes who "eat in due season for strength, and not for drunkenness" (Eccl. x. 17); in reference to which Dr. Lees says, "As 'eating' includes 'eating and drinking,' so 'drinking' here includes all table excess."⁸⁹² He also quotes Professor Stuart to the effect that "as the word *ached*, translated 'eating,' is, in cases without number employed to include a partaking of all refreshments at a meal, that is, of the drinks as well as the food, the Rabbins, it would seem, interpreted the command just cited as extending to the *wine* as well as bread of the passover."⁸⁹³ These concessions are a

⁸⁹² Temp. Bib. Com. p. 149

⁸⁹³ Works, ii. 125

The Wines of the Bible

sufficient answer to the argument against the fluidity of *tirosh*, based on the texts which speak of *eating* it.

D. Tirosh Trodden, Gathered, and Laid up

It is further alleged that *tirosh* was a thing to be trodden, to be gathered, and to be laid up in heaps, which may all be admitted, without involving the conclusion that the substance thus spoken of was a solid and not a liquid. When the moderns speak of “growing wines,” or say “the wine blooms,” &c., the term wine is obviously used proleptically; and, therefore, when *tirosh* (Micah vi. 15) of *yayin* (Isa. xvi. 10) is said to be trodden, we may assume that the same proleptical usage is employed. See this point illustrated in another section. The gathering and laying up of *tirosh* may have been the collection and storing of solid grapes, or of liquid wine, so far as the words employed are concerned, seeing that they are equally appropriate in either case. We find the same usage in reference to both *yayin* and *shemen*, “wine and oil,” which were certainly liquids. Thus *yayin* was gathered along with summer fruits and *shemen*, “oil” (Jer. xl. X0, 12). These liquids were collected and laid up in stores or cellars. Accordingly, Pliny speaks of wine being laid up in wine lofts, and he describes “the various methods of keeping and storing wines in the cellar,”⁸⁹⁴ Martial, in like manner, speaks of wine “stored in Marsian cellars.”⁸⁹⁵

We read also in Scripture of “wine cellars,” stores of *yayin* (1 Chron. xxvii. 27); and “oil cellars,” stores of *shemen* (1 Chron. xxvii. 28); and strongholds into which were put “store of victual,

⁸⁹⁴ Book xiv

⁸⁹⁵ Exp., xiv 116

The Wines of the Bible

and of oil (*shemen*), and of wine" (*yayin*) (2 Chron. xi. 11). Josephus tell us that John "emptied the vessels of that sacred wine and oil when the priests kept to be poured on the burnt offerings, and which lay in the inner court of the temple, and distributed it among the multitude, who, in their anointing themselves and drinking, used above an hin of them."⁸⁹⁶ This passage is important, as showing that liquid wine was laid up in the "inner court of the temple." And is suggesting when taken in connection with the law which forbade the priests to drink wine "when they enter into the inner court" (Ezek. xlv. 21).

Dr. Ritchie contends that the particular word employed in the text Isa. lxii. 9, "They that have brought it together" (*ksabatz*), almost uniformly denotes the bringing together of solid things," and he infers from this that the *tirosh*, brought together, must have been a solid also. But the usage is only "almost," not altogether uniform; and, therefore, the inference is not inevitable. The verb occurs in about one hundred and thirty passages, and is generally employed of the gathering of the people; in one or two instances of the gathering of food, and cattle, and money; but never of the ingathering of grapes or other fruit. On the contrary, a totally different word is employed for this purpose. Thus, *Botzar* denotes a *grape-gatherer*; see Jer. vi. 9; Obad. 5; *Batzar* designates *the gathering of the grapes*; see Lev. xxv. 5, 11; Deut. xxiv. 21; Judg. ix. 27. *Batzir*, the vintage; see Lev. xxvi. 5; Jud. viii 2; Isa. xxiv. 13; xxxii. 10; Jer. xlviii. 32; Mic. vii. 1; Zech. xi. 2. So that the fact that the ordinary term for gathering grapes is not employed in the passage under consideration justifies the conclusion that the *bringing together* of *tirosh* is not the collection of vintage fruit by the grape-gatherers.

⁸⁹⁶ Wars, v. 13, 6

The Wines of the Bible

The verb *kabatz* is, indeed, “almost uniformly” employed to denote bringing together of solid things. But there are two exceptions to the uniformity of the usage, and both of these occur in the utterances of the same prophet. The one is found in Isaiah xxii. 9, where the verb is employed to designate the gathering together of “the waters of the lower pool.” There can be no doubt that the reference here is to the gathering of a liquid, and not a solid. The other instance occurs in the text now in question, where it is said, “But they that have gathered it (*dahgan*, “corn”) shall eat of it, and praise the Lord; and they that have brought it (*tirosh*) together shall drink it in the courts of my holiness.” The reference here is manifestly also to a liquid, for the people were to “eat” the corn, and to “drink” the *tirosh*.

The argument founded upon this passage by Dr. Ritchie is much akin to that which is urged in connection with Deut. xi. 14, when he says, “It is remarkable that the term ‘gather’ is here applied to *tirosh* in common with corn and orchard fruit, and the Hebrew word used (*asaph*) is never so far as I am aware, employed in reference to any liquid.”⁸⁹⁷ This verb, like the former, is usually applied to the gathering of solid things; but in this case, as in the other, there are exceptions. Thus, it is used of “*water* spilled on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again” (2 Sam. xiv. 14); of “the gathering out of the threshing floor and *wine vat*” (Deut. xvi. 13); and of the gathering of “*wine*, summer fruit, and *oil*” — *yayin* and *shemen* (Jer. xl. 10, 12).

It is alleged by Dr. Lees, from Joel i. 10, “the new wine is dried up, the oil languisheth,” that “proof so direct and decisive, that *tirosh* and *yitshar* describe two classes of ‘fruits,’ and not artificial preparations, ought to satisfy even incredulity itself.”⁸⁹⁸ Possibly it

⁸⁹⁷ Sc. Test., p. 36

⁸⁹⁸ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 226

The Wines of the Bible

might; for unreasoning incredulity is the twin sister of ignorant credulity; but the proof alleged by the writer is not likely to satisfy any one who can distinguish between assertion and evidence. Is it impossible for *tirosh* to dry up unless it be a fruit? Are solids only capable of yielding up their moisture? Is there no evaporation of fluids? Was it not wine which dried up in the Arcadian goatskins? Was there no drying up of the wine when it was boiled, or placed in the *fumarium*, or exposed to the sun for forty days, and the like? And were “the rivers of water” which were “dried up,” along with the *tirosh* (verse 20), not liquids but solids?

The writer appeals, to Gesenius, and quotes as follows: - “*Hobish* is the Hiphil form of *yah-bash*, to be dried up, to ‘be or become dry, used of plants, trees, grass.....fruits, the harvest (Joel i. 10).” But if he had done justice alike to his subject and to the lexicographer, he would have filled up that awkward hiatus in the midst of the quotation the words he has omitted - “The moisture itself is also said to dry up; hence of streams and the sea - Job xiv. 11; 1 Kings xvii. 7; Joel i. 20; a found, Hosea xiii. 15,” &c. And if he had verified these references to the *drying up of liquids*, he might have added the following additional examples: - *Waters*, Jer. i. 38; Gen. viii. 7; Job xii. 15. The sea, Nah. i. 4. *The Jordan*, Joshua v. 1. Rivers. Psalm lxxiv. 15; Zech. X. 11. While, therefore, it is certain that *yah-bash* is applied to the drying up of *solids* such as plants, trees, and fruits, and that Gesenius places Joel i. 10 in this category, it is equally certain, from the passages omitted in the quotation by Dr. Lees, and the texts adduced above, that the word is used of the drying up of *liquids*, such as the waters of rivers, fountains, streams, and seas.

If the prophet alludes to a great drought accompanying the invasion of the land by a nation, “strong and without number” (Joel i. 6); or if he refers to the devastation wrought by the enemy when the first “devoured the pastures,” and the flame “burned all

The Wines of the Bible

the trees of the field" (verse 19); the fierce heat of that extreme drought which "consumed the snow waters,"⁸⁹⁹ or of that devouring flame which dried up "the rivers of waters" (verse 20), was equally capable of drying up the *tirosh*, even though it had been a liquid wine, and not a solid fruit. So that the text furnishes no evidence against the fluidity of *tirosh*.

E. Tirosh as a Beverage

As the various considerations appealed to by these writers utterly fail to prove that *tirosh* was the solid produce of the vineyard, we must turn to another class of Scripture references, which seem to indicate that it was a liquid wine. Thus it is said, - *"Surely I will no more give corn to be meat for thine enemies; and the sons of the stranger shall not drink thy wine (tirosh), for the which thou hast laboured: But they that have gathered it shall eat it, and praise the Lord; and they that have brought it together shall drink it in the courts of my holiness"* (Isaiah lxii. 8, 9). Dr. Lees says, - "In this very verse 'corn' (*dahgan*), which is said to be eaten, is used for bread (*lechem*) made from the flour of corn; and so 'to drink the *tirosh*' is an easy and parallel figure, signifying drinking the *yayin* which the *tirosh* would yield after pressure."⁹⁰⁰ But in this the writer assumes what he is bound to prove. We deny that the drinking of *tirosh* here is a "figure" of any kind; that the drinking of *tirosh* means the drinking of *yayin* extracted from it; that *tirosh* was a solid yielding *yayin* "after pressure." And we equally deny that *dahgan*, "corn," is here used for *lechem*, "bread," or that it was first made into bread "from the flour of corn"

⁸⁹⁹ Job xxiv. 19

⁹⁰⁰ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 179

The Wines of the Bible

before it was eaten. The Jews were accustomed to use their corn in different ways, sometimes parched and in the ear (Lev. xxiii. 14; Luke vi. 1), and in other preparations. Moreover, if the drink referred to by the prophet had been *yayin*, why should he have spoken of drinking solid grapes (*tirosh*), instead of liquid wine, and why should he not have associated *dahgan* and *yayin* together, as in Lam. ii. 12, if *yayin* had been the drink referred to? If Dr. Lees may be allowed, without reason, to crush the *dahgan* and make *lehem* of it, and to press the *tirosh* and make *yayin* of it, we see no reason why he should not also bruise the *dahgan* and make *shechar* of it; for although the sacred writer speaks of eating the corn, it would be easy to explain the "figure" as signifying drinking the *shechar* which the *dahgan* would yield after pressure? But it is manifest that the prophet refers to two different substances, and to two different methods of using them. The *corn*, which was frequently used for food without any crushing or grinding, is expressly said to be given for "meat," and the *tirosh* is almost as expressly said to be given for "drink," without any allusion to treading or pressing. And in harmony with this distinction between the two substances, there is a corresponding distinction expressed between the two methods of using them, the promise being that the people shall "eat" the one and "drink" the other, thereby indicating that *corn* is a solid and *tirosh* a liquid.

Dr. Ritchie appears to have been greatly perplexed to account for this exhibition of *tirosh* as a drink. Accordingly, he suggests, in the first place, that several manuscripts have the word which means "they shall *eat* it," instead of the term which signifies "they shall *drink* it." If these manuscripts have not sufficient authority with the reader, he suggests, in the second place, that the word may bear this meaning, "they shall *suck* it." And if the reader is, not yet satisfied with either the eating or the sucking amendment,

The Wines of the Bible

he suggests, in the third place, that the pious Israelites might be “permitted to press out a portion of it from the grape clusters, and partake of this as a thank-offering before the Lord.”⁹⁰¹ As the *permission* to press out a little grape juice from the cluster does not strike us as a very remarkable favour to be granted to these pious Israelites, we would suggest, in the fourth place, the more obvious and simple explanation, that the *tirosh* which was to be partaken of was neither a solid to be *eaten*, nor a grape to be *sucked*, nor a cluster to be *pressed*, but a veritable wine, which the people were permitted to *drink*.

In the third of his suggestions Dr. Ritchie identifies *tirosh* with the “grape clusters,” from which a portion was to be pressed out, and used as a thank-offering. In doing so he assumes, like Dr. Lees, the point to be proved, and, at the same time, furnishes us with material for a new reading of the text Isa. lxxv. 8, which we will have to render, “as the grape cluster (*tirosh*) are found in the grape cluster!”

The *sucking* theory of his second suggestion is borrowed from *Tirosh lo Yayin*, in which it is said, - “This is a peculiar passage. The word *shathah*, usually translated ‘to drink,’ must here be rendered ‘to suck,’ as in the Prayer Book translation of Psalm lxxv. 8, (9), where the wicked are represented as compelled to suck the dregs of the cup of mixture, after the liquid part has been poured away.”⁹⁰² This author, however, does not appear to be quite sure of his proposed amendment, for he appends notes of interrogation to his new renderings. Nor is his uncertainty surprising when we find that, by this translation, the text is made to read, - “And the sons of the stranger shall not *suck* thy *tirosh*, for the which thou hast laboured; but they that have brought it

⁹⁰¹ Sc. Test., pp. 42, 43

⁹⁰² Sec. xxvi.

The Wines of the Bible

together shall *suck* it in the courts of my holiness!" Dr. Ritchie thinks "that this meaning seems to be admissible in the usage of the verb, where there is any solid materials, as dregs or husk, in that which is used; and he adduces three texts as illustrative examples, Ps. lxxx. 8; Isa. li. 17; Ezek. xxiii. 34. But, unfortunately for his purpose, the verbs used in these passages, and variously rendered "shall wring them out," "wrung them out," and "suck it out," is *matzah*, and not *shatlah*. The former term literally means to "press," or "wring out," *blood* (Lev. i. 15; v. 9); *waters* (Ps. lxxiii. 10); *the dew out of the fleece* (Judg. vi. 38); and in the above texts, *the dregs of the cup of mixture*. The latter term, which occurs in more than two hundred passages of Scriptures, uniformly signifies to "drink," and never either to *press*, to *wring out*, or to *suck*. In fact, both verbs are employed in each of the three texts appealed to by Dr. Ritchie, the one term to designate *drinking*, and the other *wringing out the dregs*, in order to drink. If, then, the prophet had intended to speak of *pressing* or *sucking* grapes, in the passage under consideration, he must have used the verb *matzah* to convey that idea; but as he employs the verb *shathah*, we must conclude that he referred to *tirosh* as a liquid wine which the people were to drink.

The author of *Tirsoh lo Yayin* says, "As it is difficult to decide the correct reading, it becomes a point of importance to establish the true meaning of the verb *shathah*. If it can bear the meaning to 'suck,' it will be a matter of indifference which of the two Hebrew versions is adopted, the same mode of consumption of the grapes, viz., in the solid state, being pointed out by each." *Tirosh*, which had been previously defined by the author as denoting "the produce of the vine in general," including kernels and husks, young shoots and tendrils, has now become simple "grapes," without these accompaniments. Now if *tirosh* be a designation of grapes, it becomes indeed, "a point of importance to establish the

The Wines of the Bible

true meaning of the verb *shatlah*," which is employed to express its mode of consumption. But instead of doing so, the writer does not even refer to it here, but appeals to a speech of the late Mr. Cobden, in which he uses the expression "sucking their luscious grapes;" and to Palladius and Pallas, who also speak of sucking grapes! In the name of all the interpreters, what have these persons to say or do with the Biblical usage in question? How can their mode of speech "establish the true meaning of the verb *shathah*?" Surely the two hundred and twenty-three passages of Scripture in which the word occurs, might furnish evidence enough to enable any one to determine its true meaning, without traveling so far out of the way as to Cobden, Palladius, and Pallas! But as *shathah*, in its Biblical usage, never means to suck grapes, and always means to drink liquids, this fact may explain why these persons are appealed to, rather than the two hundred and twenty-three Scripture witnesses.

The author is evidently not ignorant that if *sucking* had been intended by the prophet, the Hebrew is not without a suitable word to designate the process; for, apart from the verb *matzah*, referred to above, we find that in referring to an infant sucking milk from the breast, he says, "and for which there is a specific term in the Hebrew." But he would lead us to infer that this word (*yanak*) is not an appropriate term by which to designate the sucking of grapes, seeing that it is limited in its signification to the infant sucklings referred to. In this, however, he is mistaken, for we find it employed in Deut. xxxiii. 19. "They shall suck of the abundance of the seas, and of treasures hid in the sand;" Job xx. 16, "He shall suck the poison of asps;" Deut. xxxii. 13, "And he made him to *suck* honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock." Now, if the prophet had intended to speak of the people *sucking* grapes in their use of *tirosh*, here is an appropriate term for the purpose; but as he eschews that word and employs

The Wines of the Bible

shathah instead, we conclude that he meant us to understand that *tirosh* was a wine, not a bunch of grapes, a liquid which the people were to drink,, not a solid which they were to *suck*.

After having passed by the Biblical witnesses as to the meaning of *shathah*, the author at length glances somewhat indirectly at them, and appeals to the metaphorical usage of the earth *sucking* in the rain, and the trees sucking up water by their roots. But even in these few cases the metaphor in no way determines that the literal meaning of the verb is “to suck.” It is quite as proper to speak of the earth and the trees *drinking* in the rain, and *drinking* up the water, as to speak of their *sucking* it. Moreover, as the substances here said to be sucked are liquids, not solids, the usage appealed to would only prove that a liquid may be sucked as well as drunk, and would determine nothing as to whether they sucked *tirosh* was a solid or a liquid. As this is all the evidence adduced by the writer in behalf of his novel interpretation, and as it logically amounts to no evidence at all, we must fall back upon the uniform Biblical usage of *shathah* and conclude that *tirosh* was neither a solid to be *eaten* nor a solid to be *sucked*, but a liquid wine which the people were to *drink*.

Dr. Lees says, “Though *tirosh* occurs thirty-eight times in the Old Testament, this is the only passage where it is connected with the act of drinking.”⁹⁰³ This fact would be of some significance if *tirosh* were indubitably spoken of as a solid, or in connection with the act of eating in any considerable number of the remaining thirty-seven texts. But we have thus far failed to discover any satisfactory evidence of the solidity of the substance; and if it is connected with the act of drinking in only one passage, it is spoken of in connection with eating in only two passages (Deut. xii. 17; xiv. 23); and as “eating” includes “drinking,” when mixed

⁹⁰³ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 179

The Wines of the Bible

refreshments are consumed,⁹⁰⁴ the argument is a *non sequitur*. He also appeals to such elliptical expressions as “to drink a bottle,” or “a cup,” as signifying “to drink what the vessels contain,” which is true enough as a common usage. But as *tirosh* is neither a bottle nor a cup, we fail to perceive the analogy. If the argument has any force, it may be applied to every kind of fruit containing juice, as well as to grapes; and if it be justifiable to speak of *drinking a grape*, it will be equally proper to speak of *drinking an apple* or a pear, a peach or a plum, a melon or a gooseberry! Moreover, as *tirosh* is defined to be, not merely a grape, but “the collective produce of the vineyard,” in the solid form of grapes and raisins, including also, “perhaps,” the young shoots and tendrils, it is difficult to understand how a solid of that “collective” and varied character could be “connected with the act of drinking,” or sucking, in any way.

