

speculators to treat this topic as they in their wisdom prefer, without offering one opposing word; but when we see the sad effects of this special spiritualism for men's conversion, concerning which there is something in the catechism but nothing in God's oracles, effectually preventing sinners from receiving simple truth, it is far from us to allow what charity we have to lie dormant and silent, and not speak out in behalf and in defence of truth.

Now let a Paul or an Apollos go to a town where Dr. Campbell in his paper has sent both himself and Edwards to propagate their views of the Spirit, and let the inspired speakers announce the gospel and call upon sinners to obey it—what would be the response? The reply would be, 'Sirs, the Spirit must come first, and as it has not yet "extraordinarily set in," we are not prepared to be converted.' From such orthodoxy may the holy scriptures soon deliver both priest and people!

D. OLIPHANT.

THE SOLEMN IMPORTANCE OF AN OPINION.

BROTHER "O.'S" OPINION OF OUR OPINION, AND OUR OPINION OF HIS OPINION!

When I wrote on the "communion question," I did not design to begin a controversy with you on the subject, neither yet do I so design. Few, in my estimation, are qualified to discuss a disputed point, in such a calm, candid manner as to benefit themselves and others, and I presume not to belong to the select number. However, as you have favoured my former letter with some attention, I will just look over what you have said, and make a few remarks in my own manner.

It appears I have done you and myself injustice by commenting as I have done. This is a serious matter to begin with; let us therefore look at it seriously. I understood your reply to Mr. Davidson in your No. 3, was in defence of the practice of permitting unbaptized persons to commune with you, and commented on it accordingly. But it appears I was mistaken. Instead of using the "spirit's answer" in defence of that unscriptural practice, you employed it "to slay the inquisitorial rigids who practice close communion, and to cut off the extra limbs of charity which have grown upon the open communionists." Hence the unappropriateness, or as you express it—the "injustice" of my remarks. But to err is human. When you stated that "the Book, and the author of the Book, the letter of the Book, and the spirit of the Book, we take for our guide at the communion table," I inconsiderately concluded that the Book guided you in communing with "others who are assured that they are the Lord's people," and hurried along as I said, "to obtain a glimpse of the new light." Whereas you were merely slaying inquisitorial rigids, and cutting off *extra* limbs of charity. (It appears the practice referred to, is but a com-