

Obituary Notices

JAMES PERCY OF BUREN, N.F. The family of which the subject of this brief biographical sketch was a beloved member, has been thrice called to experience the bitterness of bereavement during a comparatively short period. The first breach made in their number by death, removed to the world of spirits a much loved daughter, only a few months after her union in marriage to our esteemed brother, the Rev. J. S. Phinney. Early in the past year a brother followed her to the heavenly rest, whose rich Christian experience in affliction, and triumphant death, were beautifully referred to in an obituary notice furnished by brother Smith, my predecessor.

JAMES, whose recent departure from earth has again plunged the family in sorrow, was from childhood characterized by an amiable manner, a docility of spirit, and a seriousness of mind, that gained the affectionate regard and love of all who knew him. At an early age he experienced the strivings of the Holy Spirit, and, influenced thereby, frequently retired to secret places for prayer. He witnessed the holy joy with which his brother Stephen passed through "the valley of the shadow of death," and religious impressions were then made upon his mind that were not erased.

During the month of February he became indisposed, but anticipated a speedy restoration to his usual vigorous health; but, contrary to the hope of himself and friends, his sickness assumed a serious form, and it was deemed necessary to have him removed from Bay Roberts (where he resided as telegraph operator) to Brigus, to the house of his uncle, Mr. Eau Percy. It was from this time until his lamented decease that the writer had frequent opportunities of visiting him, and of conversing with him upon spiritual and eternal subjects. His naturally retiring disposition led him to be more reserved in conversation than we wished; but the visits and prayers of God's people were highly prized by him. On the Sabbath preceding his death, he was enabled to testify that God had accepted him through His beloved Son, and spoke calmly of his approaching dissolution, declaring that he feared not the last enemy. He expressed an earnest desire to see his dear mother before he passed from earth—and this wish was realized. On the following morning she arrived from St. John's, accompanied by her daughter. The meeting was deeply affecting. The mother—whose son she had not seen for several months, and who was then in robust health—saw him now reduced and debilitated by disease, suffering constant pain, and fast drawing near to the gates of death. The morning subsequent to this interview, our now sainted friend, in the most glorious manifestation of the love of God to his people, by faith he saw the celestial city, the heavenly rest; and desired, in submission to the Divine will, to depart and be with Christ. Often would he join in singing—

"Oh, heaven! sweet heaven! sweet heaven of rest! How I long to be there, and its glories to share, And to lean on my Saviour's breast."

After he had received this baptism of the Holy Spirit, he partook of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in company with a few friends. It was a solemn season—a time to be remembered. He was deeply concerned for those who were living without God. His appeals and warnings to such were very powerful, and it is hoped will be the means of saving them to the "summer's friend." His patience and resignation, amidst uninterrupted pain and restlessness, were strikingly exhibited; and the tranquillity of mind in which he was kept proved unmistakably the genuineness and depth of the work of grace in his soul. It might emphatically be said of him that he had "passed from death unto life," and become "a new creature in Christ Jesus," a saint, and a believer. He received the ordinance of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised. Its nature is thus clearly defined. It was a seal of that covenant of grace, by the provisions of which Abraham's faith was counted to him for righteousness; and it was a sign of that covenant, rather spiritual than carnal, which that covenant aimed, and which the believer it always imparted. "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." Deut. x. 1.

But while this ordinance was appointed in this manner to Abraham, and that because he had believed "with the heart unto righteousness," it was not confined to him, or to adult believers like him; it was ordained for his infant posterity also, and positively enjoined upon him. As the promise "to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee," was intended for him, and his descendants in all their generations, and as they all required that circumcision of heart which was signified by this rite, so God said, "This is my covenant which I shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised."

Now as to the identity—not the analogy, that is far too weak a term, and is indeed foreign to our purpose—between the ordinance of circumcision and that of baptism, as the initiatory rite into a visible covenant relationship with God, that will easily, and we think indisputably appear. The covenant of grace itself, is the same through all its dispensations. Its aims and provisions, its claims and conditions, its promises and privileges are substantially now what, since the first intimation of divine mercy, they have always been. But while principles are unaltered, it benefits according to man have been largely augmented by the introduction of Christianity, while various circumstantial matters have been modified or changed. Circumcision has been abolished, but that was formerly implied in that fact is now transferred to baptism. It is on this account that an inspired authority designates the latter by the name of the former. "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism," &c. (Col. ii. 10, 12). "Unto us," says an able expositor, "the Apostle here calls baptism 'the circumcision of Christ,' because that we put off the body of the sins of the flesh, that is, become new creatures, by virtue of our Lord's own personal crucifixion; but if this be absurd, then the only reason for which he can call baptism 'the circumcision of Christ,' or Christian circumcision, is, that it has taken the place of the Abrahamic circumcision."

