

arly indorsement, the exhaustive commentary by Dr. Lees on every text in the Bible which speaks of wine—a work of sound learning, the widest research and fairest argument. The ripe scholarship, long study of the Bible, and critical ability of these men entitle them to be considered experts on this question. In a matter of Scripture interpretation it would be empty compliment to say that Dr. Crosby is worthy to loose the latchet of their shoes. Now, the truth is, the only “castle built in the air” in this matter is the baseless idea that the temperance movement uses dishonest arguments or wrests the Scripture because it maintains that where the drinking of wine as an article of diet is mentioned in the Bible with approbation *unfermented* wine is meant. The fact is, there are scholars of repute on both sides of the question. But we do not claim too much when we say that the weight of scholarly authority is on our side, and not on that of the doctor.

Mr. Phillips devoted further attention to the Scriptural argument, saying that once the Bible was thrown in the way of the abolition of slavery just as it is now thrown in the way of the total abstinence movement. He said: I see your lecturer last week closed his eloquent and able address by triumphantly claiming that the gospel abolished slavery—which is true, only he should have stated that it was the gospel of Jesus Christ, and not the gospel of the church of that day. Hence I am not impatient nor distrustful. I rest quiet in serene assurance that bye-and-bye, when our temperance cause is a little stronger, men will blush to think they ever belittled and dishonored the Bible by such claims and arguments as these. At that time ninety-nine out of every hundred Christians will look askance upon you and suspect your orthodoxy unless you believe Jesus never drank any fermented wine, and that the Bible's precepts touching wine-drinking can only be reconciled with each other or with its claim as a revealed religion by

recognizing the distinction between fermented and unfermented wines. In my active life of fifty years I have seen more men made infidels by these attempts to prove the Bible an upholder of slavery than I ever saw misled by the followers of Paine, and I think this sad exhibition of New York partisanship will have the same result. The misled men to whom I refer were not ignorant, careless-minded or unprincipled, but men of conscientious earnestness, purpose, good culture and blameless lives. The Bible is a divine book, a strong proof of which is that it has outlived even the foolish praises and misrepresentations of its narrow and bigoted friends. The New Testament is a small book, and may be read in an hour. It is not a code of laws, but the example of a life and a suggestion of principles. It would be idle to suppose that it could describe in detail, specifically meet every possible question and solve every difficulty that the changing and broadening life of two or three thousand years might bring forth. The progressive spirit of each age has found in it just the inspiration and help it sought. But when timid, narrow and short-sighted men claimed such exclusive ownership in it that they refused to their growing fellows the use of its broad, underlying principles, and thus demanded to have new wine put into old bottles, of course the bottles burst, and their narrow, surface Bible became discredited: but the real Bible soared upward, and led the world onward still, as the soul rises to broader and higher life when the burden of a narrow and mortal body falls away.

Signing the total abstinence pledge was the next subject taken up by Mr. Phillips, and the general principles which are at the basis of promises were stated as follows: Dr. Crosby is undoubtedly a member of a church. Does he mean to say that when his church demanded his signature to its creed, and its pledge to obey its discipline, it asked what it was “unmanly” in him to grant? He only objects to a temperance

pledge, not to a church one. The husband pledges himself to his wife and she to him for life. Is the marriage ceremony, then, a curse, a hindrance to virtue and progress? Society rests, in all its transactions, on the idea that a solemn promise, pledge or assertion, strengthens and assures the act. The witness on the stand gives solemn promise to tell the truth; the officer, about to assume place for one year or ten, or for life, pledges his word and oath; the grantor in a deed binds himself for all time by record; churches, societies, universities, accept funds on pledge to appropriate them to certain purposes and no other; these and a score more of instances can be cited. In any final analysis of these rest on the same principle as the temperance pledge. No man ever denounced them as unmanly. I sent this month a legacy to a literary institution on certain conditions, and received in return its pledge that the money should ever be sacredly used as directed. The doctor's principle would unsettle society, and, if one proposed to apply it to any cause but temperance, practical men would quietly put him aside as out of his head. These cobweb theories, born of isolated cloister life, do not bear exposure to the mid-day sun or the rude winds of practical life. This is not a matter of theory. Thousands and tens of thousands attest the value of the pledge. It never degraded, it only lifted them to a higher life. We who never lost our clear eyesight or level balance over books, but who stand mixed up and jostled in daily life, hardly deem any man's sentimental and fastidious criticism of the pledge worth answering. Every active worker in the temperance cause can recall hundreds of instances where it has been a man's salvation.

Moderate drinking and Dr. Crosby's defence of it were next handled, Mr. Phillips saying: Dr. Crosby says it is false our constant assertion that moderate drinking makes drunkards. Will he please tell us where, then, the drunkards come from? Certainly teetotalers