

Extracts by FRANK HAMILTON *from*

The
BIBLE
and
WINE

BY THE LATE

FERRAR FENTON, M.R.A.S., M.C.A.A., ETC., ETC.

(Translator of the Complete Bible into Modern English)

A. & C. BLACK, LTD.
4, 5 & 6 SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W. 1.
13th July, 1938.

FRANK HAMILTON, ESQ.,
6701 ATLANTIC AVENUE,
VENTNOR, N. J.

Dear Sir:—

We shall have no objection to your reprinting this as you suggest, provided that the reference to the Translator of the Complete Bible appears on the title-page as in proof which we are returning herewith.

Yours very truly,

A. & C. BLACK, LTD.

(H. A. G.)

The Bible and Wine

"Thus saith Jehovah: As the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it: so will I do for my servants' sake, that I may not destroy them all"—Isa. 65: 8.

(See also Deut. 32: 14 and Jer. 48: 33.)

Having now completed the examination of the Old Testament, and its teachings upon the uses of fruits as foods or drinks, I proceed to do the same by a careful survey of the Greek text of the New Testament, and the methods in which the old Greek and Mediterranean nations prepared the fruit of the vine-plant for use in their domestic life. This latter, of course, can only be learned as to technical details from writers outside the Gospels, who treated the subject as one of agriculture and manufactures, but who, by living at the same period as the Evangelists and Apostles, were personally acquainted with the matter to which both refer.

GREEK TEXTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Oinos, Oinon, Texts in Greek.

Oinon, the Grape-tree or Vine-plant.

Oinion, the fruit of the Vine or Grape-plant. It is also used to denote various kinds of drinks or confections of other succulent fruits, such as the date and lotus fruit, according to Liddell and Scott's Lexicon. According to Professor Samuel Lee, of Cambridge University, the root of the Greek word is undoubtedly the Hebrew vocable, *Yain*, Wine; which, as I have before shown, under the sections of my essay devoted to the philology of that Hebrew noun, was not confined to an intoxicating liquor made from fruits by alcoholic fermentation of their expressed juices, but more frequently referred to a thick,

non-intoxicating syrup, conserve, or jam, produced by boiling, to make them storable as articles of food, exactly as we do at the present day. The only difference being that we store them in jars, bottles, or metal cans, whilst the Ancients laid them up in skin bottles, as Aristotle and Pliny, and other classic writers upon agricultural and household affairs describe. Consequently the contention of some of my correspondents that the Greek *oinos*, *always* meant fermented and intoxicating liquor is totally inaccurate, and only arises from ignorance, or prejudice in favour of the delusion of the commentators of the Dark Ages, who fancied drunkenness was the highest delight, and intoxication an imperative Christian practice; because Mohammedan Arabians were a sober people.

Oine, and *Oinon*, the Grape, or Vine-plant. *Oinos*, wine, or drink made from any fruit or grain, such as dates, apples, pears, barley, the lotus seed. If specially indicated as made from Grapes it is called *Oinos 'ampelinos*.

As in the Hebrew "*Yain*," the word does not in Greek always signify fermented intoxicating drink, but grapes as fresh fruit, dried as raisins, or prepared as jam, or preserved by boiling for storage, or as thick syrup for spreading upon bread as we do butter; and that syrup dissolved in water for a beverage at meals, as described in the Hebrew Bible by Solomon and others, and amongst Greek writers by Aristotle, and Pliny amongst the Roman ones. This mixing of the syrup with water ready for use at meals is alluded to in more than one of our Lord's parables. The liquid was absolutely non-alcoholic and not intoxicating. Grape-juice was also prepared by heating it, as soon as possible after it had been squeezed in the press, by boiling, so as to prevent fermentation, and yet preserve its thin liquid form as a drink. To ensure this certain resinous gums were dissolved in the juice, or sulphate of lime, or what is commonly called gypsum, was put into it, as is now done in Spain, to make the liquid clear and bright, and prevent subsequent fermentation arising from changes of atmosphere. All these plans for producing a non-intoxicating wine are still followed extensively in every grape-growing country of Southern Europe and Asia, as of old. Similar wines made in France can now be obtained in London from Ingersoll and Melluish, of 10 Eastcheap, E. C. This is not a paid advertise-

ment, but noted because I believe it may benefit some readers to know the fact, and to support my statements in the text.

It should never be forgotten that when reading in the Bible and the classic pagan writers of "Wine," we are seldom dealing with the strongly intoxicating and loaded liquids to which that name is alone attached in the English language, but usually with beverages such as above described. They were as harmless and sober as our own teas, coffees, and cocoas. Had they not been so, the ancient populations would have been perpetually in a more or less pronounced state of drunkenness, for they had none of our above-noted herb-made drinks to use as a part of their dietary. These facts should never be forgotten when we read of "wine" there,—for it was simple fruit syrup, except where especially stated to be of the intoxicating kinds, which latter the Prophets and Legislators always condemn.

Leaving further exposition, I now turn to the New Testament.

REFERENCE IN ST. MATTHEW

St. Matthew 9: 17: "Neither do they pour new wine (fresh grape-juice) into old wine-skins; for if they did, the skins would burst, and the wine (grape-juice) be spilt, and the skins destroyed. On the contrary, they pour fresh juice into new skins, and both are safe together."

Only a determination to misread this metaphorical illustration of the subject which Jesus was discussing with the disciples of John, can pervert this passage into a recommendation or sanction for habitual use of intoxicating liquors. That the *oinon*, that is "fresh grape-juice" (if literally translated), referred to had not been fermented to the still liquid form is clear, for if it had been so it would not "burst the old wine skins" by beginning to ferment in them on account of the yeast or acid with which the old skins were saturated, setting up the alcoholic action. To keep the juice of the grapes sweet and wholesome it needed to be *specialy* prepared before being poured into new sweet skins, when it would keep pure and benefit men as an article of diet, as His auditors knew well, as a syrup or jam, such as the ancient writers upon agriculture and domestic economy inform us were in common daily use.

