

all who would prove themselves the children of God, and the friends of man, are bound to abstain from drinking wine, or using any other thing, as long as their doing so grieves or stumbles their brethren. And who will say that their love and self-denial ought to stop here, or that they are not bound to regard the welfare, temporal and eternal, of all men. And if their drinking at their own table is wrong, must it not, on some accounts, be more so at the Lord's Table? Where or when will men show a tender regard to the honour of God and the good of men, if not there? Some may say that the quantity taken at the Lord's Table is so small that it can do no harm. But it ought to be known, that the quantity drank, by good men, at any table, is, in our respect, of little consequence; it is their drinking any intoxicating drink, and thereby countenancing, and adding respectability to a ruinous custom, in which the evil and mischief consist.

It is awful that anything which is an abomination in the sight of God should be highly esteemed among men, and that Christians and Christian ministers should help to make it so. And if God loves or hates things, or practices, according to the nature and amount of their effects, (and who will venture to say that he does not?) then how much must he abominate the use of all intoxicating drinks, no matter by what name they go. It is the effects they produce that render them dangerous, and the use of them hurtful.

Some may say that nothing but the fermented juice of the grape is wine. But this is an assertion so important, and involving or leading to such serious consequences, that it ought to be accompanied with proof or evidence: for who will say that it is self-evident, and needs nothing to make it more so. Is it not improbable that Jesus Christ would appoint two things as emblems of spiritual blessings—the one nourishing and daily used; the other, not only *useless*, but *poisonous, benumbing, and ruinous*? (for who will say that intoxicating drink of any kind is essential or useful to life?) Is it not improbable that he would appoint a liquid which he knew had ruined many, and against which he had warned men—Prov. xxiii. 31; and which he knew would continue to ruin millions more, filling the earth with madness, pollution, crime, and woe,—destroying far more than all other poisons put together—and above all, destroying both soul and body forever? If the assertion that Christ appointed such a thing for such purpose, needs strong proof, and clear strong proof, I know not what does. We have no more reason to think that he appointed fermented wine in the Supper, than that he used fermented bread at the Passover; either of which would be contrary to his own law, which he came to fulfil. How could either of them be in the house of a consistent Jew at the time of the Passover? yet we have every reason to think that it was in the house of such a Jew that Christ instituted the Supper.

And it ought to be kept in mind that the contents of the cup given to the disciples is not called *wine*; it was something to be drank not to be eaten. Whatever, then, men may choose to call wine, has nothing to do with the question, *What ought to be taken at the Lord's Table?* The most that any can contend for, is, that it be the "fruit of the vine." If any contend for more than this, be more specific than this, they go beyond apostolic authority. If then we can get the fruit of the vine, or the juice of the grape, unpolluted by the presence of alcohol, ought we not to prefer it?

Is it not going too far to say, Nay, but it must have alcohol in it—especially when we consider that most of the trash to be had under the name of wine, is a vile compound of whisky, water, and various poisonous ingredients. If men were to search for something that would be utterly improper as an emblem of spiritual

blessings, flowing through the atonement of Christ, could they find or invent any thing more suitable than this?

I was led into these thoughts by the objection mentioned by VERITAS, and I need not add that his objection is just; in my ears it sounds oddly to call upon men to give up all intoxicating drink *except at the Lord's Table*. What has the Lord's Table to do with intoxicating drink? I wish to remember that it is important to speak to, or of, good men, who differ from us, with love and respect. The truth is to be spoken in love; but we are to distinguish between respect to men, and respect for the errors which we think they hold.

I will just add, Mr. Editor, that the richest are not always the most liberal. There are some poor "whose deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality." The same may be said of some who are very rich in their mental stores; but they are very parsimonious in imparting of their riches. If these Omegas would contribute according to their ability, your pages would be crowded with important matter, so that you should have no need nor room for any thing from

OMICRON.

#### MODERATE DRINKING, VS. DRUNKENNESS.

It is a serious question, whether the various, and widely spread miseries which men bring on themselves in this world, and that to come, are chiefly to be ascribed to drunkenness, or to what is called moderate drinking. Some may consider this a very foolish if not an absurd question. They will be ready to say, how can moderation in the use of any thing ruin men? Moderation which good men plead for and practice, did not Ministers preach and print for many years back, and do so at present, in favour of it? They did so—they preached, and wrote against drunkenness, but not for entire abstinence; therefore, it was, at least, virtually in favor of moderate drinking; and accordingly moderate drinking prevailed, and drunkenness followed. And all their efforts to suppress this monstrous and shameful evil, were as unavailing as the efforts of the Egyptians to oppress the children of Israel. The more they oppressed them the more they multiplied. Their labor was very ineffectual in keeping men from becoming drunkards, and still more so, and necessarily so, in recovering such. It may justly be doubted whether this (with some) favorite doctrine of moderation has ever recovered one drunkard.

To solve the above question, let us suppose a case, which, alas! is a very common one. A young man keeps company with the respectable part of the drinking class, and takes a little for company and custom sake. He abhors drunkenness, and despises drunkards. He continues to act in this manner, and gradually drinks a greater quantity, and drinks more frequently—becomes more fond of and feels a desire for it—does not despise drunkards so much as formerly, but, on the contrary, can sit down with some of them, for the sake of others who are present. By and by he sits down with a jovial party, he likes the company, and now likes the drink. They are drinking healths or toasts. He deliberately takes one glass after another, with pleasure; and partly from love to the company, and partly love of drink, continues till he is drunk for the first time. Now this young man is in a sad case, he has, for the first time, unfitted himself for the proper discharge of every duty, every virtue, and prepared himself for such crimes as Satan and his own depravity, and circumstances may tempt him to commit; that he does not continue ever after in this awful state is not owing to any thing good in him, no thanks to him for his recovery. He has despised the authority of God, and disgraced human nature,—committed a crime unfitting him for heaven, an<sup>d</sup> deserving hell, and which, if not repented of, and