

to this? Can intoxicating drink, in any case, be properly recommended as an antidote to trouble? Hannah did not think so (1 Samuel i. 15; cf. James v. 13). Any rendering of the passage which will accord with morality and religion, must exclude from the initial word, *TENA*, the idea of a command. It may be read, "It is not becoming for kings and princes to drink wine and strong drink, lest they forget the law, though should such drink be given to the afflicted, they will simply drink and forget their own cares, and become unconscious of their own misfortunes." The grammatical concord supports this view, for it is not "give wine and strong drink to the afflicted, and make them forget their troubles," but it is, "Give them wine and strong drink, and the afflicted one will drink (*yis-teh*) and he will forget (*yishkekh*) his distress." This style is common in all languages, as in the proverb, "Give some an inch, and they will take an ell." This may be defined the logical imperative, in distinction from the ethical.—(DR. R. F. LEES.) Or it may be taken as a permission to give wine *MEDICINALLY*. There are cases of general suffering and distress, when wine may be administered with salutary effect. The Samaritan gave it to the wounded traveller, and Paul prescribed it for his "beloved son in the faith." Many a sinking spirit may be revived, and forget his misery under a well-timed restorative. The rule laid down here is, Give not wine to those that are well, in order to gratify their palate, drown reason, and debauch the soul, but to those that are ready to die, in order to soothe and relieve them. In their case, it may deaden the pain, quicken the action of the heart, and lead to restoration. Give the suffering what they need; if they need wine as a restorative, give it.—(BRIDGES, Dr. THOMAS, &c.) At most, this is a permission to give wine *MEDICINALLY*. Give them, if at all, to the perishing, who will find in them oblivion from their sorrows. The whole passage may be viewed as a double declar-