

British American Presbyterian

Vol. 4—No. 13.]

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, MAY 7, 1875.

[Whole No. 169

Contributors and Correspondents.

MODERN EVANGELISTS AGAIN.

The communicator to the BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN under the heading of "Modern Evangelists," discourses to a considerable length upon their presumption, forwardness, etc. Allow me, in all kindness to him, and for the information of those who may hold similar views, to say a few words through the columns of your paper:

In his first clause the communicator says, "No objection is made to any, and every Christian, lifting up Christ crucified to lost sinners at any proper time and place."

Does the Apostle limit Timothy to "proper times and places" where he says, "be instant in season and out of season." He continues, "on the contrary, the churches gladly welcome all such," etc. Yes, the churches apart from the ministers, often possess a discerning power, to which the minister may be an entire stranger, consequently those who constitute the church, welcome workers for Christ into their midst. I consider this distinction between pastor and people necessary, in order to reserve the force of the passage, for, to say certain knowledge, there are ministers who do not extend the right hand of fellowship to laborers striving to win souls to Christ.

He states in continuation, that "every effort is being made by the churches to secure workers," etc.

The workers will not be adequate to the task if they go merely on the strength of the persuasion of the church.

Again he says: "Only ignorance of the Home Mission work of all the churches can excuse a man in supposing this work is neglected," etc. I would intimate that a full knowledge of the Home Mission work would display a wide field for faithful workers or evangelists, where they might win many souls, and in this manner add faithful members to existing churches.

Our informant in the end confesses that the men and money are not forthcoming, that will be sufficient for the work. Still, he would banish evangelists to neglected localities, and require them to organize churches, elect elders, deacons, etc. He must bear in mind that Christianity was only in its infancy in the Apostle's time, and consequently organization was necessary, but is it so now; and if it were so, are all who love the Lord in sincerity, to go into remote regions and labour for Christ as missionaries?

Surely the fallacy of such an argument appears on the face of it.

The recent communicator's main objection to modern evangelists, appears to be that they have not been sent, but send themselves, and consequently are not after the New Testament model. Will he admit the Apostle Paul as a model from the New Testament? If so, hear what he says in the 1st chap. of Galatians—"But when it pleased God to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen immediately, I conferred not with flesh and blood." "Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them that were apostles before me, but I went into Arabia and returned again to Damascus." "Then after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to Peter," etc. But still of the apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother; further on he says, "I was unknown by face unto the Churches of Judea, which were in Christ."

Is such language as this to be misunderstood or disregarded? Surely it has been disregarded by our communicator. Still the Scripture is not of any private interpretation. A reference is made in Acts ix. 17, to Ananias putting his hand upon Paul in order that he might receive his sight, and he filled with the Holy Ghost; but I do not read anything further about him being sent, either by the church or by man's device.

For a further proof that workers were not always sent by the churches, look at Acts vii. 4, where it says, "Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word." Who sent those men? or who laid hands on them? Again in Rev. xvii. 17, "The spirit and the bride say come, and let him that heareth say come," etc. Almost the last recorded words breathed by the spirit of man were, "come Jesus," and he who had received Jesus, understood the passage, was asked to "come."

In the parable of the five loaves and two fishes, I take the "multitude" as a representation of the world, and the "disciples" represent believers in all ages. As it was the duty of the apostles to give bread to the multitude, so it is now the duty of believers to break to the needy the Bread of Life; and as all were needy then, so all of Christ are needy now.

In Joshua xvii. 8, we read, "How long shall ye slink to possess the land which the Lord God of your fathers hath given you. Christian was never intended to secure his own safety, and then dose away his experience. No, he must be up and doing, in possession of the land for his Lord and Master, win souls to Jesus, and as it is on earth, that they are wise who do so. Would the Lord grant his blessing to rest on the lips of his friends, if they were not doing what he commanded?"

Suppose we institute a comparison between the church as it existed primarily, and as it now stands. Are we right in supposing there were deceivers amongst those who had the privilege of laying hands upon those who were to spread the truth as it is in Jesus? If this will not be admitted, it must be patent to every one possessing any knowledge whatever of our ministers, that many of them are but as "blind leaders of the blind." And what benefit will arise from such men laying hands upon evangelists, when it is plain they have not been improved by the operation themselves.

