

THE
CYCLOPÆDIA
OF
Temperance and Prohibition.

J. R. MEADER,
DALTON, N. H.

A Reference Book of Facts, Statistics, and General Information
on All Phases of the Drink Question, the Temperance
Movement and the Prohibition Agitation.

FUNK & WAGNALLS.

LONDON.

NEW YORK.

TORONTO.

1891.

Printed in the United States.

All rights reserved.

178.03
C992

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1891, by
FUNK & WAGNALIS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D. C.
[Registered at Stationer's Hall, London, Eng.]

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

from either friends or critics, seems the very height of paradox, and cannot be rationally entertained.

14. Drugged drinks are frequently named, but never as comforters, blessings or legitimate luxuries. Mixed wine, however, is shown in Proverbs to be of two sorts—one the syrup-wine mingled with water at Wisdom's feast, the other drugged wine, upon the seekers of which a woe is elsewhere pronounced. No commentators, of any school or church, have failed to see that the Bible condemns such drinks. The last act of the Redeemer was to refuse the "wine mingled with myrrh," though the Jews often administered it to criminals about to perish, to abate their sensibility to pain and fear.

15. The defenders of strong drink endeavor to prejudice the inquiry by putting a false issue before the people, and by assuming an absurd principle of criticism. They write of their own "One-Wine theory" and of our "Two-Wine theory"—language utterly unmeaning and inapplicable. The real contention is whether the Hebrew words *yayin* and *shekar* are generic or specific terms—a question which only an induction of the terms as used can ever settle. In England, for example, corn is a generic term for grain, which, indeed, is the same word modified; in North America it has become specific, meaning *Indian* corn, not all sorts of grain. If the question were about the quality of a spirit, a wife, a man, a metal or a tree, how would the problem be advanced by a foolish clamor about a "one-spirit" or "two-spirit" theory, a "one-wife" or a "two-wife" theory, etc? The assumption that what a word means in one text it means everywhere else is equally absurd; for it is of the essence of generic terms to be capable of receiving qualifying adjectives. It is the same kind of fallacy as giving a definition with the differentiation left out. As a matter of fact, we have hundreds of examples of the use, during two thousand years, of the word *wine* (in Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, Greek, Latin, French, German, Spanish and English) for the expressed juice of the grape; and sometimes, in the earliest use, for the *grape-fruit* in the cluster.

16. The expression, "fruit of the vine," as translated from both the Hebrew and the Greek, was applied to the expressed juice of the grape, but was never originally

used, like "corn," for the natural fruit—the grape in the cluster. For that purpose a distinct word was employed. In the course of time, through human ignorance, the phrase under consideration came to be applied to the fermented juice of the grape—also called "wine"—because men did not understand the change effected by fermentation, as few do even to-day. When employed by our Saviour, however, we may surely assume that he did not fall into the errors of the Rabbins who "made the law of none effect," but selected that form of wine which was not only innocent but "good."

I close by giving an analysis and contrast of two things, which may help to illuminate the whole subject:

THE SOLID CONSTITUENT PARTS OF VINE-FRUIT:	CONSTITUENTS OF ALCOHOLIC WINE:
I. NATURAL JUICE.	II. FERMENTED JUICE.
Gluten } These totally van-	1 Alcohol, 2 Acetic Acid, 3
Gum } ish from the fer-	(Emanthic-Ether, 4 Suc-
} mented juice.	cinic Acid, 5 Glycerine.
Albumen }	Albumen, 6 pts. out of 7 lost
Sugar }	Sugar, 4 out of 5 lost.
Tannin }	Tannin, 4 out of 6 lost.
Tartaric Acid }	Tartaric Acid, 1 out of 2 lost
Potash } These three	Potash } One-half less.
Sulphur } specially val-	Sulphur } Phosphorus }
Phosphorus } able for blood.	Phosphorus }

At the top of the left-hand column are the names of two constituents not found in the right-hand column. These are wholly destroyed by fermentation, and the first is the distinctive nutritive constituent of the fruit. At the top of the right-hand column will be seen the names of five constituents not contained in the grape. They are new products generated by the destruction of the gluten, gum and other constituents in both columns. Hence, by a triple process of destruction, addition and abstraction (through fermentation) grape-juice loses its essential constituents, and its nutritive character vanishes. In scientific fact, therefore, alcoholic "wine" is not "the fruit of the vine," but an artificial product.