Jesus wished to show John's disciples that before He could form an Organization or Church to be the instrument of continuing His doctrines, He had to prepare His disciples by a course of mental education to receive His spiritual teaching, freed from the "dead rituals" of the Sadducean priesthood of Jerusalem, and then inspire them with a newly-created Organization to preserve and serve out the Gospel doctrines to mankind.

The interpretation put upon His parable by the ignorant commentators of the Dark Ages, that He was insisting upon the drinking of intoxicants, is little short of blasphemy, and it is a disgrace to our better informed age that writers should say that "Christianity has given a sacred character to wine and its use," as some I have read declare, "in opposition to the Mohammedan condemnation of it." By "wine" this writer clearly says he meant alcoholic liquor.

REFERENCES IN ST. MARK

St. Mark 2: 22: "Nobody pours new wine into old wine-skins; but if done, then the new wine (that is, the fresh unprepared grape-juice) would burst the skins, and both the wine and the skins would be wasted. On the contrary, new wine must be put into new skins."

To this passage my preceding comment will apply; but the following citation will demand a special consideration from both myself and readers, for it has been curiously distorted by commentators from its true bearing. It is—

St. Mark 15: 20-24: "And when they had insulted Him they took off from Him the purple robe, and clad Him in His own attire, and led Him out for crucifixion. Then they seized a passer-by, who was coming up from the country—Simon the Cyrenian, the father of Alexander and Rufus—forcing him to accompany them, to carry the cross, and took Him to Golgotha (which means Skull-field), where they offered Him wine medicated with myrrh: *but He refused to drink it.* There they crucified Him, and divided His clothing among themselves, casting lots as to what part each should take."

The question suggested in the above, to which no one seems to have found an answer, is: Why did Jesus refuse to drink

the wine, *medicated with a narcotic* by the Centurion, out of a feeling of mercy to the victim, whom he knew had been unjustly condemned to death upon a false accusation, and that Pilate had been driven to condemn him by terror for his own personal safety, after the Sadducean priests had threatened to accuse him to the Emperor at Rome as a confederate with Christ to incite a revolt of the Jews against the Empire, unless he did hand Jesus over to their will to be crucified? This narcotized liquor does not seem to have been offered to the two robbers who had been convicted of real crime, and therefore we must conclude, as I have done, that it was an act of mercy from the Centurion who commanded the detachment of soldiers, specially to Jesus. Then why should Christ not have drank it? He would know the kindness of heart of the soldier, and the nobility of soul that inspired the feeling of mercy. Then why did He not accept the act of mercy?

“Oh!” is the only answer I have ever read, or heard spoken, “Our Saviour refused the narcotic wine because He did not wish to diminish in the slightest degree the cruel tortures of the death He was about to suffer for mankind!”

As to the bodily torments, He was only to suffer the same as the two miserable robbers, His companions in the method of death. Consequently there must have been a far more powerful reason for His refusal than that commonly given. What was it?

Was it not the following?—Upon that day Jesus the Messiah had entered upon His office of the Eternal High Priest of Mankind, and was about to sacrifice the Paschal Lamb, His earthly body, upon the cross. St. Paul, commenting upon the fact, wrote: “Do you not know that a little ferment ferments the whole mass? Clean out the old ferment, so that you may be a sweet mass, *and thus you will be unfermented*. For Christ, our Passover, was sacrificed for us, so that we might keep a Festival, not with an old ferment, neither in a ferment of filth and wickedness, but, on the contrary, with unfermented purity and truth” (1 Cor. 5: 6-8). By this we can perceive that the Crucifixion not only occurred during the Passover week, but was done by Christ “offering Himself,” that is, His body upon the cross at the Passover to free mankind from sin, but He

was also spiritually the High Priest fulfilling the duties of His office of Sacrifice (Heb. 10: 22-28).

As the officiating High Priest was, by the Law given through Moses, prohibited from "drinking intoxicating wine" during the period of his ministration, before entering the Sanctuary, or whilst engaged in its duties, to refresh my reader's memory I give the whole passage from Leviticus, chap. 10, vers. 8-11.

"Then Moses spoke to Aaron and commanded: 'You or your sons with you shall not drink of wine or an intoxicant when you are going to the Sanctuary, so that you may not die. This is an everlasting institution for your posterity.

"For you shall distinguish between the sacred and the common, and between sin and purity, so that you may teach the sons of Israel'."

These Divine Laws, and the statements of the Apostles, show *why Jesus refused to drink of the drugged wine offered to Him by the pagan but merciful Centurion, or by his order*; the wine was the ration liquor served out to the Roman soldiery as part of their dietary, and was fermented as well as drugged, and so was an intoxicant, and forbidden to Christ as our High Priest, and also as an Israelite humanly; and the whole nation was also prohibited during the seven days' Preparation for the Passover from having any fermented thing in their dwellings or to drink fermented liquors,—*and Jesus came to "fulfil the whole law."* He obeyed it absolutely, and refused both as Priest and as an Israelite to drink the intoxicant offered to Him. He did not abstain with the object of securing to Himself the utmost of bodily agony; nor is any such motive suggested in the Gospels. As a further illustration of the continuous force of this command in regard to the ministering priesthood from the Hebrew Church of God to the Christian one, I now subjoin the striking passage from St. Luke's Gospel in chap. 1, vers. 11-16:—

REFERENCES IN ST. LUKE

"Then a messenger of the Lord appeared, standing at the right of the altar of incense. And on seeing him, Zacharias was struck with awe, and gave way to fear.

