

our social usages. It is a "stronghold" for us total-abstainers from the bottle: strong in its knowledge of human nature, strong in its support to conscience, strong with the unselfish sweetness and strength of LOVE.

After walking carefully and candidly around my good brother Crosby's ingenious exegetical structure, I do not find it strong in any particular, except it be in the epithets launched at us abstainers from the decanter. As a "paste-board fortress" for the protection of the drinking-usages, it will be a popular place of resort for all those who believe that "the drinking of wine is sanctioned and commanded by the Word of God, and must remain as the general rule." For all those who like this sort of beverages, this will be just the sort of logic which they will like. Ingenious and pretentious as my brother's logical structure may be, it cannot stand against the powerful instincts of unselfish Christian love. Even the sigh from the broken heart of one poor drunkard's wife will blow it down.

III.—THE PLACE OF THE SENSIBILITY IN MORALS.

By MARK HOPKINS, D.D., LL.D., WILLIAMS COLLEGE, MASS.

IN the leading article of the December number of the HOMILETIC REVIEW, Dr. Gregory imputes the decadence of public morality in Massachusetts and in the country at large, and also the debate at Des Moines, to certain moral teachings in the higher institutions of the country. Among those who teach these corrupting doctrines he refers particularly to me. In connection with this, he says, I am quoted as saying two things in the debate referred to, neither of which I did say. Where he got his quotations I do not know, but they are not to be found, nor anything like them, in the verbatim report of the debate as printed by Houghton & Mifflin, nor in any other report that I have seen. The second quotation makes me speak of "the merits of the question." On that point I said nothing. My remarks had sole reference to the best method, in the present emergency, of selecting candidates for missionary work. Dr. Gregory had, therefore, no basis for inferring, as he does, my "attitude" on the theological question. Of that, it is sufficient to say here, that I stand with Dr. Clark as his position is given in his published speech. So much for misrepresentation, which I do not charge as intentional.

Of the essay at large, I think it may be said that the essence of it, briefly and fairly stated, is contained in three propositions:

1st. That for a man to desire and seek blessedness in connection with holy activity, as it is implied in the Beatitudes that he should, is selfishness. It is different from Epicureanism, but is on the same plane, and is, on the whole, rather worse.

2d. That for a man to desire and seek for the perfection, and so the