F. R. LEES.

Bible Wines.—1. *Reasons Against the Unfermented-Wine Theory.*—No one in reading the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, without prejudice, would imagine that there were two kinds of wine, intoxicating and the non-intoxicating, mentioned in the holy book. He would find that the same word for wine is used for that which Noah drank to drunkenness, and that which Melchizedek brought

forth to Abraham; for that which is called a "mocker," and that which was used as a drink-offering at God's altar; for that which inflames man, and that which makes glad man's heart; for that which figures God's wrath and man's wickedness, and that which figures our Lord's salvation. (See Gen. 9: 24; 14: 18; Prov. 20: 1; Ex. 29: 40; Isa. 5: 11; Ps. 104: 15; Jer. 25: 15; 51: 7; Isa. 55: 1.) In the New Testament he would find the same thing. The same word in Greek is used for that which Jesus drank and made, and that whose excess is deprecated. In neither Testament is the slightest hint given that there was a difference in these drinks. If there had been a difference we should have found a difference in the word used; or, at least, if the word was the same we should have found some adjective or explanatory phrase to warn us of the difference. For example, when Paul rebuked the Corinthian Christians for their drunkenness at the Lord's Supper, how easy it would have been for him to say to them: "Drink only the unintoxicating wine." If there had been a difference between wines, as intoxicating and unintoxicating, it was his apostolic duty to emphasize that distinction at such a crisis. So again, when the same apostle tells the deacons and old women not to use *much* wine (1 Tim. 3: 8; Tit. 2: 3) he must have meant intoxicating wine, for what reason could he frame for cautioning them not to use much innocuous juice? He did not appear to know that there was a non-intoxicating wine. He advises Timothy (not as a physician, but as a friend) to use a "little," and warns against its excessive use. (1 Tim. 5: 23; Eph. 5: 18; comp. 1 Pet. 4: 3.) The little and the excess evidently refer to the same liquid.

That "fruit of the vine," in the accounts of our Lord's Supper (Matt. 26: 29; Mark 14: 25; Luke 22: 18), is the same as *wine*, and only means the wine used at the time, is evident to anyone who knows that the phrase "fruit of the vine" was the Jewish formula for wine at the Paschal feast. The Jews mingled water with the wine at the Passover to avoid drunkenness, and the blessing said over it was, "Blessed be he that created *the fruit of the vine*." Our Saviour simply used the Paschal term for intoxicating wine. (See Lightfoot on Matt. 26: 29.) Herodotus

uses the same phrase, "fruit of the vine," for intoxicating wine. He represents queen Tomyris as saying to Cyrus: "Be not elated . . . that by the *fruit of the vine* with which, when filled with it, ye so rave," etc. (Herod. 1: 212). The Greek fathers, who certainly knew what "fruit of the vine" meant, always speak of our Saviour using *wine* at the Supper.

Wine is grape-juice fermented. Grape-juice, left to itself, will ferment. To prevent fermentation and keep its juice there is need of elaborate restrictive processes, and they are these that Pliny and Columella refer to, but nowhere do these and other ancient authors refer to these preserved juices as the wine of commerce and the country. They are extraordinary productions, while wine, intoxicating wine, is the only thing known by the name in the ancient poets and essayists. To prove this by quotation would be to write a book of quotations from scores of writers. And what is true of the ancient heathen writers is true of the early Christian fathers. We find not the slightest hint of two kinds of wine, the intoxicating and the non-intoxicating, in any of them. Clement of Alexandria, who is especially quoted by those who would sustain the two-wine theory, warns the young not to use wine, but never suggests an unintoxicating kind. He says of the one kind, which alone he knows: "Toward evening, about supper-time, wine may be used. But we must not go on to intemperate potations." (Clem. Alex. *Paed.* 2: 2.) If preserved grape-juice were a common thing in his day, why did not this Christian father urge this as a substitute for intoxicating wine?