In reply to the charge that "modern evangelists try to break down the churches, and draw off from the churches all they can," I would express my conviction that it would be well for some of those churches, that are neither cold nor hot, if their dangerous security was broken upon, and the members roused to a sense of duty. Far be it from me, however, to depreciate the churches in their proper work, and I think evangelists do much to build up the churches, in bringing to enjoy the means of grace, many saved sinners for whom the services of the sanctuary have then a reality not possessed before.

In conclusion, I would just call the attention of my readers to the work being done in England and Scotland, through the instrumentality of Mr. Moody and Mr. Sankey, not in neglected localities, but right amongst the churches, and with their co-operation.

THE REVIVAL IN BRITAIN.

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—Our notices of the controversy between Dr. Bonar and Dr. Kennedy would be incomplete without reference to that part—perhaps the most interesting and instructive—which deals with the two schools of Scotch theology, of which they may be regarded as representatives. In this, I shall avoid as far as possible the unpleasant and unprofitable personalities with which it is tinged. "It is," says Dr. Bonar, "the theology of the Lowlands that Dr. Kennedy has summoned to his tribunal, and against which he utters such hard impeachments. The reader is left in doubt whether the real gospel is preached in the south, or rather he is left in no doubt as to this,—that it is not preached at all." His deliverances against former revivals in the south are cited in comparison of this view, and Dr. Bonar proceeds to discuss what is really the true ground of controversy. He says, "I confess I do not understand what 'hyper-calvinism' is. I know what 'hyper-calvinism' is, or even 'hyper-hyper-calvinism' is; but I do not, even with the help of the explanation in the pamphlet, comprehend what 'hyper-ovangelism' can be. I know what 'another gospel' means, because the Apostle, who gave us the expression, has showed us, in the same epistle where it occurs, what it was in Galatia; and how it exhibited itself in putting restrictions on the freedom of the gospel, in mingling law with gospel, in destroying the simplicity of faith, in adding something to the finished work of Christ,—something to be done by the sinner himself, in addition to what Christ has done, to give the weary rest. This Galatian gospel raised a barrier between the sinner and the cross; it tried to intercept the flying manslayer in his way to the city of refuge; it made the way to Christ a long, dark, laborious, uncertain by-path; it set salvation afar off, and made the sinner's reception of it one of the most painful and complex of all processes, a thing of uncertainty to the last. I should not certainly like to preach 'another gospel'; but I should like to be very sure that what I preach is really 'another gospel,' before I give it up. I should not like to be more evangelical than Paul; yet I should like to be as evangelical as he, preaching as free a gospel, and saying as broadly and unconditionally as he did at Antioch in a sermon where no mention of law, or of sovereignty is made, 'by Him all that believe are justified from all things.' And here I would notice that in the Acts of the Apostles we have many specimens of Apostolic preaching to promiscuous multitudes, yet in not one of them is the law introduced. The Apostles confined themselves to the glad tidings concerning Christ and his cross. Christ crucified was that which was preached for conviction and conversion. Peter did not say to his hearers, 'ye have broken the ten commandments,' but 'ye have crucified Christ.' This was the sword which the Apostles used for smiting the sinner's conscience, the sword which they brought down with such awful force upon his head. I might charge some of our northern men with ignoring the cross as the divine instrument for conviction, much more truly than they could charge me with ignoring the law. I do not ignore the law; I know that 'this law is good, if a man use it lawfully.' The question before us is, do we use it lawfully? do we give it the place which God has assigned it? do we preach it as the Apostles did?"

