

But we are very gravely told that we are not now under the law of Moses, and consequently not under so rigid a rule in relation to Sabbath observance as he enjoined. It is true that we are not under the legislation of Moses on this matter. The Sabbatical institution goes back of Moses to the period when God rested from his works. Man is so constituted as to require every seventh day as a day of rest,—he requires it for body and soul; and if the New Testament admits of a violation of this arrangement, it sanctions physical, intellectual, and moral suicide. This institution was incorporated with the ceremonial law and its observance guarded by the most fearful penalties, but the law of commandments contained in ordinances Christ nailed to his cross. So far then as the legislation of Moses is concerned on this subject we have nothing to observe; (not regarding the tables of stone as a part of his legislation for Israel,) but the Sabbatical institution is God's gift to man; is based upon natural law; and consequently can never cease to be binding upon man in his present condition. The law of Moses has passed away, having been fulfilled; but the Sabbatical institution remains, a sacred day commemorative of a most sacred event—the resurrection of our Lord. The Redeemer never, that we read of, met with his disciples on the Jewish Sabbath, after his resurrection, but once and again he sanctioned by his presence their assembling together on the first day of the week, and on this day the disciples came together to break bread and listen to the Apostle's doctrine. So testifies the Spirit of God. We have then still a day of rest—a sacred commemorative day: the "Lord's Day."

Every institution which God has given to man must be observed with holy hearts. He, the Most High, cannot sanction any other kind of observance. What would we think of the church who in celebrating the Supper, should partake of the bread in the most devout manner and state of mind; but should smile and chat about their worldly business, when the cup, containing the emblem of a Saviour's blood, was in their hands? Would we not call such conduct desecrating the ordinance? What then must we think of serving God on one part of the Lord's Day, and serving the world on another part, the WHOLE day is the Lord's Day. Sabbath breaking is a fearful evil. No family can be thus guilty and prosper. No nation can disregard this heavenly institution, without sinking deeper and deeper into degradation. And shall the people of Canada remain indifferent to this subject? We cannot believe that they will. Love to Christ—love to his day—nay, love to social order, must and will, we think, lead our country to raise its voice against Sabbath desecration.

The "North British Review" on Infant Baptism.

"Religious controversies are every day assuming more and more the sharp and definite form of an antagonistic struggle between the Christianity of Scripture and the Christianity of tradition."—*N. B. R.*

Speed the time when this issue will be felt and acknowledged every where! For years we have watched and wearied for the day when parties and principles shall no longer be confounded at the

point of conflict; but in distinct array we shall stand the host of Christ and the host of Antichrist, to contend respectively for the Word of God and tradition. We have fondly thought that the separation was silently but effectively advancing. Every thing seems conspiring to aid it. The bold and somewhat reckless advances of superstition and tradition has done much to open the eyes of the unsuspecting, and to force the undecided to declare themselves. The signs are thickening around us, that on either side the time of truce and compromise will not be tolerated much longer.

The sentence quoted above is one of many distinct intimations which we have recently heard from influential quarters of the approaching change in the attitude and relations of religious parties. The article from which it is taken is on "Liturgical Reform in the Church of England," in the August Number of the *North British Review*. This article contains what is better far than an expression of opinion as to what is taking place, in matters of religious debate: it contains a gratifying exemplification of the progress which the advocates of evangelical truth have made in disencumbering themselves of the shackles of tradition. It shews not only a disposition to appeal to Scripture, but a preparation to appreciate the testimony of Scripture. It shews not only a preparation to perceive the truth, but great boldness and freedom in its avowal.

