

# The Wesleyan,

137

Rev. A. W. NICOLSON,  
Editor and Publisher.

Published under the direction of the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Canada.

\$2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE  
Postage Prepaid.

VOL. XXIX

HALIFAX N.S., MAY 5, 1877.

NO. 18

**WESLEYAN BOOK ROOM,**  
125 GRANVILLE STREET,  
HALIFAX, N.S.  
DEPOSITORY FOR  
**ALL METHODIST PUBLICATIONS**  
AND SALES-ROOM FOR  
General Literature, Stationery, Blank Book  
**AND SCHOOL BOOKS.**  
Sabbath Schools, Clergymen and Students  
purchasing in quantities have  
**A SPECIAL DISCOUNT**

**EXAMINATION OF REV. EMORY  
J. HAYNES.**

Our readers will recollect that this minister, a few weeks ago, renounced his faith in Armenianism, having been a Methodist, and chose the fellowship of Close-Communion Baptists. He was re-baptized, immersed, of course,—that we all expected. But it has astonished everybody to find that Methodist ordination has not been regarded by Baptists as any more valid than Methodist Baptism. Had Mr. Haynes been converted from Heathenism, the processes to which he was subjected could not have taken a very different form. It is now too apparent that, whatever may be the profession of our Baptist brethren as they meet us in public gatherings, their real view is that we are unbaptized, unordained unbelievers. We have often had occasion to complain that their conduct toward other Christians was not logical or consistent; we shall soon, at this rate, have little cause for complaint. But what of the man who would submit to such trumpery? If there are any other such we hope they will also depart.

It is interesting to note what other churches think of the affair. We quote:—

The "Christian Intelligencer" says: The Rev. Emory J. Haynes, in a time of profound ecclesiastical peace, in the era of evangelical alliances and universal good fellowship, in passing from the Methodist to the Baptist Church has been conducted by the latter through a series of remarkable proceedings. It was known of all men in this region that he had been for many years a member and a minister of the Methodist Church—a thoroughly evangelical body, abounding in love and good works. Yet he has been examined for admission to church membership, the examination including, if the reports are correct, a presentation of evidences of conversion and unbelief. This proving satisfactory, he was re-baptized. Then he was examined for ordination and re-ordained. Why didn't they shave his head and scrape his fingernails? We do not know which party to admire the most—the brother who submitted to the operation, or the association which conducted it. What a broad face it was! Mind you, the last question, "Do you hold to close communion?" was evaded by the candidate, was not insisted on by the examiners, and remains unanswered. How in the world was it that Brother Haynes hesitated a moment to say "Yes?"

From the New York "Herald," which is seldom troubled with religious preferences or prejudices, the "Central Advocate" quotes as follows:—

The New York "Herald" gives an interesting account of the examination and re-ordination of Rev. Emory J. Haynes. It says: "For two and a half hours the council kept Mr. Haynes on the rack examining him not merely on experience, call to the ministry, and doctrines, but on nice theological and metaphysical points which some of the councilors wished settled for themselves. Such, for instance, as whether justification precedes regeneration or follows it; whether the atonement of Christ includes in its sweep all the descendants of Adam or only 'the elect'; how Christ shall come again, and when and what form of invitation to the Lord's Supper Mr. Haynes would give." The "Herald" is impressed with Mr. Haynes' ingenuities, which it thus portrays: "He was shrewd enough throughout his examination to evade answers to questions until they were made so plain by repetition that he could say 'Yes' or 'No,' or, as in one case he did to Dr. Hodge, 'You have put it very happily,' which created laughter and applause. The doctrines of election and the extent of the atonement were those on which he was pressed most closely and whose details he most cleverly avoided." At the conclusion of his examination, Mr. Haynes was approved by the council, and in the evening

was ordained with considerable pomp, as this quotation will show: "Rev. William Reed made the opening prayer, Dr. Sarles the ordaining prayer, Dr. Armitage preached the sermon, Rev. Dr. Fulton gave the hand of fellowship, and Rev. Mr. Lawson the charge to the pastor, and Dr. Daniel Read, Revs. Hughes, Fulwell and other ministers took other parts of the service, which was prolonged until nearly ten o'clock." The logical conclusion of all this is that in the eyes of our Baptist brethren a Methodist preacher is no preacher at all.