“Fear not, Zacharias, said the messenger, addressing him, ‘for your supplications have been heard, and your wife Elizabeth will give birth to a son for you, and you shall give him the name of John. He will be a joy and delight to you, and many will exult at his birth, for he shall be distinguished in the presence of the Lord, and shall drink no wine or strong drink.¹ But he shall be full of the spirit of holiness, even from his birth, and shall turn many of the sons of Israel back to the Lord their God, and will advance in His presence in the spirit and power of Elijah.’”

Upon the above no comment is needed.

Luke 5: 37: “No one pours new (that is, fresh grape-juice) wine into old wine-skins; for if he did the new wine would burst the skins and the wine be spilt, and the skins destroyed. On the contrary, new juice must be stored in fresh wine-skins, and both will be preserved.”

This may seem in contradiction of the foregoing, but that it is not the reader can ascertain if he turns to my exposition of the equivalent text of Matthew’s Gospel, chap. 9, ver. 17, upon page 5 of this essay.

Luke 7: 33: “‘To what, therefore,’ He added, ‘shall I liken the men of this generation? They are like children sitting in a market-place, and shouting out to one another,

*“We piped to you, and you did not dance;—
We wailed, and you did not weep!”*

For John the Baptizer came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and you say, “A demon possesses him!” The Son of Man comes eating and drinking; and you say, “Look at Him! —an eater and drinker of wine,—a friend of taxgatherers and profligates!” Wisdom, however, will be justified by all her children’.”

In this striking passage from the Gospel there is not the slightest encouragement for the habitual use of intoxicants of any kind, by whatever name they may be called. The whole force of the reproof of our Lord to the men of His day lay in the falsehood of the statements of His and John’s critics.

¹ See Num. 4: 2-4.

That is, that the charge against John, the Nazarite, was a lie, and the libel against Jesus was also a lie, both invented by malicious adversaries, because the two inspired teachers denounced the hypocrisy and vices of that age, and of all succeeding ones. Only a perverse effort to justify themselves in drunkenness could ever have made commentators distort the narrative into a command to Christians to drink alcoholic liquors as a sacred duty, and to impose them upon all the converts they make from amongst hereditarily sober nations or tribes.

Luke 10:29-37: "A lawyer . . . asked . . . 'Who is my neighbor?'"

"Jesus in reply to him said, 'There was a man who, on going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, fell among robbers, who both stripped and wounded him, and went away, leaving him half dead.

"'It happened also that a priest was going down the same road, but seeing him, he passed on the other side. And in the same way a Levite also, when he got to the same place, looked at him and passed along. But a certain Samaritan on a journey came to where he was, and seeing him, took pity, and went to him and dressed his wounds, making use of oil and wine. Then, setting him upon his own beast, he conveyed him to an inn, and took care of him. And as he was leaving the following day, he threw down two denarii, and said to the host, "Attend to him; and whatever more you spend I will repay you upon my return.'" Which, therefore, of these three do you think proved a neighbor to him who fell amongst the thieves?"

"'He who pitied him,' was the reply.

"Jesus then said, 'Go you and do the same'."

Wine is certainly mentioned in this beautiful illustration of what constitutes true humanity and neighborly kindness, but there is not in it any command to drink intoxicants, or statement that the 'wine' used with the oil to prevent inflammation of the wounds was a fermented alcoholic liquor. Therefore it cannot justify missionaries in teaching the converts they make from the habitually sober Mohammedan and Hindu peoples, or from barbarous tribes in Africa or elsewhere, that the Christian Faith demands they should, as one of the first

acts to prove their adoption of it, drink intoxicating wine in its most sacred rite of the Holy Sacrament, and to habitually do so in domestic life to show they are not influenced by their former religions, with the result always following, according to very wide testimony, that those converts become, as did the converts of those ardent missionaries who of old "crossed sea and desert to make even *one* proselyte," and by the example of their personal vices made the convert a double "child of Hell" to what he had been as a heathen, instead of becoming a son of God. To justify my comment, the reader (and the missionary) have only to read the history of the extermination of the New Zealanders, the Sandwich Islanders, and the Fijians under the curse of intoxicants, and fornication, its attendant, within thirty to fifty years after their profession of the Christian religion. These are facts, not wild assertions, and it is shameful that our missionaries should shut their eyes to the terrible history, and refuse, when their attention is directed to it, to inquire into the cause.

REFERENCES IN ST. JOHN

St. John 2: 1-10: "There was a marriage at Cana in Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was present; and Jesus was invited to the marriage with His disciples. And when the wine ran short, Jesus was spoken to by His mother, who said to Him:—

" 'They have no more wine.'

"Jesus said to her in reply:—

" 'What is that to you and Me, mother? Has not My time yet come?'

"His mother then said to the attendants, 'Whatever He bids you, let it be done.'

"Now, there were standing there, for the Jewish purifications, six stone water-jars, holding from two to three firkins.

"Jesus said to them, 'Fill the jars with water.'

"They accordingly filled them to the brim. He then said to them,—

"Now draw out, and take to the master of the feast.

"They accordingly did so. And when the master of the festival had tasted the water which had become wine—(not knowing where it came from, although the servants who had drawn the water knew)—he called the bridegroom, and said to him:—'A man usually serves out the best wine at the beginning, reserving the inferior until the guests have tasted, but you have kept the best wine until now'."

Probably the above is one of the most misunderstood, and misrepresented passages in the whole of the Gospels.

The misunderstanding has arisen from imposing upon the ancient Greek text, and ancient Jewish habits of food and drink, entirely the modern and Northern European conception, that the word "wine" always means intoxicating liquor. Amongst the old Orientals and the Romans, such an idea was not attached to "wine" as a universal conception. On the contrary, their "best wines" were not fermented at all, as I have shown from the Old Testament above, and will now go on to do with Roman classical writers.

