

The Wesleyan

Published under the direction of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of Eastern British America.

Volume IX. No. 9.

HALIFAX, N. S., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1857.

Whole No. 398.

I Long to be There!

I have read of a world of beauty,
Where there is no gloomy night;
Where love is the mainspring of duty,
And God the fountain of light;
And I long to be there!

I have read of its flowing river,
That bursts from beneath the throne,
And the beautiful trees that ever
Are fount on its banks alone;
And I long to be there!

I have read of the myriads choir,
Of their holy love that burns like fire,
And the shining robes they wear;
And I long to be there!

I have read of the sanctified throng
That passed from earth to heaven,
And now sit in the loudest song
Of praise for their sins forgiven;
And I long to be there!

I have read of their freedom from sin,
And suffering and sorrow, too,
And the holy joy they feel within,
As their risen Lord they view;
And I long to be there!

I long to rise to that world of light,
And to breathe its balmy air;
I long to walk with the Lamb in white,
And to shout with the angels there;
O I long to be there!

Controversial

BAPTISTS NOT PROTESTANTS.—THE GENUINE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.—*Christian Messenger*, Jan. 14, 1857.

MR. EDITOR.—Your readers have been accustomed to hear Roman Catholics denounce Luther, Calvin, Knox, and the whole Protestant body as execrable heretics; and the Puseyites, following closely in their train, have repudiated Protestantism and arrogantly claimed the Church of England to be the 'only true Church,' and all who are not within its pale are *ipso facto* heretics and heresies, and as such are under the wrath and curse of God; but we were not prepared for any statement like that which appears in the *Christian Messenger* of the 14th inst. from Sydney, signed C. H. H., in which the Baptists, who, notwithstanding their peculiar practices and scriptural dogmas, have always been hailed as brethren—who were thought to be firmly and thoroughly Protestant: that the people should show the 'cloven foot' by seeping their Protestantism, and in the very same language, but with infinitely less talent and show of reason, apply to themselves that preposterous signment 'the genuine apostolic succession,' a doctrine which others they held in such sovereign contempt.

As it may appear, this writer on the part of the Baptists denies that they are Protestants, or that there is any other Church upon earth except themselves. The writer, after speaking of the abandonment of their contemplated mission to Australia, says:—

Besides the duty which is equally binding on all who profess to love the Lord Jesus Christ, to extend his kingdom by every means in their power, there are considerations which make it peculiarly incumbent on Baptists to make incessant active efforts, in humble reliance on the Divine promise, to place the truths of the Gospel, as held by them, before all mankind. BAPTISTS DISCLAIM THE NAME OF PROTESTANTS.

'They (the Baptists) claim—and the most learned and eminent of Peto-Baptist writers to be just history acknowledge the claim to be a just one—that they alone have existed since the days of the apostles as Christian Churches; that they alone, during the dark ages preceding the Reformation, held the doctrines and ordinances of the Gospel in their purity; and they claim to be the only Church now in existence which is modelled after the pattern of the primitive Church founded by our Saviour in Jerusalem, and which keeps the laws and ordinances appointed by Him for the guidance of His Church, in the order and manner He gave them.'

It is doubtful if so shameless and groundless an assertion as the above was ever made before by mortal man. That the Baptists 'claim to be the only true Church,' is admitted; but that Peto-Baptists acknowledge the claim to be just, is both untrue and absurd; for they know well that the Baptist Church never existed until about the year 1521. But our author's reason for his assertion—

'For proof that Baptists existed previous to the Reformation, I filled their testimony with their blood, in thousands and thousands of instances, we appeal to Cardinal Bona, President of the Council of Trent A.D. 1562.'

and even offered themselves to the most cruel sorts of punishments, than these people.' The italics in this quotation belong to C. H. H., but why they are there, or why the quotation is made at all, it is difficult to divine. He asserts that 'the Baptists existed before the Reformation,' and to prove his assertion he quotes an author who wrote 230 years after, and his author does not say a word about their existence before the Reformation, but simply, that there have been more 'generally punished,' &c., 'for these 1200 years past.' C. H. H. must go somewhere else to prove the antiquity of the Baptists, so to prove that they existed *all before the Reformation*.