**FREE AND CLOSE COMMUNION  
BAPTISTS.**

Dr. Ryerson sent the following letter to the *Guardian* last week. It shows that the relation between old and new-world Baptists is not more intimate than that which binds evangelical Christians generally. Would not Spurgeon to-day, and Robert Hall if he were alive, be brought under discipline by such Baptists as we are acquainted with on this side of the water?

MR. EDITOR.—Before and since my return from England, I have observed articles in the *Guardian* on the subject of open and close communion among the Baptists, some written by Baptists, some in reply to them. I believe the discussion originated in a letter in favor of open or free communion, written by Mr. McCord, justly respected by all who know him. I have no intention to renew the discussion; but I have thought it would not be unacceptable to your readers for me to give my own experience among our Baptist brethren, during my recent sojourn in England.

A short time after I took lodgings near the British Museum, in Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury, I went one Sabbath evening to the Baptist Bloomsbury Chapel, a large and fine place of worship, the pastor of which for many years was the late Rev. Dr. Brock, long a leading representative of the Baptist denomination, and standing in the first rank of Protestant ministers in London. The congregation was very large, the singing excellent, including the chanting of psalms, and the sermon was masterly, simple, eloquent, practical and fervent. At the close, the pastor (Mr. Chown) announced that the Lord's Supper would be administered, and invited any members of other Churches who felt disposed to remain and commune with them. I accepted the invitation, felt myself at home among the communicants, and was much profited by the sacramental service.

Just before leaving England, I went one Sabbath morning to Mr. Spurgeon's immense Tabernacle, which was crowded in the very aisles. The singing was hearty and general, and the sermon was most impressive and affecting: "The Higher Christian Life; or, Rest in God." After the sermon, Mr. Spurgeon stated that the Lord's Supper would be administered in the lecture hall, and invited those members of other denominations present who desired to commune with them at the Lord's Supper. I accepted this invitation also, and found it, indeed, good to be there. After the service was over, I had some conversation with Mr. Spurgeon, in the course of which he observed, "I spent last Tuesday evening in company with several ministers, including Dr. Punshon, adding, 'He is a grand man.' I could not but think and feel how much more apostolic was the spirit of such men as Mr. Chown and Mr. Spurgeon, as well as that of the late Robert Hall, than that of those High Church Baptists who will recognise none as brethren at the Lord's Table, unless they had been plunged under water, any more than those High Church Episcopalians who will acknowledge none as ministers of Christ whose heads have not been under the touch of Episcopal hands."

Yours very truly,  
E. RYERSON.

**TRANSFERS IN THE UNITED STATES.**

We copy the following from Boston correspondence of the *Central Advocate*, for two reasons. Names are specially introduced with which many of our readers are familiar. One is Dr. Clarke, delegate to our Conference at Charlotte-town a few years ago. The other is Rev. John Cookman, lately of Tremont Church, Boston, abrother of the sainted Cookman, whose death lately made such a deep impression on the Churches. Our next reason for making the extract is to show the great danger connected with a system of invitations and transfers on which we have recently been making editorial comment. There are revolutionary elements concealed in this question.

The immediate occasion for these thoughts is the unpleasant and shameful condition of things now existing in one of the churches of this city—the Saratoga Street Church of East Boston—resulting from a conflict of this false theory with the regularly constituted law and authority of the Methodist Church. It is but the repetition of a very old story. This particular society, being on something of an independent footing, conceived that it was entitled to select, out of the whole range of the conferences, the man who should be its pastor. A suitable candidate could not be found in their home conference, so they selected from the New Hampshire Conference, the Rev. O. W. Scott, and demanded his transfer. The New England Conference was full and no such transfer could be made without displacing some one, unless a man of the same rank as Mr. Scott could be transferred to the New Hampshire Conference in his place. Efforts were made to secure a man of this Conference who would consent to such an exchange, but without success until a very late hour. A half hour before the Conference at Lynn was to adjourn, the committee of the Saratoga St. Church came to Bishop Foster asking the change. They were then told that it was too late, as to make such a change would require a general revision of the appointments, and an injustice to many others. W. E. Clarke, D. D., one of the very best men of the New England Conference, was appointed to Saratoga Street, an appointment made as a special favor, inasmuch as the man they sought could not be had. Here a sensible and loyal Church would have let the matter rest, but in this instance both of these characteristics seem to be wanting. Dr. Clarke found the church locked last Sabbath, and a committee waited on him to inform him that he would not be received as pastor. Last night there was a meeting of the members of the church, at which Bishop Foster was present. The case was reviewed and the Bishop gave the reason for the course he had pursued, and urged the church to accept the situation in good spirit. In the course of some remarks he gave utterance to some things that greatly need to be impressed on many of our churches. "No committee," said he, "has a right to say that a transfer must be made. That is treason to the Methodist Church and a direct violation of the constitution which governs it." Again he said very decidedly, "If anybody proposes not to submit, why the door of the Church is wide open." On the utterance of these last words some of the members cried out, "We don't propose to have a thing crammed down our throats." It is a pudding of their own making, and we hope to see it put down their throats somehow. We fail to see how it can be any more a case of "cramming" in this instance than with thousands of other churches having the same rights as Saratoga Street, who have pastors sent them by the regular authorities. If we do not greatly mistake the mettle of Bishop Foster, he will make no concessions, but if they continue so reasonably fractions, will hold their faces steadily to the grindstone. We can better afford to lose a score or two of such churches than to sacrifice one jot or tittle of Methodist law.

