

coagulate; and from this fact therefore it is undeniably evident, that the wines which the Jews mingled with milk in their feasts were not intoxicating: for they would not use such a trashy compound as this.

11. Is there any evidence, in *Scripture*, that Christ made, or used, any intoxicating drink? It has been argued by our opponents that he must have used wine, at least moderately, for the Pharisees reproached him as "a gluttonous man, and a wine bibber;" and they would not have done so, had they not seen something in his practice, which, however innocent, might have given a colour to this calumny. But this is too much tenderness for the character of the Pharisees—they could raise a calumny without any foundation, good or bad, as appears from their having reproached Christ as a blasphemer. This slander only proves what they said, not what our Lord did.

1. I argue that Christ used unfermented wine at the institution of the Supper; because the Israelites were forbidden to have "leaven" in their houses, during the seven days of the feast. There is nothing in this prohibition itself to make us believe that it did not exclude leavened drinks, as well as leavened bread; and it is so understood by the Jews at the present day, as appears from a late letter of Mr. Noah to Mr. Delavan. The person who violated this precept was to be "cut off from among his people." And are we to believe on no other evidence than the convenient way of taking things for granted, that Christ violated this precept himself.

2. I find that Christ refused an intoxicating drink, when he was about to be nailed to the cross. Mark xv. 23, "And they gave him to drink wine mingled with myrrh, but he received it not." This drink was evidently intoxicating, for it was intended to stupefy him, and thereby render him insensible of the pain of that barbarous punishment which they were about to inflict.

3. While Christ refused an intoxicating draught at that very trying moment, I find that he did receive an unintoxicating draught after he had been suspended on the accursed tree. John xix. 29, 30. "Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar &c.—When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar."

4. The account of the marriage in Cana, John ii. 1, furnishes ground for, at least, a strong presumption, that the wine which Christ made on that occasion was unintoxicating. All that is said respecting its quality is, that it was *good wine*; it was therefore equivalent to *old wine*. See Luke v. 37, 39, where we have also some account of the Jewish method of preserving wine. But from this it has been argued by our opponents, that the old wine must have been fermented, because the reason why new bottles were preferred to old ones was that, by their superior strength and elasticity, they might better resist the power of fermentation. But this reason appears to me to fall short of the case, for if the process of fermentation were once begun, I have a suspicion that it would burst the strongest bags which they could make. And this leads to the opinion, that the juice of the grapes was put into new bottles to prevent fermentation and not to resist it. These bottles would be quite free from the lees of the old wine, which would have infallibly corrupted the new, and which, owing to the peculiar structure of the bags, no process of washing could completely remove.

5. The Jews were in the habit of using wine as a salve for wounds. Luke x. 34. Let it be considered that unfermented wine is a thick syrup, resembling jelly or honey, and let any person then judge whether that, or "good old Port," is likely to be the better application for a wound. The first time any of our opponents gets a cut finger, or a broken crown, I would advise him to make the experiment; it will be an excellent *argumentum ad hominem*.

These considerations are sufficient, Sir, in my judgment, to prove that the Jews were in the habit of using the juice of the grape in an unfermented state. And if so, then, before our opponents can plead the authority of *Scripture* for the use of alcoholic drinks, they must bring better evidence to prove their point, than to assume that all wines were necessarily intoxicating. We refuse opinions which have nothing to rest on but prescription; we demand proof.

Montreal, March 6, 1841.

MR. JAMES COURT, Cor. Sec'y.

DEAR SIR,—I left Montreal on the 24th ult., to attend a series of temperance meetings, the first of which took place

at La Chute on the following day, Mr. Baker, Vice-President of the Society, in the chair. After I had addressed the meeting, the Rev. Wm. Blood, Presbyterian, brought forward the scripture objection as a reason for not becoming a teetotaler sooner, stating that as long as he believed that the Saviour made and drank intoxicating wine, he did not feel himself at liberty to condemn the practice in others, or called upon to adopt total abstinence principles himself. The perusal of *Anti-Bacchus* had, however, convinced him of the fallacy of that belief, not by supplying him with new facts, for he had before read the same statements respecting ancient wines in classical authors, and respecting the wines of the East in Clark and Maundrell's travels, but he had never combined them so as to produce the conviction which the reading of *Anti-Bacchus* had produced, and which prepared him for entering heartily into the total abstinence enterprise. The result of the meeting was an accession of 32 members to the pledge (teetotal of course), amongst whom were the Rev. Mr. Blood, and some of the most influential persons in the settlement, also a number of ladies. A proposition was made that two or three active and zealous young men should visit every family in the settlement, for the purpose of requesting them to subscribe for the *Advocate*, which I trust was carried into effect: why should the strength of our temperance youths remain inactive? Are there no inducements to exertion in the temperance enterprise? Will the hope, nay, the almost certainty of saving multitudes, from the fearful doom of the drunkard, not call forth their energies? Surely they must see, that the duty they owe to their country and their God calls upon them to do every thing in their power to save the country from the wide spread and desolating evils of intemperance. And what can they do that is more likely to save it, than to prevail upon every family to take a temperance paper.

La Chute is a beautiful settlement, its chief drawback being intemperance. In passing through it, I suddenly came upon a distillery, situated in the midst of a beautiful rural scene, where Providence had evidently lavished every blessing. I know of nothing more calculated to shock the moral sense than such a sight. One expects to find peace and purity in the country, instead of the smoke of a distillery ascending up like the smoke of the pit. Yet there it stands, busy all the time, converting the wholesome and kindly fruits of the earth into streams of fiery poison, which are to flow out to every corner of the settlement, carrying with them poverty and vice, desolation and death.

A meeting was held in St. Andrews on the evening of the same day, which proved a remarkably interesting one. Mr. Blanchard was in the chair, and the speakers were the Rev. J. Edwards (Baptist), the Rev. Mr. Shaler (Wesleyan), the Rev. W. Blood (Church of Scotland), the Rev. J. T. Byrne (Congregational), and myself. The addresses of the Rev. gentlemen presented on the whole a combination of talent which I have rarely met with at a temperance meeting, and the effect upon the audience must have been excellent. At the close of the meeting, 26 persons signed the pledge, amongst whom were seven or eight youths who refused at first, but afterwards went to the Secretary's house, and joined the Society. This circumstance gave me great pleasure, as there is much drinking about St. Andrews, and these youths were at the critical age when man is most liable to be overcome by temptation, because most confident in his own strength.

On the 26th I left St. Andrews in company with the Rev. Mr. Byrne, and enjoyed a delightful drive along the banks of the majestic Ottawa to L'Orignal. Indeed I hardly know where the lover of natural scenery would be more highly gratified. We passed some large commercial esta-