F. Tirosh in the Vat

The Scripture references to *tirosh* in the wine-vat confirm the opinion that it was not a solid, but a species of wine. Thus, “*So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses (ye-kabikah) shall burst out with new wine (tirosh). And the floors shall be full of wheat, and the fats (ye-kabim) shall overflow with wine (tirosh) and oil*” (Prov. iii. 10; Joel ii. 24). It will be observed that, in both of these passages, the *tirosh* is found in the vat (*yekeb*), and not in the press (*gath*); the former being the receptacle of the expressed juice, and the latter the place of treading of the solid grapes. In both cases here, however, Dr. Lees identifies the vat with the press, and thereby confounds the one with the other. In the same

⁹⁰⁴ Lees

The Wines of the Bible

way, when the vat is met with elsewhere in a text, he converts it into the press; and even where both words occur together, as in Joel iii. 13, "the press (*gath*) is full, the fats (*yekabim*) overflow," he renders the one "the press," and the other "the presses," as if the latter term were the plural of the former, and the two words were identical in meaning. He also says, "It is most certain that grapes were put into the vat, not wine. The wine flowed out through an orifice into the receiving vessel, as the grapes were being trodden."⁹⁰⁵ Now, if this be "most certain," it must be, most certainly, a fancy of the moment, and not a fact, certainly believed even by himself; for we find him speaking of the "fermenting vat,"⁹⁰⁶ of the "wine vat," and "vat wine;"⁹⁰⁷ and of "the vat" bursting and spilling "the wine"⁹⁰⁸ By all which he contradicts his own statement "that grapes were put into the vat, not wine."

But if, as alleged, "the wine flowed out through an orifice into the receiving vessel," what was the name of the "vessel" into which the expressed juice flowed? Not *gath*, for that was the name of the press in which the grapes were trodden. Not *yekeb*, for that is the alleged name of the vat into which "grapes were put," and out of which the juice flowed into a receiving vessel." What then? There are only three Hebrew words used in this connection – *yekeb*, *poorah*, and *gath*; and, according to Dr. Lees, each of these denoted the place of grapes, and not of wine. Thus, he defines *yekeb* as "the fruit-house and winepress as a whole, including the press vat and the receptacle for grapes intended for preservation." Here are four different terms - (1) The "*fruit-house*," this of course, is the place of grapes. (2) The "*winepress*;"

⁹⁰⁵ Works, ii. 114

⁹⁰⁶ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 305

⁹⁰⁷ Nott's *Lectures*, pp. 61, 62, note

⁹⁰⁸ Works, ii. 115

The Wines of the Bible

this press must also be the place of grapes. (3) The “press vat;” this vat should be the “receiving vessel,” the place of the expressed juice, but it is termed the “*press vat*,” and we have been told that “it is most certain that grapes were put into the vat, not wine;” so that this also must be the place of grapes. (4) The “receptacle for grapes;” this, of course, is also the place of grapes. Thus there is no place in the *yekeb* for anything but solid grapes; no place for the expressed juice! The second Hebrew term, *poorah*, is defined as follows: - “*Poorah* was perhaps the term applied exclusively to the *grape-vat*, as distinguished from the oil-press (*gath-shemen*);” and “Gesenius derives it from *poor*, ‘to break,’ and regards it as the vat in which the grapes are crushed or broken.” Thus *poorah*, whether termed “press,” or “vat,” is, like *yekeb*, the place of grapes, and not of wine. Here, again, is no place for the expressed juice. *Gath*, the third term, “denotes the vat or trough in which the grapes and olives were trodden with the feet.”⁹⁰⁹ Here, again, is no place for the expressed juice. According to these definitions the three words are substantially identical, and they all designate *the place of treading*; so that there is no term left to describe the “receiving vessel” into which the expressed juice flowed.

On another occasion, however, the writer defines *yekeb* as signifying “originally a ‘cavity,’ ‘coop,’ or vat in which grapes or olives were put for the purpose of being trodden; but perhaps, secondarily, by becoming generic for the whole apparatus (*tota machina*), the lacus or cavity into which the wine and oil flowed.”⁹¹⁰ But in another place he says, “It is to be noted, however, that this word [*gath*] is of wider use than ‘press.’ As Dindorf says, ‘The Hebrews truly distinguished *gath* into two

⁹⁰⁹ Works, ii. 134-6

⁹¹⁰ Temp. Bib. Com. p. xxvi.

The Wines of the Bible

parts; the first they called *gath higher*, the other *gath lower*. The first is the place in which the grapes were trodden, the wine (*vinum*) flowing into a *lacus* beneath through a tube.”⁹¹¹ Here we have the same description given of the *gath* as he gave above of the *yekeb*, and we are consequently puzzled to know which is which. But however this may be finally determined, there is an alleged double usage, originally and secondary; the former designating the press, the place of grapes, and the latter the vat, the place of the expressed juice; so that, after all, it is not quite so certain that “grapes were put into the vat,” and “not wine.” He observes further, the word “occurs sixteen times, and in most of the texts is more appropriately referred to the upper than the under vat;” and in evidence he refers to twelve passages in which the word is used in such connections as, he thinks, shows that it denotes the place of grapes.⁹¹² On turning to his Commentary, we find that one of the remaining texts is not given, and in the other three passages he gives the *press* in each, the *vat* in none! So that, according to this writer there are three words in the Hebrew to designate the *press* where the grapes were crushed, but not a single term of any kind to denote the *vat*, or *lacus*, or “receiving vessel,” into which the juice flowed. Three words for the place of grapes, and absolutely none for the place of wine! A curious fact, if not a fancy!

Appeal is made to Job (xxiv. 11), who speaks of men who “make oil within their walls, and tread their winepress (*yekabim*), and suffer thirst;” and from this it is inferred that the *yekeb* here must designate the place of grapes, and not of wine. It is quite as possible, however, that the patriarch refers, not to the treading of

⁹¹¹ Ibid., p. 202

⁹¹² Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

grapes in the vat, but to the treading of the juice into the vat, as in the Greek of Isa. xvi. 10, *καὶ οὐ μὴ πατησουσιν οἶνον τὰ υπολήνια*. The expression is manifestly elliptical, for neither the press nor the vat was itself trodden; and we are as much entitled to read they “tread the juice into the vats,” as Dr. Lees is to read, they “tread the grapes in the vats.” When the place of treading is unmistakably referred to, the *gath* or the *poorah* is the term employed, as in Neh. xiii. 15, “In those days saw I in Judah some treading winepresses” (*dorkin gitoth*). Lam. i. 16, “The Lord hath trodden the virgin, the daughter of Judah, as in a winepress” (*gath*). Isa. lxiii. 2, “Like him that treadeth in the wine fat” (*be-gath*). Isa. lxiii. 3, “I have trodden the winepress” (*poor betah*). And hence the distinction between the two places, “The press (*gath*) is full, the fats (*yekabim*) overflow” (Joel iii. 13).

In Isa. xvi. 10, the prophet says, “They shall tread out no wine in their vats” (*be-yekabim*). Dr. Lees says, The Hebrew “does not say trodden ‘out,’”⁹¹³ But the verb “to tread” both in English and Hebrew, when applied to grapes or grain, *does* signify “to tread out,” to press out with the feet; to press out wine or wheat; as, to tread out grain with cattle or horses.”⁹¹⁴ And, in Hebrew, “*To tread the winepress*, etc., i.e., in order to break the fruit and express the wine or oil.” “*To tread a threshing floor*, i.e., to tread out the grain.”⁹¹⁵ The doctor further says, “The treading is also said to take place in the *yequeb*, showing that the *yeqeb* included the place of treading as well as the reservoir into which the liquor ran.” But we have seen that he can find no place in the *yekeb* for the “reservoir” in all the sixteen passages in which the former term occurs. In the text now under consideration, the preposition

⁹¹³ Answer to the Unanswerable, p. 53

⁹¹⁴ Imp. Dict.

⁹¹⁵ Gesenius

The Wines of the Bible

beth, prefixed to *yekabim*, may, indeed, denote the place in which the grapes are trodden, but it may, as certainly, designate the place into which the wine (*yayin*) was pressed, seeing that the preposition signifies *in, at, to, with, &c.*

In Deut. xvi. 13, Moses speaks of “gathering the threshing-floor and the *yekeb*,” which cannot mean gathering corn *into* the floor, that it might be threshed, and grapes into the *yekeb*, that they might be pressed; for he uses the preposition *min*, “out of,” or “from,” to denote that the threshed corn was gathered out of the threshing-floor, and the expressed juice *out of* the wine-vat; or, as our translators render the passage, “thou hast gathered in thy corn and thy wine.” In Jer. xlviii. 33, the prophet says, “I have caused wine (*yayin*) to fail from the vats” (*mikabim*); which shows that while grapes had their appropriate place in the press (*gath*), where they were pressed or trodden, the *yekeb* was the place of wine (*yayin*). In Prov. iii. 10; Joel ii. 24, the *yekeb* is described as overflowing with tirosh, of which more anon; and in Joel iii. 13, as already observed, the two words are associated together, and distinguished from each other, “The press (*gath*) is full, the vats (*yekabim*) overflow.”

Now, as wine (*yayin*) is found in the *yekeb*, or wine-vat, and the vats are here said to overflow with tirosh, it may justly be inferred that the overflowing tirosh was a species of the generic *yayin*, and not a solid vine fruit. Dr. Ritchie “demurs to the soundness or force of this argument,” and asks, “Are not instances numerous in common language in which the word “overflow” is used of other things besides fluids? Do we not speak of an ‘overflowing house,’ of an ‘overflowing audience,’ and why may we not then understand the sacred writer as here speaking of the wine-vats overflowing with vine-fruit heaped into them?”⁹¹⁶ We answer, (a)

⁹¹⁶ Sc. Test., p. 47

The Wines of the Bible

The writer has missed the point of the argument to which he demurs. It is not a question of mere “overflowing,” which may be appropriately applied to houses, audiences, and presses, but it is the overflowing of “wine-vats,” which are the receptacles of *yayin*. (b) He also fails to notice the distinction between the *press* and the *vat*, and assumes, without evidence, that they are identical, and alike the receptacles of vine fruit. (c) *Tirosh* is defined as “the collective produce of the vineyard,”⁹¹⁷ and including “grapes, rasins,” &c.,⁹¹⁸ “perhaps the young shoots and tendrils.”⁹¹⁹ Now, although grapes may be heaped into, and overflow the winepress, grapes and raisins, shoots and tendrils are not mingled together or heaped up, either in vats or presses. (d) The *gath*, or press, was certainly the place of “vine fruits,” in which it was trodden, and of it the prophet says, “the press is full.” But the *yekeb*, as distinguished from the *gath* in the text was, as certainly, the receptacle of *yayin*, and of it he says, “the vats overflow.” Consequently, while the “bursting forth” of the former would, undoubtedly, denote “superabundance” of vine fruit, the “overflowing” of the latter must, in like manner, designate a “superabundance” of vinous liquor.

The argument for the fluidity of *tirosh*, founded on the expression “thy vats (*yekabim*) shall burst forth with *tirosh*” (Prov. iii. 10), is also objected to by Dr. Ritchie, on the ground that “we often speak of both flames and flocks and men, as bursting forth.”⁹²⁰ This is true, and the fact would have been of significance if the prophet had referred to these persons and things; but the point presently at issue is as to the meaning of the word when applied to the bursting forth of the contents of a wine-vat. Be it so

⁹¹⁷ Lees.

⁹¹⁸ Ritchie

⁹¹⁹ *Tirosh lo Yayin*

⁹²⁰ Sc. Test, p. 46

The Wines of the Bible

that the Hebrew term (*pharatz*) is applied to the dispersion of an enemy, the scattering of a flock, the increase of wealth, the diffusion of a rumour, and the like; it is also employed of the bursting forth of a fluid, as “the flood *breaketh out*” (Job xxviii. 4); The Lord hath broken forth upon mine enemies before me, as the *breach* of waters” (2 Sam. v. 20); “The *breaking forth* of waters (1 Chron. xiv. 11); “A wide *breaking in* of waters” (Job xxx. 14). Seeing then that the word is applied to fluids as well as solids, does it mean here, as Dr. Ritchie alleges, that the “vine fruit should be so plentiful that it would overheap the wine-vat, and droop from it on every side?” or does it designate the bursting forth of the expressed juice, as “the flood breaketh out?” The verb by itself determines nothing as to the overflowing substance, but taken in connection with *yekeb*, from which the tirosh burst forth, there can be no doubt that the reference is to an overflowing liquor. The doctor terms this “a novel argument,” and fails to see that it has “any force on the subject;” and says “Is Dr. Murphy prepared to stake his reputation for Hebrew scholarship on what is essential to the validity of his argument, that *yekeb* always means the vat, or ‘receptacle for the juice below the press?’”⁹²¹ We think he might, even in the face of Gesenius and Ritchie. If *yekeb* does not always mean the vat, does it always mean the *press* in all the sixteen passages in which it occurs? If so, what is the name of the “receiving vessel” into which the juice flowed? Is it a nameless thing, or has it a name? If so, how is it designated? But if *yekeb* does not always mean the vat, does it sometimes do so? If so, where has it this meaning? And how shall we be certain that we are not there again confounding the press with the *vat*?

⁹²¹ Sc. Test., pp. 47, 48

The Wines of the Bible

Referring to Joel ii. 24, "The floors shall be full of wheat, and the vats (*yekabim*) shall overflow with wine (*tirosh*) and oil." Dr. Lees says, "If the figure is not too strong, we may consider that the prophet represents the presses as causing the *tirosh* and *yitshar* to run into them, so as to fill them to the brim; not with the expressed juice, but with the substances whose subsequent pressure should yield the desired drink."⁹²² The figure is certainly "too strong;" for how could the presses cause the grapes and olives "to run into *them*," i.e., into themselves? Would it not be more natural to conceive of the presses causing the fruit *to run out of*, rather than to run into them? And would it not be still more natural to conceive of the presses causing the expressed juice to run into the vats; or for the vats to cause the juice to run over, or overflow their burns? He further alleges that "the Hebrew *shook* has no connection with liquid."⁹²³ We maintain, on the contrary, that it properly has no connection with anything else. It occurs only in three passages, Joel ii. 24; iii. 13; Ps. lxxv. 9. In the first two of these it is used in connection with the vats, which are said to *overflow* with *tirosh*; but as these texts are in dispute, they may be held to be indeterminate, for we deny that the overflowing substances were solids. In the only other passage in which the word occurs the reference is unmistakably to a fluid: - "Thou visitest the earth and *waterest* it: though greatly enriches it with the river of God; which is full of water." Here the verb employed to describe an overflowing river, just as it is used in the other two passages to describe the overflowing *tirosh*. The word signifies literally, to run, to run to overflow; hence the noun *shock*; a leg, and *shook*, a street or thoroughfare. Following the analogy of *shoob*, to turn back, from *shabah*, to capture; *shoor*, to

⁹²² Temp. Bib. Com., p. 227

⁹²³ Nott's *Lectures*, p. 62

The Wines of the Bible

travel about, from *sharah*, to loose, or let go free, *shook* is connected with *shakah*, to drink, to give drink, to water cattle, to irrigate the ground. Hence the usage in the above text, “Thou visitest the earth and waterest it,” and the derivatives *shikkui*, drink, and *mashkeh*, cup-bearer, drinking vessel, a well watered region. In this way *shook* will be the overflowing of a liquor, denoting in Joel, not that the vintage has been so abundant that “the grapes have to be *piled up* in the press,”⁹²⁴ or that the vats were “overflowing with vine-fruit *heaped* into them,”⁹²⁵ but that it had been so plentiful that the press was *full* of grapes, and the vats *running over* with wine.

G. Tirosh taking away the Heart.

Passing from this usage as to wine-vats and presses, we find another Biblical reference to *tirosh*, which seems to indicate that it was a vinous liquor: - “Whoredom and wine (*yayin*), and *new wine* (*tirosh*), *take away the heart*” (Hos. iv. 11). It appears to us utterly incongruous, if not altogether ludicrous, to interpret this text literally, or metaphorically, as if the sacred writer gravely intended thereby to exhibit, in association with wine and women, the demoralizing tendency of eating grapes and raisins,, with or without the young shoots and tendrils! Would any religious teacher of day describe the depravity of the people by saying, “Whoredom and wine, and gooseberries (or other fruit), *take away the heart* from God?” And yet the Hebrew prophet is credited with the utterance of a kindred puerility!