After denying emphatically the swooping and reckless assertion, "a call to repentance never issues from their trumpet. In their view, there is no place for repentance either before or after conversion." Dr. Bonar proceeds, "It is unfair to blame Mr. Moody for casual expressions on regeneration, and repentance, and faith; and to charge him with holding; that man can work these changes in himself, without the Holy Spirit. Mr. Moody does not hold this; and they who seize hold of some stray words of his, which seem to intimate this, should remember that Calvin, in his well-known Institutes, has given us what they must regard as a much more offensive and unsound announcement. The third chapter of his third book is entitled 'Regeneration by Faith; and the first section of this chapter is to show how repentance follows faith, and is produced by it; and to expose the error of those who take a contrary view. He then proceeds, 'that repentance not only always follows faith, but is produced by it, ought to be without controversy. Those who think that repentance precedes faith, instead of flowing from or being produced by it, as the fruit by the tree, have never understood its nature, and are moved to adopt that view on very indifferent grounds. . . . There is no semblance of reason in the absurd procedure of those, who, that they may begin with repentance, prescribe to their Neophytes certain days, during which they are to exercise themselves in repentance, and after these are elapsed, admit them to communion in gospel grace. I allude to great numbers of Anabaptists, those of them especially who plunge themselves on being spiritual. What then? Can true repentance exist without faith? By no means, under the term repentance, is comprehended the whole turning to God, of which not the least important part is faith. The term repentance is derived from the Hebrew term, conversion, or turning again, and in the Greek, from a change of mind and purpose; nor is the thing meant inappropriate to both derivations, for it is substantially this, that, withdrawing from ourselves, we turn to God, and laying aside the old we put on a new mind.' (Institutes, 6. iii., ch. 13).

It is impossible here to take up the question of repentance and its connection with faith. It is evident, however, that the repentance which does not come from believing, must be simply that of the natural conscience. It was the preaching of a crucified Christ at Pentecost that produced repentance. It is not said 'they shall mourn and look to him whom they have pierced,' but 'they shall look to him whom they have pierced, and mourn.' Our old and best divines were very strong and full upon this point, accounting the opposite to be the Popish doctrine of a man's being able to recommend himself to God, and prepare himself for Christ, by mortifications and penances. Let us read a few of these precious teachings of the olden time. Thus wrote old John Davidson in his catechism, "When I call upon you, what is craved of a man after that we are joined to Christ by faith, and made truly righteous in Him. ye shall answer, we must repent and become new persons." James Melville, in his old catechism, says, "What is thy repentance? The effect of this faith, with a sorrow for my sins by-past, and purpose to amend in time to come." "It is not sound doctrine," says Dr. Calhoun, "to teach that Christ will receive none but the truly penitent, or that none else is warranted to come by faith to him for salvation. The evil of that doctrine is, that it sets needy sinners on spinning repentance, as it were, out of their own bowels, and on bringing it with them to Christ, instead of coming to him by faith to receive it from him. If none be invited but the true penitent, then impenitent sinners are not bound to come to Christ, and cannot be blamed for not coming." (View of Evangelical Repentance, pp. 27, 28.)

In Shepherd's well known work, *The Sound Believer*, now more than 200 years old, we have statements like the following: "More are drawn to Christ under the sense of a dead, blind heart, than by all sorrows, humiliations, and terror." For others see the *Marrow of Modern Divinity*, with Thomas Boston's notes.

Many other charges Dr. Bonar meets in a manner equally direct and effective; but time and space forbid farther quotation, beyond the closing paragraph. Dr. Kennedy's coarse and disgusting description of the religious abortion, which would result from this pseudo-travail of Zion, having been set aside by evidence of the hardy, healthy fruit which already abounds, (as set forth in last letter), Dr. Bonar adds a firm and manly protest against the terrible and most uncharitable judgment passed by this one brother against hundreds of brethren, such as the Master only had the right to deliver, and closes his pamphlet thus:—"I can hardly admit that, even were the work an unreality, Dr. Kennedy's position and language would be justified. But on the other hand, what if THAT WORK BE TRUE? What if all his hard words have been really spoken against men who have been really doing God's work, and against a work which with all its imperfections, is essentially divine? He accepts the responsibility of opposing it; I accept the responsibility of upholding it. I cannot but think that the first of those is by far the heavier of the two. To be contending for God even under a mistake, is not so serious as contending against him, even though this last hostility may be the best of motives zeal for the honour of him whose doings in the land are the subject of question. Gamaliel's position would be safer so long as there is the shadow of a doubt about the matter, 'Refrain from these men, and let them alone, for if this counsel and this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.'" W. M. R.

WHAT must be the disclosures of the last day! God holds the key to inmost thought of all men; and when they are all open to inspection, how fearful will then be the outcry. Take heed, O hypocrite; the Lord knows thee. Rejoice, thou sincere heart; the Lord will come and bid thy witness.—Stearns.

What is the Scriptural Mode of Baptism?