In all the poets of Greece and Rome, such as Anacreon and Horace, we find wine constantly mentioned as an intoxicating drink, if taken to excess. No one in reading these classics would ever suspect there were two kinds of wine, the intoxicating and unintoxicating. We cannot prove a negative by quotations. We declare that no ancient author hints even at two kinds of wine, the intoxicating and unintoxicating, as the ordinary wine drunk by the people, and it is for the two-wine advocates to prove their position by a single honest quotation. There have been plenty of twisted quotations unfairly used, but not one hon-

estly quoted with its context that sustains the two-wine theory. The extraordinary preservation of must has been used for the ordinary making of wine. Now must stands to wine just as dough stands to bread; and must may be called wine just as dough may be called bread. One may loosely say to the baker, "Put your bread into the oven" before it is actually bread; and so one may say, "Do not touch my wine," to one who is meddling with the must before it becomes wine. So, also, poetically, one may say, "My vineyard bears the repaying wine;" just as another poet says, "My ship was then the growing trees of the forest." But to suppose that the poet meant the grapes were wine is as wise as to suppose he meant that the growing trees were a ship. We must use common sense in our interpretations. These anticipatory or poetical uses of the word "wine" are found in all writers, but no argument can be founded on their literal truth.

The two-wine theory is a modern affair. It began in our own century with a few excellent men who longed to meet the intemperance of the day with a new argument, and who said that the ordinary interpretation of the word "wine" in the Bible was an obstacle to the theory and practice of total abstinence. They honestly thought that they detected a difference in terms and expressions both in the Hebrew and the Greek, on which they could base their theory. Two or three prominent names, of the highest character and of good scholarship for that day, gave currency to the theory among the less learned philanthropists, who saw no way of escape from the curse of intemperance but by the total denunciation of wine. The temperance literature at once gave wide circulation to this error, and now there are thousands and tens of thousands who firmly believe that both the Bible and the ancient writers generally recognize two kinds of wine, one intoxicating and the other unintoxicating; one to be condemned and the other to be praised. A mighty stream of sentiment has flowed from this little beginning, and its prevalence tends to substantiate it. Many sound and strong minds, who have not personally examined the question, give in their adherence to the utterly unfounded theory. This is the way of an error that becomes inveterate.

We hazard nothing in saying that the present scholarship of the world repudiates the theory in toto. Etymologically, historically and scientifically, the theory is condemned by every scholar who has given his thought and study to it in late years. In a brief article like this it is impossible to take up each department and show the processes and results of careful observation. The *onus probandi* belongs to those who assert the theory, which was never heard of until this century. We have examined scores of books that advocate the theory, and have yet to find the first evidence of its truth. It is purely an invention, honestly prompted in minds to which the wish was father to the thought, and naturally grasped by the earnest advocates of total abstinence. We do not wonder at the zeal of such men and women. It is most laudable. A mind that can unmoved see the dreadful evils of intemperance is an unenviable one. Every lover of his race should be most earnest to meet the usages that are destroying both body and soul with such appalling power. We cannot but commend the energy of all who are enlisted to extirpate the baleful influence of the saloon. And yet we should be careful in the warfare to use no improper weapons and to wield no untruth which will only react against us and stop the progress of reform. The two-wine theory, by reason of its baselessness, is, as promulgated, only an advantage to the enemy, who, by overthrowing one weak defense, will impress the public mind that they have conquered in the main strife. If we are to make steady progress we must adhere to truth, and declare wine an evil only in its excessive use; and standing by and with God's word, and by and with the human conscience, too, denounce and hinder excess in every legitimate way. Man's wisdom cannot take the place of God's wisdom.

HOWARD CROSBY.

2. *Reasons for the Unfermented-Wine Theory.*—The study of Bible wines requires notice of their historic mention, the sources of knowledge as to their nature, the methods of their preparation, and their uses as beverages and medicines, and in religious rites. The word "wine" occurs in the English translation of the Old Testament about 200 times, and in