Next quotes from Dr. J. J. Dumont, and Dr. Ypeig as follows: 'We have now seen that the Ana-Baptists, and in later times the Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and have long in the history of the Church, received the honour of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the Apostles, and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the Gospel through all ages.' The italics are by C. H. H.

Now the reader will please to observe that this quotation is made in order to show that the 'Baptists are not Protestants; that they did not come down through the Church of Rome; and the 'Baptists as a Christian society' has existed since the days of the apostles; or, in the words with which C. H. H. headed his article, 'Baptists and Baptist Churches—The Genuine Apostolic Succession.'

Observe, then, first, that Dr. Ypeig and the Rev. J. J. Dumont are not ancient writers, but wrote their account of the Dutch Baptists in 1819. Second, Dr. Ypeig and Rev. J. J. Dumont, in the very same work from which the above extract is made, gives the following account of the origin of the Dutch Baptists or Mennonites:—

'In the year 1536 their scattered community obtained a regular state of church order, separate from all Dutch and German Protestants, who at that time had not been formed into one body by any bond of unity. This advantage was procured then by the sensible management of a Frenchland Protestant, Menno Simons, who had formerly been a Popish priest.'

Now, does C. H. H. and the Baptists claim to be the descendants of Mennonites? If so, then the Baptists, as a Church, did not exist until the year 1536, and their founder was once a Popish priest.

With such a statement from his own authors, viz., Ypeig and Dumont, is not C. H. H. ashamed to iterate such Popish and Puseyite bombast about *Apostolic Succession*? and will not his own Church be ashamed of him for daring to assert that 'Baptists disclaim the name of Protestants?' But were not the Mennonites descendants of the Waldenses? Perhaps they were, and so were many other Protestants. But does not C. H. H. know that children are not always as good as their parents; and so the Ana-Baptists of Germany were an awfully corrupt people compared with the Waldenses.—But the argument is this: The Baptist Church was formed out of the Mennonite Church; the Mennonite Church was formed from the German Protestants in the year 1536; the Ana-Baptist Church was formed in the year 1521 in Germany; many of the Ana-Baptists had been Waldenses; and therefore the Baptists have existed since the Apostles: 'Baptists and Baptist Churches are the genuine Apostolic succession; and 'Baptists disclaim the name of Protestants.' What a precious pedigree! Baptists, Mennonites, Waldenses, Puseyites, Christians!—and what an argument! *Reverendissimi amici!*

There are two circumstances connected with the Mennonites which C. H. H. has omitted for very good reasons. Those circumstances are their different modes of baptism: they both pour water and immerse. Mr. Gan, of Lloydswick, a Mennonite minister, says of baptism: 'It consists in immersion, or pouring upon of waters, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, &c. The Mennonites in Pennsylvania do not baptize by immersion, although they administer the ordinance to none but believers. Their common method is this: the person to be baptized kneeling, the minister holds his hands over him, into which the *doctores* pour water, and through which it runs upon the head of the baptized, after which follows imposition of hands and prayer.' (See Edwards' and Benedict's Hist. Am. Baptists.)

Now, we might ask, is C. H. H. a Mennonite? If he is, why does he not adhere to the tenets of his sect and believe that pouring is baptism as well as dipping? It is in the above quotation? He pretends, and in order to produce effect upon an unformed and ignorant people, who, because he mentions writers whose works they have never read and whose names they have never heard, think him a very learned man, and that he has enclosed himself behind a series of arguments and historical statements from whence his heresies become impossible. But he hears him, and he will judge himself.

'For further proof on this point we refer your readers to Neander, Mosheim, Zwingle, D'Aubigne, &c., &c., and would recommend to all Baptists, who are not well acquainted with these facts, to read Orchard's History of Foreign Baptists.'

There is no such thing as a Baptist Society before that period on any part of earth; that the Ana-Baptists were the most heretical and diabolical people that ever existed in the Christian Church, and who held the most horrible and disgusting practices were discovered by the Mennonites and afterwards by the Baptists; yet their peculiar opinions about baptism, and particularly their rant about infant baptism being papt, was derived from their Grandfathers, the Ana-Baptists of Germany.

leg to make two short extracts from their works. One shall be from Mosheim, and the other from D'Aubigne.