⁹²⁴ Lees

⁹²⁵ Ritchie

The Wines of the Bible

Dr. Ritchie says, "The passage under review, then, simply declares that this material blessing, good in itself, may become an occasion of evil, by excessive indulgence, and in this case it takes away the heart. This truth is confirmed by all history of its use in the lands of vineyards. The concurrent testimony of experience and fact, in vine countries, verifies this statement of the Divine Word, that indulgence in grape fruit is an occasion of taking away the heart from God."⁹²⁶ What a series of astounding *facts*! And all confirmed by history and concurrent testimony! Is the writer poking fun at his readers? or is he playing on their credulity? However this may be, we remark (1.) If this "material blessing" be "good in itself," and yet "an occasion of evil," the fact will serve to answer his argument in behalf of two kinds of wine, founded on "the diversity of expression in Scripture," as proving "beyond all reasonable doubt a difference of character in these wines." The good creature, whether *yayin* or *shechar*, may be a "material blessing," as well as innocent *tirosh*, and yet, like the latter, "an occasion of evil." (2.) The writer's importation of "excessive indulgence" into the text will justify a similar importation into such passages as, "wine is a mocker;" "It is not for kings to drink wine," &c., and, at the same time, serve as an answer to all that he has said on "the theory of excess" (3.) If *tirosh* be, as here, "an occasion of evil," and such evil as "taking away the heart from God;" and if it is associated in that evil with "whoredom and *yayin*," the blessing is in this case turned into a curse. This fact negatives his assertion (p. 12), that "*tirosh* is, without a single exception, spoken of as a blessing; not a syllable of disapproval or of caution is uttered respecting it in the whole Book of God." It appears to us that both "disapproval" and "caution" are unmistakably indicated in the very mention of the great evil which

⁹²⁶ Sc. Test., p. 50

The Wines of the Bible

indulgence in it has occasioned. (4.) If indulgence in tirosh, i.e., grapes and raisins, has the effect of “taking away the heart from God,” what severer accusation, in a moral and religious point of view, could be brought against any form of unlawful indulgence, not excepting the “cursed drink?” Now, what evidence is there of the demoralizing effect of excessive indulgence in grapes and raisins upon any people, in any age or country under the sun? The writer affirms that “this truth is confirmed by all history of its use in lands of vineyards,” and is verified by “the concurrent testimony of experience and fact in vine countries.” But beyond his own dogmatic and unsupported assertion of the alleged “fact,” we are not favoured with even the tiniest fragment of that universal history and concurrent testimony! On the contrary, the testimony of Rev. S. Robson, missionary at Damascus, is given elsewhere (p. 76), showing that grapes and raisins are extensively used in the East as “a substantial part of the food of the people;” and that “it is perfectly safe to eat grapes constantly to satiety, or if there is anything unwholesome in them, it produces its effects very slowly and imperceptibly.” This missionary must have been sadly ignorant of our author’s “history,” and “concurrent testimony,” for he seems oblivious of the demoralizing effect of eating grapes “constantly to satiety!” (5.) If indulgence in vine fruit be attended with such disastrous moral consequences as “taking away the heart from God,” &c., the indulgence in that fruit must be as pernicious as drinking any kind of “cursed drink.” Dr. Ritchie cannot be allowed to save the innocence of the grapes and raisins from the bad character he has ascribed to them by merely calling them *material blessings, good in themselves*, or by importing “excessive indulgence” into the text, unless he is prepared to extend the same favour to the Biblical references to *yayin* and *shechar*. He tells us, often enough, that it is not *excess* but *wine* which the Scripture denounces as “a mocker;” and we

The Wines of the Bible

must tell him in requital for the information, that it is not “excessive indulgence,” but *tirosh* which the prophet denounces as “taking away the heart from God.” (6.) If indulgence in grapes and raisins be, as alleged, an occasion of such moral evil, the use of these fruits should be incontinently abjured and proscribed, as the ministers of evil, by all good people; for the writer argues from exhortation, “Abstain from all appearance of evil” (p. 257), that “it is not only evil itself that is interdicted, but the appearance of it, the circumstances out of which it springs,” &c. Now the appetite for grape fruit, like that for the “cursed drink,” grows by what it feeds upon, and thus moderate use degenerates into “excessive indulgence,” and becomes both an evil itself and the appearance of it. The “taking away the heart from God,” resulting from that excess, is confessedly a moral evil; and as it springs out of the circumstance of eating too many grapes and raisins, which thereby become “an occasion of evil,” the use of such dangerous fruits must, on Dr. Ritchie’s showing, be “interdicted!” But that there may be no uncertainty as to the context of that interdict, he lays down, illustrates, and enforces two general principles, with the object of showing the “appearance of evil” to be shunned. He says, “(1.) What always precedes an evil in an appearance of it, and this requires all to abstain from intoxicating drinks.” And he says, “It must be remembered that the argument here refers not to commanded, but to indifferent actions; not to things necessary, but to luxuries or mere comforts.” Excluding the “drinks,” which do not concern us at present, and dealing with the general principle itself, in its application to “luxuries or mere comforts,” it must be admitted that eating grapes and raisins, however moderately, always precedes the evil of excessive indulgence in them; and, therefore, on this principle, the use of such fruits must be interdicted! He says again, “(2.) What supplies the means of committing evil is an

The Wines of the Bible

appearance of it, and this command requires all to abstain from traffic in intoxicating drinks." Seeing, then, that the cultivation and sale of grapes and raisins supply the means of committing the evil of excessive indulgence, whereby the heart is alienated from God, this command as explained above, requires that all traffic in grapes and raisins be interdicted! Go, then, ye luscious grapes of a sunny clime! The divine law, expounded by a learned doctor, commands your departure; and in the fact of such interdict, who can bid you stay? Alas! for our lost grapes and raisins.

If it were not for the severe gravity of the writer, we should have thought that he was again poking fun at his readers; but with the gravity in view, we can only suppose that, in attempting to establish his *tirosh* theory by such arguments as these, he has been laboring to make an empty bag stand upright like a full sack!

The doctor regards the text as affording "an example of an anti-climax," pointing "to an evil in each of three *occasions* of it, - the *greatest*, the *greater*, and the *great*. The evil spoken of is taking away the heart. First, the *greatest* occasion of this is whoredom.....Second, the *greater* occasion of this evil is wine.....Third, the *great* occasion of this evil is here said to be *tirosh*" (p. 49). Now, if *tirosh* be, as previously defined, a designation of vine fruit - i.e., grapes and raisins - we must conclude that these innocent fruits furnished "the *great* occasion of this evil" departure of the heart from God; and, consequently, that, while given to the *greater* sins of wine and women, *the great evil of this people consisted in their excessive indulgence in grapes and raisins*! There can be no doubt that the first two evils are frequently associated together in the case of the intemperate, but we question if they are ever associated with the third; for Dr. Lees assures us that "the constituents of fat (starch and sugar) give *a distaste for alcoholics*, since the two substances would retard

The Wines of the Bible

each other's combustion."⁹²⁷ If this be so, the *tiros*h which took away these people's heart could not have been the innocent sweets alleged, for their excessive use did not give them "a distaste for alcoholics."

However this may be, it is manifest, from the representations of Scripture, that the people of Ephraim were at this period an eminently besotted people, who were distinguished by their love of drink, rather than by an excessive indulgence in grapes and raisins. Accordingly, they are exhibited in Hosea ii. 5, as going after their lovers, who gave them "oil and drink" (*shikkui*). In Hosea vii. 5, the princes are accused of having made the king "sick with bottles of wine" (*yayin*). In Isaiah xxviii. 1-3, the people are branded as "the drunkards of Ephraim." And in Amos xv. 1, they are described as saying to their masters, "Bring, and let us drink." It is evident from these and other references that the tribes of Israel, "in the mountain of Samaria," had been corrupted by the licentious practices which prevailed among the heathen, and which were now, to some extent, incorporated with the Hebrew worship; so that their once pure and beautiful worship; and the people who had borne the honourable title, "children of God," were not branded as "the drunkards of Ephraim." The spiritual depravation of character which they had undergone was associated with, and had, in fact, culminated in social and national disintegration. Religious "whoredom," or illicit intercourse with pagan deities in heath worship, resulted in actual and literal fornication and adultery, and was associated with actual and literal drunkenness. It is, therefore, obviously to these evils the prophet alludes when he says, "Whoredom and wine, and new wine, take away the heart." So that the *tiros*h, which "lured Israel

⁹²⁷ Works, iii. 144

The Wines of the Bible

away from the pure worship of God,”⁹²⁸ was not mere grapes and raisins, but a specific kind of *yayin*, with which it is associated, and of which the nation says, “I will go after my lovers that give me.....my drink” (Hosea ii. 5).

Dr. Ritchie objects to the interpretation of *tirosch* as a wine, and says, - “To affirm, as is usually done, that this means in this text intoxicating liquor, involves a manifest absurdity. If ‘wine’ means this in the second term, what need of a third to denote the same quality, and on this supposition is it possible to show any distinction between them?”⁹²⁹ There is no “absurdity” in the association of the two terms, unless it can be proved that there was only *one* description of “intoxicating liquor” among the Hebrews. But we have seen that they possessed “all sorts of wine.” The writer forgets that the one term (*yayin*) is generic and the other (*tirosch*) is specific. Gesenius says, “Sometimes two nouns are connected by *vau*, of which the first denotes a genus, and the other a species, or at least the latter is included in the former; here *vau* is *i.q.*, and especially, *and particularly, and namely.*” Now all the *tirosch* was *yayin*, the former being included in the latter; but all the *yayin* was not *tirosch*, there being only one kind of the latter, and many kinds of the former. There is, therefore, a manifest “distinction between them,” although it is no more than the distinction between a genus and its species. We may accordingly, render the text, “Whoredom and wine (*yayin*), and especially new wine (*tirosch*), take away the heart.”

The usage is so common both in Scripture and in other writings, and is so generally recognized, that illustrative examples are unnecessary. We read in Zech. ix. 9, “Riding upon an ass, *and* upon a colt, the foal of an ass;” 1 Sam. xxviii. 3, “They buried him

⁹²⁸ Fausset

⁹²⁹ Sc. Test., p. 49

The Wines of the Bible

in Rama, *and* in his own city;" 1 Thess. i. 3, "In the sight of God *and* our Father;" John iii. 3, "Born of water *and* of the Spirit." Even in the matter of wines we find *wine* and *must* associated together, not only in ancient authors, but also in the writings of Lees and Ritchie, of which examples are given elsewhere; and these latter regard the *must* as being a species of *wine*. *Yayin* and *shechar* are frequently connected in Scripture, and both are wines. *Yayin* is also found associated with *khemer* and *mesech* in Ps. lxxv. 8, "In the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the *yayin* is *khemer*; it is full of *mesech*" – i.e., the *yayin* in the cup was the species of wine known as *khemer*, and that specific *khemer*, by the addition of potent drugs, was made *mesech*. *Yayin* is also connected with *ahsis* in Joel i. 5, and Cant. viii. 2. In Prov. xxiii. 20, 21, the generic "wine bibbers" (drinkers of *yayin*) are individualized into the specific "drunkard" (*soveh* drinker). And in Deut. xxxii. 14, the "blood of the grape" is united with *khemer* – "And thou didst drink the blood of the grape, *khemer*" – i.e., the species of that "blood of the grape" was *khemer*. So that there is no more "manifest absurdity" in connecting *yayin* with *tirosh*, both being vinous liquors, than in any other of the associations noticed above.

The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin* adopts a different method of exegesis from that of Dr. Ritchie. He thinks that "the prophet, after first reproving the sins of the people, proceeds to inveigh against those of the priests," and, in the verse under consideration, declares the cause of their sin, which may be paraphrased thus, - "The indulgence of the priests in marriages prohibited to *them in particular* by the law of Moses, their drinking of wines on prohibited occasions, and the use of wine in

The Wines of the Bible

general, have alienated their hearts, and caused them to forget and neglect the Lord.”⁹³⁰

According to this interpretation the evils condemned in the text are sins of the priests – viz., priestly marriages, priestly wine drinking, and priestly grape eating! Here is neither inebriation, nor “excessive indulgence” or any kind. In support of this novel exposition the author quotes several texts, showing that certain marriages were unlawful to the priests “in particular,” and that wine-drinking was also unlawful to them, “on prohibited occasions.” But what of the third evil, the “use of the produce of the vine in general?” Was this also interdicted? Were the priests under the same regimen as the Nazarites? Were they, indeed, forbidden to eat grapes or rasins? Were the tithes and firstfruits of the vine not to be used in their solid form, or until they were converted into wine? And did this unlawful grape-eating really alienate their hearts, and cause them to forget and neglect the Lord? If it did, these pernicious grapes must have been “grapes of Sodom,” and not the innocent and blessed “fruit of the vine,” of which we have read so much. The author seems to have anticipated some of these questions, for he proceeds to say, “To complete the argument, could forgetfulness of the law and rejection of the knowledge of God result from so innocent a thing as the solid fruit of the vine? Let those who are inclined to deny the affirmative of the proposition refer to the prophet we are endeavoring to illustrate, who expressly connects it with idolatry where, in speaking of the children of Israel, he says, ‘they look to other gods, and love *aeshiysheey genabhim*, “sweetmeats of grapes.”’ But even admitting this love of these “sweetmeats” by the children of Israel, it is not said that either the grapes or the love of grapes caused them to “look to other gods.” Whereas it is

⁹³⁰ Sec. xxvi.

The Wines of the Bible

said that *tirosh* takes away the heart from God. In the former cause the love of sweetmeats is merely associated with idolatry, but in the latter case the *tirosh* and the alienation of the heart are connected together as the cause and effect. These so-called “sweetmeats of grapes” are “flagons of wine;”⁹³¹ “cakes of risins;”⁹³² “pressed cakes of grape clusters;”⁹³³ “a cake of dried fruit;”⁹³⁴ “a cake of grapes.”⁹³⁵ And they appear to have been used, in this case, not from a mere love of sweetmeats, but because they were an idolatrous offering, “cakes to the queen of heaven” (Jer. vii. 18). So that if this be the particular evil referred to in the text, the sin of the priests must have consisted, not in their “love of sweetmeats,” nor in their “use of the produce of the vine in general,” but in idolatrously offering those *cakes* to that *queen*, instead of more piously and sensibly using them for their own enjoyment!

The author affixes a side note to this paragraph on the evils arising from the use of grapes, in which he directs the reader to see a note on another page. On proceeding thither, we find a quotation from Wern’s *African Wanderings*, relating to a woman and her husband “indulging in an immoderate consumption of grapes.” But instead of any injurious consequences, moral or physical, resulting from their excess, we are told that the “regimen had such an excellent effect on both, that I hardly again recognized madame.” This is a curious fact to adduce as an illustration or proof of the “forgetfulness of the law and rejection of the knowledge of God,” resulting “from so innocent a thing as the solid fruit of the vine!”

⁹³¹ Eng. Ver.

⁹³² Sept.

⁹³³ Lees.

⁹³⁴ Douglas

⁹³⁵ Ritchie

The Wines of the Bible

If, however, the evils condemned by the prophet were these sins of the priests, then, unlawful marriages were expressly forbidden; wine also was interdicted and declared unlawful “on prohibited occasions.” But when or where were the priests ever forbidden to eat grapes, or “the use of the produce of the vine in general?” The author appeals to the law of the Nazarite, the injunction to Manoah’s wife, and the regimen of the Rechabites. But what have all these to do with the law of the priesthood? The Jewish priests were not, by office, either Nazarites, or Rechabites, nor were they in any way under obligation to imitate Monoah’s wife. The question at issue here has nothing whatever to do with these latter, but exclusively relates to the former. Were the priest forbidden to eat grapes? That is the only question before us at present. If they were under any such obligation we shall be glad to learn when and where? If they were not, the ingenious theory of the author collapses, and, in this case, at least, he has failed to make good the title of his book, *Tirosh lo Yayin*.

Dr. Lees does not agree with either of the two writers in their interpretations of the text, and proposes two different explanations of his own. He alleges that “now-a-days, this verse is the last resource of those who hold that both *yayin* and *tirosh* denote the same species of intoxicating wine.”⁹³⁶ In this he is mistaken. No one holds any such absurdity. We do not believe that the two species were one species, or that they were both “the same species,” our contention being that one term is generic, and the other specific. He also, alleges that “the ground of this notion” is found in the verb “to take,” which is thought to “mean intoxication,” but which is never once used in this sense in the Scriptures. In this, again, he is mistaken. No one holds any such absurdity. The “taking away of the heart from God” is regarded,

⁹³⁶ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 219

The Wines of the Bible

not as signifying intoxication but as exhibiting the *effect* of intoxication, arising from indulgence in “*yayin*, and especially *tirosh*,” as in Prov. xxiii. 33, “Look not thou upon the wine,” for “thine eyes shall behold strange women (‘harlots,’ Lees), and thine heart shall utter perverse things.” He says, “it would be absurd to associate the generic term ‘wine’ with the specific *tirosh*, as if they were different in the common quality of producing ‘intoxication.’” But we fail to perceive any “absurdity” in supposing the prophet to say that what is true of wine, generally and universally, is especially and significantly true of that particular species of wine designated *tirosh*. A modern physician would not be thought chargeable with absurdity if he should say, “wine is bad for a patient in the height of fever, and especially port or sherry.” He says further, “It violates a fundamental law of thought and composition to put the weaker element last; and the critics with whom we are now dealing will hardly deny that ‘new wine’ (*mustum*, as they would render *tirosh*) is weaker than ‘old wine.’” If this be so, the writer himself is chargeable with that violation of law, for he can hardly deny that vine fruit is a “weaker element” in taking away the heart from God than either *yayin* or whoredom. But however it may be with the “critics” referred to, we, at least, are not prepared to render *tirosh* by *mustum*; neither do we admit that *tirosh* denotes “new wine,” and is “weaker than old wine,” or that *yayin* is a designation of “old wine.” We can only say that *yayin* is a generic term for all sorts of fermented wine, new and old, weak and strong; and that *tirosh* is the designation of one of these species; but of its specific qualities we know nothing. All wines must be new before they become old, and, therefore, *tirosh* may have been both. The fact that it is spoken of as being pressed from the grapes, and overflowing the vats, determines nothing as to the

The Wines of the Bible

question at issue, as we have shown in a previous section in reference to *yayin*.

Having thus disposed of the views of his opponents, the writer proceeds to give two different interpretations of his own. His first explanation is, that the text describes “the threefold apostacy of which the children of Abraham had been guilty; they went after strange gods instead of the true God; their best affections centered in sensual pleasures instead of being fixed upon the divine love; and their estimate of good was limited to earthly things (represented by *tirosh*, one of the most delicious of natural elements), instead of embracing Him ‘from whom all blessings flow.’” According to this view, *whoredom* is “illicit worship rendered by the chosen people to heathen gods.” *Yayin*, “wine,” is “the type of sensual gratification.” And *tirosh*, “vine fruit,” is “the type of natural, earthly good.” But as the explanation of the text may not be deemed satisfactory, and as “another interpretation may possibly be preferred by some readers,” the writer favours us with his second explanation in a note to the above. According to this latter view, the three evils of which the people were guilty were, whoredom, i.e., “idolatry;” the “use of wine (especially of an intoxicating kind) by the way of ceremonial offering and indulgence at pagan rites,” “and the prayers presented for the increase of their fruits – *tirosh* being named as one of their chief productions.” Thus the sins of Israel were idolatry (*whoredom*), indulgence in intoxicating wine (*yayin*), and prayers for an increase of fruit (*tirosh*). So that *tirosh* took away their hearts from God, not by excessive indulgence,⁹³⁷ nor by unlawful use by the priests,⁹³⁸ nor as being a type of natural, earthly good, more highly regarded than God,⁹³⁹ but by inducing

⁹³⁷ Ritchie

⁹³⁸ *Tirosh lo Yayin*

⁹³⁹ Lees.

The Wines of the Bible

them to pray to heathen deities for an increase of fruits, of which *tirosh* was one of the chief!

If the reader is not satisfied with any of these far-fetched and unnatural interpretations of the text, we recommend him to fall back upon the simpler and more reasonable view, that the prophet is depicting the demoralizing effects produced upon the people of Ephraim by indulgence in wine and women, the chosen wine of the inebriates being a species of *yayin*, designated *tirosh*.

