

be equally right to organize laughing parties, and weeping parties, and parties to kill, and parties to make war, and parties to "embrace." The latter, however, is synonymous with dancing parties, according to the definition of Sam Jones—"dancing is hugging set to music." I know of no better definition of the modern dance than the above. You see then the absurdity of quoting my text in support of the modern pleasure dance. Again it is argued that "David danced before the Lord with all his might," and therefore it is right to dance to-day. Now, any person with a particle of common sense, will see that there can be no analogy between the dance of David, single and alone, and that of a promiscuous pleasure dance, so that I will not insult your intelligence by argument from such a standpoint. The modern dancer will also seek to justify his dancing by that of Aaron's sister, Miriam, or by the dancing in the nobleman's house when the prodigal returned. But why enlarge upon the subject from a Scriptural standpoint. I assert that there is little or no analogy between the Scriptural dance, and that of the indiscriminate dance of to-day—save that, perhaps of Salome, in the days of Herod, or the "vain fellows" referred to by David's wife. Spurgeon says: "When I hear of a dancing party I feel an uneasy sensation around the throat, remembering that a far greater preacher had his head danced off in the days of our Lord. However pleasing the polkas of Herodias might have been to Herod, they were death to John the Baptist. The caperings and waltzing of the ball-room are death to the solemn influences of our ministry, and many an ill-ended life, first received its bent for evil amid the flippancies of gay associations met to trip away the hours."

In clearing the Scripture, then, of the unholy imputations made against it, in seeking to make it support and justify the modern pleasure dance, I cannot do better than to sum up the Scripture teaching by the findings of Dr. Lyman Beecher, who says: "It will sufficiently appear, 1. That dancing was a religious act, both of the true and also of idol worship. 2. That it was practised exclusively on joyful occasions, such as national festivals or great victories. 3. That it was performed by maidens only. 4. That it was performed usually in the daytime in the open air, in highways, fields, or groves. 5. That men who perverted dancing from a sacred use to purposes of amusement were deemed infamous. 6. That no instances of dancing are found upon record in the Bible in which the two sexes united in the exercise, either as an act of worship or amusement. 7. That there is no instance upon record of social dancing for amusement except that of the "vain fellows," devoid of shame; irreligious families described by Job, which produced increased impiety and ended in destruction; and of Herodias, which terminated in the rash vow of Herod, and murder of John the Baptist." I am always reminded of a few lines in Shakespeare when I hear those dancers quoting Scripture:

"Mark you this, Bassanio,  
The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose,  
An evil soul, producing holy witness,  
Is like a villain with a smiling cheek;  
A goodly apple rotten at the heart;  
O, what a goodly outside falsehood hath."

II. In the second place I deem it to be only fair to the advocates of the modern pleasure dance, to note some of the so-called arguments used in favor. And first. It is argued that our young people must have amusements of our day. Yes, dancing does rank high as an amusement! And why? It must be very amusing to engage in an entertainment where "hugging is set to music." "Where, hour after hour, it whirls