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—A copy of the tract under the above heading, in which the writer, Rev. J. McTavish, of Woodstock, tries to show that "immersion is not proper spiritual baptism, and therefore has its origin in will-worship, its foundation in the ritualistic tendencies of fallen humanity, the disposition to add to the ritual of God's appointment, and to compensate for lack of spirituality by the number and magnitude of its rites, and the costliness and painfulness of its service," which was noticed in THE BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN two weeks ago, has fallen into my hands.

Now, sir, while I am not prepared to admit that immersion is the only true way in which the ordinance of baptism may be administered, yet I am prepared to say that Mr. McTavish has utterly failed to show that it is not; and if his pamphlet is to be taken as a fair sample of the arguments in favor of pouring or sprinkling, I must say such arguments are very poor indeed.

His first assertion regarding baptism, which is that, "No more is taught by the expressions referred to (i.e., went down into, came up out of the water, in Jordan, etc.), than that the persons spoken of went to or from the water, or were at Jordan," may or may not be true, as, according to his own showing, they may have been baptized in the Jordan; and if in, they must have been partly or wholly immersed. But suppose we take it for granted that what he says in this respect is true, let us notice what—

I. "Old Testament baptisms (purifications or washings) were performed by sprinkling or pouring." This, certainly, is no reason why the Christian baptism should be performed in the same way, also why should we not read of persons baptizing themselves, as we do of their purifying themselves. There were no Christian rites in Jewish times.

II. "Baptism . . . is the antitype of the deluge—the world of the ungodly was immersed but not baptised, while the saved were baptised by being sprinkled by the rain and spray." Here it is very improbable that the saved, shut up in the ark and covered with a roof, were sprinkled either by the rain or spray. As an argument in reference to the mode of baptism this must therefore go for naught, unless, indeed, we say the world was baptised in water, and came out of it purified by sin; and this would make the deluge a perfect type of spiritual baptism which purifies from sin, and also a type of baptism by immersion.

His next argument is somewhat similar. "The children of Israel were baptised unto Moses, as they crossed the Red Sea. Surely we are not to believe they were immersed into Moses?" No; neither are we to believe they were sprinkled, or poured, into or unto Moses. But surely Mr. McTavish does not mean to say that the Israelites were really baptised in the now Testament sense of the term. Is not this baptism a figure of the Christian baptism, and did not the Children of Israel literally go down into the sea, and literally come up out of it again?—a perfect type of baptism by immersion, as it implies the coming out of, as well as going down into.

His fourth argument is based upon "the tradition of the Pharisees concerning makers of religion," in regard to which I have only to say we are not to take the traditions of men, even as perfect as the Pharisees, that the Baptist calls a "generation of vipers," as our guide in religious duties.

He next speaks of such passages as "being buried with Christ," "nailed to the cross," etc., and says, "these, all Christians admit, are to be taken figuratively or spiritually, save that the Baptists insist on taking one part literally and physically. They insist on a literal burial of the baptized. But can we be buried bodily with Christ, unless his body, at least, is in the same grave? And how can this be, if he is in glory? And besides how can he be buried in a large number of places at the same moment, and this while no person either sees or feels him in any of them? Transubstantiation is not stronger than this demand on our capacity for believing." The above does not show very clearly that the reverend gentleman understands the views of those against whom he is writing. As near as I can understand, Baptists hold that baptism by immersion, is a figure of their being spiritually buried with Christ, and rising again into newness of life, and not that it is a bodily burial with Christ. If this, then, be so, the above tirade against Baptists is simply "a waste of words."

His closing remarks in reference to the uncleanliness of baptising several persons in the one baptism have no weight, as they prove nothing in regard to the mode, and something the same is adopted by Presbyterians, when they dip and re-dip their hands into the small quantity of water with which they perform their baptisms.

In conclusion, what shall we say, then? Is immersion the only scriptural mode of baptism? Nay, I am not prepared to say this, only that it may be one of the Scriptural modes, and that Mr. McTavish has failed to show that it is not, and that such pamphlets as his are not calculated to alter the opinions of any person regarding the mode of Baptism. Yours, etc., A. McP.

Dundas, April 30.

Spiritual Sower—Don't Sow Sparingly?