H. Tirosh in Religious Offerings

The use of *tirosh* in religious offerings is supposed to furnish additional evidences of its having been a solid, and not a fluid substance. Thus it was included among the tithes and firstfruits appointed by the law, and these, it is said, were all solids. Accordingly Dr. Ritchie says, "In this relation I might adduce the argument derived from the silence of Scripture law, respecting the tithe of the fruit of the vintage, that *tirosh* denotes grape fruit."⁹⁴⁰ We do not profess to understand this passage, for if *tirosh* denotes "the fruit of the vintage," as defined by the writer in the same paragraph, and was actually tithed by the Law, it is difficult to understand what he means by "the silence of the Scripture law respecting the tithe of the fruit of the vintage." But, whatever may be intended by this reference, he proceeds to say, "If *tirosh* had denoted grape juice, the tithe law respecting it could have been easily evaded by drying it as raisins, or preserving it in other ways, so that, from these texts regarding the tithe of this, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to deduce the obligation to pay tithes, or present firstfruits of a large and

⁹⁴⁰ Sc. Test., p. 34

The Wines of the Bible

valuable class of products, viz., the fruit of the vintage.” The Scripture law which was silent in the previous sentence, appears to have found its voice in this one, for here are “texts regarding the tithing of this,” and “an obligation to pay tithes of.....the fruit of the vintage. The possibility of evading the law, and so escaping from the obligation to pay tithes of their grape juice, is an ingenious discovery, and could easily be accomplished by the simple process of making *no wine*. We commend the suggestion to modern ratepayers. If *whisky* denotes “barley bree,” the modern tax on spirits could be easily evaded by converting the corn into bread, and making no whisky! We fear that, even with this facility of evasion within their reach, some of the old Jews and modern Christians would rather pay the tax than be deprived of the liquor.

It is alleged that *wine* was not subject to the tithe law, nor to the law of the firstfruits. Dr. Lees says, “The tithe of liquid wine must have been a late introduction, for it is not once mentioned in a series of texts extending over eleven centuries. If by this the writer means that the tithe law does not specify *yayin*, the generic term “for liquid wine,” as the substance to be tithed, the reference is irrelevant to the present issue. If he means that the law does not specify *tirosh*, a specific term for “liquid wine,” the texts of those centuries prove the contrary. But if he means that the *tirosh* to be tithed was not a “liquid wine,” he simply assumes the very point at issue. It is admitted by all parties that *tirosh* was included among the tithes required by the law (Deut. xii. 17; xiv. 23; Neh. xiii. 5, 12). The only question in dispute is as to the meaning of the term, which is employed to designate one of those tithes. Dr. Lees and the other two writers assert that the tithe law was limited to fruits and other solids, and that, therefore, *tirosh* must have been the solid produce of the vineyard. We, on the contrary, maintain that the law was exceeding broad; that it

The Wines of the Bible

extended to “all the tenth in the land,” and “all the tithes of thine increase;” and that it thereby covered all the substance and possessions of the people, so that a Jew could justly say, “I gave tithes of all that I possess” (Luke xviii. 12). Accordingly we read, “But the tithes of the children of Israel, which they offer as an heave offering unto the Lord, I have given to the Levites to inherit” (Num. xviii. 24). These *heave offerings* were to include “all your tithes” (ver. 28), and “all your gifts” (ver. 29). Among these tithes gifts there were “the best of the oil, and all the best of the wine (*tirosh*), and of the wheat” (ver. 12). And the wheat to be tithed included “the first dough,” as well as of “the threshing-floor” (Num. xv. 20, 21). The Levites are then directed to offer, as a heave offering (a method of consecration), a tenth of all the tithes which they receive from the people; and are informed, “this your heave offering shall be reckoned unto you as though it were the corn of the threshing-floor, and as the fullness of the wine vat” (*yekeb*). And the people were similarly informed, “When ye have heaved the best thereof from it, then it shall be counted unto the Levites as the increase of the threshing-floor, and as the increase of the wine vat” (Num. xviii. 27, 30). Now if the contents of the “threshing-floor” were tithed and heaved unto the Lor, so also must have been the contents of the “wine vat;” and if the former included the *dough* of the crushed wheat, as above, the latter must, in like manner, have included the *liquid wine*.

Besides the tithes, there were *firstfruits* offered unto the Lord, which were also assigned the Levites. These consisted of “the best of the oil, and all the best of the wine (*tirosh*), and of the wheat” (Num. xviii. 12). Referring to this text, Dr. Lees says, “If any uncertainty existed as to these terms denoting the fruits of the soil in their solid state, it would be removed by the expression

The Wines of the Bible

‘the firstfruits’ (*rashithim*), and by the language of ver. 13.”⁹⁴¹ But the writer knows, or ought to know, that the phrase “fruit of the vine” is commonly used as a periphrasis for liquid wine; and that the Hebrew term *rashithim* merely designates the *fruits* of a thing, without any specification of solids or liquids, fruits or flowers. It is used of the first creation (Gen. i. 1); the beginning of Nimrod’s kingdom (Gen. x. 10); Amalek, the first of the nations (Num. xxiv. 20); a cake of the first dough (Num. xv. 20); the first of a fleece of sheep (Deut. xviii. 4); the firstfruits of *devash*, grape, jelly (2 Chron. xxxi. 5); the firstfruits of dough (Neh. x. 37); the land assigned to the Levites (Ezek. xlvi. 14); the beginning of wisdom (Ps. cxi. 10); the beginning of knowledge (Prov. i. 7); the beginning of strife (Prov. xvii. 14); the beginning of sin (Mic. i. 17) &c.

We may be reminded that there is another Hebrew term (*peri*) which literally signifies *fruit*, and is sometimes applied to “firstfruits.” But this word is never so employed, except in one instance, where it is thus rendered in our version (Deut. xxvi. 10) by mistake. It literally means *fruit*, *produce*, or *progeny*, and has no reference to the so-called “firstfruits.” It is used of the fruit of trees, the fruit of the womb, the fruit of the body, the fruit of cattle, the fruit of the mouth, &c. There is, however, another term which is frequently employed of the firstfruits, viz., *bikoor*. But even this word has no specific reference to *fruits*. It literally signifies the *firstlings*, or *first things*, whether of fruit, or grain, or bread. So that the argument based on the expression, “the firstfruits,” has no force, being founded on a mistake.

Moreover, the same writer who thus pleads for the solidity of *tirosh*, on the ground that it was included in the offerings of firstfruits, feels constrained to admit the fluidity of one of these alleged solids. Thus it is said, “Thou shalt not delay to offer the

⁹⁴¹ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 47

The Wines of the Bible

first of thy ripe fruits and of thy liquors" (Exod. xxii. 29). Dr. Lees says that the one Hebrew word rendered "the first of thy ripe fruits," literally means 'thy fullness,' or 'abundance,' here used to signify the firstfruits due to the Giver of all good."⁹⁴² We admit his definition, but deny that the word refers to *fruits* of any kind, as distinguished from other substances, whether first or last. It does literally mean "fulness" or "abundance" but it is the same term which is employed to designate "the fulness of the wine vat" (Num. xviii. 27), and is associated, in the text under consideration, with *liquor*. This latter word (*demagh*) occurs only once in this form, and appears to be connected with a verb signifying "to weep," and with a noun denoting "tears." Dr. Lees interprets it as "a tear," and says, it is an "an expressive metaphor of the gums and rich juices of trees and fruits that spontaneously drop from them." He compares these *spontaneous drops* of the text, with the Spanish wine called *lagrima*, "made from the droppings of Muscated grapes," and with "the famous Tokay wine, or Tokay Ausbruch," which "derives its name from the juice which drops from the unpressed grapes." Gesenius gives the same explanation of the word, and represents it as a metaphorical designation of the "tears of olives and grapes, i.e., wine and oil."

Viewed in this light, the text is an exhortation addressed to the people, calling upon them not to defer the offering of the fulness, or abundance, of their most precious wines. And as *tirosh* is the only term used in connection with these offerings which can bear the signification, we may conclude that it is a designation of "the best of the wine," which was included in "the firstfruits which they shall offer unto the Lord." Pliny incidentally supplies an illustration of this religious usage among the heathen, when he says, "In former days too, they would not so much as taste the

⁹⁴² Temp. Bib. Com., p. 31

The Wines of the Bible

corn when newly cut, nor yet wine when just made, before the priests had made a *libation* of the *firstfruits*.”⁹⁴³

It is further argued that *tiros*h was a firstfruit, and that the firstfruits were products of the soil in their natural condition, and not artificial preparations. This argument has been anticipated and disposed of in the preceding paragraphs; for we have seen that the firstfruits included such artificial preparations as dough, cakes of dough, bread, grape jelly, and even wine. But it is objected by Dr. Lees, “fermented cakes were no proper symbols of the corn – the fruit of the earth. Fermentation was synonymous with corruption among the ancients, as it is, in fact, a downward decomposing process. It is, therefore, unreasonable to suppose that fermented things – symbols of impurity – would be employed on this occasion in preference to pure wine, as the representative of the firstfruits of *tiros*h (grapes) and *yitshar* (orchard fruit). The opinions of the Jews concerning fermentation negative supposition.”⁹⁴⁴ Facts are stubborn things, and of more value than many bold assertions. Pentecost is called “the day of the firstfruits” (Num. xxviii. 26), and the feast of harvest “the firstfruits of thy labours, which thou hast sown in thy field” (Exod. xxiii. 16). And yet, the offerings which were to be made on the occasion of this celebration, instead of being the products of the soil in their natural condition, were, in fact, some of them, artificial preparations. And notwithstanding all that is said above about “fermented cakes” being “no proper symbols of the corn, the fruit of the earth;” and of fermentation being “synonymous with corruption,” and fermented things “the symbols of impurity,” the offering actually prescribed for the feast of harvest is as follows: - “ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves

⁹⁴³ Book xviii.

⁹⁴⁴ Works, ii. 73

The Wines of the Bible

of two tenth deals; they shall be of fine flour; *they shall be baked with leaven*; they are the firstfruits unto the Lord." (Lev. xxiii. 17).

It is further alleged that *yayin*, not *tirosh*, was directed to be used as a libation or "drink-offering" in the worship of God; and from this it is inferred that the former was a liquid wine, and the latter solid vine fruit. But there is quite as little solidity in the argument founded on this fact as there is in the *tirosh* itself. If *yayin* be a generic term, as admitted it, of course, includes all sorts or species of wine; and, therefore, the law which prescribed the use of *yayin* for this purpose, without specifying the particular kind to be used, left the worshippers free to employ such wines as they possessed, with the obvious understanding that the best should be used. This being so, any of the Hebrew wines, whether *tirosh*, or *shechar*, or *soveh*, or *khemer*, would have been perfectly lawful as a libation, all these being species of *yayin*. Indeed, two of these are mentioned in this connection. Thus in Ezra vi. 9, *khamar*, the Chaldee equivalent of the Hebrew *khemer*, is specified among the provisions appointed for the service "of the priests, which are at Jerusalem. And in Num. xxviii. 7, *shechar* is assigned for the drink offering. Now, if *yayin* be a generic term, *tirosh*, as a wine, must have been one of its species, and quite as lawful a libation as either of the two species noticed above.

The point in dispute as to the nature of *tirosh* is not, as we have previously said, of very great importance in the present controversy; but on reviewing all that has been said for and against its solidity, the preponderating evidence of Biblical usage leads us to infer that it was a veritable vinous liquor, which took away the heart of the drinker when too freely indulged in.

We have now gone over all the Hebrew terms used in the Bible for wine, and have found – (a) That all sorts of wines were in common use among the Jews; (b) that these several kinds of wine differed from each other, more or less, in their particular

The Wines of the Bible

qualities; (c) that they were used at different times, and by different persons, both in moderation and excess; (d) that however different in their specific qualities and uses were all fermented liquors. (e) But from the remoteness of the period and the comparatively scanty fragments of Jewish history available, it is now impossible to determine all the specific differences which distinguished the several wines. This only is certain, that, so far as the wines of the Bible are concerned, the unfermented theory is a myth!

The Wines of the Bible

VIII. ANCIENT WINES - SACRAMENTAL

The advocates of the unfermented wine theory appeal to the law of the Jewish Passover in evidence of the existence and use of such wine among the Jews. It is contended that as wine was undeniably employed in the paschal supper, and the law expressly forbade the use of leavened things, the wine used in this service could not have been a fermented liquor. Now we admit at once that, in harmony with the special character of the solemnity, fermented *solids* were excluded from the observance, and expressly prohibited by the law of the Passover. The predominating thoughts which the institution was designed to cherish in the hearts of the people, were thoughts of a cruel slavery, a bitter bondage, a terrible oppression, which had been endured by their fathers in Egypt; and this mournful affliction was to be appropriately commemorated with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. But as the events celebrated were not wholly or altogether sad and afflictive, seeing that the Lord had delivered them out of the house of bondage, and brought them into a land flowing with milk and honey, the commemorative institution blended together the dark with the light, -

"The sable cloud turned forth her silver lining on the night."

Accordingly unleavened bread, called the "bread of affliction," with bitter herbs, were associated in the festival with "the cup that cheers but not inebriates," when used, like the bread, in due moderation; and from the Passover the same wine passed into the Lord's Supper, and was introduced into the *Agapae*, or "love feasts," where, as we shall find, it was grossly abused. These facts

The Wines of the Bible

are of course challenged and loudly exclaimed against by the advocates of the unfermented theory, who deny that fermented wine was employed in either of those institutions. But mere exclamations, by whomsoever uttered, are only so much wasted breath in the presence of opposing facts. Abundant evidence has been given in previous sections, showing that the wines of the ancients – Greek, Roman, Egyptian, and Hebrew, were all fermented beverages; and hence it follows that the wine used in the observances now under consideration must have been of the same nature. It is, however, alleged that the specialties of these institutions lead to an opposite conclusion. We must, therefore, inquire into the laws which were given for their regulations, and we shall begin with an examination of –

1. The Wine of the Passover

In the institution and first observance of this ordinance, on the occasion of the exodus from Egypt, no wine of any description is mentioned as entering into the solemnity. The feast was inaugurated amid the hurry and bustle of preparation for immediate flight; and the command was given, “Ye shall eat it in haste; it is the Lord’s passover.” The paschal lamb was to be slain, and its blood sprinkled on the door posts of the houses. The flesh was not to be eaten “raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire.” The bread was to be hastily prepared without leaven, and eaten with the roasted flesh, together with bitter herbs. All this was said and done; but no allusion was made to wine, probably because the moment was inauspicious. It was a time of trouble and anxiety. Hope was at length beginning to smile on the oppressed people, and they heard the fluttering of her gentle wings, as she emerged from the cloud which darkened their life,

The Wines of the Bible

but too faint and far away, as yet, to inspire them with much cheerfulness or courage. They were still in the house of bondage; a rough and rocky path lay before them; a powerful and numerous enemy was around them; the Red Sea murmured threateningly against them; the great and terrible wilderness, with its trackless waste and arid desolation, frowned ominously upon them. The Lord, indeed, was in the cloud, and in the fire, but it was dark, very dark; and thus, in the hour of their great trouble, they kept their first Passover, without a cup of cheer, eating the “bread of affliction,” and with a seasoning of “bitter herbs” – fit emblems of their accumulated sufferings.

After their hasty flight out of Egypt, the people provoked the Lord to anger, and, therefore, instead of being conducted at once, and directly, into the land of promise, they were doomed, to wander forty years in the wilderness. During this period their national and church organizations were perfected, and the exiles were prepared, by severe and lengthened course of discipline, for becoming a theocratic nation, a people whose king is their God. The laws which were then promulgated embody all those minute and detailed precepts which distinguished the ancient ritual; and in these regulations we notice the first appearance of those libations, or “drink offerings,” which were so intimately associated with the later religious observances of the Jews. After the people had entered into the “rest” of Canaan, some modifications appear to have been introduced into the paschal solemnity, suitable to their changed circumstances, among which were the use of wine, and the reclining on couches, instead as of old, with loins girded, shoes on feet, and staff in hand, when they did “eat in haste” as the Lord’s Passover.

Now, as the use of wine was a custom of later growth, it was not necessarily covered by the original prohibition against leaven, which had to do exclusively with the bread and dough of the

The Wines of the Bible

festival, and thus the use of fermented wine was no more inconsistent with the paschal regulations than the use of wine at all; and, certainly, not more than the reclining at table, instead of the original and prescribed attitude, with loins girded, shoes on feet, and staff in hand.

We admit, in its fullest extent, the prohibitory enactment against leaven and leavened bread in the observance of the Passover; but we deny that the prohibition extended to wine, seeing that wine formed no part of the original institution, and could not have been included in the original law. But it is argued that, apart from the question of alcohol, leaven or ferment, whether in solids or liquids, is a thing so bad in itself, that the word was used by the sacred writers as a symbol of impurity or corruption; that, as “the product and producer of corruption,” it was not allowed to be offered in the sacrifices; and that, on this account, it was excluded from the Jewish Passover and the Lord’s Supper. Dr. Lees says, “The general conception involved in the prohibition of leaven here and elsewhere is obviously this: *leaven and fermented substances, were regarded as symbols of corruption*; so that, in the symbolical rites and sacrifices of the law, not only were fermented things forbidden, but things readily fermentable as honey. Offerings designed merely for food formed an exception.”⁹⁴⁵

First, then, as to the symbolical usage. Leaven is employed as a symbol of “malice and wickedness” (1 Cor. v. 8); and of “the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees” (Matt. Xvi. 12). This usage might justify the inference that leaven is a bad thing, and an appropriate symbol of that which is evil. But we find the same substance used as a symbol of the highest good; for it is said, “The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took

⁹⁴⁵ Works, ii. 165

The Wines of the Bible

and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened" (Matt. Xiii. 33). And this usage would equally justify the conclusion that leaven is a good thing, and an appropriate symbol of that which is good! Now what is the common property of leaven which fits it for being the symbol of both good and evil? Certainly not putridity; otherwise the kingdom of heaven will be like unto corruption! And certainly not purity; otherwise malice and wickedness will be like unto goodness! What, then? Undoubtedly its penetrating and assimilating power, which is equally true of both good and evil. Hence the reference to the leaven of the kingdom, "till the whole be leavened." Hence, also, the reference to the leaven of wickedness, "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." The same metaphor is frequently employed in ancient and modern literature, and is, in like manner, applied both to good and evil agencies, which are described as more or less leavening society. Neander says, "Christianity must here form a union with the scientific culture which had resulted from the previous history of mankind, in order that, as the leaven for all that pertains to humanity, it may gradually pervade it, and fashion it to its own likeness." And he adds in a note, "which similitude of the leaven Clement understood how to explain in a very beautiful manner. He calls it 'the power best bestowed on us by the Word, which, by small means, effects much in a secret, invisible manner, attracting to itself every one who has received it, and reducing his whole nature to unity.'"⁹⁴⁶ The allusion in all of these cases is not to the corruption, or corruptible tendency of leaven, but simply to its all-pervading, penetrating, and assimilating power. So that there is no reference in this Scripture usage to the inherent badness of the leaven.