The ordinary drink of the Romans, learned writers tell us, was juice of the grape, *which they mixed with water, both hot and cold*—(the same as the "mingled" or "mixed" wine of Solomon, and the parable of Jesus about the royal feast at the King's son's marriage), and sometimes with spices. Fermented wine was rare in early Roman times; was only used as an act of worship in the temples, and men under thirty years of age, and women all their lives, were forbidden to use it, except at the sacrifices.³

Fresh grape-juice was called *mustum*, and to make it keep without fermentation *it was boiled until it became thick*, like our *treacle*, or *molasses*, and in that state was named *defrutum*, that is, "made from fruit," and stored away in large jars for future use, to be eaten spread upon bread, as we do butter or treacle, or mixed and stirred up in water, as we do sugar in tea, to make a drink, as stated above. The Greek scientist, Aristotle, says that by keeping for a time in the skins or jars,

³ Valerius Maximus, Book ii. 1, 5; vi. 3; Aulus Gellius, Book x. 23; Pliny xiv. 13.

it became as thick as butter, and had to be cut out by spoons. The Roman writer, Pliny, records that when the grape-juice was boiled down to *one-third of its bulk*, to secure the finest flavor,—that is, to be made into the “best wine,”—it was called *sapa*, from which word comes our vocables, “sapid,” well-flavored, and “savory,” delicious in taste.⁴

To give variety of flavor, herbs and spices were often boiled in the juice during its preparation.

Such was the “best wine” of the Ancients, the sweetest and nicest flavored to the taste,—not as we imagine and mean, the most intoxicating, when we speak of “best wine.”

It is practically certain that the “wine” created by Christ at Cana was of the non-intoxicating kind, which, as I have shown by the references to them, the ancient writers upon agriculture and domestic economy say was, “the ordinary drink of the people” in daily life. The knowledge of that fact disposes of the argument I have heard even good ministers of religion found upon the narrative, asserting that the guests were all drunk before the miraculous wine was produced, and therefore that Jesus decided to make them more so, to show His disciples and the people the sacred nature of intoxicants.

I am not exaggerating when I state this, for I have more than once had that very argument brought against me in private discussion over the subject. And indeed the old translations seem to justify their contention. I need not add that these old versions were made innocently by men ignorant both of the Greek and Hebrew domestic habits, and therefore of the idiomatic powers and import of their languages.

REFERENCES BY ST. PAUL

Rom. 14: 21-23; chap. 15: 1-3: “It is noble not to eat flesh, or to drink wine, or anything by which your brother is made to stumble, or is offended, or is weakened.

“You have faith? Have it by yourself before God—he is happy who does not convict himself by what he approves! and all not originating from faith is sin. And we, the strong, ought

⁴ Pliny, Book.

to support the weakness of the feeble, and not to indulge ourselves. Let each make himself pleasant to his neighbor to promote loving-kindness. For Christ did not indulge Himself."

What a loving but forcible reproof the above is to our missionaries, whose mania for denouncing the Mohammedan and Hindu peoples for not habitually drinking intoxicating liquors is notable. Nay, I may add, forcing their converts to drink them as the first and most essential sign that they have become Christians, until, as a fact, the names "Christian" and "drunkard" are held in the popular mind of Asia and Africa to have the same meaning,—“All the Sahibs' servants in Calcutta are 'Christian' now,” said Mr. Bayard Taylor's native attendants to him during his travels in India, “for they all drink brandy!” And that is the popular idea of the essence of Christianity. I know this from personal acquaintance with educated Asiatics, and it is painful to hear them speak on the subject—at least, to my feelings.

“I did not know our religion had spread so much in India,” the American statesman says he answered.

“Oh, yes, it has,” was his attendant's reply, “*for they all drink brandy!*”

I surely need not ask our missionaries to reflect on this record.

Ephesians 5: 18-21: “Be not drunk with wine, in which there is folly; but instead be full of the Spirit, speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and dancing in your hearts to the Lord; giving thanks at all times for everything, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to the God and Father,—and supporting one another in a reverence of Christ.”

The Apostle here refers to intoxicating drink, which he condemns, not to the simple unfermented grape-juice he did in Rom. 14: 21, which I quote immediately above. Surely I need not add a comment.

1 Tim. 3: 8: “Deacons should be grave; not deceitful, or addicted to much wine, nor greedy for money, but they should preserve the secret of the faith with a pure understanding.”

In this rule for the ministers of the Church there is no indication whether the Apostle speaks of the ordinary domestic unfermented wine of his day commonly used then in domestic life, as I have shown, or of the same juices fermented so as to be intoxicating. Probably he meant the latter, *which he clearly forbids.*

1 Tim. 5:23: "No longer drink water alone, but use with a little wine for the stomach, because of your frequent infirmities."

This advice of the Apostle to his friend is the favorite field of battle of those who claim the habit of using intoxicating drinks to be commanded to Christians. But St. Paul could hardly have so contradicted himself in his prohibition of the habitual use of intoxicating wine to the ministers of the Church as he had done (see 3:8 above), and a few lines afterwards have ordered Timothy, who held an Apostolic position in it, to regularly drink such liquor? It is only gross ignorance of the customs of olden times, and of the idiomatic use of the Greek language that originated the absurd import thus put upon St. Paul's words. "Stomach wine," or "*wine for the stomach,*" the old writers upon Greek medicine tell us, was grape-juice, prepared as a thick, unfermented syrup, for use as a medicament for dyspeptic and weak persons, and there cannot be a doubt but that was the "wine for the stomach," the Apostle told his friend to "use" a little of mixed with water, which it is evident that Timothy, like other pious Jews of that period, restricted himself to, and had drunk previously, so as to avoid breaking the Levitical command against priests drinking "wine or strong drink" during the course of their ministry.