Mosheim says: 'The sect in England which rejects the custom of baptizing infants, are not distinguished by the title of *Anabaptists*, but by that of *Baptists*. It is, however, probable they derive their origin from the German and Dutch Mennonites; and that, in former times, they adopted their doctrines in all their points.'—Cent. xvii, ch. 3, sec. 22.

Here Mosheim agrees with C. H. H. that the Baptists derived their origin from the Mennonites. Now for the origin of the Mennonites.—Mosheim says:—

'If they (the Mennonites) maintain that one of their sect descended by birth from the Anabaptists who involved Germany and other countries in the most deadly calamities, or that none of these *fugitives* adopted the doctrine and discipline of Menno, they may be easily justified by a great number of facts and testimonies, and particularly by the declarations of *Mennonism*, who glories in his descent from the sect which attacked the lives and souls of several members of this *pastoral* sect. Nothing can be more certain than this, viz., that the first Mennonite converts were composed of the different sorts of Anabaptists already mentioned, of those who had been always inoffensive and upright, and of those who before their conversion by the ministry of Menno, had been *zealous fanatics*.'—Cent. xvii, chap. 3, sec. 22.

And now, as C. H. H. refers us to D'Aubigne, let us hear what he says about the Grandfather, who may be called the grandfather of the Baptists, viz., 'Baptist brother'; but that would likely insult C. H. H. and his friends, for I am not in 'the Succession.' I will say, then, that the Anabaptists are the Grandfather of the Baptists. D'Aubigne says of the Anabaptists as to their origin:—

'A simple clothier, Nicholas Storck had appeared to him during the night, and that after communicating matters which he could not yet reveal, said to him that he should sit on the throne of the Emperor of Wittenberg, one Mark Stubner, joined Storck, and immediately forsook his studies; for he had received direct from God (so he said) the gift of interpreting the Holy Scriptures. Another weaver, Mark Thomas, was added to their number; and a new apostle, Thomas Munzer, a man of fanatical character, gave a religious sanction to this rising sect. The new prophets, pretending to walk in the footsteps of the old, began to proclaim their mission: 'We! We! said they, a Church governed by bishops cannot be the Church of Christ.' The impious rulers of Christendom will be overturned. In five, six or seven years, a universal association will come upon the world. The Turk will seize upon Germany; all the priests will be put to death, even those who are married. No ungodly man, no sinner will remain alive; and after the earth has been purified by blood, God will set up a kingdom; Storck will be put in possession of the supreme authority, and will command the Government of the nations to the saints. Then there will be 'one faith, one baptism.' The day of the Lord is at hand, and the end of the world draweth nigh. 'We! we! we!' Then declaring that infant baptism was *unnatural*, the new prophets called upon all men to come and receive the *true baptism*, as a sign of their introduction into the new Church of God.'—Hist. Ref. book ii, chap. 7.

Another quotation from the same author, which C. H. H. recommends to our attention:—

'They resolved to form an independent congregation in the midst of the great confusion, a church within a church. A *new baptism* was to be their mark, and the exclusive of true believers. *Infant baptism*, said they, is a *horrible abomination*, a *flagrant impiety*, invented by the wicked spirit, and by Nicholas II. Pope of Rome.—Some of them, girding themselves with cords or other ties, ran through the streets exclaiming: 'Yet a few days, and Zurich will be destroyed!' 'We! we! we!' Many thousands of converts were made, and the sect increased rapidly. It is no more allowable to baptize a child than to baptize a cat.'—Ibid, book xi, chap. x.

Such are the statements of the very Authors upon whom C. H. H. refers us for information as to the origin of the Baptists, and from those Authors we learn the Baptists have descended from the Mennonites; and the Mennonites from the Anabaptists; and the Anabaptists took their rise in Munster in Germany, in or about the year 1521. That there was no such thing as a Baptist Society before that period on any part of earth; that the Ana-Baptists were the most heretical and diabolical people that ever existed in the Christian Church, and who held the most horrible and disgusting practices were discovered by the Mennonites and afterwards by the Baptists; yet their peculiar opinions about baptism, and particularly their rant about infant baptism being papt, was derived from their Grandfathers, the Ana-Baptists of Germany.