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—Is such done? Yes, in Sabbath-schools by many of the teachers, and by parents in the family circles. The Sabbath-school assemblies—opening part is over—classes are in their places—the teacher begins, and the spiritual seed which he or she, as the case may be, is not of the best quality, and consequently the sowing is very miserable. The same holds true of the family altar in many cases. Let me illustrate, from the consideration of the lesson, the child is solemnly warned against doing wrong and is exhorted to be good, and he may promise the teacher so to do. But his idea of being good, or how to become good is very vague. His notion of good may consist in getting the lesson well, reading the Bible, obeying when asked to go on errands, and saying prayers. The child is carefully told to commit to memory the verses in the scheme of lessons, and notice carefully the suggestive topics, and all the rest. And all the while the lesson never once applied to the heart of the child. Hence, sowing sparingly. He is reminded of being in school regularly, so as not to have bad marks, and thus be a good boy. Review day comes, the children are asked who committed such and such verses, and questions, and it may be every hand is up. They are then commended for their diligence by teacher or superintendent, hence another addition to their supposed goodness. They did well for the Foreign Mission, and are told they are good children. Thus the teacher unthoughtfully, teaching them that salvation is by works, and by and by they will be good enough for heaven. This is sowing unsparingly to the flesh, not to the spirit.

They are found to be well versed in Bible history, e.g., the falling of the walls of Jericho, call of Abraham, the deluge, etc. On this I might go to show the kind of information given, but like the valley of dry bones of Ezekiel, without the living breath. We want, and must have, the incorruptible seed of the kingdom sown, before we can reap bountifully. The same defect, sad defect, is seen in the family circle. No father piously reads a long chapter, and no comment or remark, a prayer perhaps, to cover up the conscious defect thus going through an ear-spelled routine of much labor, but the bountiful sowing of the living seed is missing. Why do we find, those we would expect flocking into the kingdom of God coming so tardily? I answer, largely, because the sowing was so sparingly done by those who had the young of our churches given to their trust, by a too much suppressing of the Cross of Christ. A very popular notion with children and young people generally, is that salvation is by doing and being good. The doctrine of justification before God, by faith in Christ, is not sufficiently taught; no matter how you teach, or what you teach, if this doctrine of God's Word is not dwelt upon, enforced, and come over by the teacher again and again, so that the mind will become impressed with it so as to eradicate this notion of doing, the teacher fails and lamentably so. A child may live and die in a Sabbath School, and still fail to grasp the great and absolutely necessary truth. I take a living example, known to me personally, of a young girl trained in a first class Sabbath School, but had no conception of the necessity of going to God through Christ Jesus; still she was well versed in the international scheme of lessons. There is too much teaching by theory on the part of teachers, and too little practical. This young girl's teacher sowed too sparingly and there was the result. Teach them that all, both old and young, are sinful, by nature and by practice, and that outward goodness, or reform cannot reach the conscience, only the blood of Christ. How many children when asked if Christ saves good people or bad people; the answer almost invariably is, good people. The blunt, dull teaching imparted by many in Sabbath Schools, must get the credit very largely for such ignorance. The teacher who fails to set forth Christ's finished work as the way of becoming good, is better to take his or her place along with the children. Going over the lesson, and giving a general outline, is not teaching. Let Jesus Christ be lifted up. Let the pupil be taught where he is, and how he is by nature in God's sight. Let the merits of Christ's obedience and death be enforced, that they may become familiar to the child, till becoming to their mind and heart as something that cannot be dispensed with in order to salvation and holiness; no more than the sun in the heavens for the comfort of man. This being faithfully and prayerfully done, and left to the Holy Spirit, (for He alone can take of Christ and show it,) the teacher may expect the blessing, the increase in a bountiful harvest, for he sowed faithfully in God's name. A good divine once said, "Let God speak much, man little." The way to carry out this is to speak much of Christ's work on behalf of the lost. Channiquy is leveling successful blows at Pappay, but he does not fail to put the Saviour in the place of the errors it expresses. He sows bountifully by giving Christ an exalted place. We speak with joy of the approaching Union of the Presbyterian Churches of this Dominion, and the confederation in prospect of all the Reformed Presbyterian Churches throughout the whole earth, for the extension of the kingdom of the Prince of Peace. The success of these combined forces of the Lord Jesus, will depend much on the place we give to the Lord Jesus Christ in our motives and teachings. Let them, the Sabbath School teachers of these churches and of others, also most unsparingly show the demerit of sin and God's hatred of it; and then on the other hand, faithfully teach that God commendeth His love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us, Rom. v. 8; and then the sowing is of the right sort.

