

"WHOM HE LOVETH, HE CHASTENETH"

(Owen Insist, in the Century Magazine.)

Even as the sculptor's chisel, flake on flake,
Scales off the marble till the beauty, pent
Sleeping within the block's imprisonment,
Beneath the wounding strokes begin to wake,

So love, which the high gods have chosen to make
Their sharpest instrument, has shaped and bent
The stubborn spirit, till it yields, content,
Its few and slender graces for love's sake.

But the perfected statue proudly wears
Its whiteness for the world to see and prize,
The past hurt buried in forgetfulness;

While the imperfect nature, grown more wise,
Turns with its newborn good, the streaming tears
Of pain undried, the chastening Hand to bless.

PROHIBITION vs. LICENSE.

We have decided to open our columns for a limited time to the discussion of the question of Prohibition vs. License, and have made arrangements with two representative writers to contribute each alternate week a communication upon the subject. We believe our readers will be interested in a fair and manly discussion of this burning question, and we trust the writers will deal with the subject in a manner becoming broad and liberal-minded men.

BIBLE WINES.

To the Editor of the Critic:—

SIR,—“A more barefaced assumption” was never put forth than that the Prohibitionists assert: “the unfermented nature of Scripture wine.” We have, however, proved, over and over again, that both fermented and unfermented wine was in common use among the ancients, and that it continues in use to some extent in wine-producing countries down to the present day. The man who assumes that the (*oinos*) wine made by our Saviour at the wedding of Cana, and that used by him when instituting the Supper as an emblem of His own Blood, were the same article as that which Solomon says “is a mocker,” must have a strange view of the Divine character and attributes. Solomon, moreover, does not intimate here that the *excessive use of wine* is a mocker, but the article itself “wine is a mocker,” and the experience of thousands of years have confirmed the wisdom of Solomon, in giving utterances to this truth. This is the very same article he so graphically describes in Prov. xxiii, ver. 31—“Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color (eye) in the cup, when it moveth itself aright (32) At the last, it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder.” W. B. Richardson, M. D., F. R. S., says the English language is incapable of more accurately describing fermenting wine than that used by the inspired writer in the above quotation, and this article was not, according to Solomon, to be even looked upon, much less used as a beverage.

It is not only “a barefaced assumption,” but an altogether inexcusably absurd one, for any man to assert, that the Greek word “*oinos*” means invariably fermented wine, or that “the cognate word ‘*vinum*,’ in Latin, everywhere bears the same meaning. The merest novice in a knowledge of these languages knows that these words, with their cognates, “*yayin*,” in Hebrew, and *vine*, in English, are generic, as the word man or grain in English, the former meaning all mankind of every race, color or sex, and the latter all kinds of cereals, the context alone determining the specific kinds: and so *oinos* means all sorts or any sort of wine, whether fermented or unfermented. In Jer. xxiii, 9—“I am like a drunken man, and a man whom *yayin* hath overcome.” In other texts, *yayin* signified an unintoxicating drink; as in Jer. xlviii, 33—“I have caused *yayin* to fail from the wine press none shall tread with shouting”; and in Isa. xvi, 10—“The treaders shall tread out no *yayin* in their presses.” Literature, ancient and modern, affords numerous instances of unfermented or unintoxicating grape juice being called *oinos* and *vinum*.

ANACREON, 510, B.C., says—“Only males tread the grapes, setting free the (*oinos*) wine.”—Ode lii.

OVID—“And scarce the grapes contain the (*vinum*) wine they . . . have within.”—*Trist* liv., iv., ch. 6.

COLLAMELLA—*Ineritula* . . . *boni vini*. “Unintoxicating . . . good wine.” Similar sentences may be quoted in large numbers.

DR. ADAM CLARKE, on Gen. xlii—“From this we find that *vine*, anciently, was the mere expressed juice of the grapes without fermentation. This was anciently the *yayin* of the Hebrews the *oinos* of the Greeks, and the *mustum* of the Latins.—(Com. i, 259, Lond. 183).

PROF. MOSES STEWART says—“Facts show that the ancients not only preserved their wine unfermented, but regarded it as of a higher flavor and finer quality than fermented wine.”

In his “World before the Flood,” James Montgomery represents the wife of Enoch “midst fruits and flowers,” as engaged

“Plucking the purple clusters from the vine
To crown the cup of unfermented wine.”—Canto, 3

Kitto's Cyclopaedia, article Wine—“*Yayin* in Bible use is a very general term, including every species of wine made from grapes (*oinos ampelinos*) though in later ages it became extended in its application to wine made from other substances.”

DR. MURPHY, Professor of Hebrew, at Belfast, Ireland, says—“*Yayin* denotes all stages of the juice of the grape.” “*Yayin* (sometimes written *yin*, *yain*, or *ain*), stands for the expressed juice of the grape, the context sometimes indicating whether the juice had undergone or not the process of fermentation. It is mentioned one hundred and forty-one times.”