⁹⁴⁶ Ch. Hist., ii. 269

The Wines of the Bible

And next, as to the use of leaven in the sacrifices. There can be no doubt that the use of leaven was forbidden by the Mosaic law in certain offerings. But the prohibition was limited to the two following cases, viz., - It was not to be offered with the blood of the sacrifices (Exod. xxiii. 18; xxxiv. 25) and it was not to be burned with "any offering of the Lord made by fire" (Lev. ii. 11). As the meat offering and the peace offering were, in part, consumed on the altar, they came under the same general regulation as the burn offering (Lev. ii. 11; vi. 17; vii. 11; x. 12). Thus the prohibitory law, with respect to leaven, was restricted to certain offerings of blood, and offerings made by fire.

Drs. Ritchie and Lees infer from this prohibition that leaven was forbidden because, according to the former, it is "a substance in a state of putrefaction, and everything in this state is unfit to represent that 'eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;'"⁹⁴⁷ and, according to the latter, "It is from this point of view we are enabled to perceive the symbolical fitness of the Biblical prohibitions of ferment and its degenerated products in all such ceremonies and sacrifices as typified life, purity, and regeneration."⁹⁴⁸ But innocent honey was included with leaven in the same condemnation and prohibition (Lev. ii. 11). Was it also a vile degenerated product, and unfit for use in these symbolical rites? It is said honey is liable to ferment. It may be so, but at present we do not believe it; unless, indeed, the honey is mixed with a sufficient quantity of water for the purpose. But if honey was excluded from the altar because it was liable to ferment, the same liability affected almost every other substance used in the sacrifices. Thus *flour*, if mixed with water, like honey, will certainly ferment. Liebig says, "We cannot bring flour and

⁹⁴⁷ Sc. Test., p. 98

⁹⁴⁸ Temp. Bib. Com. p. xl

The Wines of the Bible

water together without the formation of sugar from the starch; and it is this sugar, and not the gluten, of which a part enters into fermentation, and is resolved into alcohol and carbonic acid.”⁹⁴⁹ We shall see immediately that “certainly *blood* doth.” Even the *flesh* of the victims is subject to the same process; for Liebig tells us that the putrefaction of animal substances is a true fermentation; and putrefaction of animal substances is a true fermentation; and Nott says, “From the moment the animal is slain, the herb gathered, or the cluster of the vine plucked, the process of decay commences, which, unless arrested, will continue in each till all alike are rendered unfit for use by progressive fermentation.”⁹⁵⁰ Wine also, even if it were unfermented grape juice, and used in the “drink offering,” is surely as liable to ferment as honey, or any of those other fermentable substances. So that, according to this theory, none of these things could have been offered on the altar, and, therefore, there could have been no sacrifices of any kind, either with leaven or without it.

If leaven was an unfit symbol of “life, purity, and regeneration,” it was, as we have seen, actually employed by Christ for this purpose when he said, “The kingdom is like unto leaven.” And why not? “Fermentation,” say these writers, “is the death principle at work,” and, therefore, an unsuitable emblem of life. But out of death emerges new life. Like all created things, we live to die, and die to live again. Lucretius says, -

*“One thing still is from another brought
By provident nature, who lets nothing rise,
Nor be, except from something else that dies.”*
(*De Rer. Nat. i. 264*)

⁹⁴⁹ Letters, xxxii.

⁹⁵⁰ Lectures, p. 76

The Wines of the Bible

Shakespeare also, speaking of flowers, says, "Of their sweet deaths are sweetest odours made;" which Tennyson appears to have had in view when he said, -

*"Life evermore is fed by death,
In earth, and sea, and sky;
And that a rose may breathe its breath,
Something must die."*

If leaven was unfit for use in one class of offerings, on account of its being a degenerated product, the same bad quality must have rendered it equally unserviceable in all "the symbolical rites and sacrifices of the law." If it was, on that account, unsuitable in offerings that were to be burnt on the altar, it must have been still more unsuitable on the same account, in those that were to be consumed by the priests as food. If it was so bad as to be abjured in the service of God, it could not be so good as to be justifiably incorporated in the domestic usages of the people. And if it was unfit, as a symbol of corruption, for use in the festival of the Passover, it must have been equally unfit, for the same reason, to be employed in the feast of Pentecost. But, in fact, this bad substance was in common use in the households of the Jews, and that without any disapprobation being expressed against it either by prophet or priest. It was also associated with *unleavened* bread in the peace offerings; for the same law which provides that "he shall offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving *unleavened* cakes mingled with oil," adds, "Besides the cakes he shall offer for his offering *leavened* bread with the sacrifice of thanksgiving of his peace offering" (Lev. vii. 12, 13). And while it was forbidden in the ordinance of the Passover, it was employed by divine command in the services of Pentecost: "After the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer a new meat offering unto the Lord. Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves of

The Wines of the Bible

two tenths deals: they shall be of fine flour; they shall be baked with *leaven*; they are the firstfruits unto the Lord.” (Lev. xxiii. 16, 17).

Thus these two institutions, the Passover and Pentecost, were not more remarkably distinguished from each other by the quality of the bread used – in the one case leavened, and in other unleavened – than by general character of the ordinances. The former was an occasion of humiliation and sorrow, tempered by consolation; and the latter was a season of devout thankfulness and universal rejoicing. Accordingly, a Jewish writer, quoted by Dr. Lees, says, “There is no rejoicing spoken of at the Passover, because the fruits were yet in the fields; but at *ghatzoreth*, ‘the day of assembly’ (Pentecost), when corn is reaped and wine is now in the grapes, there is one rejoicing mentioned.”⁹⁵¹

The exclusion of leaven from the one service, and its introduction into the other, finds a parallel in a somewhat similar regulation as to certain other offerings. Thus in the meat offerings of flour and of firstfruits, which were thankofferings, oil and frankincense were to be added to the sacrifices (Lev. ii. 1, 2, 15). But in the sin offering of fine flour, and in the offering for jealousy of barley-meal, both oil and frankincense were prohibited; and the reason of this prohibition is said to be, in the one case, “for it is a sin offering” (Lev. v. 11); and in the other, “for it is an offering of memorial, *bringing iniquity to remembrance*” (Num. v. 15). It may be assumed, therefore, that in the twofold regulation as to leaven there is not the remotest allusion to its being a “degenerated product,” or a “symbol of corruption;” and that its prohibition in the Passover was founded exclusively on the circumstances of the event which the institution was designed to commemorate, *bringing the sufferings of Egypt to remembrance*.

⁹⁵¹ Works, ii. p. 168

The Wines of the Bible

Accordingly, we read that when the people fled out of the house of bondage, they “took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading-troughs being bound up in their clothes, upon their shoulders;” and when they reached their first encampment at Succoth, “they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, and could not tarry, neither had they prepared for themselves any victual.” This hurried flight, with all its attendant privations and humiliation, was to be kept in perpetual remembrance by an appropriate commemorative institution; for “it is a night to be much observed unto the Lord for bringing them out of the land of Egypt; this is that night of the Lord to be observed of all the children of Israel in their generations” (Exod. xii. 34-42). With this object in view, Moses said to the people, “Remember this day in which ye came out 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.....And it shall be when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What is this? That thou shalt say unto him, By strength of hand the Lord brought us out of Egypt, from the house of bondage” (Exod. xiii. 3, 14). And when directing the people to “observe the month of Abib, and keep the Passover unto the Lord by God,” he says, “Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith, even the bread of affliction; for thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt in haste: that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy life. And there shall be no leavened bread seen with thee in all thy coast seven days” (Deut. xvi. 1-4).

The seasoning of *bitter herbs* commemorated the old distress when the Egyptians “did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens.....And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour. And they made their lives bitter and

The Wines of the Bible

hard bondage” (Exod. i. 11-14). The unleavened bread, as we have seen above, commemorated the last afflictive stroke when the people were “thrust out of the Egypt” unprepared, and in such haste that they had to flee with their dough unleavened, and to eat their bread unleavened by the way. Bread which ever afterwards was to bear the designation “bread of affliction,” and to be used in the institution appointed to commemorate the afflictive event; and to be so employed, as Moses expressly says, “for thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt in haste.” And, in later times, this “bread of affliction” gave special form and significance to those expressive phrases, the “bread of sorrows” (Ps. cxxvii. 2), the “bread of tears” (Ps. lxxx. 5), the “bread of adversity” (Isa. xxx. 20), and the “bread of mourners” (Hos. ix. 4).

It is impossible, in the light of these references to evade the conclusion that, whatever may have been the reason for the exclusion of leaven, honey, and frankincense from particular sacrifices, the one great purpose intended to be served by the prohibition of leaven in the Passover was to keep in remembrance the great events in Israel’s history, when the people did not “eat their meat with gladness,” but with the “bread of tears.” It is in view of these circumstances that Moses imposes on the people the obligation of the seven days of unleavened bread; that he calls this bread of memorial the “bread of affliction;” that he directs them to “remember this day,” and to remember it “all the days of thy life;” and that he requires them to put away all leaven from their habitations, &c.

Indeed, so obviously is this the true meaning of the ceremony, that Dr. Lees, in explaining the manner of its observance by the Jews, recites the concluding prayer of the festival. “Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, King everlasting, who hath redeemed us, and redeemed our fathers out of Egypt, and brought us to this night to eat *matzowth* and bitter herbs.” And the following

The Wines of the Bible

benediction, "Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who bringest forth food out of the earth" (Ps. civ. 14); probably saying, as he distributed a piece of the bread to each person around him, 'This is the bread of affliction which our fathers did eat in the land of Egypt,'"⁹⁵² Thus, both in the prayer and the benediction, the unleavened bread is regarded as a memorial of the "bread of affliction" eaten in Egypt. Here is no allusion to leaven as "a symbol of corruption," and here is no reference to leavened bread as being a bad thing, a "degenerated product," the "product of corruption," &c. On the contrary, and *let it be carefully noted*, it is the unleavened, and not the leavened bread, which bears the Mosaic stigma of being "bread of affliction." This was to be *bad* bread which the fathers did eat in Egypt, and which their children were to keep in perpetual remembrance in the observance of the days of unleavened bread. So that if the badness of the article is the ground of the prohibition, *unfermented*, and not fermented, things should be excluded from the paschal feast.

The advocates of the unfermented theory interpret the prohibition against leaven and leavened things as applying to everything fermented, whether solid or liquid. Accordingly, Dr. Lees alleges that, "all fermented substances were prohibited in the paschal feast of the Jews;"⁹⁵³ and he speaks of "the special occasion of the Passover, when all fermented things were so cautiously banished."⁹⁵⁴ Now one of the "substances" used at the feast was a species of "sauce," into which our Lord dipped the "sop" which he gave to Judas (John xiii. 26); and we are informed by Dr. Gill, on the authority of Bartenora, Maimonides, and others, that this sauce, called *charoseth*, was made of various

⁹⁵² Watch, ii. p. 173

⁹⁵³ Ibid., p. 109

⁹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 124

The Wines of the Bible

fruits, bruised in a mortar, and mixed with *vinegar*.⁹⁵⁵ Vinegar, of course, is *sour wine*, and, therefore, a fermented liquor; so that, these authors being witnesses, “all fermented substances” were not excluded from the Passover.

It is certain from all these varied references that the prohibitory law of the Passover applied only to solids, not liquids, to bread and dough, not wine. This appears (1.) From the nature of the institution as a symbolic ordinance, in which all the symbolical elements correspond with the symbolized facts. (2.) From the events commemorated, which include a reference to the act of the destroying angel, in the lamb slain and the roast flesh; to the grievous bondage, in the bitter herbs; and to the hasty flight, in the unleavened dough and bread. But wine had no place in the original institution and observance of the Passover, and was not introduced into the festival until all that affliction had ceased. It was, therefore, in no way affected by, or included in the prohibitory law. It was neither a symbol of sacrifice, like the slain lamb; nor of grievous bondage, like the bitter herbs; nor of cruel oppression, like the thick sauce; nor of hasty flight, like the unleavened bread. But it was a cup of cheer on arriving at the promised rest, and a symbol of joy in the accomplished deliverances. (3.) From the express terms of the law in its original enactment, and the varied explanations given by Moses as to the meaning and purpose of the observance – the reference uniformly being to the unleavened bread as the “bread of affliction.” (4.) From the associated elements and the manner of their use. Here are three substances – the roast lamb, the bitter herbs, and the unleavened bread; and they are all solids, not liquids, articles of food, not drink. Therefore the prohibition against leaven and leavened things could have no reference to a

⁹⁵⁵ Com. on Matt. Xxvi. 23

The Wines of the Bible

liquor which had no place in the original observance. If it is said that the wine of the Passover, when introduced at a later period, must have been unfermented, because the bread was unleavened, we answer, that it may with equal justice be alleged that the wine must have been sour; because the sauce was prepared with vinegar, and bitter, because the herbs used as a seasoning were bitter herbs. But the law as to leaven had no more to do with the fermented or unfermented quality of the wine than with its sweetness, or sourness, or bitterness.

Dr. Lees quotes a variety of extracts from the Mishna, and other writings of the later Jews, illustrative of the observance of the Passover. When these authors in any way seem to smile on the doctor's favourite theory, they are treated as invaluable witnesses, whose testimonies are worthy of being exhibited with all the prominence which can be given to them by different sizes of types. But when adduced in evidence by opponents, their value ceases, and they are summarily dismissed as persons who "often knew as little of the point they attempted to explain, and sometimes not so much, as we do at this day."⁹⁵⁶ The "learned physician," Ben Israel, is not ranked among these ignorant people, for he is appealed to as an authority, and his testimony is printed thus: - "Here at this feast, EVERY CONFECTION OUGHT TO BE SO PURE AS NOT TO ADMIT OF ANY FERMENT, OR ANYTHING THAT MAY FERMENTATE, which certainly blood doth."⁹⁵⁷ And to this the doctor adds, "There cannot, we think, with such facts before us, be any reasonable doubt as to the sort of wine in which the pious Israelites must originally have observed the Passover in Palestine." We cannot but think so too; for if the learned physician's evidence be worth the paper on which it is printed, it

⁹⁵⁶ Works, ii. 188

⁹⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 170

The Wines of the Bible

demonstrably proves that every kind of unfermented grape juice must be excluded from the observance, as being quite as liable to “FERMENTATE” as “blood doth.” And thus we arrive at the extraordinary conclusion that no wine of any kind is admissible, fermented or unfermented, seeing that every description of vinous liquor is liable to that obnoxious fermentation!

Dr. Lees repeatedly appeals to the Mishna in evidence of the use of boiled wine by the Jews, quoting the following paragraph for that purpose: - “Wine of the heave – offering must not be boiled, because it lessens it. Rabbi Yehudah permits it, because it improves it.” The doctor assumes, without evidence, that this boiled wine was an unfermented substance. But we have shown, in a previous section, that the ancients boiled their grape juice in order to promote, as well as to prevent fermentation; that they boiled their wines as well as their juices; that they boiled their juices to make wines as well as jellies; and that the unfermented boiled juice of the Hebrews was *devash*, not *yayin*. So far, therefore, as the statement of the Mishna is concerned, the reference may be to a wine which has been both boiled and fermented (*yayin*), and not to a mere grape syrup or jelly (*devash*). Of course, the boiling would diminish the liquor, whether the latter was fermented or unfermented; and it is quite as conceivable, if not more so, that it was the boiling of a wine, and not of a jelly, which was regarded by Rabbi Yehudah as an *improvement*.

Dr. Lees further appeals to the Mishna to prove that “a warming pot or kettle” was used in mingling the wine of the Passover, from which he infers that the wine, or rather jelly, was so thick as to require warm water to dissolve it.⁹⁵⁸ But we have shown, in another section, that both hot and cold water were extensively

⁹⁵⁸ Works, ii. 188

The Wines of the Bible

used by the ancients in the dilution of their strong fermented wines; and we need only add here that Athenaeus refers to this use of the *tripod* or pot in which the wine was mixed; and, as indicating the quality of the liquor thus diluted, he says, “it is this last tripod that is the tripod of truth; and it is considered appropriate to Apollo, because of the truth of his prophetic art; and to Bacchus, *because of the truth which people speak when drunk.*”⁹⁵⁹ So that the use of that warning pot or kettle by the Jews may have been intended merely to dilute their fermented wine, and, therefore, it furnishes no evidence that the diluted wine was an unfermented substance.

The doctor alleges that at the paschal feast “about two and a half pints English” of wine, exclusive of water, was “drunk by each person present,” including men, women, and children; and he argues that if the wine had been fermented, the drinking of such a large quantity “would have transformed this sacred festival into a sad scene of revelry and drunkenness.”⁹⁶⁰ Possibly it would, if we could only be certain that the doctor’s estimate of the consumption is correct. But how does he know the quantity of wine each person drank? The people may, indeed, have been “bound on this night to drink four cups of wine, and this number is not to be diminished” – the reference being to the four cups successively partaken of at the different parts of the service; but what law, human or divine, imposed on them the obligation of draining each cup to the bottom? There was only one cup used at the Supper, which Christ gave to his disciples, saying, according to Dr. Lees, “Drink all of you out of it.”⁹⁶¹ Why, then, may we not suppose that, at the paschal feast, the cup was similarly handed round for each person to drink out of it? In partaking of the

⁹⁵⁹ Book ii. 6

⁹⁶⁰ Works, ii. 124

⁹⁶¹ Ibid., p. 131

The Wines of the Bible

“salads,” we are told that they were required to eat “not less than the size of an olive;” and each person took “a small portion” of the roasted lamb, if only “the size of an olive.”⁹⁶² Is it not equally probable that, in partaking of the wine, the same restriction would have been lawful, and lawfully observed; and that, instead of drinking the whole contents of every successive cup, they ay have only “consumed a small portion” on each occasion? Dr. Eadie says, “The master of the feast took a cup of wine in his hand, and solemnly blessed God for it, and for all the mercies which were then acknowledged. *It was now passed to all the guests, each of whom drank of it in his turn.*”⁹⁶³

We are, of course, under no obligation to make even this concession; for the allegation that the people were required, either by law or custom, to drink, or that “each person” actually drank, “two and a half pints” of wine, whether fermented or unfermented, is a mere assumption. We deny the facts, and demand proof of the unproved assertion. Ainsworth intimates, on the authority of the Rabbins, that every one, both of men and women, is bound to drink that night four cups of wine without fail: and though he be poor, and live on alms, he must not drink less than those four cups.” But he says, “Every cup contained a quarter of a *log*, that is, so much as an egg and a half.”⁹⁶⁴ So that, even according to this estimate, the total quantity of wine and water consumed by each person amounted only to about four glasses, instead of “two and half pints English.” It may be quite true that great excesses were committed at the feast of Purim; and that it was customary on that occasion to drink to intoxication. But the feast of Purim is not the feast of the Passover; and the excesses of the former furnish no evidence of

⁹⁶² Ibid., pp. 172, 173

⁹⁶³ Cyclo., Art. “*Blessing.*”

⁹⁶⁴ Annotations, Exod. xii. 8

The Wines of the Bible

the character of the latter observance. And even although it could be proved, which has never been attempted, that the same excesses were committed at the Passover as at Purim, either by the earlier or later Jews, the fact would furnish no evidence of the requirement of the law as to drinking; for we find excesses of this kind committed at the observance of the sacrament in Corinth, although our Lord and his disciples all drank out of the one cup at the institution of the Supper.

