

furrow over his whole farm, while one would do the plowing much better especially if the four quarrelled so much as not to do the work of one. But the difference between the furrow cut by the religious plow in the hands of the four sects, is no way essential, only for the support of the quarrelling plowmen. It is a very patient public which pays for all this folly.—*Christian and Citizen.*

REMARKS.

The above short and pithy article from the "Christian and Citizen," though somewhat unique in style and imagery, is, nevertheless, a well drawn picture of one particular aspect of sectarianism, a cogent argument against the foolish, and worse than useless expenditure of time, talent and money, for the support of party tenets; and one which, in my humble opinion, the advocates of sectarian theories will find difficult to answer.

The writer of this sketch calls the peculiarities which distinguish one sect from another "non-essential theories." This is right—right in reason—right in revelation, and right by universal concession; for there is not a sect in protestant Christendom but will acknowledge the Christianity of other sects. Indeed, so common is it for sectarians of every denomination to award to other protestant sects the same right to the epithet Christian which they claim for themselves, that the man or woman who presumes to call it in question is at once charged with being "uncharitable."

Thus we see that all the religious denominations are by sectarians regarded as Christians. This is a point universally acknowledged. But what does this universal concession amount to but a *bona fide* acknowledgment on the part of every sectarian that their denominational peculiarities—that is—the *things* in their respective system which distinguish them from each other, and which make parties of them, are non-essential?

Whether sectarian religionists make this concession intentionally, which, by the way, is so fatal to the consistency of their practice in keeping up these party walls, or whether they do it inadvertently, is a question not now to be answered, but certain it is that whenever they do admit that there are Christians in all parties, whether they intend it or not, they concede at once that the distinguishing peculiarities of any one sect are not essential to Christianity. For example:

When a Presbyterian admits that a Methodist is a Christian, he acknowledges that a man can be a Christian without being a Presbyterian, and hence, that the peculiarities of *Presbyterianism* are not essential to Christianity; and *vice versa*—When a Methodist admits that a Presbyterian is a Christian he acknowledges that a man can