What is the Scriptural Mode of Baptism?

EDITOR BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR,—A copy of the tract under the above heading, in which the writer, Rev. J. McTavish, of Woodstock, tries to show that "immersion is not proper spiritual baptism, and therefore has its origin in will-worship, its foundation in the ritualistic tendencies of fallen humanity, the disposition to add to the ritual of God's appointment, and to compensate for lack of spirituality by the number and magnitude of its rites, and the costliness and painfulness of its service," which was noticed in THE BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN two weeks ago, has fallen into my hands.

Now, sir, while I am not prepared to admit that immersion is the only true way in which the ordinance of baptism may be administered, yet I am prepared to say that Mr. McTavish has utterly failed to show that it is not; and if his pamphlet is to be taken as a fair sample of the arguments in favor of pouring or sprinkling, I must say such arguments are very poor indeed.

His first assertion regarding baptism, which is that, "No more is taught by the expressions referred to (i.e., went down into, came up out of the water, in Jordan, etc.), than that the persons spoken of went to or from the water, or were at Jordan," may or may not be true, as, according to his own showing, they may have been baptized in the Jordan; and if in, they must have been partly or wholly immersed. But suppose we take it for granted that what he says in this respect is true, let us notice what—

I. "Old Testament baptisms (purifications or washings) were performed by sprinkling or pouring." This, certainly, is no reason why the Christian baptism should be performed in the same way, also why should we not read of persons baptizing themselves, as we do of their purifying themselves. There were no Christian rites in Jewish times.

II. "Baptism . . . is the antitype of the deluge—the world of the ungodly was immersed but not baptised, while the saved were baptised by being sprinkled by the rain and spray." Here it is very improbable that the saved, shut up in the ark and covered with a roof, were sprinkled either by the rain or spray. As an argument in reference to the mode of baptism this must therefore go for naught, unless, indeed, we say the world was baptised in water, and came out of it purified by sin; and this would make the deluge a perfect type of spiritual baptism which purifies from sin, and also a type of baptism by immersion.

His next argument is somewhat similar. "The children of Israel were baptised unto Moses, as they crossed the Red Sea. Surely we are not to believe they were immersed into Moses?" No; neither are we to believe they were sprinkled, or poured, into or unto Moses. But surely Mr. McTavish does not mean to say that the Israelites were really baptised in the now Testament sense of the term. Is not this baptism a figure of the Christian baptism, and did not the Children of Israel literally go down into the sea, and literally come up out of it again?—a perfect type of baptism by immersion, as it implies the coming out of, as well as going down into.

His fourth argument is based upon "the tradition of the Pharisees concerning makers of religion," in regard to which I have only to say we are not to take the traditions of men, even as perfect as the Pharisees, that the Baptist calls a "generation of vipers," as our guide in religious duties.

He next speaks of such passages as "being buried with Christ," "nailed to the cross," etc., and says, "these, all Christians admit, are to be taken figuratively or spiritually, save that the Baptists insist on taking one part literally and physically. They insist on a literal burial of the baptized. But can we be buried bodily with Christ, unless his body, at least, is in the same grave? And how can this be, if he is in glory? And besides how can he be buried in a large number of places at the same moment, and this while no person either sees or feels him in any of them? Transubstantiation is not stronger than this demand on our capacity for believing." The above does not show very clearly that the reverend gentleman understands the views of those against whom he is writing. As near as I can understand, Baptists hold that baptism by immersion, is a figure of their being spiritually buried with Christ, and rising again into newness of life, and not that it is a bodily burial with Christ. If this, then, be so, the above tirade against Baptists is simply "a waste of words."

His closing remarks in reference to the uncleanliness of baptising several persons in the one baptism have no weight, as they prove nothing in regard to the mode, and something the same is adopted by Presbyterians, when they dip and re-dip their hands into the small quantity of water with which they perform their baptisms.

In conclusion, what shall we say, then? Is immersion the only scriptural mode of baptism? Nay, I am not prepared to say this, only that it may be one of the Scriptural modes, and that Mr. McTavish has failed to show that it is not, and that such pamphlets as his are not calculated to alter the opinions of any person regarding the mode of Baptism. Yours, etc., A. McP.

Dundas, April 30.

So much as thou lovest, so much thou knowest.

PRESBYTERIAN OBIQUITY.