However, as the passage has been made, by mistranslation and perversion, a serious stumbling-block, I venture to give it as in the Greek:

"No longer drink water alone, but use with a little wine for the stomach, because of your frequent infirmities."

The Apostle's use of the dative case, which must be rendered in English by the adverb "with," indicates that "a little stomach wine" should, as a medicament, be mixed, or "mingled" as in other parts it is translated, *with water*, as the

syrup anciently prepared from grapes and other fruits was done for use as a tonic to the stomach in cases of dyspepsia. When this fact is known, the absurdity of teaching that this bit of advice is a sacred sanction for always drinking intoxicant wine, in the place of water as a beverage, will be seen. Missionaries to pagan nations ought especially to avoid repeating the false rendering of the versions of this Epistle, which are unfortunately by irreflection put into their hands.

Among the recommendations of this book is the following from the Dean of Durham, D.D.: "The book is full of the most interesting matter, and I feel sure that you have rescued the Bible from the degrading imputations of taking sides with the disciples of drink. I wish the truths contained in it could be forced into people's heads. It ought to be spread broadcast."

PART TWO

INTOXICATING WINE AT THE HOLY COMMUNION

*Extracts by Frank Hamilton from
THE BIBLE AND WINE by Ferrar Fenton.*

The Anglican bishops at the Lambeth Conference also declared, "That the example of our Lord *necessitates* the use of fermented (and therefore alcoholic and intoxicating) wine in the administration of the Lord's Supper." This is indeed a strange statement for bishops of the Church of God to have made. I ask, What historical or other facts have the bishops in proof of this God-dishonouring statement? and I answer, None. They have simply made it because the Roman, Greek, and Anglican Churches have used intoxicating drink for commemorating Christ's great act of atonement for the sins of men for generations. But their using it is no proof that Jesus Christ used it at the first institution, or that it was used by the Apostles and the sub-Apostolic Churches. If Christ did use it, it never should have been used; and there is not a trace of evidence to show that His "fruit of the vine" was intoxicating. We know that at the end of the second century and onwards heathen customs were gradually introduced into the Christian system, and took the place of Apostolic usages.

There is no divine authority for the use of wine at all, fermented or unfermented, at the Passover; and at what period it was introduced by the Jewish priests no one appears to know. But all agree that Almighty God absolutely forbade even the presence of *bharm* (yeast, ferment, leaven) at the Passover, because it is the cause of putrefaction. It pu-

trefies or rots fruit, corn, vegetables, etc., etc., and is the emblem of corruption, disease, and death, and not of life. Fermentation is putrefaction, and it would be almost, if not quite, impossible in our Lord's time to have found any fermented wine that did not contain *bharm* (leaven). And therefore, according to the teaching of the bishops, Jesus Christ, the divine Son of God, used and sanctioned the use of the very thing which had been strictly forbidden to be even present in the dwellings of the people at the Passover!

Now, Jesus Christ described the wine that was being used at His Passover as the "fruit of the vine," *e.g.*, the offspring of the vine, or that which is borne of the vine. Now, the vine does not bear intoxicating drink. The fruit of the vine is not intoxicating. There is no alcohol in the fruit of the vine. It is pure, good, wholesome, and health-giving, a beautiful emblem of the life and strength-giving grace of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Intoxicating wine is the emblem of disease, sin, and death. Moreover, just think of the condition the party keeping the Passover must have been in; for the Jewish *Mishna* (chap. 10) says: "A person shall not have less than four cups of wine, even if they be given to him from the fund devoted to the charitable support of the very poor. Each cup must contain the quarter of a quarter of a hin—that is three gills English measure—so that the four cups would contain twelve gills, or a bottle and a-half (three pints)." So Dr Lightfoot tells us (Vol. 9, p. 151). If the wine used was fermented grape-juice, the four cups would contain about six ounces of pure alcohol, equal to twelve ounces of proof spirit; and when we remember that each member of the family of twelve years of age and upwards had to drink four cups, twelve gills, it is certain that, if the wine was intoxicating, they must have been drunk at the end of the feast, especially the women and the boys and girls who were not accustomed to the use of intoxicating wine. How terrible to think of the mass of drunkenness in the Jewish families on the Passover night!

It is perfectly revolting to think that our Lord and Saviour could countenance or sanction such a man-injuring and God-dishonoring system.

Jesus Christ was God's High Priest. And Almighty God had strictly forbidden the priests to use intoxicating wine when ministering before Him. In Lev. 10: 8-10 it is written: "The Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Drink no wine nor strong drink, thou nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tent of meeting, that ye die not: it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations: and that ye may put difference between the holy and the common, and between the *unclean* and the *clean*." God had also forbidden the presence of all fermented things at the Passover Service. It was therefore impossible for His Incarnate Son to act contrary to the Father's will, for He said, "I am come not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it" (Matt. 5: 17).

Although the customs of the Jews are no certain guide to Christians in this matter, yet it is an undeniable fact that vast numbers of pious Jewish families have used unfermented wine at the Passover all down the ages, and are using such wine now year by year. It is simply "the fruit of the vine." They cut up a quantity of raisins and place them in an earthen vessel, and add water to them, and allow them to simmer in the oven for a time, then separate the juice from the skins and pips, then put it in the Passover vessel, and they use the wine (juice) for the Passover Service.

In our Lord's time there was always an ample supply of the pure "fruit of the vine," which was preserved in an unfermented state.

The theologians have taught, and alas, still teach, that the contents of the cup which our Lord said was His blood was of the same nature as the thing which the Scriptures had said was as the poison of serpents—as the adder's poison. How can such a death-producing thing be a fit emblem of the life-giving power of the blood of Jesus Christ?