PROF. MOSES STEWART, one of the best Philologists of his time, again

says—“There are in the Scriptures (Hebrew) but two generic words to designate such drinks as may be of an intoxicating nature when fermented, and which are not so before fermentation. In the Hebrew Scriptures the word *yayin*, in its broadest meaning, designates *grape-juice*, or the *liquid which the fruit of the vine yields*. This may be new or old, sweet or sour, fermented or unfermented, intoxicating or un-intoxicating. The simple idea of *grape juice* or *vine liquor* is the basis and essence of the word, in whatever connection it may stand. The specific sense which we must often assign to the word arises not from the word itself, but from the connection in which it stands.” He is a bold man who will dispute this scholar.

The 70 Jews invariably rendered this word *yayin* by the word *oinos* in the Greek Septuagint, and King James translates with the recent revisors, render these words by the English word *wine*, and the Latin vulgate by the word *vinum*, hence the Bible does not, as the one-wine theory compels it to commend and condemn the same article, but condemns the bad or intoxicating, and commends the good or unfermented.

In short, I might quote almost indefinitely from ancient classic writers, as well as modern critics of the first standing, proving that these words have been used in all ages to express both fermented and unfermented wine, but the above is sufficient for our present purpose, and will show that there is no excuse for ignorance on this point, and I can assure “F. T.” that no intelligent Prohibitionist was ever so stupid, as either to say or believe, that either Noah, Nahal, or the Corinthians, ever got drunk on unfermented stuff, and that our Lord was a wine-bibber, as the Pharisees falsely charged him with being, is as untruthful as to say that J. B. Finch called Goldwin Smith a blackguard, when he only said that he was surprised that a man of his well-known standing could stoop to “use the tools of a blackguard” or worse to that effect.

I will more fully examine the Bible wine question in future letters, and there is no phase of this whole controversy I approach with more confidence. Though I make no pretensions to a personal knowledge of the ancient languages, I do claim to be tolerably familiar with what the best Philologists and scholars have said and written upon the subject, and there is no truth taught in the word of God made more clear to my mind, than that the Bible nowhere sanctions the use of fermented or alcoholic wine or strong drink as a beverage, however moderately, but everywhere condemns its use, or than that our blessed Lord neither made, used, or sanctioned its use for any purpose whatever. As “F. T.” seems incapable of supporting his assertions on this part of the argument, I cannot see but that I shall have to set about “carrying the war into Africa,” and prove a negative for him, or some of your readers may fancy he has some shadow of ground for his repeated, but untenable assertions.

With reference to F. T.'s “bubble pricking” and the “kind of wine which would have had any particularly good effect on Timothy's stomach,” I may say that unfermented wine was regularly used and recommended by Aristotle, Pliny and other ancients, particularly for diseases of the stomach.

Pliny mentions a wine in good repute, *atuminum*—that is, without power, without strength. He particularly states that the wines most adapted to the sick are “*Utilissimum vinum omnibus saeco visibus fractis*,” which the alcoholic wine men translate, “For the sick, wine is most useful when its forces have been broken by the strainer,” or filter, after which it will not ferment.

Athenaus says of the sweet Lasbon, “Let him take sweet wine, either mixed with water or warmed, especially that called *protopos*, as being very good for the stomach.” (Nott, Lon. Ed., p. 96.) Why not treat Paul honestly then, and grant that he recommended Timothy to take the wine that Pliny said was good for the sick, and Athenaus for the stomach. Why try to make him countenance the alcoholic poison which is so palatable to the perverted tastes of modern “wine-bibbers,” when he was recommending a very different article, and only as a medicine. It is not at all difficult to “prick” the absurd “bubbles” blown off into the air by the lovers of alcoholic wines and liquors, as excuses for their wine-drinking practices.

Truly “wine is a mocker.” God's word says so, and no one doubts that intoxicating wine is here referred to. Why is it called of God a mocker? Surely not because when used to excess it is hurtful. Beef is hurtful when used to excess. Is beef a mocker? We must all be agreed, I think, that wine is a mocker because of its inherent quality—a something in the wine itself by which its users are lured into excess. That something is alcohol. It deceives men. Its effects are gradual almost imperceptible. It is seduction, tripping, alas! the noblest and the best before they are aware. So it deceived Noah when he drank of the wine and was drunken. So it deceived Ephraim and Judah, priest and prophet, when they were “swallowed up of wine.” It is in the very nature of wine, as an essential element, this power of deceit. Hence the Scriptural injunction, “It is not for kings to drink wine, nor for princes strong drink; lest they drink, and forget the law, and pervert judgment.” Hence also the command, “Look not upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth its eye, when it goeth down smoothly.” The very quality is here described that gives to wine its deceitful power. These are the signs of the presence of alcohol. No one doubts that alcoholic wine is here referred to, and it is this kind of wine that we are solemnly commanded not to look upon, for this kind is a “mocker.” The gule of the serpent is in the mixture, and at last it giveth the serpent's bite.

Equally absurd is the idea that because Paul says an elder should “not be given to much wine,” that it follows he may drink in moderation, for by this mode of interpreting Scripture any sort of sin and wrongdoing may be justified. For instance, “Thou shalt not kill” would imply that you might abuse a man up to the point of killing. “A Bishop must be the husband of one wife” would imply that others than Bishops could have as many as they choose. “Let not the sun go down on your wrath” is a reason for indulging in anger of any kind from sunrise to sunset, etc. How absurd,