Mr. Cookman, who was transferred to the Tremont Street Church from the New York East Conference last year, is to go back to his own Conference again. For some reasons he has not had a very satisfactory time with the church here. This church is understood to be one of the most difficult to manage in the conference. At their request, Rev. Mr. Stedley, who was pastor of the church some ten or more years ago, was sent them this Spring. This is one of the churches that expects always to have its own way, and though very generally gratified in its demands, is not often satisfied for any great while. At the Conference of 1873, Dr. L. T. Townsend was sent them to succeed Dr. Steele. That was quite a prosperous year. In the winter, Dr. Townsend preached a series of sermons on the doctrine of future punishment, the materials of which have since been published in his "Lost Forever." It may be of interest to those who think there is no necessity for the preaching of that disagreeable doctrine now, to know that those sermons resulted in a most gracious revival.

**STUDENTS IN ABUNDANCE.**

There is something exceedingly hopeful in the announcement following. It speaks volumes for the noble ambition by which the American youth are actuated. No nation can be prosperous without these two great factors—religion and intelligence. The United States, by nurturing their training advantages, will do much toward counteracting the baneful influence of bad men and doubtful organizations now becoming so common in their borders. The paragraph shows the Universities have so much material that they can afford to take sufficient time to do their work justice.

The rare embarrassment of a prospect of too many students has induced the authorities of Boston University to announce that after this year additions will be made to the requirements for admission for four successive years. These additions are of such a character that the resulting standard for admission is asserted to be higher than is now maintained in any university in the world. Nevertheless, while three years suffice to attain the degree of Bachelor of Arts at Oxford or Cambridge, four years will still be required at Boston. To avoid overburdening the candidate for admission, there are to be, henceforth, two entrance examinations, a Preliminary and a Final, the former to be passed, as a rule, one year before the student desires to enter. The order in which the additions are to be made may be seen by consulting the just published volume fourth of the University Year Book.

**THE WAR.**

Battles have been fought, the telegraph giving, in every instance, the gain to the Turks. A few notable circumstances have occurred which we must record. England has issued this proclamation:—

A proclamation has been issued by the Queen, stating that she is determined to maintain a strict and impartial neutrality in the war between Russia and Turkey, and commanding her subjects to abstain from violating the laws relating thereto. Then follows the English statute, instituted to regulate Her Majesty's subjects during the existence of hostilities between foreign states with which Her Majesty is at peace. The proclamation concludes with an admonition to British subjects not to disobey the commands at their peril.

Which means that England will only be led into this war very much against her will, if not against her own interests. A false step on the part of either of the combatants, however, might produce from the Queen a very different manifesto. Gladstone has begun to agitate in a way that indicates that a party exists in England having deep feeling and strong purpose in respect to the quarrel. At any moment this party may grow into great proportions, take the reins of government and strike for the honour of Britain. Who can see a month in advance?

LONDON, April 30.

In the House of Commons to-day Mr. Gladstone gave notice that he would introduce five resolutions. They declare, in effect, that England has just cause for complaint at the conduct of the Porte. Reference is made to Earl Derby's despatch of last September, relating to the Bulgarian massacres, and the resolutions proceed to declare that until there is a change of conduct, and guarantees are given, the Porte has no claim to the support of the British crown; that in the midst of complications, and with war actually begun, the House earnestly desires that the influence of England in the councils of Europe be employed for the effectual development of liberty and local self-government in disturbed provinces; that the House further desires that the influence of England be addressed to the promotion of harmonious action among European powers, with a view of Turkey as necessary for the purposes of humanity and justice, for effectual defence against intrigue, and for security of the peace of the world. Mr. Gladstone stated that the resolutions would be submitted solely on his own responsibility.