It is painful to realize how the Churches have erred, and misrepresented Christ, and misled the nations by forcing the use of intoxicating wine on the Lord's table and upon mankind.

The general word for wine, *oinos*, is never used in Holy Scripture to describe the wine used at the Lord's Supper.

Is this by chance, or is it of design? Surely it is of design, because *oinos* might be intoxicating, but the fruit of the vine never is.

According to God's command (Lev. 10:9) and the teaching of the Jewish *Mishna*, they were not allowed to drink intoxicating wine when serving before the Lord. How terrible it is to be taught by Christian theologians that Christ broke the divine law, and taught His infant Church to break the law He Himself had made, for He was the lawgiver with the Father and the Holy Ghost.

If the wine which was used at the first institution was intoxicating, then the great body of Nazarites, Rechabites, the followers of John the Baptist, and especially the Essenes (a vast multitude of the best of the people), would be prevented partaking, because they never used intoxicating wine of any kind. Jeremiah's description of the Nazarites might fairly be used to describe these holy people. They "were purer than snow, whiter than milk, more ruddy in body than rubies" (Lam. 4:7). These people were all abstainers from intoxicating drink, and were in much favor with the Lord. Surely it is not possible that the Lord of life would cause all these people, who were the cream of society in that day in Jerusalem, to violate their consciences by forcing upon them the intoxicating cup.

It is most trying to many communicants who are abstainers to be forced either to partake of the intoxicating wine or to pass the cup. It is especially trying for them to have to take their children to the holy table, where they will taste intoxicating drink for the first time. And some of it is most intoxicating, having not less than from 10 to 30 per cent alcohol in it.

The four passages in the New Testament (R.V.), in which is given the account of the Institution of the Lord's Supper.

ST. MATTHEW 26: 26 to 29.	ST. MARK 14: 22 to 25.	ST. LUKE 22: 15 to 20.	1 CORINTHIANS 11: 23 to 26.
<p>26 And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. 27 And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, 28 Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins. 29 But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth OF THIS FRUIT OF THE VINE, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.</p>	<p>22 And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed, brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye; this is my body. 23 And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it. 24 And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many. 25 Verily, I say unto you, I will no more drink OF THE FRUIT OF THE VINE, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.</p>	<p>15 And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: 16 For I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. 17 And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves, 18 For I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth OF THE FRUIT OF THE VINE, until the kingdom of God shall come. 19 And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. 20 And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you.</p>	<p>23 For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; 24 and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you; this do in remembrance of me. 25 In like manner also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. 26 For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.</p>

NOTE.—In no one of these four passages does the word *oinos*, "wine," occur.

The fruit of the Vine before and after it is fermented.

THE COMPONENT PARTS of
THE FRUIT OF THE VINE,
UNFERMENTED.

Gluten. }
Gum. }
Aroma. }

Albumen.
Sugar.
Tannin.
Tartaric Acid.
Malic Acid.
Potash.
Lime.
Sulphur.
Phosphorus.

THE COMPONENT PARTS of
THE ALCOHOLIC LIQUOR into which
the Fruit of the Vine is
CHANGED BY FERMENTATION.

Alcohol.
Acetic Acid.
OEnanthic Ether.
Extractive.
Succinic Acid.
Glycerine.
Bouquet.

Albumen.
Sugar.
Tannin.
Tartaric Acid.
Malic Acid.
Potash.
Lime.
Sulphur.
Phosphorus.

EXPLANATION.—The reader will observe at the top of the Left Table, in a bracket, the names of three constituents, *Gluten*, *Gum* and *Aroma*, which do not appear in the Right Table. These are the constituents of the grape which are wholly destroyed by fermentation.

At the top of the Right Table will be seen in italics, seven constituents, *Alcohol*, *Acetic Acid*, *OEnanthic Ether*, *Extractive*, *Succinic Acid*, *Glycerine*, and *Bouquet*, which are not constituents of the grape, and do not appear in the Left Table. These are entirely new products, generated out of the three constituents of the Left Table, which have been destroyed by fermentation (putrefaction).

Other constituents appear in both Tables. The introduction of the italic letters in the Right Table is intended to indicate that the proportions of the constituents in which they occur have been materially diminished in the transformation of grape-juice into alcoholic liquor. The thick black letters represent what is left of the original grape after fermentation.

Thus it will be seen that by a triple process of destruction, addition, and abstraction—the result of fermentation—*grape-juice loses all the essential qualities of "THE FRUIT OF THE VINE."* It should be specially noted that, in parting with its gluten and gum, and with nearly the whole of its sugar and albumen, the nutritive and life-sustaining qualities of the fluid are destroyed, for it is to these constituents that grapes owe their value as human food.

Thus it is demonstrated that

ALCOHOLIC WINE is not the "FRUIT OF THE VINE."

There are *Thirteen* different words or vocables used (in the Bible); *Nine* in the Hebrew and Chaldee, and *Four* in the Greek, all of which are rendered by the European translators indiscriminately as "Wine or Strong Drink," although all intrinsically are solid substances, but which may be turned into intoxicants by human ingenuity. When, however, we examine the passages where these words are used, we find the sacred writers speak, in the most numerous cases, of them, not as intoxicants, but as foods, which was their ordinary form of consumption. *Where distinct reference is made to them as means after human manipulation of intoxication, drunkenness, and debauchery, their use in that form is invariably condemned and vehemently denounced by the Prophets and Moralists of the Bible as the causes of personal sin and national ruin.* Their use in these forms of alcoholic liquors, or fermented wine, was absolutely forbidden in the religious ordinances of the Temple or Altars, and especially from the sacred rites of the Passover, and to all priests during the period of their ministrations.

Grape Juice, unfermented, is "WINE," and a lawful emblem.