It has long been apparent to us that if the practice of Pædo-baptism could be sustained by Scripture then the doctrine of baptismal regeneration could not be denied, that your full-blooded Tractarian is the only consistent advocate of infant baptism, that Scriptural language could not be used with reference to this ordinance without implying all that the Bishop of Exeter demands. This advantage has been pressed by the High Church party in England with great zeal and success, until there remains no choice to their brethren but to admit the conclusion or deny the premises—to avow the fearful dogma of baptismal regeneration or to renounce infant baptism. We could not have wished another voice to be the first to break silence at such a crisis than the *North British Review*. Most of our readers are aware of its excellence and influence, and of its relation to the Free Church of Scotland, and to the noblest and best men in the land. We quote the manly and honest declaration of truth from such a quarter, not in the littleness of sectarian triumph, but with feelings of respect for the writer, and of honest joy at the prospect of seeing eye to eye on this and kindred questions with many whom we love in the truth, and from whom we are own reluctantly sundered in our advocacy of a common faith:—

"The doctrine of the baptismal service is true: the unconscionableness of the infant is the real *pons mali*. The baptismal service is founded on Scripture; but its application to an unconscionable infant is destitute of any express Scriptural warrant. Scripture knows nothing of the baptism of infants. There is absolutely not a single trace of it to be found in the New Testament. There are passages which may be reconciled with it, if the practice can only be proved to have existed; but there is not one word which asserts its existence. Nay more, it may be urged that 1 Cor. vii. 14, is incompatible with the supposition that infant baptism was then practiced at Corinth. The Apostle in this passage

seeks to remove the scruples of those Christian partners in mixed marriages, who believed that a conjugal union with a heathen was a state profane and unholy in God's sight. He re-assures them by an argument founded on a *reductio ad absurdum*. You admit, says he, that your children are holy; then be persuaded that the marriage from which that sanctity was derived is holy also. For, were it otherwise; if, as you imagine, the marriage is unholy, then it would follow that the children that are the fruits of it would be unclean and unholy also; whereas you know and admit the reverse; you confess them to be holy. It is absolutely indispensable for the validity of this argument, that the sanctity of the children should have been exclusively derived from the sanctity of the marriage; for on no other hypothesis could the sanctity of the children have furnished a proof of the sanctity of the marriage. Had the children been baptized, they would have been holy in their own right, as members of Christ; and a father, who had had his children baptized, would have effectually demolished the Apostle's reasoning by the simple reply, that the holiness of his children, as members of Christ's Church, was no reason for his thinking the marriage holy, or his not putting away his unbelieving wife. Many, indeed, have explained the term holy as meaning, "have been admitted to baptism," making the verse say, that if the faith of the believing partner had not sanctified the marriage, the children would not have been admitted to baptism, whereas they had been baptized. But this is to re-write Scripture, not to interpret it.

"History confirms the inference drawn from the sacred volume. Infant baptism cannot be clearly traced higher than the middle of the second century; and even then it was not universal. Some, indeed, have argued that in the silence of Scripture it is fair to presume that a custom whose existence is seen in the second century must have descended from the Apostles: but the presumption is wholly the other way. Baptism appears in the New Testament avowedly as the rite whereby converts were incorporated into the Christian society: the burden of the proof is entirely on those who affirm its applicability to those whose minds are incapable of any conscious act of faith."

After further remarks to the same effect the reviewer adds, "Dr. McNeile, Mr. Litton, we may almost add the Archbishop of Canterbury, are perceiving that the practice of infant baptism is not found in Scripture." It may seem strange to some that a writer so plain and straight-forward should say after all this, "We have not wished to breathe the slightest insinuation against the legitimacy and the importance of infant baptism," and then go on to argue the policy and fitness of the "institution." But, we may bear with this lingering attachment to the cherished rite. Such a lover of truth will soon acknowledge the peril and Popery of such will-worship; and at all events when the teachers abandon the Scriptural grounds of the rite, the people will speedily abolish its observance.

EDMUND GALLUP.—During the commencement season of Madison University we were sharers of the hospitality of Professor Gallup and his excellent Lady; and we shall not soon forget their unwearied efforts to render all around them happy. The guests were all deeply interested in the Professor's little family, and especially in the eldest son. God has so constituted the human mind that except in cases where a long course of moral obliquity has subverted the finer feelings of the soul, the sympathies of the mind are spontaneously cast around helpless innocence; and little "Eddie," as we familiarly called him was fitted to awaken