

shock the feelings of many modern religionists—a statement opposed to the spirit of the age—one which may possibly call forth a storm of vituperation, and yet it must be said : for it is the truth—the truth of God and of His Holy Word.

Our Lord Jesus Christ began His Messianic career—began that glorious and dazzling series of mercy-giving, life-prolonging, pain-destroying, evil-dispelling miracles—with the production of an alcoholic, intoxicating drink. And that in no mean quantity : on the lowest computation the amount of wine thus divinely manufactured was one hundred and twenty gallons. (See Alford *in loc.*)

Now let us face this fact ; for faced it must be. Our Lord Jesus Christ, whom we all confess to be God, of God, and yet very man, began his official career as the Messiah with the miraculous creation of an intoxicating element : He was all through his official life assailed by the Pharisees as a “ wine-bibber :” and His last official act was His consecrating that same intoxicating element to be the sacrament of His own most precious blood.

Now what are we to make of this ? Was Christ mistaken ? Was He ignorant of the laws of hygiene and physiology ? Is His doctrine behind the times ? For there is of necessity a terrible mistake somewhere. Either our modern moral reformers are wrong, or Jesus Christ was wrong. I put it plainly, but so it is. The *Dominion Churchman* very truly said last week : If Christ had worked that miracle to-day in one of our Scott Act counties He would have been convicted of a crime. And so it is. If Jesus Christ was right, prohibition is wrong. If prohibition is right, Jesus Christ was wrong. That is simply the naked truth.

And what escape can be framed from this dilemma, viz. : that not only our Lord Jesus Christ, but the whole Word of God, from beginning to end, countenances and makes provision for the drinking of intoxicating liquor : therefore either the consumption of such liquor is lawful and right, or the Word of God is wrong. There are three efforts to answer this :

1. The effort of some to prove that there are two kinds of “ wine ” and “ strong drink ” mentioned in the Bible, one alcoholic and the other non-alcoholic ; that whenever “ wine ” is commended it means the unfermented juice of the grape. I have only to say of this that such a plea is beneath contempt. No accurate scholar would ever think of thus “ handling the Word of God deceitfully.” A great deal of capital has been made by some of the fact that two words, in special, occur to designate “ wine ” in the Hebrew—the one “ Yayin ” and the other “ Tirosh ;” and they claim that one of these—it makes no matter which—is alcoholic and the other non-alcoholic. The Rev. Dr. Carry, of Port Perry, has lately issued a pamphlet which effectually disposes of all this sophistry. But it needs no learned Hebraist to understand the matter nowadays. The Rev. Dr. Young, a Presbyterian minister, has within the last few years published a most valuable Analytical Concordance ; and any ordinary English scholar, by looking up the words “ wine ” and “ strong drink ” in the said Concordance, can see for himself what an amount of special pleading and prevarication they are guilty of who resort to this line of argument. Prohibitionism, it seems,