

ter in another sack or cell, and covered the whole with a nice skin bottle, and then hung the grape upon the pendant vine to ripen so that there might be no commingling of the elements causing fermentation. He manifested his glory by making wine without alcohol. Is it not reasonable to suppose that Christ did the same? Neither in the history of the miracle; nor the whole compass of the Bible is there a single evidence, that this wine was intoxicating, why then do men excuse their drunkenness by the conduct of the Son of God.

(c) But it is said again, "Did not Paul tell *Timothy* to use wine? Certainly he did; but observe well, what is plainly taught in this Apostolic prescription. First, that Timothy had been a total abstainer, otherwise there would not have been the slightest need of the advice, "Take no longer water." Secondly, it was but the *medicinal use* of a little wine," For thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities." Thirdly, there is not a syllable to intimate that the wine was alcoholic. Now look at the logic of the drinking *man* in the interpretation of this passage. Paul says he prescribed the use of a *little unalcoholic wine medicinally* for the Teetotaler Timothy, therefore I may drink, as a beverage, Brandy, Gin, Rum, Whiskey, *Forty rod*, *Rotgut*, and all kinds of alcoholic liquors. Did ever any sane man, reason in such a way before? Did ever any whose