

the Lord's approval. In view of this, let the reader please re-peruse what I have said under that head in the preceding two paragraphs.

I am called to notice a manoeuvre which works most admirably to break the force of my Letter No. 1. Publicly and privately it has been gravely repeated that my first communication, in all its length and breadth, was founded upon a slip of the minister's tongue in quoting a passage of scripture erroneously. Great is the triumph in making it appear that I have cavilled at a "little mistake," an "innocent mistake." Yes, indeed, a little innocent mistake. It was a little mistake for the preacher to leave his 'sacred desk' and walk down among the people he had addressed. An innocent mistake that he ordered with official voice the seats to be cleared. Quite a little mistake, that these seats were appointed to receive the anxious and the inquiring, the mourning and the striving after mercy. Only an innocent mistake that he "blessed the Lord" for sending some to the newly devised altar. A little mistake that he invited various preachers and leaders to assist in praying regeneration into the hearts of the anxious young friends who were kneeling. A very innocent mistake that he opened his own mouth and prayed for the Spirit, and for fire, and for faith. It was nothing but a mistake that he referred to Peter at Pentecost, Philip, the Eunuch, Cornelius, and in every case misquoted and perverted the holy Spirit's language. It was an innocent mistake to substitute excitement for confidence in the Lord, and turn certain sympathetic feelings into the influence of the Spirit. All these make up what is called one little innocent mistake. I would give an old steel pen to learn from these reckoners and arithmeticians what constitutes in their estimation a great mistake. But my old pen may be saved, for I know by "experience" what a big mistake is. It consists in writing to a minister, noticing his public ministrations, and showing how he failed to abide by what is taught and exhibited in the holy scriptures when professedly converting the ungodly.

Courteous reader—the time has come when it is not enough simply to be Protestants or to be partizans, but to measure all that is taught from the pulpit or the press with the word of the living God. There are grand errors both doctrinal and practical in the ranks of Protestants, as indeed every Protestant will allow, nay, that every Protestant boldly and unequivocally avers. How shall these impurities be swept from the professing community? How shall these defilements be separated from the avowed sanctuary of Jesus? Do we not all answer alike,—by strictly comparing what is now taught and enacted with the sayings and doings of the inspired men who first taught and exhibited the Saviour's religion?—and by actively carrying out the comparison in rejecting the fleshly and human, and accepting the spiritual and divine?

Multitudes honestly and fondly cling to the doctrines and customs which their fathers venerated. True. This is a venerable argument for continuing to be pious according to the grace of the fathers; but the question will force itself upon the reflecting. What fathers shall we follow? The Roman fathers? The episcopal fathers? The