If, however, it is still maintained, and even can be proved, that, at the Passover, the Jews drank the precise quantity alleged by Dr. Lees, but that the wine used was a thick syrup or jelly, what sort of scene must have been exhibited at the sacred festival after each person had imbibed “about two and a half pints English” of grape jelly, exclusive of water! But this is not all, for we are informed that “besides these four cups, wine was also drank during the supper.”⁹⁶⁵ Here is more jelly, and more water to dissolve it! Could any human stomach contain such quantities of jelly and warm water, without reproducing something like the scene exhibited by the drunkards of Ephraim (Isa. xxviii. 8)? Clearly the doctor’s estimate of the Passover drinking is as extravagant as his theory is absurd.

Passing from this, we observe that the prohibition against leaven is at once definite and broad. “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 till the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel” (Exod. xii. 15). “Seven days shall there be no leaven in your houses: for whosoever 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” (Exod. xii. 19). “Unleavened

⁹⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 124

The Wines of the Bible

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" (Exod. xiii. 7). "And there shall be no leavened bread seen with thee in all thy coast seven days" (Deut. xvi. 4).

It will be observed that the breadth of the prohibitory laws extends to "leaven," and "that which is leavened" – i.e., to that which "could cause fermentation, or that had undergone fermentation"⁹⁶⁶ It applies equally to the "stranger" sojourning in Israel in Israel, and the Hebrew "born in the land." It forbids alike the possession and use of the prohibited substances; and its provisions cover the entire breadth and length of the land, including houses, quarters, and coast. The later Jews were so careful in this matter that Dr. Lees informs us, "the Rabbins enumerate four degrees of preparation for the feast of unfermented things. (1.) *Expurgatio fermenti*, the cleansing of all their household utensils, lest any taint of ferment might be attached to them. (2.) *Inquisito fermenti*, the searching after ferment or leaven throughout all their houses, even to the mouse-holes, the Mishna expressly enjoining the cellar to be searched. This search was made with a wax candle on the night preceding the Passover. (3.) *Conflagratio fermenti*, or burning the ferment, which took place about noon. (4.) *Execratio fermenti*, the cursing or annulling of the ferment in this form: - All manner of ferment, or whatever fermented thing is in my possession, whether seen of me or not seen, cleansed of me or not cleansed, let it all be scattered, annulled, and accounted as the dusts of the earth."⁹⁶⁷

Such, then, were the requirements of the ancient law, and such was the manner of its observance by the later Jews. No wine

⁹⁶⁶ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 28

⁹⁶⁷ Works, ii. 122

The Wines of the Bible

entered into the original institution, or was contemplated by the original law. The enactment refers exclusively to things that were eaten, both in what it prescribes and in what it prohibits. In the one case, ye shall “eat unleavened bread;” “unleavened bread shall be eaten;” and in the other, “whosoever eateth leavened bread;” “whosoever eateth that which is leavened.” And along with this latter prohibition, *leaven* itself is forbidden: “Ye shall put away leaven;” there shall be “no leaven found in your houses,” “neither shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters.” By the observance of this law the people kept in continual remembrance the flight of their fathers out of the house of bondage, when they “took their dough before it was leavened,” and “baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt.” But, from the very nature of the case, there could be no reference to wine in the prohibition, seeing that the cup of cheer had no part in the original institution, or in the painful events commemorated by the exclusion of leaven and leavened bread from the paschal observance.

If wine was included in the prohibitory law, then, seeing that the requirements of the law were so exceeding broad, and so carefully observed by the Jews, all kinds of fermented wine must have been put away from the houses, and out of possession of the people, on the approach of the paschal season. So that no fermented wine could have been left in Palestine after the feast; and, therefore, if any such wine was ever used by the Jews during the intervening months, it must have been a new wine, made after the last Passover, and could never have attained maturity, or have been even a year old. If the Jews were thus restricted in their drinks, it is difficult to understand how they ever became a *besotted* people, “the drunkards of Ephraim.”

The reply to this argument is a unique specimen of a theory in distress. Dr. Lees, “The article to be banished from the borders or

The Wines of the Bible

quarters was not *khometz*, but another thing called *seowr*.”⁹⁶⁸ We might have quoted Exod. xiii. 7, in contradiction of this assertion, in which both substances are ordered to be put away; but we are saved that trouble by the doctor, who does his own contradiction in an immediately succeeding paragraph, where he says, “neither the sourer [*seowr*], nor the fermented bread [*khometz*], were to meet the sight, and were therefore to be put away from all the accustomed places of resort.”⁹⁶⁹

He also says, “Even the mere English reader could have answered, that soured dough, and fermented bread or wine, might have been put away from the dwelling places, for the time, into barns or caves in the country, or into private and public repositories in the towns.”⁹⁷⁰ No doubt, the obnoxious substances *might have been* put away in this fashion; but were they ever thus removed? Where is any reference to such a national cartage of fermented things to be found in sacred or profane literature? But even if they had been thus transferred from one place to another, whether barn or cave, public or private repository, what object would have been gained by the transference? The prohibitory law was not limited to one place more than another, but extended to all the houses, coast, and quarters of Israel.

Dr. Lees answers, that the objector “might better have rested his case upon the original word in Exod. xiii. 7, *gebhulecha*, ‘thy border or boundary,’ which to the lazy, who would eschew the fatigue of comparing passage with passage, would pass as conclusive.”⁹⁷¹ Resting our case on that original word, and having compared these passages, we fail to see the force of the doctor’s reply. But in another paragraph he says, “In short, house,

⁹⁶⁸ Works, ii. 166

⁹⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁹⁷¹ Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

habitation, and quarter, are words used here interchangeably, and are obviously designed to carry the same meaning.”⁹⁷² Is this really so? The first two confessedly denote the dwelling places of the people, including all the premises, barns, and cellars, pertaining thereto. But the third term, *gebhulecha*, “coast” or “quarter,” occurs in about 230 passages of Scripture, and is *uniformly* employed to designate the bounds, borders, coasts, boundaries or limits of cities, field, lands, and countries; and is never, as far as we can discover, applied in any instance to a house, habitation, or dwelling. Consequently the prohibitory law embraced, in the first place, the utmost limits or bounds of the land of Judea; and, in the second place, all the houses, habitations, or “accustomed places of resort” within those extended boundaries.

Such being the extent of the law, what was to be done with the leaven and the leavened things? They were to be put away “out of your houses” (Exod. xii. 15); were “not to be seen with thee in all thy quarters” (Exod. xiii 7); and “in all thy coast” (Deut. xvi. 4). According to Dr. Lees, the law merely required that the obnoxious things should be put away anywhere, so as not “to meet the sight,” or “be seen.” Hence the cartage into caves, barns, &c. But if nothing more than *hiding* the things was necessary to satisfy the requirement of the law in this particular, the object was already sufficiently accomplished, in the matter of the wine, by its concealment in the casks or bottles in which it was contained, without any necessity of a universal cartage. We suspect the mere English reader will regard this hiding process as a modern discovery for evading the law, or getting rid of a difficulty. Will the doctor apply the same principle of interpretation to the prohibition, “Look not upon the wine when it is red,” and admit

⁹⁷² Ibid.

The Wines of the Bible

that the requirement of this law would be sufficiently observed by drinking the red wine *without looking upon it* – i.e., with the eyes shut? When God said to Moses, “neither let any man be seen throughout all the mount” (Exod. xxxiv. 3), did the prohibition require nothing more than that any one who ascended the mountain should carefully conceal himself from the sight of others in doing so? The usage of the verb in such cases as to see death, to see sleep, to see famine, to see good, to see evil, and the like, shows that the law of the Passover forbids, alike, the possession and use of the fermented things during the prescribed period.

If, then, these things were to be *put away*, not only out of all the houses and habitations of the people, but also out of all the coasts, quarters, or boundaries of Israel, how was this to be effected? If they were not to be put away, according to the formula *execratio fermenti*, “whether seen of me or not seen;” or destroyed, according to the *conflagratio fermenti*, or “burning the ferment,” how were they to be disposed of? There is no difficulty conceivable in respect to the solids; but how about the fermented wines, if there were such liquors in Judea? Were they to be exported to other countries and stored with the heathen for seven days, and then to be brought back again when the days of unleavened bread were ended? But if they were neither to be destroyed nor exported, what was to be done with them? There removal to barns, caves, or other repositories, although it might involve something like a great national cartage of liquor on the occasion, would secure their extrusion from the houses and habitations, but it could not satisfy the requirement of the law to *put them away*, so that “there shall be no leavened bread be seen with thee; neither shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters,” or “in all thy coast.”

The Wines of the Bible

If, then, the law extended to wine, and fermented wine was thus effectually destroyed, or put away out of the country, on the approach of the paschal season, there could have been no wine of that kind left in Judea after the feast. Dr. Lees says, "But if grapes and grape juice were preserved in large quantities, surely the desire to get a new supply of intoxicating wine could at any time be gratified, leaving importation out of consideration. This is on the supposition that all fermented *yayin* would have to be destroyed – a notion entirely devoid of existence outside 'the quarters' of Dr. Watt's exuberant imagination."⁹⁷³ The "notion" referred to is too firmly entrenched in the Hebrew "quarters" to be dislodged by a fling at an opponent's "exuberant imagination." As the doctor says, in a passage already quoted, "to the lazy, who would eschew the fatigue of comparing passage with passage" of the two hundred and thirty texts in which *gebhulecha* occurs, the mere assertion that "*house, habitation, and quarter*, are words used here interchangeably, and are obviously designed to carry the same meaning," may "pass as conclusive" with such persons. But a careful examination of the different passages will satisfy the dispassionate inquirer that the assertion is utterly unjustifiable.

If, then, fermented wine was included in the prohibitory law, and was to be banished from the "borders" of Israel, how was a new supply to be obtained before the next vintage? Importation must certainly be left "out of consideration;" for if the Jews, and even the Jewish Christians, had conscientious scruples against partaking of heathen wine, which they regarded as "the cup of devils," because it was consecrated to heathen deities, it is in the highest degree improbable that they would import such wine from foreign countries for their own use. This being so, they must have made new wine after the festival, from the grapes and grape

⁹⁷³ Reply to Professor Watts, p. 475

The Wines of the Bible

juice which they are said above to have “preserved in large quantities.” But in that case the fermented wine of the Jews must have been *simper mustum*, “always new,” for it could never, at any time, have been even a year old. Consequently old fermented wine must have been unknown in Judea, notwithstanding the Scripture references to such a liquor, and especially the saying of our Lord, “No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new: for he saith, *the old is better*.”

When Christ says, “I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it *new* with you in my Father’s kingdom,” there is manifestly an allusion to the *old* wine he had partaken of at the paschal supper. Dr. Lees thinks “it is not probable that the Saviour would associate the words, ‘This is the testament in my blood,’ with the use of *old* wine as the representative of His blood about to be shed;” and he is of opinion that as Christ was then “instituting a new dispensation,” it would be “probably with *new* wine.”⁹⁷⁴ But, elsewhere, he tells us that “*the wine was not new*” on that occasion.⁹⁷⁵ And again, he says that “*old* wine (or wine made from old grapes) was necessarily drunk at the season of the Passover.”⁹⁷⁶ Here we have a pair of contradictions, -

1. It was probably new wine.
It was not new wine.
2. It is not probable that it was old wine.
It was necessarily old wine!

Assuming that the wine was old, how was that old wine procurable at the paschal feast? The doctor informs us, in the last

⁹⁷⁴ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 278

⁹⁷⁵ *Answers to the Unanswerable*, p. 130

⁹⁷⁶ Works, ii. 194

The Wines of the Bible

of the above quotations, that it was “wine made from old grapes!” And, in the pamphlet, he repeats the same, saying, “Our Lord’s words at the Passover most aptly fit the idea of ‘old grapes’ being used on the occasion in question, for the wine was not new.”⁹⁷⁷ But if the wine was made from these grapes, and the grapes were only “five months old,”⁹⁷⁸ the wine when newly made must have been *new* wine; and even if the age of the wine is to be computed by the age of the grapes from which it is made, the wine of the Passover could never have exceeded “five months old.” And yet this five months’ liquor is an *old* Hebrew wine, which no man, after he had drunk, desireth new, for he saith the old is better!

The fermented made at the last vintage would, of course, be the same age as these grapes, and that newly made old wine, i.e., five months old; and just as it was ripening, and before it could have become fit for use, the paschal season arrived with its prohibitory law, commanding all fermented things to be put away. And so that wine was lost! But after the festival, the preserved grapes could be brought into requisition, and new wine made which might be kept till the next Passover; and thus the Jews may have had a fermented nearly twelve months old. But if it did not take all these months to ripen the wine, the prepared liquor would again be swept away by the coming festival, at the time when it had become mature and fit for use! So that we must conclude that all the *old* Hebrew wines were unfermented liquors; for in no case could a fermented wine have been more than five or twelve months old. And when we have accepted that conclusion, we may add to it the assurance that all the wines of the Jews, however designated, were unfermented liquors; for it is inconceivable that

⁹⁷⁷ *Answers to the Unanswerable*, p. 130

⁹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

The Wines of the Bible

the people would make fermented wines at one period, which they must put away just as they were becoming fit for use at another. How then did the Jews become a *besotted* people, “the drunkards of Ephraim”?

But we have not yet reached the end of the matter. The fermented wines have been got rid of, and after their departure Jewish drunkenness becomes a myth. But, as we have seen, Dr. Lees has saved the grapes and the grape juice which “were preserved in large quantities,” the latter “by boiling or by preventing the access of air.”⁹⁷⁹ Unfortunately, however, for his purpose, he has adduced the testimony of “the learned physician, Rabbi Manasseh Ben Israel,” and as evidencing the importance which he attaches to that valuable testimony, he says, - “It will now be clearly seen, both what the law was and how it was formerly understood. There cannot, we think, with such facts [! ! !] before us, be any reasonable doubt as to the sort of wine in which the pious Israelites must originally have observed the Passover in Palestine.” Now, what are these wonderful “facts,” which are to make all those matters so clear? We have quoted them already, but they will bear repetition here, in ordinary type, - “Here, at this feast, every confection ought to be pure as not to admit of any *ferment*, or anything that may *fermentate*, which certainly blood doth.”⁹⁸⁰

We need not pause here to inquire if the Rabbins believed that grape juice did not ferment, like “corn stuff,” or if they understood the fermentation of grape juice as a process by which the liquor purged itself, and became pure,⁹⁸¹ and thereby fit for use among the pure confections at the Passover. It is enough that we are assured by Dr. Lees, on the authority of that “learned

⁹⁷⁹ Works, ii. 132

⁹⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 170, 171

⁹⁸¹ *Answer to the Unanswerable*, p. 132

The Wines of the Bible

physician,” “both what the law was, and how it was formerly understood.” And, as previously observed, if the evidence be worth the paper on which it is printed, it demonstrably proves that every kind of unfermented grape juice must be excluded from the observance, as being quite as liable to fermentate as “blood doth.” Has the doctor not informed us, on the authority of Columella, that “*defrutum*, however carefully made, is liable to grow acid?”⁹⁸² and is the acidity of grape juice not the result of the acetous fermentation? Thus that dreadful law has rigorously banished the unfermented along with the fermented wine; so that no wine of any kind, whether old or new, sweet or sour, weak or strong, is left for use either at the Passover or the Supper.

We see no way escape from these absurd conclusions but by abandoning the theory which necessarily involves them. If wine was included in the prohibitory law, and if the decree was so strict as to admit of no exception as to place or person, every description of grape juice, fermented and fermentable, must have been utterly destroyed, or effectually banished from every house and quarter of Judea, on every successive paschal season; and, in that case, the absurd conclusions are inevitable. But if wine was not included in the original decree, and the prohibition was limited to fermented solids, in accordance with the origin, the nature, and commemorative purpose of the institution, these conclusions are avoided; and, in the case, the unfermented wine theory finds neither refuge nor countenance in the Jewish Passover.

Referring to our Lord’s observance of the paschal feast, Dr. Lees says, “We here reach the last pinch of the argument. Did the Saviour understand the law, or break it?”⁹⁸³ We answer, He may

⁹⁸² Temp. Bib. Com. p. xxiii

⁹⁸³ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 281

The Wines of the Bible

have both understood the law, and used fermented wine, and yet have neither ignorantly, nor intentionally, broken it; for He may have understood the law differently from Dr. Lees. But if this be, as alleged, “the last pinch of the argument,” we shall do well to examine it carefully. Now, what are the facts? Our Lord was crucified during the days of unleavened bread, and while the prohibitory law was in force; “Whosoever 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.” He was not ignorant of the requirements of the law, nor can we suppose that He was indifferent to its prohibitions; for, among the latest and most solemn acts of His life, He kept the Passover with his disciples. Rising from the table at which this solemnity had been celebrated, He went out into the garden, where He was betrayed, and shortly thereafter He was led forth to execution. At Golgotha they offered Him a cup of wine “mingled with myrrh,” which He refused, for it was a “drugged potion.”⁹⁸⁴ But on the cross, “After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, saith, ‘I thirst,’ Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar; and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop, and put it to his mouth. When Jesus, therefore, had received the vinegar, he said, ‘It is finished;’ and He bowed his head, and gave up the ghost” (John xix. 28-30). The prophecy fulfilled in this event is found in Ps. lxxix. 21, “In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.”

Now, according to the unfermented theory, the last act of Christ, amid the agony and awful solemnity of the death on Calvary, was a deliberate and willful violation of the law, which condemns the transgressor to be “cut off from the congregation of Israel, whether he be a stranger or born in the land!” And yet,

⁹⁸⁴ Lees.

