

should be made, that no preacher should preach thrice on the same day. Messrs. Mather, Pawsons, Thomson, and others, said this was impracticable: as it was absolutely necessary, in most cases, that the preacher should preach thrice every Lord's Day, without which the places could not be supplied. Mr. W. replied, "It must be given up: we shall lose our preachers by such excessive labour." They answered, "we have all done so, and you, even at a very advanced age, have continued to do so." "What I have done," said he, "is out of the question, my life and strength have been under an especial Providence; besides, I know better than they how to preach without injuring myself; and no man can preach thrice a day without killing himself sooner or later: and the custom shall not be continued." They pressed the point no farther, finding he was determined, but they deceived him after all, by altering the minute thus, when it went to the press: "No preacher shall any more preach three times in the same day, (to the same congregation.)" By which clause the minute was entirely neutralized. He who preaches the Gospel as he ought, must do it with his whole strength of body and soul: and he who undertakes a labour of this kind thrice every Lord's day, will infallibly shorten his life by it. He who, instead of preaching, talks to the people, merely speaks about good things, or tells a religious story, will never injure himself by such an employment. Such a person does not labour in the word and doctrine: he tells his tale, and as he preaches, so his congregation believes, and sinners are left as he found them."

To the Editor of the Wesleyan.

SIR,—The "Christian Messenger," of May 17, in its editorial, when speaking of the revival in Horton, has the following paragraph:

"We understand that our Methodist brethren, in several instances during the present religious excitement, have administered the ordinance of baptism by immersion to those who had been newly converted, and who sought admission to their churches."

"We believe that, as the light of Divine truth shall continue to shine in the earth, the minds of Christian men, every where, will come to see more distinctly the true nature and design of the ordinance of baptism, and also be led to attach more importance to the duty of obeying the command of our Saviour,—by adhering to that mode of baptism of which alone we have any example in the New Testament. We therefore cannot but feel peculiar pleasure at all times, when we hear of penitent believers being immersed upon a profession of their faith in Christ, to whatever body of professing disciples they may subsequently join themselves."

Sir, your readers know that baptism by immersion is not the general practice of the Wesleyan Body, but only of a very few of its ministers, who have thought it well to meet the prejudices of certain individuals. The above paragraph, therefore, seems to show a want of Christian liberality. For there is evidently in it a three-fold charge, not only against the Wesleyan ministers, but also against all other Christian ministers who do not baptize by immersion.

The first charge preferred is that of ignorance. "We believe that as the light of Divine truth shall continue to shine in the earth, the minds of Christian men, every where, will come to see more distinctly the true nature and design of baptism."

Here is clearly a charge of ignorance "of the true nature and design of baptism," preferred against "Christian men."

Sir, is this charge true? Is this subject understood by no body of Christians, except our Baptist brethren? are those numerous and respectable Christian bodies, the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, the Independents, and the Methodists all ignorant of the "true nature and design of baptism?" Is it possible that, notwithstanding that mass of learning and piety which they have possessed and spread abroad, that they still have not intelligence enough to understand the meaning of the Greek word *Baptizo*? Is it so; that although they have sent their missionaries into every part of the earth, and myriads have, through their influence, been turned unto the Lord, that they themselves have yet to learn the "nature and de-

sign" of the initiatory rite of Christianity? And, to locate the idea, have all the Wesleyan ministers, who have preceded the one now in Horton, been in a state of ignorance on the subject of baptism? and are all our members there, and their children, who have been baptized by sprinkling, still "*ipso facto*" unbaptized?

If the above paragraph is correctly understood, then an affirmative must be returned to each of these questions; but if they be answered in the negative, and it is said, no charge of ignorance was intended to be preferred, then the sentence quoted seems to be unintelligible.

The second charge preferred is a breach of Christ's command. "And also be led to attach more importance to the duty of obeying the command of our Saviour."

Sir, this charge is serious. However, leaving other religious bodies to answer for themselves, from a long acquaintance with Methodism, I beg to say, that the Wesleyans do not consider any command of our Redeemer as of little importance. As they believe he was the Great God enshrined in human flesh, so they consider that every command given by him is of the greatest importance; and therefore, however they may increase in the knowledge and love of God, yet it is not possible for them to attach any "more importance to the duty of obeying" any command of the Saviour, than they have done from the commencement of their existence as a religious society.

The fact is, that no person has ever yet found any command of the Saviour for immersion; and therefore to talk of attaching "more importance to the command of our Saviour," on the subject of immersion, is absurd.

The third charge is for not following the examples of immersion, said to be found in the Scriptures, "by adhering to that mode of baptism of which alone we have any example in the New Testament."

Now, Sir, as no person has ever yet found any command for immersion, so no portion of the Christian world, except our Baptist brethren, have ever pretended to have found one single clear example of immersion in the whole of the New Testament. And when our Baptist brethren have referred us to an instance of what they thought was an example of immersion, the text has never been sufficiently explicit of itself; but a comment of their own was necessary in order to make it speak their sentiment.

With our Baptist friends we wish not to interfere. If they think proper to immerse, let them do so; but let them not arraign the whole Christian world at their tribunal, and accuse all other bodies with ignorance, and unchristianize them, because they reject their comments and explanations, and cannot see it their duty to be immersed.

Sir, we live in a strange world. One body of men comes forward and tells us they have received authority to baptize by "*uninterrupted succession*" from the Apostles, and that none others have any right to administer the ordinance: another comes forward and tells us these pretended successors of the Apostles have themselves never been baptized. No wonder madmen deride.

If no man can be a Christian who is not baptized; and if immersion is the only form of Christian baptism, then it follows that no person who has not been immersed can be a Christian. Therefore, the whole body of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, and Methodists, and, in fact, all who have not been baptized by immersion, to whom the Baptist Church, in point of number, is as a drop in the bucket, are not Christians. Our gracious Queen is not a Christian, because she has not been immersed; the whole body of English and Scotch clergy, as well as the Wesleyan and Independent ministers, are not Christians, because they have not been immersed. And as there are only four classes of men upon earth,—Christians, Jews, Mahometans, and Heathens,—we might ask, to which class do all persons who have not been immersed belong? It will not be pretended that they are either Jews or Mahometans; and if they are not Christians, then they must be Heathens, unless we coin a new term, and call them *semi-Heathens*. If so, then the clergy referred to are semi-Heathen; our Missionary Societies are only *semi-Christian*, and spread abroad only a *semi-Christianity*; and the revival that has taken place at Horton is not of a genuine character, except with those who have been immersed; all the others, notwithstanding their repentance, faith, and subsequent peace, are only *semi-Christians*, because they have not been immersed.

These consequences principles expressed graph be insisted on not be vindicated, I pained.

Hants, May 23.

A Short Catechism: Established Christians: be on the same Burgess, D. 1 tion: London. Lewis M. Dau to the Re-print

"Q. From w of publicly exerc "A. From th fessed."

But is this "Ministry? It is Apostles of our is notorious they laws of the land invalidated.

"Q. What is "A. That is a law."

The first Churches, as th yet they were no

"Q. Is every "A. No. A it is not a lega law."

Then other el not established l being "establish spiritual charac establishment as not established, is?

"Q. Is every "A. No. A and so be a leg not preached p administered by church."

What a dead Scotland! In legal church; by persons "ri dained by bisho The Church of a rival! In Scot Church of Scotland England perse England, beca their "duty"