From their history C. H. H. next comes to their mode and manner of baptism, let me refer our Episcopalian friends to their rubric. We refer our Presbyterian friends to Kito, McKnight, Barnes, Prof. Stewart, Chalmers, &c., and our Wesleyan friends to Wesley, Benson, Adam Clarke, Burkett, &c.

The reader will please observe that persons of other religious persuasions are not called *heretics*, but *heretics*, because they are not in 'the Succession,' should not be allowed to read 'Orchard's History of Foreign Baptists.' No, Sir; that is only for those who are in the true and only Church, and not for heretical Protestants. But Orchard's History will, I trust, give Baptists as clear and correct views of Church history as that base production, the Great Iron Plates, or Wesleyan Methodism. But when these plates are recommended to read 'Neander, Mosheim, Zwingle, D'Aubigne,' to convince us that 'the Baptists are the only Christian community which has stood since the Apostles.'

ter shall say to the parents or friends, taking the child in his arms. Name this child. And naming it after them, he shall dip it in the water, or pour water upon it, or sprinkle it therewith, saying, I baptize thee, &c.'

I have quoted both rubrics, that the reader may have them before him, and by which he will see that there is not the least reason in the rubric, that the 'Baptists are correct in their mode;' for the children are to be baptized, and the mode is optional with the minister; he is not to dip at all except the 'child may well endure it;' and when dipping is done, it is to be done discreetly and warily. But the Baptists most unwarrantably and incorrectly assert on the sole authority of their Grandfather the Anabaptist of Germany, that *Infant baptism* is a *horrible abomination*, a *flagrant impiety*, invented by the wicked spirit, and by Nicholas II. Pope of Rome; that it is no more allowable to baptize a child, than to baptize a cat; and moreover with the same boldness and lack of authority, they assert that dipping is the mode and the only mode, and when performed by them it is done oftentimes anything but discreetly and warily; for persons in delicate health, and females at improper times, are taken down into the water and scenes most indelicate and disgusting are presented to the gaze of an indelicately and sometimes a scoffing multitude. C. H. H. had better look somewhere else for support for his dipping hypothesis, than the rubric in the book of common prayer.

But C. H. H. does look somewhere else, for he refers his 'Presbyterian friends,' to Kito, McKnight, &c.; and his 'Wesleyan friends,' to Wesley, Benson, Adam Clarke, Burkett, &c.

But our Presbyterian friends, to answer for themselves, which they are quite competent to do, and will only reply for his Wesleyan friends:—

'I am at a loss! C. H. H. refers his "Wesleyan friends" to Burkett. Whom does he mean? There certainly never was a Wesleyan writer named Burkett. I know the name "William Burkett" who wrote "expository notes on the New Testament," but I cannot divine why C. H. H. should refer his Wesleyan readers to William Burkett, any more than his Baptist readers, for Burkett was not a Wesleyan, and knew nothing about John Wesley, inasmuch as he died in the year 1703 the very year John Wesley was born.'

With the other writers named by C. H. H. we have to do, viz., Wesley, Benson, and Adam Clarke.

Now Mr. Editor, as two of these writers, John Wesley, and Adam Clarke, are so often referred to by our Baptist friends, as teaching the exclusive hypothesis of 'dipping,' I would really like to see, if it becomes necessary fully to state what those writers really said on this matter.

The Rev. John Wesley, the Founder of Methodism, wrote a *Treatise on Baptism*, in which he says:—'It is true, we read of being "buried with Christ in baptism;" but nothing is said therein of the mode of baptism. Nay, if it held exactly, it would make as much for sprinkling as for plunging; since, in burying, the body is not plunged through the substance of the earth, but rather earth is poured or sprinkled upon it.'

And as there is no clear proof of dipping in the Scriptures, there is none in the history of the contrary. The Jews and all his house were baptized in the prison. Cornelius with his friends, and (so of several households) at home. Now is it likely that all these had ponds or rivers in or near their houses, sufficient to plunge them all? Every unprejudiced person must allow the contrary is far more probable. Again, three thousand at one time, and five thousand at another were converted and baptized by St. Peter, at Jerusalem, where they had none but the gentle waters of Siloam, according to the observation of Mr. Fuller.—There were no water mills in Jerusalem, because there was no stream large enough to drive them; the place, therefore, as well as the number, makes it highly probable that all were baptized by sprinkling or pouring, and not by immersion. To sum up all, the manner of baptizing whether by dipping or sprinkling, is not determined in scripture. There is no command for one rather than the other. There is no example from which we can conclude for dipping, rather than sprinkling. There are as many examples of both; and both are equally proper in the natural meaning of the word. *Treatise on Baptism*, Sect. 1.