To the same purpose—as establishing the identity of the two ordinances as the initiatory rite into a covenant relationship with God, under the two dispensations—may also be cited, Gal. iii. 27-29. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

If, then, circumcision was a "sign" of that spiritual purity which the covenant of God requires and confers, so is the washing of baptism. If it was "a seal of the righteousness of faith," so is baptism. If by it men were formerly admitted into formal covenant with the Lord; by baptism alone are they now admitted to that relationship. Or, if by baptism we are now "circumcised with the circumcision of Christ," and become "Abraham's seed," formally, and as a means to an end; it follows that the objection falls to the ground, and as believing Abraham was required to administer the sign and the seal of his dispensation, to his infant children, we are required to administer the sign and seal of our dispensation, to our infant offspring. From this also the fallacy of another remark will appear.

It has been said that circumcision was a positive institution, under the law, and intended to pass away with the ceremonial law of Moses. Now the fact is, that it dates in its appointment long before Moses; that, like the Sabbath, it was only adopted into the Mosaic economy, and that, again, like the day of rest, though changed in its circumstances by the establishment of Christianity, yet in its principles, as "the circumcision of Christ," it was to remain unaltered to the end of time.

It has also been objected against infant baptism, that our Lord's words, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," necessarily excludes children, as incapable of properly receiving this ordinance. But to assume, as this view of the matter does, that this affirmation or promise of the Redeemer, includes the whole ground on which our ordinance is to be administered, is simply to beg the question. Seeing that of "every creature" whom a reasonable sinner, the Apostle and his successors should preach the gospel, "He that believeth and is baptized," should be saved, and we necessarily infer that none else were to be baptized or saved? The words do not refer to children at all, but describe an adult who should take place among those adults to whom the gospel should be preached for the first time. Had Abraham, after his receding to version, seen the instruction which he receded to version, and to administer this ordinance to his children, been commissioned also to preach that gospel whereby himself had been saved, among the Gentile nations, we know of no more cheering words that could have been addressed to him than these, "He that believeth and is circumcised shall be saved" but such an affirmation, necessary as it must have been for his direction and support of his faith, would have been liable to the construction, that the infant children of his converts were to be deprived of that rite. Elsewhere he had directions respecting them; and, as we have shewed elsewhere in the oft quoted text, which makes no reference to infants, and which of course does not exclude them, their introduction to the church is fully warranted.

Besides, if this text is asserted to exclude children from baptism because it says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," by a parity of reasoning it must exclude females from baptism, for it makes no mention of "She that believeth." Nor is this the only, or the worst conclusion, to which such a rash mode of drawing inferences inevitably leads. If because "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," therefore, he that cannot believe cannot be baptized, it follows that neither can he be saved. And not only so, but there is no mention made of "She that believeth," and only those who are mentioned obtain the rite and get salvation, it must follow, if the objection which we are now considering be good for anything, that neither children, females, nor heathen, all such are lost, and must perish forever!

Provincial Wesleyan.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1862.

In consequence of the official relation which this paper sustains to the Conference of Bishops British Columbia, we require that Obituary, Revival, and other notices addressed to us from any of the Circuits within the bounds of the Conference, shall pass through the hands of the Superintendent Minister. Communications designed for this paper must be accompanied by the name of the writer in connection. We do not undertake to return rejected articles.

Infant Baptism.

NO. IV. OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

Objections of various kinds have been raised against infant baptism. With much plausibility and with unyielding perseverance, these have often been urged upon the attention of all denominations of Christians. Some have doubtless been led to question the validity of this ordinance, and others probably to withhold its administration from their offspring. It is not our intention to deride the objectors, or dogmatically to assert that their reasoning is illogical, or fallacious, and highly injurious. To say this and not prove it, would betray a petulant spirit, and might justly excite suspicion that our own cause was untenable; and if we could prove it, we were disposed to do so, that itself would be sufficient, without saying that such was the case.

In the present paper we simply propose to consider, with calmness and candor, a few of those objections which are most frequently quoted against what we believe, and have shown to be a gospel ordinance. But here we must reaffirm our first stated principles. We do not write controversially. Our design is not to proselyte the members of other churches to an adherence to our faith. We write for the benefit of our own people and their families. And if it should seem that we are endeavouring to refute certain opinions which are tenaciously cherished by some of our fellow Christians, let it be remembered that our only other alternative is tacitly to yield up the Scriptural authority of this rite, to throw discredit upon the membership of the great majority of our communicants, and leave them exposed to be "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine." Of such procedure and its consequences, it is sufficient to say that we are quite unprepared to bear the responsibility.

It has been objected that there is no connection between the ordinance of circumcision and that of baptism, and that consequently no principle involved in the one belongs to the other. The latest form of the objection which we have seen declares, that it cannot be shown that circumcision was ever a moral obligation, and therefore to be continued, either itself or a substitute.

We are much mistaken if the refutation of this objection has not already appeared in these articles, so that it will now only be necessary to recapitulate our argument, and to add a passage or two, which we have not yet quoted from the New Testament.

Circumcision, then, according to the teaching of St. Paul, was both a "sign," and a "seal of the righteousness of faith" (Rom. ii. 11). As such, it was appointed first to Abraham, an adult, and a believer. "He received the ordinance of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." Its nature is thus clearly defined. It was a seal of that covenant of grace, by the provisions of which Abraham's faith was counted to him for righteousness; and it was a sign of that covenant, rather spiritual than carnal, which that covenant aimed, and which the believer it always imparted. "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." Deut. x. 1.

