

their assertions till they get some proof, and proof must mean something real and visible to others as well as to themselves.

As to what is said by "O," if I understand him aright, of putting new wine into new bottles to prevent a rupture by a secondary fermentation, it is proper to ask could bottles new or old resist the power of fermentation? As the pure juice, or what Moses calls, the pure blood of the grape (words which are not true of alcohol) would be far sweeter and far more nourishing, than what is fermented, and would be preferred by all except the lovers of intoxication; would it not be more rational to suppose that it was put into new bottles to prevent fermentation. If they designed that the bottles should resist the power of fermentation, might they not leave it to ferment before putting it into bottles, or leave the bottles untied, and then there would be no danger of a rupture? I think "O's" view of the passage very unsatisfactory; his view of Isaiah lxx. 8. is I think more so. The evidence in this passage in favor of the pure juice of the grape being in the Bible called wine, is rejected on the principle of anticipation. This it would seem is a very convenient and favorite method of evading an argument. To support the idea of anticipation it is said that this is a prophecy; that verses 8, 9, 10, contain a prophecy no one will deny; but surely the part we have now to do with, (as the new wine is found in the cluster,) is not a prophecy, but refers to a present matter of fact. The wine is found in the cluster as flour is found in wheat—the meaning of this is in no wise affected by the rest of the passage being a prophecy, nor was it fair to make any reference to its being such. But "O" adds—"Some process must be implied, and why not fermentation?" we answer because fermentation destroys the nutritive juice of the grape, and converts it into a new thing—a most bewitching deadly poison, which "stingeth like an adder," and because by pressure we get what was formerly in the cluster, but by fermentation we get what was not in it. It is as contrary to truth to say that alcohol or fermented wine is found in the cluster, as it would be to say that whisky is found in barley: flour or meal is, but whisky is not found in it. To say it is, by "anticipation," is to introduce an artful way of speaking, of which plain people have no idea; by which men may assert or deny what they please.

"O" thinks that as Mr. SMITH has not found the thick syrup of grapes frequently used in the East to bear the name of wine or be used as such, it was never so. This is plain evidence that they use the unfermented juice of the grape; the thing disputed is the name. "O" thinks that as it has not the name in our day, it never had it. He pays no regard to Mr. SMITH's opinion,—that the name may have changed in consequence of the increased taste for alcoholic drinks; saying that it is possible, but that no unbiassed mind would deem it probable. It was not very prudent in one on his side of the question to talk of bias respecting this matter. We are all liable to be biased in favour of our own opinions, because they are our own. But one thing is obvious, those who abstain from all that can intoxicate, might admit the lawfulness of such drinks, and not be bound in any sense or any degree to use them; but those who use them if they admit that the use of them is sinful, or, considering their effects in time and eternity, inexpedient, are in duty and consistency bound to give them up; and the longer they have used them the fonder they are of them, the harder it must be to believe that the use of them is sinful. It is easy then to see who are most in danger of being biased in regard to this important question.

"O" would have us think that the burden of proving that some wines were not intoxicating falls on those who hold that opinion: they need not fear it as a very heavy burden, but why should it fall on them? When we consider the moral character of God, his abhorrence of all intoxication, as it appears in the doom he has passed on the drunkard—wine being in some passages the emblem of the wrath of God which his enemies must drink, and in others of spiritual blessing; that the use of it is spoken of in some places as lawful, and in others as leading to every thing wicked and vile which human beings can commit; must not the opinion that such opposite things are spoken of the very same wine appear highly improbable, if not absurd, implying a contradiction? Have we not therefore a right to deny it, till it be proved; and surely it needs very clear proof.

Would it not be more rational and safe to judge of the nature of the wine spoken of in different passages by the effects ascribed to it; by the commendation or condemnation bestowed on it, rather than by the mere name? What would be thought of the man who would assert that the word corn in Britain must mean one kind of grain. The view of any subject or parts of Scripture, which wicked people are partial to and which tends to encourage them in their sins, is surely to be suspected. The view which many yet take of the wine which Christ made, and commanded to be used in drink offerings under the law, and in the Supper, is very palatable to tipplers and drunkards, and encourages them in their ruinous courses. But I cannot think of making this article much longer by dwelling on these points. As to Christ making wine, we may remark, that he, with equal ease, could make wine containing alcohol, or wine without it; but not with equal safety to his creatures whom he came to save. The latter would be more sweet and nourishing and would please temperate guests; the former could not nourish, but would stimulate and please the lovers of intoxication; and we are to consider which class would Christ be most likely to please; if the latter, then it will be hard to convince men that he hates intoxication so much as his words seem to teach. This would sanction what is called the moderate use: and the moderate use would lead to drunkenness to the end of time. And Satan might say, "Aha, so would I have it." That God should have commanded such a pernicious thing to be used in his worship is still more improbable, and leads to very strange conclusions. This represents him as approving and enjoining the cause, intoxicating drink, and abhorring and eternally punishing the effect, intoxication; as forbidding the use of the same thing in one form in the passover, and as expressly enjoining it in another form in drink offerings. Who can believe this on any evidences which have yet been brought forward to prove it?

As to 1 Cor. xi. 2^d. we may say that the view taken by many of the text, besides its tendency to encourage a most ruinous custom, is liable to other objections. 1. It is so unlikely that a church, planted by PAUL, should so soon have become so depraved as to get drunk at the Lord's table; that if the word rendered drunken be at all capable of another meaning, that meaning ought to be preferred—see McNIGHT and CLARK on the text. 2. As the apostles quoted from the Greek translation of the old testament, made before their time, it is likely that PAUL would use the word rendered drunk, in the sense in which he found it used in that translation, Jer. xxxi. 14. where it would be absurd to render it drunk, and our translators therefore render it *satiate*. 3. Such a writer as PAUL would hardly have used such words as *one is hungry and another is drunken* as they do not express things properly opposite or forming