With such a statement from his own pen, we know not which is the most astonishing, the sheer ignorance of C. H. H. in referring us to the writings of John Wesley, for proof that dipping is the only mode of baptism; or the bare-faced impudence of some Baptist preachers, who repeat from memory, in several respects, a misquoting of the words of the Founder of Methodism used in favour of their dipping hypothesis.

Let us now hear what Dr. Adam Clarke says on this subject, in his note on Mark iii. 6:—'And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins,' he says:—

Were the people dipped or sprinkled? For certain. There were all dipped, say some. Can any man suppose that it was possible for John the Baptist to baptize all the multitude of all the country round Jordan? Were both men and women dipped, for certainly both came to his baptism? This could never have comported either with safety or with decency? Were they dipped in their clothes? This would have endangered their lives if they had not changed of raiment with them; and as such a baptism as John's, however administered, is not at all likely, that the people would come so provided.

many months of the year he would have dipped neither man nor woman, unless he could have had a tepid bath? Those who are dipped, or immersed in water, in the name of the Holy Trinity, I believe to be evangelically baptized. Those who are washed—sprinkled with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost—I believe to be equally so; and the repetition of such baptism, I believe to be profane.'

If my reader is not previously acquainted with the sentiments of Dr. Adam Clarke on the subject of baptism, he will from the above quotation be surprised at the boldness with which the name of the Doctor is introduced by Baptists and Baptist preachers, as a believer and teacher of the dipping theory; while he never either believed or taught that either John the Baptist or any of the Apostles ever dipped any one; and moreover, he tells Baptist preachers that by dipping those who had been before sprinkled, they are guilty of an act that is truly profane.

It is no wonder that C. H. H. blunders so about Wesleyan writers, whose writings he appears never to have read; as he cannot quote a plain text from the Bible with accuracy, for he says: 'About the year 1866 the Church of Christ—the Baptist Church—will come forth out of the wilderness leaning on the arm of her beloved.' If the reader will turn to Solomon's Song vii. 25, he will not find the word *arm* in the text,—perhaps it is in some of the new versions. After some more rant about the Baptist Church being 'the Church of Christ'—the Baptist Churches being 'the only Churches formed after the primitive model'—the only Churches which have existed as pure communities of Churches from the ascension of our Saviour until now, &c., &c., &c.—C. H. H. has the following sentence: 'All the Protestant sects, though they have come out from the Church of Rome, and abandoned many of her idolatrous and corrupt practices, still retain many of the rites and trappings of the beast, such as sprinkling or pouring, infant baptism, baptismal regeneration, episcopacy, apostolic succession; Baptists alone reject all of these traditions of men.'

Here the anti-Protestant character of the Baptists is again crowed. 'All Protestant sects have come out from the Church of Rome,' but not the Baptists; for they 'disclaim the name of Protestants!' But it certainly is ridiculous for C. H. H. to put 'apostolic succession' among the 'trappings of the beast,' and say, 'Baptists alone reject all those traditions of men,' while the very article which he was then writing is headed, 'Baptists and Baptist Churches, the Genuine Apostolic Succession.' The whole article of C. H. H. is, in accuracy and absurdity from beginning to end.

But before C. H. H. closes his article we must have a little more about the antiquity of the Baptists. 'We have seen that the Baptist Church was founded in Jerusalem, A. D. 33; the Baptist Church was founded A. D. 606; the Lutheran was founded 1525; the Church of England, A. D. 1534; the Presbyterian, A. D. 1541; and the Methodist, 1729.'

From this synopsis of Church history, I make two selections both of which are glaringly and palpably incorrect.

The Methodist Church, C. H. H. tells his readers (which statement is endorsed by the Editor of the *C.M.*) was founded in 1729.