The Wines of the Bible

on that theory, there is no possible escape from this conclusion; for it is admitted, even by Dr. Lees, that the “vinegar” partaken of by Christ was, in fact, a species of fermented wine. He says, “The obvious conclusion is, that wine which had undergone both the alcoholic and acetous fermentations was used, agreeably to the prophecy, ‘In my thirst they gave me vinegar (khometz) to drink.’”⁹⁸⁵

It is admitted that the quantity of wine received by Christ was small, but we have no concern here with any question as to quantity, the only point of importance in this connection being the quality of the drink. Moreover, however small it may have been, it was all that could be conveniently conveyed to Him, when uplifted on the cross; and it was sufficient for the purpose for which it was sought and given, to relieve His anguished thirst. Accordingly Dr. Lees says, “Jesus ‘received the vinegar,’ for the saturated sponge cooled His lips and relieved His burning thirst, without beclouding His mind.”⁹⁸⁶

The author of *Tirosh lo Yayin*, in like manner, takes notice of the two drinks offered to our Lord on the two different occasions referred to, and specially emphasizes His rejection of the one and acceptance of the other. He tells us that when Christ had tasted of the *mingled wine*, he would not drink. “The tasting would, to the spectators, be a necessary evidence of some reason for its rejection. This was when He had come to Golgatha, But when Christ, as Mark relates (xv. 36) was actually suspended on the cross, and ‘vinegar’ (unmixed, except perhaps with water) was offered Him, the evangelist does not record that He rejected it. Neither does Matthew (see xxvii. 48), nor Luke (see xxiii. 36); while John, who is here more circumstantial, notices that Jesus

⁹⁸⁵ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 287

⁹⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 288

The Wines of the Bible

expressed a sensation of thirst; and that they filled a sponge with vinegar from a vessel set there full of it, and put it to His mouth, and *that when he had received the vinegar* he said, 'It is finished.' See John xix. 29, 30."⁹⁸⁷

It must also be admitted that our Lord was under no obligation or necessity of receiving this liquor; and, therefore, in so doing, He acted of His own free will. When the mixed wine, "mingled with myrrh," was offered Him, he deliberately *refused* it; but when the simple unmixed wine was presented, he deliberately *accepted* it. Seeing, then, it is admitted that Christ partook of the wine, in whatever quantity, and that the wine received by Him was a fermented liquor, whether alcoholic or acetous; and that this fermented wine was taken by Him during the days of unleavened bread, it follows that, either Christ died in the very act of violating the law,, or that the law did not forbid the use of fermented wine. We can see no way of escape from the horns of this dilemma, and, therefore, have no hesitation in accepting the latter alternative.

2. The Wine of the Supper

It is generally agreed that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was instituted by Christ, and first administered to His disciples, on the night of His betrayal, in connection with and at the close of the paschal feast; and that the bread and wine employed in the Christian sacrament were such as had been prepared for and used in the Jewish ordinance. There can be no doubt, therefore, that on the night of its institution and first observance, the bread of the Supper was unleavened, because no other was available, or

⁹⁸⁷ See xlvii.

The Wines of the Bible

could be lawfully used by Jewish Christians at that time. But the absence of leaven, necessitated by the exigencies of the period, was no more essential to the observance than the “bitter herbs” which was extruded from it. As long as the paschal feast continued to be held by the Jewish Christians the bread of the Supper, as well as that used in their common meals, would necessarily be unleavened on every recurrence of the “days of unleavened bread.” But as the Supper, in early times, was a weekly, if not daily celebration throughout the whole year, and was observed by Gentiles as well as Jews, the bread of the sacrament, on other days than those of the paschal week, would naturally be the common bread in daily use among the people. When, therefore, the unfermented theory, in its application to the Lord’s Supper, is based on the absence of leaven in the Jewish Passover, we deny the legitimacy of the argument, and are supported therein by the almost uniform practice of modern churches. Leaven was excluded from the Passover by a law which had no reference to the Supper, and unleavened bread was introduced into the first observance of the latter, because no other was available at the moment, or lawful to Jewish communicants. Even assuming that the paschal wine was an unfermented liquor, and that such wine was used on the occasion of that first observance, during the days of unleavened bread, both of which assumptions are negative by the facts already adduced, we are, nevertheless, under no moral obligation to use unfermented wine in the Supper, than we are to employ only unfermented bread.⁹⁸⁸ So that those who plead for the use of the former, while they reject the latter, may claim the liberty

⁹⁸⁸ **Publishers note:** 1 Corinthians 5:6-8 does demand moral obligation to use unleavened bread in the Supper. However, this denial by Wilson does not affect his final argument at all.

The Wines of the Bible

expedient; but they can find no precedent, nor example, nor authority in Scripture, for their arbitrary selection or preference.

In the early history of the church a variety of heretical sects arose at different periods, such as the Gnostics, Ebionites, Marcionites, Severians, Manichaeans, and the like. Differing materially in their leading principles, these sects agreed substantially in their ascetic practices. Some of them attempted to incorporate Oriental dualism with Christianity; and others were guided in their lives by “the delusive notion of rendering themselves more acceptable to the Deity by their austerities.”⁹⁸⁹ These different sects were “abstinents,” and variously designated *Encratites*, *Aquarians*, &c. The Severians “were averse to wine as the cause of drunkenness;” the Encratites, to which the Severians belonged, “did not use wine at all, saying, it was of the devil;” Tatian, the Gnostic, “abhors the use of wine;” and the Manichaeans “call wine the poison of the prince of darkness.”⁹⁹⁰ It is observable here that these heretics abstained from wine universally, making no exception in favour of the alleged unfermented wine. Accordingly, it is said above, the Encratites “did not use wine at all.” Neander says it is uncertain how the Manichaeans celebrated the Lord’s Supper. “It is only certain that that the Elect drank no wine. Whether, like the Encratites, the so-called υδροπαρυσταται, they used water instead of wine, or if not, what else they did it is impossible to say.”⁹⁹¹ And, in a note, he says that the Encratites, &c., were so called “because they made use of water only at the communion.”⁹⁹² Hence the name Aquarians.

⁹⁸⁹ Mosheim, *Hist.*, i. 55

⁹⁹⁰ Nott’s *Lectures*, p. 233

⁹⁹¹ *Ch. Hist.*, ii. 230

⁹⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 167

The Wines of the Bible

Dr. Lees repeatedly refers to what he regards as an amusing exhibition of ignorance on the part of Augustine, because the latter charges the Manichaeans with inconsistency in denouncing wine, while they do not hesitate to use grapes; and the doctor says, "that the ancient Encratites knew very well what they were about, and objected not to natural grapes or grape juice, but to humanly *fermented* wine."⁹⁹³ But (a) Augustine refers to the particular sect of the Manichaeans, and not to the Encratites generally. See the distinction between these two parties in the quotation from Neander above. (b) Augustine, having been a Manichaean, was more likely to know accurately the opinions and practices of the sect, to which he himself belonged, than a modern writer like Dr. Lees. (c) If the Manichaeans had used unfermented wine as a beverage, or in the celebration of the Supper, while they merely refused and denounced a "humanly *fermented* wine," as alleged by Dr. Lees, there would have been neither point nor reason in the charge of inconsistency brought against them by Augustine. But if they abstained from, and denounced alike the fermented and unfermented juice, while they used without scruple the grapes themselves, there is both point and reason in the charge made against them. (d) The dualism of the Manichaeans, and of all the abstinent sects affected by "the poisonous heresy of Manichaeism,"⁹⁹⁴ regarded the grape, and the juice of the grape, whether fermented or unfermented, as proceeding from *matter*, the antagonist of the spirit, under the dominion of "the evil principle," *Ahriman*; hence the Encratites "did not use wine at all, saying it was of the devil;" and the Manichaeans "call wine the poison of the prince of darkness." (e) Dr. Lees *supposes* that the Manichaeans would not

⁹⁹³ Nott, p. 233

⁹⁹⁴ Lees.

The Wines of the Bible

scruple to “drink fresh grape juice,”⁹⁹⁵ and on that *supposition* he accuses Augustine of “self-exposed folly,” and ignorance of “the facts of nature.” Would it not have been more becoming on the part of the doctor to have made good his *supposition* by satisfactory proof, before uttering that railing accusation? And yet how could he make it good, when he has himself informed us that “the dualist branded both good and bad” wine – i.e., fermented and unfermented – “in ignorance”!⁹⁹⁶

While these heretical sects thus abjured wine, and “made use of water only at the communion,” wine was universally employed at that early period by the orthodox church, both at the love feast and the sacrament. Accordingly, Tertullian says, “As much is eaten as is necessary to satisfy the demands of hunger; as much as drunk as consists with sobriety.” The allusion in this last sentence is manifestly to the use of a wine which, if it had not been partaken of in moderation, would have intoxicated the drinkers. Hence, he adds, - “The supper being ended, and all having washed their hands, lights are brought in; then each is invited to sing as he is able, either from the holy Scripture or from the prompting of his own spirit, a song of praise to God for the common edification. *It then appears how he has drunken.*”⁹⁹⁷ From this last sentence we again infer that the wine used in those times was a fermented liquor. But as the inquiry we are prosecuting has nothing to do with the practice of the later Christians, we must proceed to the observance of the sacrament by our Lord and the apostolic churches.

In the evangelical narrative of the institution of the Supper, we learn that the administration followed the observance of the paschal festival, so that the wine of the Supper must have been

⁹⁹⁵ Nott, p. 223

⁹⁹⁶ Works, iii. xxxii.

⁹⁹⁷ Neander, Hist., i. 444

The Wines of the Bible

identical with the wine of the Passover. If the latter was unfermented, so was the former; but if the latter was fermented, so was the former. We appeal, therefore, to the argument in the previous section for evidence as to the kind of wine used in both ordinances.

The evangelical narrative further informs us that when Christ distributed the cup to his disciples, He designated its contents “the fruit of the vine.” But as we have shown in a previous section, that this phrase is a mere periphrasis for wine, the expression, by itself, determines nothing as to the specific nature of the liquor. The wine in the cup was undoubtedly the juice of the grape; but we have also shown elsewhere, that grape juice was preserved by the Jews in two forms – as a boiled jelly, syrup, or honey, called *devash*, and as a fermented wine, called *yayin*. Consequently the “fruit of the vine” used by our Lord at the paschal feast and subsequent communion, must have been either a fermented wine, or an unfermented syrup or jelly. In the latter case it may have been an old jelly, but it could not have been an old wine, unless *devash* is a species of *yayin*, and domestic jellies are home-made *wines*.

If a grape jelly of this kind had been used by Christ on the particular occasion referred to, and if He had designed that the same substance should ever afterwards be employed in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, it is morally certain that the early churches would have used this jelly in their observance of the ordinance. But in the apostolic reference to the abuses which were associated with the communion in the church at Corinth, it is manifest that the fruit of the vine used was fermented liquor. It may be alleged that, even if this can be proved, the Corinthians must have “deviated from the original custom,” and “their

The Wines of the Bible

conduct is no precedent for us.”⁹⁹⁸ But, (a) The supposed deviation from the “original custom” is not proved, and must not be assumed without sufficient reason. (b) Is it conceivable that in denouncing the abuses of which they were guilty, the apostle would have overlooked such a grievous offence as the substitution of a “cursed drink” for the innocent grape jelly, which they ought to have used? Dr. Lees says, it cannot be concluded “that the apostle must have condemned their deviation from the primitive pattern, for he says nothing concerning their use of fermented bread.”⁹⁹⁹ If this be so, the advocates of the unfermented theory are wiser in their generation than the apostle, for they very emphatically condemn the alleged departure of modern churches in this matter. But, admitting silence of the apostle in reference to the kind of bread used in the sacrament at Corinth, was the substitution of alcoholic for unfermented wine such a trifling and insignificant error as to be undeserving of notice, like the deviation in the case of the bread? If all that has been said recently against the use of the “cursed drink” in the Lord’s Supper be accepted as well founded and true, the silence of the apostle is simply inconceivable. But “he says nothing concerning their use of fermented bread.” Be it so. What evidence is there that they used any such bread? Or that the use of it was improper or unlawful?¹⁰⁰⁰ If neither of these facts can be established, there was nothing to censure in the conduct of the Corinthians in respect to the bread, and therefore no censure is pronounced against them. And, as no fault is found with them for having used an improper description of wine, we conclude that

⁹⁹⁸ Temp. Bib. Com., p. 340

⁹⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁰ **PUBLISHERS NOTE:** *Indeed there is no evidence they departed from the use of unleavened bread. However, 1 Cor. 5:6-8 does provide evidence that unleavened bread is to be used even among gentile believers.*

The Wines of the Bible

there had been no such “deviation from the original custom” as is supposed. This being so, it follows that the wine used on the occasion referred to was according to this “primitive pattern.” What, then was its nature?

It is clear from the statement of the apostle that the Corinthians had been guilty of grievous sin, and that this sin had reference to their conduct in respect to both the bread and the wine of the sacrament. Hence the question, “Have ye not houses to *eat* and to *drink* in?” and the warning, “Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.” The sin of which they were guilty was no trifling offence, for it subjected them to the chastening judgments of God. Hence, the words, “For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the Lord’s body. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep” – the long sleep of death. Their offence was twofold: they converted it into an occasion for sensual indulgence, whereby one was hungry and another drunken.

There is no dispute as to the nature of the excess in the matter of the bread, but there is an important difference of opinion as to the excess in the matter of the wine. In the latter case the advocates of the unfermented theory deny that the wine used was a fermented liquor, and maintain that the sin consisted in drinking to repletion or satiation, and not to intoxication.

The verb *μυθω*, employed by the apostle, and its kindred *μεθη*, *μεθυσκομαι*, *μεθυσος*, are the ordinary terms used in the New Testament to express the idea of intoxication. When, therefore, the apostle says, “One is hungry, and another is drunken” (*μυθει*), why should the latter word not have its usual signification here? What is there in the text, or its surroundings, which requires a departure from the ordinary New Testament

The Wines of the Bible

usage? Dr. Lees appeals to a variety of passages in the Septuagint, and other writings, to show that *μυθῶ* is employed with the signification of drinking largely, freely, and to repletion, without any reference to intoxication. On examining these passages, we find that in one class the verb is used *tropically* of arrows drunk with blood, a sword bathed in heaven, the land soaked with blood, and the like: and, in another class, it is used *literally* of Joseph's brethren, who drank and were merry with him, the drunkard who comes to poverty, filled with drink, drinking abundantly, drinking until they are drunken and spue and fall, and the like. Now, the first class of texts determines nothing as to the literal signification of the word, as we shall see farther on. The second class may be interpreted either of actual intoxication, or of large drinking, for there is nothing in most of the passages quoted to necessitate the one interpretation rather than the other. Some of them clearly refer to drunkenness; others are more doubtful. This being so, the usage appealed to is indeterminate, and can prove nothing as to the drinking of the Corinthians now in question.

But even although it could be proved that *μεθῶ* is employed by some Greek writers to designate large drinking, without intoxication, we should still object (a) That, as the verb is the common term for drunkenness, we must so interpret it in every case, unless good reason can be shown for a different interpretation. But no such reason has been shown in the present case. (b) If the New Testament usage of the word were doubtful and indeterminate, recourse might be had to other writings for evidence of its signification; but as there is no such uncertainty either in the usage of the New Testament in general, or in the Pauline usage of the term in particular, the appeal to other writers is unnecessary and irrelevant.

The Wines of the Bible

We have shown elsewhere that the only species of unfermented grape juice discoverable among the ancients was a boiled syrup or grape jelly; that this substance was commonly distinguished from the wines used as beverages; and that it was an article of food rather than a drink. Now if this had been the substance with which the Corinthians “gorged” themselves; and if that gorging had been the offence charged against them by the apostle, when he said “One is hungry (πεινα), and another is drunken” (μεθυει), he would doubtless have used the ordinary term for being filled or “gorged” (χαρταζω), which occurs in fifteen passages, and is thus employed in every instance. Indeed, he does use this latter term in a contrast of that kind when he says, “Everywhere and in all things I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry” - χορταζεθαι και πειναν (Phil. iv. 12). And Athenaeus tells us that χορταζομαι is used by Cratinus in this way –

“You were all day glutting yourselves with white milk.”

(Athen., iii. 56)

Dr. Ritchie, following Moses Stuart, appeals to etymology, and says, “*Methu* means sweet wine, and most naturally, therefore, unfermented wine. *Methuo* is a denominative verb formed from it, and means to partake of *methu*; and very naturally, in the second place, to partake freely of it. But as to being drunken, that is another question. A free partaking of the sweet wine would make no man drunk.”¹⁰⁰¹ But even if *methu* did mean “sweet wine,” it would not “most naturally” designate an unfermented wine, unless we assume that all sweet wines were unfermented liquors! But we have shown in another section that some of the most potent liquors of the ancients were sweet wines, and that

¹⁰⁰¹ Sc. Test., p. 204

The Wines of the Bible

several of the strongest modern wines are distinguished for their lusciousness. Accordingly, if *methuo* signifies, in the first or second place, “to partake freely of it,” the verb will “most naturally” designate “being drunken,” the sweet *methu* being an inebriating beverage. Thus *shakar* and *savah* are the common Hebrew terms for drunkenness, and both *shechar* and *soveh* were sweet, but fermented wines.

In Homer *methu* is used interchangeably with *oinos*, and certain qualifying terms are added to express the sweetness of the liquor. Thus, in recounting his adventures in the land of the Cyclops, Ulysses speaks of some jars of *methu*, “the prize of our Ciconian wars.”¹⁰⁰² This prize, he tells us, he obtained from Maron, “the priest of Phoebus at the Ismarian shrine;” and the liquor which he previously called *methu* he now terms *oinos*.¹⁰⁰³ In both cases, however, the adjective *ηδύς* is added to denote the sweetness of the wine - *μεθυσ ηδύς*, and *οινον ηδύν*. Numerous examples of this usage occur.¹⁰⁰⁴ But instead of this sweet *methu* being an unfermented wine, as alleged, it was the very liquor with which Ulysses intoxicated the huge Cyclops, Polypheme. Now, if the noun *methu* thus designated an intoxicating wine, the verb *methuo*, “formed from it,” and meaning “to partake freely of it,” must have denoted, not mere repletion, but actual intoxication. Accordingly, Aristotle is cited by Athenaeus as saying that “the word *methuein* is derived from the fat that men used wine, *meta to thuin* after sacrificing;” and Soleucus testifies that *methai* has its origin from the vinous excesses which were indulged in by the heathen “on occasion of some sacred festival,” when it was customary for the worshippers to drink to intoxication.¹⁰⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰² Odys., ix. 162

¹⁰⁰³ Ibid., 204

¹⁰⁰⁴ Ibid., ii. 340, 349; iii. 391

¹⁰⁰⁵ Athen., ii. 11

The Wines of the Bible

Dr. Lees quotes from Plato a reference to a democratic state whose evil rulers “bear the wine cup to it, and is filled (μεθυσθη) beyond what is fitting with the strong unmixed draught,” &c., and says, “Can there be any rational doubt, after this, that the *Methusthee* does not necessarily imply an undue filling?”¹⁰⁰⁶ We answer, there can be no “rational doubt” that the word in question is thus rendered in the translation given above, but beyond that fact there is nothing proved. We deny the correctness of the translation, and maintain (a) that the *filling* with “strong unmixed wine” is, and must be, intoxication; (b) that the reference to a *drunkenness* “beyond what is fitting” is quite in accordance with Plato’s notion that intoxication may be permitted “under due regulations, and with a view to the enforcement of temperance,” as shown in a previous section on Drinking Laws of the Ancients.