ST. CYPRIAN, A.D. 230.—“When the Lord gives the name of His body to bread, composed of the union of many particles, He indicates that our people, whose sins He bore, are united. And when He calls WINE SQUEEZED OUT FROM BUNCHES OF GRAPES His blood, He intimates that our flock are *similarly* joined by the varied *admixture of a united multitude.*”—Epst. 75 ad Magnum.

THE FOURTH COUNCIL OF BRAGA, held A. D. 675.—Reference being made to some who used no other wine but what they pressed out of the cluster at the Lord's Table, and to others who communicated with the unpressed cluster, the Council condemned the use of uncrushed grapes with water—thus, by implication, allowing the use of expressed grape-juice. (Dupin *Eccl. His.* p. 20, 3rd. Edition, pub. 1724. Bingham, *Ant. of the Christ*, Ch. v. 410).

THOMAS AQUINAS, 13th Century.—“In unripe grapes the juice is still in process of being *developed*, and has not yet the form of wine; *therefore* this Sacrament cannot be fulfilled in the juice of *unripe grapes.*”

“The juice of *ripe* grapes, on the other hand, has already the form of wine; for its sweet taste evidences a mellowing change, which is its completion by natural heat (as it is said in the *Meteorologica*, iv. 3, not far from the beginning); and for that reason this Sacrament can be fulfilled with the juice of *ripe grapes.*”

ST. ANSELM, Archbishop of Canterbury, A. D. 1096.—“He behaved so that all men loved him as their father. He bore with even mind the ways and weaknesses of each. To each he supplied what he saw they wanted. Oh, how many, given over in sickness, has he brought back to health by his loving care! You found it so, Hereward, in your helpless old age, when disabled by years, as well as by heavy infirmity, you had lost all power in your body except in your tongue, and were fed by his hand, and *refreshed by wine squeezed from the grapes into his other hand*, from which you drank it, and were at last restored to health. For no other drink, as you used to say, could you relish, nor from any other hand.” (Quoted from *Eadmer* by DEAN CHURCH, in his life of St. Anselm, p. 81, new ed., Lond., 1882.)

*There is much danger to some Communicants in
Communicating in Fermented Wine.*

Dr. B. W. RICHARDSON, F.R.S.—“Dr. Kerr has drawn no imaginary picture of the danger menacing reformed drunkards in taking the Communion in Fermented Wine. I say the danger is very great indeed in regard to a considerable number of people. The physician’s room is, in fact, a confessional. Very often statements are made to us physicians which are made to no others. In respect of this very question, hardly a month passes but some one speaks to me on this very point. I could at this moment, if it were right to do so, name at least ten persons who wish to accept the Communion, and who do not go to it from the fear lest they should fall back into those ways from which they have been rescued.”—CHAIRMAN’S speech, Church Homiletical Society, Chapter House of St. Paul’s, London, Nov. 1st, 1881.

The REV. NEWMAN HALL, LL.B.—“Unfermented Wine has been adopted at Christ Church, Lambeth, for the Holy Communion, by the unanimous opinion of the minister and elders. The Rev. N. Hall explained from the pulpit the reasons for this decision. There were many reclaimed drunkards in our churches, who feared that the taste of alcohol might act upon them like a spark to gunpowder. This was no idle fear. He had been told in Edinburgh, on good authority, of two elders of churches who had thus fallen. The previous week he had been told by a brother minister of a drunkard in the West of England who was frequently taken home in a wheelbarrow from the public-house. He became a teetotaller, and, as was hoped, a Christian. He joined a Congregational Church. The next Sunday again he tasted the intoxicating cup, and that very week was taken home intoxicated. Mr. N. Hall referred to his own father, who, as deacon of an Independent Church, and then as elder of Surrey Chapel, during 30 years, handed the cup to others, but never tasted it himself.”

A young minister of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church changed from unfermented to fermented wine at his communion services, because he was taught that otherwise he would dishonor his Lord, who made, drank and used intoxicating wine.

DID THE LORD JESUS CHRIST DRINK INTOXICATING WINE?

The theologians have taught all down the ages that our blessed Lord and Saviour did drink intoxicating drink as His ordinary everyday drink, because they say there was no such thing as unintoxicating wine in His day. But the eyes of some of the most learned of *our* day appear to be opening wide enough to see that the theologians were wrong.

Dr. Kynaston, Professor of Greek at Durham University, says: "We cannot prove from the words in the Bible that our Lord did or did not drink intoxicating wine." This is a step in the right direction. The theologians have also taught equally definitely that *oinos* always meant intoxicating wine; but Sir Richard Jebb, Professor of Greek at Cambridge University said that "*oinos* is a general term, and might include all kinds of beverages."

Anacreon, who wrote some five hundred years, B.C., Ode lli, says:

"Only males tread the grapes,
Setting free the *oinos* (wine)."

Here, at this early period, we see that the juice in the grapes was called (wine) *oinos*. And all sane persons know that the juice in the grapes is not intoxicating. Nothing is clearer to those who have studied this question than that the Hebrew word *yain* and the Greek word *oinos* were, as Professor Sir R. Jebb says of *oinos*, general words in those early days, and were used to describe sometimes the fruit on the vines, the juice in the grapes, the juice when it was being pressed out, when it was preserved in an unfermented state and therefore unintoxicating, and when it was fermented and intoxicating

There is overwhelming proof that there has been in use all down the centuries, in all grape-growing countries, grape-juice fermented and intoxicating, and also an abundance of grape-juice preserved in an unfermented state, and therefore not intoxicating; and both have been called wine.