It cannot be conceived that C. H. H. has ever read a page of Methodist history in his life, nor does he appear ever to have seen the rules of the Methodist Society which are scattered over the earth by tens of thousands; otherwise he would never have made this blunder; for he makes Methodism 10 years older than he says it is. The Methodist Society was not founded in 1729, but 1729. What can such a man know about Methodism?

The other selection is, 'the Baptist Church was founded at Jerusalem in 33.' This is a similar blunder, for it does not synchronize with what his brother Baptists have told the world.

Baptist preachers have everywhere proclaimed that John the Baptist was their founder; but C. H. H. seems to have discovered that this is a mistake, for he expressly tells us the Baptist Church was founded A. D. 33. Nobody pretends to say that John the Baptist was alive in the year 33. According to the best chronologies, John commenced his ministry in the year 29 or 30 of the vulgar era; and was beheaded in the latter end of 31, or the beginning of 32. Who, then, might ask C. H. H., was the founder of the Baptist Church? Not John the Baptist surely, if he had been dead nearly two years before it was founded.

Reader, C. H. H. has revealed an important fact, and the Editor of the *Christian Messenger* says: 'The letter of C. H. H. will show the vast importance of extending the circulation of our journal.' Yes it will, and let the *Christian Messenger* issue a few more letters like that of C. H. H., and declare the Baptist Church was founded in Jerusalem in 33, and the public mind will be disabused. The public will see that if the Baptist Church was founded in Jerusalem; it certainly was not founded in the wilderness of Judea; if founded in 33, it was not founded in 29, and John the Baptist was not its founder. If John the Baptist was not the founder of the Baptist Churches, how has he been the founder of all the country round Jordan? Were both men and women dipped, for certainly both came to his baptism? This could never have comported either with safety or with decency? Were they dipped in their clothes? This would have endangered their lives if they had not changed of raiment with them; and as such a baptism as John's, however administered, is not at all likely, that the people would come so provided.

But, suppose they were dipped, which I think it would be impossible to prove, does it follow that in all regions of the world men and women must be dipped in order to be evangelically baptized? In the eastern countries baptisms were frequent, because of the heat of the climate, it being there so necessary to cleanse and health; but, our climate, or, at most northerly one, admit of this with safety, for at least three-fourths of the year? we may rest assured that it could not. And may we not presume, that if John had opened his commission in the North of Great Britain, for

t a Baptist was *then* born? Does C. H. H. mean to take his stand towards his business of Rome, and say, "St. Peter" founded the Peter certainly founded the Christian Church, and in the year A. D. 33, but we dispute the position that he founded the Baptist Church, or that he or any of the Apostles, any more than John, ever dipped any one.

Between the Baptist Churches, and the Church of Rome, there is a striking analogy, as my business and following particulars—

1st. Rome claims to be the first Church, and to have been founded in Jerusalem by St. Peter, &c., &c., &c.

2nd. Rome claims to be the only pure Church upon earth.

3rd. Rome claims to be the only pure Christian Church, and that she alone after the primitive model—the only Church which have existed as pure communities of Christians from the ascension of our Saviour until now.

4th. Rome claims to be the only pure Christian Church, and that she alone after the primitive model—the only Church which have existed as pure communities of Churches from the ascension of our Saviour until now, &c., &c., &c.—C. H. H. has the following sentence: 'All the Protestant sects, though they have come out from the Church of Rome, and abandoned many of her idolatrous and corrupt practices, still retain many of the rites and trappings of the beast, such as sprinkling or pouring, infant baptism, baptismal regeneration, episcopacy, apostolic succession; Baptists alone reject all of these traditions of men.'

Here the anti-Protestant character of the Baptists is again crowed. 'All Protestant sects have come out from the Church of Rome,' but not the Baptists; for they 'disclaim the name of Protestants!' But it certainly is ridiculous for C. H. H. to put 'apostolic succession' among the 'trappings of the beast,' and say, 'Baptists alone reject all those traditions of men,' while the very article which he was then writing is headed, 'Baptists and Baptist Churches, the Genuine Apostolic Succession.' The whole article of C. H. H. is, in accuracy and absurdity from beginning to end.