The doctor further quotes from Herodotus, that the Persians are accustomed “to deliberate about the most important of their matters when they have drunk freely (μεθυσκομενοι),” and says, “It is obvious that the persons could not have been ‘drunk,’ in the modern sense of that word, for drunkenness is wholly incompatible with deliberation,” &c.¹⁰⁰⁷ And yet he tells us elsewhere, “It is also their general practice to deliberate upon affairs of weight *when they are drunk*; and then on the morrow, when they are sober, the decision to which they came the night before is put before them,” &c. The Germans also “took counsel first *when drunk*, and then when sober. And the historian adds, ‘They deliberate when unable to devise anything, they decide when not able to go wrong.’”¹⁰⁰⁸ He also quotes from Professor

¹⁰⁰⁶ Answers to the Unanswerable, p. 107

¹⁰⁰⁷ Ibid., pp. 107, 108

¹⁰⁰⁸ Temp. Bib. Com. pp. 109, 110

The Wines of the Bible

Rawlinson as to the habits of the ancient Persians, “that most banquets terminated in general intoxication. Drunkenness even came to be a sort of institution. Once a year, at the feast of Mithras, the King of Persia, according to Duris, was bound to be drunk. A general practice arose of deliberating on all important affairs under the influence of wine, so that in every household, when a family crisis impended, intoxication was a duty.”¹⁰⁰⁹

He next proceeds to Philo, “an author of special value in the discussion of the Greek of the New Testament,” and quotes the words, “the good man may be *filled (methuo)* without losing any of his virtue;” and “so that, with these, *methuein* is clearly acknowledged to be nothing but *oinousthai*.” The doctor then says, “Need more be said as to the fact that the word had an innocent sense?”¹⁰¹⁰ We think that a very great deal more will have to be said before that conclusion can be accepted. He assumes, instead of proving, that *methuo* here signifies “filled,” and translates accordingly. We deny the assumption, and maintain that the word signifies *drunk*, and should be so rendered. He also assumes that because *methuein* and *oinousthai* are here said to be the same, both terms designate free drinking, without intoxication. We again deny the assumption, and maintain that they denote drunkenness. Observe that Philo is speaking of drinking, not innocent grape juice, but poisonous, maddening, unmixed wine. Accordingly, after saying that “unmixed wine is a poison, which is the cause, if not of death, at least of madness,” that “men of old time called skill in the art of making wine madness,” and “called the Bacchae, who were carried away under the influence of wine, mad women (μαίναδες), since wine is the cause of madness and folly to those

¹⁰⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 251

¹⁰¹⁰ *Answers to the Unanswerable*, pp. 108, 109

The Wines of the Bible

who indulge in its insatiably;" he proceeds to say, "The ancients called unmixed wine οἶνος and also μεθυ;" and he concludes that, as these two words are identical in their signification, the verbs μυθνεῖν and οἶνουσθαι sustain the same relation to each other as do the nouns from which they are derived, and are, therefore, also identical in meaning. If, then, these latter denote the being *filled* with that poisonous, maddening, unmixed wine, what is this but *drunkenness*? And if the being thus filled with that wine is madness, as above, what, again is this but *drunkenness*?

Philo further says, "Some persons think that drunkenness(μεθη) derives its name, not merely from the fact of its being admitted after sacrifice [which was reckoned a lawful proceeding], but also because it is the cause of relaxation (μεθεσις) to the soul. But the reason of foolish men is relaxed so as to get strength for many sins; while that of those inclined to be sensible is relaxed, so as to enjoy freedom from care, and cheerfulness, and lightness of heart. For the wise man, when he is intoxicated, becomes more good humored than when he is sober; so that in this respect we should not be at all wrong in saying that he may get drunk."¹⁰¹¹ Athenaeus also says, "And from this relaxation (απο του μεθιεναι) they call wine μεθυ, and the god who gave them wine [Bacchus] they call Methymnaeus, and Lyaeus, and Evius, and Icious."¹⁰¹² And Plutarch also says, "Bacchus called wine μεθυ, and himself μεθυμναι θεος," and brought ivy into reputation, as "being a preservative against drunkenness, and an enemy to wine."¹⁰¹³ So that, these ancient authors being witnesses, this appeal to etymology leads to very different conclusions from those arrived by Dr. Lees and Ritchie.

¹⁰¹¹ Planting of Noah, 40

¹⁰¹² Book viii. 64

¹⁰¹³ Sympos., iii. 2

The Wines of the Bible

Leaving, however, this heathen ground, and entering the sacred domain of Scripture, we find that μεθη occurs in three passages of the New Testament. It is used by Christ when cautioning his disciples against “surfeiting and *drunkenness*” (Luke xxi. 34); by St. Paul, when similarly exhorting Christians against “rioting and *drunkenness*” (Rom. xiii. 13); and by the same writer, when describing the works of the flesh, “*drunkenness*, revelings, and such like” (Gal. v. 21). Μεθυω occurs in six other passages, besides the text. It is employed by Christ when speaking of those who “eat and drink with the *drunken*” (Matt. xxiv. 49); by the governor of the feast when referring to men that “have *well drunk*” (John ii. 10); by St. Peter when denying that the disciples were “*drunken*,” as had been alleged by their enemies (Acts ii. 15); by St. Paul when he says, “They that be drunken are *drunken* in the night” (1 Thess. v. 7); and by the author of the Apocalypse, when he says, “The inhabitants of the earth have been made *drunk* with the wine of her fornication” (Rev. xvii. 2); and again, “I saw the woman *drunken* with the blood of the saints” (Rev. xvii. 6). Μεθυσκομαι is found in three texts, and is used by Christ, when he says, “to eat and drink, and to be *drunken*” (Luke xii. 45); by St. Paul when he says, “Be not *drunk* with wine, wherein is excess” (Eph. v. 18); and by the same writer, “they that be *drunken* are drunken in the night” (1 Thes. v. 7). Μεθυσος occurs only twice, and is used by St. Paul in both cases of *drunkards* (1 Cor. v. 11; vi. 10).

Thus, in the Pauline and New Testament usage, these terms are uniformly employed to designate, not mere repletion, but actual drunkenness, both literal and tropical. The only possible exception is the reference by the governor of the feast to “men that have well drunk;” and yet, even here, there is no necessary or imperative reason for departing from the otherwise uniform meaning of the word in all the other passages of the New

The Wines of the Bible

Testament. Why should we assume that the men spoken of were not accustomed to get “well drunk?” Or why should the governor not refer to such a practice by such persons? No shadow of reflection is thereby cast upon the marriage guests, seeing that these are not the persons of whom he is speaking, and to whom this custom is ascribed. He merely refers to a common practice in general society, which no one acquainted with the drinking habits of the age can possibly deny. And so far from intending thereby to reflect unfavourably on the conduct of the company then present, he appears, on the contrary, to have carefully guarded against such an inference, when he so expressly distinguishes between the “every man at the beginning,” and the “but thou.” It is as if he had said, “It is common at other marriage festivities for the bridegroom to treat his guests with the best wine at the beginning, and then, when they have become more or less intoxicated, to supply them with an inferior liquor; but nothing of this kind has been done here, for you have kept the best wine to the last.” There is, therefore, no more reason for supposing that the governor of the feast referred to the excessive drinking of the guests at Cana, whatever the beverage may have been, than that Christ alluded to the practice of his own disciples when he spoke of the custom “to eat and drink, and to be drunken;” or that St. Paul referred to the intemperate habits of the Thessalonian Christians, when he spoke of those that are “drunken in the night.” Dr. Lees agrees with us in this, when he observes, in reply to Zeta, “As Olshausen, the learned and liberal German commentator says, ‘the discourse has reference *only* to what was customary in the world, so that no conclusion can be drawn from the expression as to the marriage itself at which Jesus was present, or as to the use of the wine he bestowed.’”¹⁰¹⁴ Now, if

¹⁰¹⁴ Works, iii.

The Wines of the Bible

the governor referred to “what was customary in the world,” then, we submit that the evidence adduced in a previous section as to the drinking habits of the ancients, shows that it was “customary” to get “well drunk” on festive occasions.

Thus the use of μεθω in the text under consideration forms no exception to the general rule, that in every passage of the New Testament where this word and its kindred terms occur, the uniform reference is to actual drunkenness. But even if the usage of the governor of the feast, in that one instance, could be proved to be an exception, we should still contend that, however others may have used these terms they are uniformly employed by St. Paul to denote actual drunkenness. There are, as we have seen, four different words employed in the new Testament, μεθη, μεθω, μεθυσκομαι, and μεθυσος, and they are all used by the apostle. The four terms occur in all in fifteen passages, and eight of these are the words of St. Paul. And the whole eight passages, including the text under consideration, are descriptions of drunkenness. Thus, “rioting and *drunkenness*,” “*drunkenness*, revellings, and such like,” “*drunken* in the night;” “*drunk* with wine;” “they that be *drunken*,” “a *drunkard*,” and “another is *drunken*.”

In two of the passages in which μεθω occurs in the New Testament, it is employed tropically by the writer of the Apocalypse, of being *drunk with the wine of fornication*, and *drunk with blood*. But this peculiar usage in no way affects the literal meaning of the term when employed in connection with the actual drinking habits of the so-called “drunkards.” Every language teems with illustrations of a similar tropical usage. Thus

—
“Linden blossoms, drunk with moonlight,
Fly about in fragrant showers.”

The Wines of the Bible

Virgil speaks of being “exalted hence and drunk with secret joy.” Meleager – “drunk with drops of dew.” Another ancient writer speaks of “an imagination intoxicated with poetic rage.” Dr. Mason Good, on Job, has “drunk with my abasement,” and “till the morning let us drink deep, let us intoxicate ourselves with ravishments.” Sir William Jones gives from the Persian, “The man who had inebriated himself with milk from the nipple of anguish;” “drunk with the wine thy charms display;” and the perfume of flowers “intoxicated in the senses, and made the heart drunk.” Klopstock says –

*“The godlike man forthcoming he describes,
And the drunk with holiness, to meet him flies.”*

Dunbar says, -

*“In false vainglory they so drunken are,
Their wit is went, of woe, they are not waur.”*

And Coleridge revels in the usage –

*“Through the streaming streets
Of Paris, red-eyed massacre, o’er-wearied,
Reels heavily, intoxicate with blood.”*

He speaks also of being “inebriate with dew;” “tipsy joy that reels with tossing head;” “the fierce and drunken passions;” “she that reeled heavily, whose wine was blood;” “she reeled intoxicate the soul;” “a dizzy drunken spirit possesses the whole town.” Cowper, too, speaks of arrows whose feathers are “drunk with wine.” And lord Lyttleton says, “For wit, like wine, intoxicates the brain.”

It is evident from these references, which might be multiplied indefinitely, that this tropical usage is common to both ancient

The Wines of the Bible

and modern writers. And it is manifest from the associated allusions that, even in this usage, the figurative drunkenness has an underlying reference, not to mere repletion or satiation, but to intoxication; hence the reeling, staggering, &c. Now, as St. Paul is speaking of actual abuses in eating and drinking in connection with the sacrament, the drunkenness which he ascribes to the Corinthians is no mere figurative, but a very real and sinful intoxication with wine.

Dr. Lees, however, alleges that “what had been done wrong at the love feast would not have been amiss at home, for Paul asks, ‘What! Have ye not houses to *eat* and *drink* in?’ – language which would hardly be applied to acts of intoxication.”¹⁰¹⁵ The inference intended to be drawn from this reference is twofold; first, that the wine used was not an intoxicating liquor, and, second, that the drinking complained of was not actual drunkenness. But the argument has two material defects; it is a mere assumption, and it is self-destructive. It is a mere assumption to allege that “what had been done wrong at the love feast, would not have been amiss at home.” Was the wrong-doing, after all, only a breach of good manners, a violation of propriety, an offence against good taste? Did the apostle magnify this trifling and inconsiderable breach of decorum, which “would not have been amiss at home,” into the grave culpability of despising “the church of God,” putting the brethren to shame, “coming together to condemnation,” provoking the displeasure of their inspired teacher, “eating and drinking unworthily,” and drawing down the chastening judgments of Almighty God? Surely it is a very large assumption to conclude that an offence of which all these things are predicated “would not have been amiss at home!”

¹⁰¹⁵ Works, ii. 183

The Wines of the Bible

But the argument is also self-destructive; for what was the wrong-doing complained of by the apostle? Dr. Lees describes it in one word, “gorged.” They had *gorged* themselves with the bread and they had *gorged* themselves with the sweet syrup of the sacrament. If this really was the offence of the Corinthian wrong-doers, was that gorging, or gluttonous eating and drinking, “wrong at the love feast,” but “amiss at home?” If so, it would be difficult to convince an offender that either church or home drunkenness is a very wrong thing, when home gorging or gluttony is so little amiss. The unfermented theory must be hard pressed for evidence when it requires to be buttressed by such arguments as these.

Dr. Lees further alleges that “the exposition which imputes drunkenness, in our sense, to the Corinthian Christians at their social meal, implies that many of the members were guilty of the awful sin of celebrating the Lord’s Supper, which followed that meal, while in an inebriated condition – an imputation highly improbable in itself, and tacitly contradicted by the language of the apostle.”¹⁰¹⁶ There can be no doubt that “many of the members” were implicated in the offence for which they are censured, for the apostle expressly says, “For this cause *many* are weak and sickly among you, and *many* sleep.” And there can be as little doubt that inebriation, on such a solemn occasion, was, indeed, an “awful sin;” but alas! Awful sins, even, at the Lord’s table, and apart from inebriation are not unknown in the history of the church, either in ancient or modern times. The doctor admits that these guilty persons came to the Lord’s Supper after having “gorged” themselves with the bread and wine; and surely that gorging was an “awful sin” on such an occasion, and the twin-sister of drunkenness. Moreover the Pauline and other epistles

¹⁰¹⁶ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 340

The Wines of the Bible

are pervaded by references to awful sins in the early churches, and, noticeably, in this very congregation at Corinth." St. Jude describes certain scandalous abuses which had crept into the church as "spots in your feasts of charity" – i.e., in the Agape or love feasts. And we know from ecclesiastical history that these evils eventually became so great and frequent that the Agape had to be abolished by ecclesiastical authority.

We have also independent testimony, adduced in previous sections, that, at this period, general society was corrupt to the core, and that intemperance was one of the most prevalent and formidable evils of the age. Many of the members of the Corinthian church had been heathen, and addicted to this very sin. The heathen associated actual drunkenness with their religious worship, and regarded it as both a privilege and a duty to become religiously drunk at some of their sacred festivals. Corinth was one of the most profligate cities of the Roman empire, and was specially noted for its vicious indulgences. Professor Plumptre describes it as having "risen rapidly from its ruins, and regained in no small measure its former greatness, and even more than its former fame for luxury and vice. The old proverbial speech which made the verb 'to live as at Corinth' (*korinthiazesthai*) a synonym for profligate indulgence, had not become obsolete. And "the teaching of Epicurus would appear there in the pithy maxims of a self-indulgent easy-going morality."¹⁰¹⁷ Dr. Lees, also testifies that "an excessive addiction to liquors, even such as would not readily, or at all, intoxicate, was a vice of the apostolic age, and one that abounded in Corinth, the most profligate city of Greece."¹⁰¹⁸

It is a curious fact, if it be not a mere fancy, that "the most profligate city of Greece" should have been viciously addicted to

¹⁰¹⁷ *Bib. Ed.*, pp. 376, 377

¹⁰¹⁸ *Temp. Bib. Com.*, p. 329

The Wines of the Bible

such innocent indulgences as these liquors, which “would not readily, or at all, intoxicate.” Profligates of vicious habits are not usually distinguished for their abstinence from unintoxicating liquors. If, however, this “vice of the apostolic age” “abounded in Corinth,” we must read the old proverb “to live as at Corinth,” as signifying excessive indulgence in liquors which “would not readily, or at all, intoxicate!” But the wine of Corinth, instead of being distinguished for its weakness or innocence, was regarded by the ancients as being particularly harsh or austere liquor. Accordingly, Athenaeus says, “And Alexis mentions Corinthian wine as a harsh wine, -

*“And foreign wine was there; for that from Corinth
Is painful drinking.” – Athen., i. 56*

The drinking habits of the Corinthians, and noticeably, the previous intemperance of some of the members of this very church, are indicated in such apostolic references as these, - “But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be.....a drunkard” (1 Cor. v. 11). “Be not deceived; neither fornicators.....nor drunkards.....shall inherit the kingdom of God. *And such were some of you*” (1 Cor. vi. 10, 11). “Awake to righteousness and sin not,” paraphrased by Conybeare and Howson, “Change your drunken revellings into the sobriety of righteousness, and live no more in sin”(1 Cor. xv. 34). Now, if intemperance was a sin of the age, as we have shown elsewhere; if that sin abounded in the profligate city of Corinth; if some of the members of the church there were previously addicted to that evil; and if “a man that is called a brother” might be “a drunkard,” it is not at all “improbable,” as Dr. Lees alleges, that in this, as in other things, some of these members may have exemplified in their own character, both at the love feast, and the sacrament,

The Wines of the Bible

the truth of the ancient saying, against which the apostle warns them, “Be not deceived; evil communications corrupt good manners” (1 Cor. xv. 33).

But however this may be, there can be no doubt of the criminality of these offending members of the church; and the very awfulness of the sin laid to their charge can alone explain, if not justify, the very awful character ascribed to their offence, and the still more awful judgments which it evoked. Here is no more *gorging* on innocent grape jelly, like gluttonous little children on sweets, but an awful desecration of the holy communion by an exhibition of actual inebriation at the very table of the Lord.

Dr. Lees says, that if drunkenness had been the wrong-doing complained of, the apostle “would have condemned, in strong language, so foul an insult to the eucharist, while he simply inquires (ver. 21) whether they had not houses to eat and to drink in.”¹⁰¹⁹ In making this inquiry the apostle probably intended, in the first instance, to disabuse their minds of the false notion that the love feast and the sacrament which followed, were mere social banquets at which they might gratify their appetites; and to impress upon them that these were religious services, designed for spiritual blessing, and commemorative of human redemption by the sacrifice of the Son of God. But if there is an absence of the “strong language” desiderated in respect to the imputed *drunkenness*, there is equal absence of such language in respect to the alleged *gorging*; so that the objection cuts both ways. There is, however, severe condemnation expressed against the “foul insult,” and that, as we think, in the strongest terms which human language can supply. The very mention of the offence, in connection with such a sacred observance, is itself condemnation sufficient to stamp the evil with the character of a most “awful

¹⁰¹⁹ Temp. Bib. Com. p. 340;

The Wines of the Bible

sin.” But, along with this, there are the associated characteristics, consequences, and warnings, such as despising the church of God, eating and drinking unworthily, coming together to condemnation, evoking the judgments of God, and the like, - language strong enough to express the utmost displeasure against the perpetration of such a grievous offence against the church and her crucified Lord. From all these considerations, we conclude that the wine of the Supper was identical with that of the Passover, and that both were fermented liquors.