Says the *St. John Telegraph*:—

The news which our readers will probably regard with the greatest concern is that which refers to the remarkable preparations which England is making, especially in strengthening her fleet. The statement that she has it in contemplation to seize the Suez Canal may be premature, but that would assuredly be the result if the Khedive showed himself to be under French influence and cringed a disposition to harass Turkey. Probably the measure which England is now taking are merely in view of possibilities, but they are certainly extremely interesting to the British race on both sides of the Atlantic.

**APPRECIATIVE.**—At the close of the sermon before one of the recent conferences one of the preachers congratulated us very cordially, saying: A gentleman came into his house in the twilight, and greeted a woman supposed to be his wife with a hearty kiss, when he was surprised by the voice of an ancient maiden lady saying, "I do not know you, but you have done me a great deal of good."—*Dr. Fowler.*

**WEALTH OF THE ROTHSCHILDS.**—Three men have died in this country within a year, William B. Astor, A. T. Stewart, and Cornelius Vanderbilt, whose united wealth would probably amount to \$150,000,000. Some estimate the sum at \$200,000,000. This seems large, but what is it to the wealth of the Rothschilds, the famous bankers of Europe? Their wealth is stated by Emile Burnoit, the well known publicist, to have attained in the past year to the almost incalculable sum of 17,000,000,000 francs or \$3,400,000,000. The significance of these stupendous figures may be rudely conceived by comparisons, but there is nothing in the history of private wealth with which they can be compared. Baron Edward de Rothschild has just purchased by auction a curious piece of furniture, covered with plates of Sevres ware for 700,000 francs.

Books.—Dr. L. T. Townsend has added another to the list of his admirable books. He began with "Credo," which established at once his reputation. This recent volume is entitled "The Supernatural Factor in Religious Revivals." Lee and Shepherd are the publishers. Mr. Gossip, Halifax, has it on sale.

Rev. Jas. Roy of Montreal, has written a book the fame of which is likely to spread far and wide. Our Montreal correspondent gives our readers a good impression of the effect it is producing within Methodistic circles. The *Guardian* in noticing this work begins with the intention of offering no opinion upon its propositions, pro or con; an intention which is very effectually lost sight of before the close of the editor's very able article. The ideal Methodist Church of Mr. Roy's pamphlet is not, as the *Guardian* very properly hints, to-day without illustration in the world. Sects and denominations have made a boast of rising superior to creeds, into an atmosphere of "Liberal Christianity"—from bondage to freedom. A fine result they have shown for their advancement in every instance!

But the work will probably go into court. Its merits and fate are now the subjects for consideration by Mr. Roy's immediate ecclesiastical relatives. We give the *Guardian's* epitome of its contents:—

It is maintained that Methodism was originally broadly catholic, but through imperfect conceptions of God's love, narrow, restrictive rules, rigid uniformity of method, restrictions on the liberty of the preachers and other causes, it lost its primitive catholicity—that this catholicity may be regained by taking Wesley's later theological views rather than his earliest ones, and by adopting as our standard Wesley's principles and methods rather than his opinions—that as the orthodox forms of doctrine took their present shape long after the apostolic age, and were the work of fallible men not free from the errors of their times, they should not be imposed upon the churches, as if the human expression of these truths was essential—that orthodoxy cannot rest upon the authority of the Church, because these dogmas were merely the opinions of the men who formulated them, and never received the sanction of the universal Church—that orthodoxy cannot rest upon the Bible, because we depend upon the testimony of the Church as to what is Scripture and what is not, and because of the inaccuracies and contradictions of Scripture, and the disagreement about its meaning—that Christian consciousness is the true basis and test of Christianity and piety—that the opinions expressed in the Wesleyan standards are self-contradictory and cannot be held by any one person—that Wesley's principles and methods imply the repudiation of "sacerdotal" orthodoxy—that in order to bring itself into harmony with the methods and spirit of this scientific age, and to secure future prosperity, Methodism must be reorganized on a basis affording greater liberty of thought and action to both ministers and laymen—and, if we understand him correctly, that all denominational creeds and peculiarities be so far renounced as to allow all Christians to form one liberal Christian organization to do the work of Christ in the world. These are some of the main points presented in a forcible and masterly essay, indicating familiarity with the currents of theological thought in the past and in the present.

Carlton Mrs. C. O.