But before C. H. H. closes his article we must have a little more about the antiquity of the Baptists. 'We have seen that the Baptist Church was founded in Jerusalem, A. D. 33; the Baptist Church was founded A. D. 606; the Lutheran was founded 1525; the Church of England, A. D. 1534; the Presbyterian, A. D. 1541; and the Methodist, 1729.'

From this synopsis of Church history, I make two selections both of which are glaringly and palpably incorrect.

The Methodist Church, C. H. H. tells his readers (which statement is endorsed by the Editor of the *C.M.*) was founded in 1729.

It cannot be conceived that C. H. H. has ever read a page of Methodist history in his life, nor does he appear ever to have seen the rules of the Methodist Society which are scattered over the earth by tens of thousands; otherwise he would never have made this blunder; for he makes Methodism 10 years older than he says it is. The Methodist Society was not founded in 1729, but 1729. What can such a man know about Methodism?

The other selection is, 'the Baptist Church was founded at Jerusalem in 33.' This is a similar blunder, for it does not synchronize with what his brother Baptists have told the world.

Baptist preachers have everywhere proclaimed that John the Baptist was their founder; but C. H. H. seems to have discovered that this is a mistake, for he expressly tells us the Baptist Church was founded A. D. 33. Nobody pretends to say that John the Baptist was alive in the year 33. According to the best chronologies, John commenced his ministry in the year 29 or 30 of the vulgar era; and was beheaded in the latter end of 31, or the beginning of 32. Who, then, might ask C. H. H., was the founder of the Baptist Church? Not John the Baptist surely, if he had been dead nearly two years before it was founded.

Reader, C. H. H. has revealed an important fact, and the Editor of the *Christian Messenger* says: 'The letter of C. H. H. will show the vast importance of extending the circulation of our journal.' Yes it will, and let the *Christian Messenger* issue a few more letters like that of C. H. H., and declare the Baptist Church was founded in Jerusalem in 33, and the public mind will be disabused. The public will see that if the Baptist Church was founded in Jerusalem; it certainly was not founded in the wilderness of Judea; if founded in 33, it was not founded in 29, and John the Baptist was not its founder. If John the Baptist was not the founder of the Baptist Churches, how has he been the founder of all the country round Jordan? Were both men and women dipped, for certainly both came to his baptism? This could never have comported either with safety or with decency? Were they dipped in their clothes? This would have endangered their lives if they had not changed of raiment with them; and as such a baptism as John's, however administered, is not at all likely, that the people would come so provided.

A City Missionary "Sentenced"

On Wednesday the 14th inst., says the Boston Recorder, a well known City Missionary, Rev. Peter Mason, was with his family invited to a friend's house to spend the afternoon, and returning home early in the evening, was surprised to find his residence filled with neighbor and friends, and a large table filled with substantial refreshment among them a costly and comfortable dinner sent by W. H. Bartlett, Esq., and other friends at the jail. Judge Russell, one of the Police Court, applied explained the demonstration on account of his conduct, "summing up" and "passing sentence" as follows:—

'Peter Mason—You have been accused of doing grave offences against God and man; you have your eyes, moved by the instigation of humanity, you have habitually sought and relieved the destitute, the sick and the afflicted; that you have preached the gospel to the poor; that you have comforted those in prison. It is said that you have believed that even men and women who had been convicted of the most heinous crimes, might yet have hearts to feel and souls to save. You are further charged of diminishing the number of inmates at the jail, (and the jailor conspires to *cloak* your offence) with reducing the fees of the constable and the business of the Court. You bring the laws into contempt by preventing the crimes which those laws are intended to punish. You are known to be an old offender, and you have declared that you will not depart from these ways as long as you live.'

'Now receive the sentence of the Court, and, as a famous judge said on a similar occasion to the State's prison for 1846, "I could give you a heavier sentence, excepting him a purse of \$13 in gold." And you, Mrs. Mason, as you have shared your husband's trials, and helped him to bear his afflictions, as only a woman could, it is right that you should share his joys (giving her a purse of \$50). Our gift is accompanied not only with the kind wishes and warm regards of the kind-hearted and benevolent friends who have been relieved in distress, or saved from vice. I have passed sentence on your husband, and I do not doubt that both of you, continuing your charitable labors, will in the full sentence: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these, ye did it unto me."'