But the unintoxicating, in addition to being called wine, has been called by various other names, such as *glukus*, *vinum*, *mustum*, *sapa*, *careum*, *siraeum*, *hepsema*, *pekmez*, *new wine*. A great many more names might be added, but a full description may be seen in Dr. Norman Kerr's book on *Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical*, also in the *Temperance Bible Commentary* by Dr. F. R. Lees and Dr. Dawson Burns. These words mainly describe a wine made from grape-juice by reducing the juice to a sweet liquid by boiling. It was too thick and too sweet to drink pure. And this is a main reason why the Greeks and Romans added so much water to it before drinking, and also why water was added to it before it was used at the Lord's Supper. Water was also added to the intoxicating wine to reduce its intoxicating power.

Varro speaks of "gathering wine."

Cato of "hanging wine" (grapes on the vine).

Columella of "unintoxicating wine."

Celsus says: "Gather the berries of the myrtle, and from them express wine."

Ovid says: "And scarce can the grapes contain the wine they have within."

Ibycus says:

"And new born clusters teem with wine,
Beneath the shadowy foliage of the vine."

Goethe beautifully says:

"And bending down, the grapes o'erflow
With wine into the vat below."

There is therefore clearly no justification whatever for the misleading statements of the theologians, viz., that there was

no such thing as unintoxicating wine in the days of our Lord. And it is equally clear that there is no proof, either in holy Scripture or out of it, that our Lord ever drank intoxicating wine.

It is no more true to say that the word "wine" always meant intoxicating wine than it is to say that the word "bread" always meant fermented bread just as the word "bread" sometimes meant fermented bread and sometimes unfermented. So the word *oinos* (wine) sometimes was used to describe the grape-juice when it was fermented and sometimes when it was unfermented. St. Matthew 26: 26, "Jesus took bread and blessed it." Here it is not stated whether the bread was fermented or not, but we know it was unfermented (unleavened), because it was the Passover bread. Haggai 1: 11, "I called for drought upon the corn, and upon the new wine, and upon the oil." It is clear that the new wine in this verse means the growing grapes, for if the wine was in the casks or skin bottles the drought could have no effect upon it. The translation in this passage, like many others, is misleading; instead of "new wine" it should be "vine-fruit" (*Thirosh*). Thank God! there is therefore not even a trace of evidence to prove that our Saviour Jesus Christ ever drank or sanctioned the use of intoxicating drink,

HISTORY SHOWS THAT THERE HAS BEEN UNFERMENTED WINE ALL DOWN THE AGES

The theologians have denied the existence of unfermented wine and have asserted that all drinks described by the words *shekar*, *thirosh*, *yain*, or *oinos* were fermented and intoxicating. This theory I have already controverted, but it is most important in this discussion to show that unfermented wine has been well known, and has been drunk and used more or less for sacramental purposes all down the ages.

It has been known by many names, but the thing itself has existed, and does exist, in many countries at this day. In fact, all the grape-juice the earth produces could be preserved in an unfermented state.

I have shown that it was well known and much used by the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans. Isaiah says: "Buy *yain* (wine) and milk." Aristotle says: "*Oinos glukus*" (thick sweet wine) is wine, though it is not so in reality, for its taste is not vinous, therefore it does not intoxicate."

Columella speaks of "unintoxicating good wine." He also gives the following recipe for preserving it unfermented, *i.e.*, "That your *must* may always be as sweet as when it is new, thus proceed. Before you apply the press to the grapes take the newest *must* from the lake, put it into a new amphora, bung it up and cover it up very carefully with pitch, lest any water should enter, then sink it in a cistern or pond of pure cold water, and allow no part of the amphora to remain above the surface. After forty days take it out; it will remain sweet for a year" (Book 12; ch. 29). And if for one year, it is equally true to say it will remain sweet for many years.

Rev. S. Robinson, Missionary at Damascus, when writing on the food of the country, says: "The fruit of the vine is a substantial part of the people's food from August to December. Bread and grapes are substantially the food of the people. The fruit of the vine is preserved in substance as thick as honey, and called *dibs*."

Pliny, who lived in the apostolic age, says: "The first of the artificial *wines* has *wine* for its basis; it is called *adynamon* (i.e., without strength), and is made in the following manner: twenty sextarii of white *must* are boiled down with half that quantity of water until the amount of the water is lost by evaporation. This beverage is given to invalids (stomach wine that Timothy was advised to take a little of) to whom it is apprehended that *wine* (i.e., fermented wine) *may prove injurious*" (Book 14: ch. 19).

Dr. H. Adler, Chief Rabbi of the British Empire, says: "I know of no authority for limiting the use of the word 'wine' to fermented wine" (Speech, Medical Society, London, Feb. 20th, 1883).

Sir James Miller, Professor at Edinburgh, Surgeon to Queen Victoria, said to an extensive wine-grower on the Moselle: "Have you any unfermented wine—juice of the grape?" And received for reply: "Tuns, ten years old" (*Nephalism*, pp. 147, 148).

The juice of the grape has been preserved in an unfermented state in all grape-growing countries, and in some for 3,000 years, and it has been called "wine." It is called "wine" by nearly all the great travellers and in ancient and modern dictionaries. It is sometimes called "new or sweet wine" in the Bible.

A short time ago I met a missionary who is laboring in Syria, and I said, "Do the natives preserve their grape-juice in an unfermented state and use it as drink and food?" And the answer was, "Yes, they do; it is thick and very sweet, and is in common use in the villages in Syria. They make us presents of it, and we eat it with porridge and drink it mixed with milk, also use it as you use golden syrup with bread." Here we have the very custom continued to our day, referred

to by the prophet Isaiah (55: 1), where he says, "Come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." I have drunk some of this myself, and it is a delightful drink. It is simply the Greek *glukus*, or the Latin *mustum* or *defrutum*, mixed with milk.

PHILIP SIDERSKY, a Christian Jew, told Mrs. Hamilton that at the Passover Supper the Jews squeeze the juice from a bunch of grapes into the chalice.

FRANK HAMILTON.