Mr. Mason was greatly affected, and expressed a feeling address to his friends for their present and past labors. After a short season of social intercourse, the company retired, leaving the good man and his wife to enjoy their deserved gift.

The Tower of Babel

We put a mark of interrogation at the end of the title of our article on this subject last week, and expressed a doubt of the alleged discovery of the tower of Babel in the article itself. The Boston Atlas has since referred, as we think, the views of Mr. Frazer on the subject. It says:—

'It is a notion that "the locality was assigned to the structure," is directly contradicted by the plain language of Scripture: "So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth; and they left off to build the city: therefore is the name of it called Babel." This conclusively fixes the locality. Babel and Babylon are the same. The city which in Hebrew is called Babel, in Greek is called Babylon. The Tower of Babel means precisely the same as the Tower of Babylon.—Now, the site of Babylon is well known, and there, if anywhere, we must look for the remains, if it remains exist, of the famous tower, and not at Arbel, which lies three hundred miles north of Babylon. The fact that Babel is found at Arbel is a no more important for Babel is found at many places in the neighborhood of the Tigris and Euphrates, and is nowhere more plentiful than at Hal, on the Euphrates, at no great distance above Babylon. On the site of Babylon there still exist stupendous ruins, pre-eminent among which are two vast piles of masonry, the one of which is the site of the Tower of Babel, and the other of which is the site of the Temple of Bel. The tower of Babel is found at Arbel, and there, if anywhere, we must look for the remains, if it remains exist, of the famous tower, and not at Arbel, which lies three hundred miles north of Babylon. The fact that Babel is found at Arbel is a no more important for Babel is found at many places in the neighborhood of the Tigris and Euphrates, and is nowhere more plentiful than at Hal, on the Euphrates, at no great distance above Babylon. On the site of Babylon there still exist stupendous ruins, pre-eminent among which are two vast piles of masonry, the one of which is the site of the Tower of Babel, and the other of which is the site of the Temple of Bel. The tower of Babel is found at Arbel, and there, if anywhere, we must look for the remains, if it remains exist, of the famous tower, and not at Arbel, which lies three hundred miles north of Babylon. The fact that Babel is found at Arbel is a no more important for Babel is found at many places in the neighborhood of the Tigris and Euphrates, and is nowhere more plentiful than at Hal, on the Euphrates, at no great distance above Babylon. On the site of Babylon there still exist stupendous ruins, pre-eminent among which are two vast piles of masonry, the one of which is the site of the Tower of Babel, and the other of which is the site of the Temple of Bel. The tower of Babel is found at Arbel, and there, if anywhere, we must look for the remains, if it remains exist, of the famous tower, and not at Arbel, which lies three hundred miles north of Babylon. The fact that Babel is found at Arbel is a no more important for Babel is found at many places in the neighborhood of the Tigris and Euphrates, and is nowhere more plentiful than at Hal, on the Euphrates, at no great distance above Babylon. On the site of Babylon there still exist stupendous ruins, pre-eminent among which are two vast piles of masonry, the one of which is the site of the Tower of Babel, and the other of which is the site of the Temple of Bel. The tower of Babel is found at Arbel, and there, if anywhere, we must look for the remains, if it remains exist, of the famous tower, and not at Arbel, which lies three hundred miles north of Babylon. The fact that Babel is found at Arbel is a no more important for Babel is found at many places in the neighborhood of the Tigris and Euphrates, and is nowhere more plentiful than at Hal, on the Euphrates, at no great distance above Babylon. On the site of Babylon there still exist stupendous ruins, pre-eminent among which are two vast piles of masonry, the one of which is the site of the Tower of Babel, and the other of which is the site of the Temple of Bel. The tower of Babel is found at Arbel, and there, if anywhere, we must look for the remains, if it remains exist, of the famous tower, and not at Arbel, which lies three hundred miles north of Babylon. The fact that Babel is found at Arbel is a no more important for Babel is found at many places in the neighborhood of the Tigris and Euphrates, and is nowhere more plentiful than at Hal, on the Euphrates, at no great distance above Babylon. On the site of Babylon there still exist stupendous ruins, pre-eminent among which are two vast piles of masonry, the one of which is the site of the Tower of Babel, and the other of