But while this ordinance was appointed in this manner to Abraham, and that because he had believed "with the heart unto righteousness," it was not confined to him, or to adult believers like him; it was ordained for his infant posterity also, and positively enjoined upon him. As the promise "to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee," was intended for him, and his descendants in all their generations, and as they all required that circumcision of heart which was signified by this rite, so God said, "This is my covenant which I shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised."

Now as to the identity—not the analogy, that is far too weak a term, and is indeed foreign to our purpose—between the ordinance of circumcision and that of baptism, as the initiatory rite into a visible covenant relationship with God, that will easily, and we think indisputably appear. The covenant of grace itself, is the same through all its dispensations. Its aims and provisions, its claims and conditions, its promises and privileges are substantially now what, since the first intimation of divine mercy, they have always been. But while principles are unaltered, it benefits according to man have been largely augmented by the introduction of Christianity, while various circumstantial matters have been modified or changed. Circumcision has been abolished, but that was formerly implied in that fact is now transferred to baptism. It is on this account that an inspired authority designates the latter by the name of the former. "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism," &c. (Col. ii. 10, 12). "Unto us," says an able expositor, "the Apostle here calls baptism 'the circumcision of Christ,' because that we put off the body of the sins of the flesh, that is, become new creatures, by virtue of our Lord's own personal crucifixion; but if this be absurd, then the only reason for which he can call baptism 'the circumcision of Christ,' or Christian circumcision, is, that it has taken the place of the Abrahamic circumcision."

To the same purpose—as establishing the identity of the two ordinances as the initiatory rite into a covenant relationship with God, under the two dispensations—may also be cited, Gal. iii. 27-29. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

If, then, circumcision was a "sign" of that spiritual purity which the covenant of God requires and confers, so is the washing of baptism. If it was "a seal of the righteousness of faith," so is baptism. If by it men were formerly admitted into formal covenant with the Lord; by baptism alone are they now admitted to that relationship. Or, if by baptism we are now "circumcised with the circumcision of Christ," and become "Abraham's seed," formally, and as a means to an end; it follows that the objection falls to the ground, and as believing Abraham was required to administer the sign and the seal of his dispensation, to his infant children, we are required to administer the sign and seal of our dispensation, to our infant offspring. From this also the fallacy of another remark will appear.

It has been said that circumcision was a positive institution, under the law, and intended to pass away with the ceremonial law of Moses. Now the fact is, that it dates in its appointment long before Moses; that, like the Sabbath, it was only adopted into the Mosaic economy, and that, again, like the day of rest, though changed in its circumstances by the establishment of Christianity, yet in its principles, as "the circumcision of Christ," it was to remain unaltered to the end of time.

It has also been objected against infant baptism, that our Lord's words, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," necessarily excludes children, as incapable of properly receiving this ordinance. But to assume, as this view of the matter does, that this affirmation or promise of the Redeemer, includes the whole ground on which our ordinance is to be administered, is simply to beg the question. Seeing that of "every creature" whom a reasonable sinner, the Apostle and his successors should preach the gospel, "He that believeth and is baptized," should be saved, and we necessarily infer that none else were to be baptized or saved? The words do not refer to children at all, but describe an adult who should take place among those adults to whom the gospel should be preached for the first time. Had Abraham, after his receding to version, seen the instruction which he receded to version, and to administer this ordinance to his children, been commissioned also to preach that gospel whereby himself had been saved, among the Gentile nations, we know of no more cheering words that could have been addressed to him than these, "He that believeth and is circumcised shall be saved" but such an affirmation, necessary as it must have been for his direction and support of his faith, would have been liable to the construction, that the infant children of his converts were to be deprived of that rite. Elsewhere he had directions respecting them; and, as we have shewed elsewhere in the oft quoted text, which makes no reference to infants, and which of course does not exclude them, their introduction to the church is fully warranted.

Besides, if this text is asserted to exclude children from baptism because it says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," by a parity of reasoning it must exclude females from baptism, for it makes no mention of "She that believeth." Nor is this the only, or the worst conclusion, to which such a rash mode of drawing inferences inevitably leads. If because "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," therefore, he that cannot believe cannot be baptized, it follows that neither can he be saved. And not only so, but there is no mention made of "She that believeth," and only those who are mentioned obtain the rite and get salvation, it must follow, if the objection which we are now considering be good for anything, that neither children, females, nor heathen, all such are lost, and must perish forever!

It has been said that circumcision was a positive institution, under the law, and intended to pass away with the ceremonial law of Moses. Now the fact is, that it dates in its appointment long before Moses; that, like the Sabbath, it was only adopted into the Mosaic economy, and that, again, like the day of rest, though changed in its circumstances by the establishment of Christianity, yet in its principles, as "the circumcision of Christ," it was to remain unaltered to the end of time.

It has also been objected against infant baptism, that our Lord's words, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," necessarily excludes children, as incapable of properly receiving this ordinance. But to assume, as this view of the matter does, that this affirmation or promise of the Redeemer, includes the whole ground on which our ordinance is to be administered, is simply to beg the question. Seeing that of "every creature" whom a reasonable sinner, the Apostle and his successors should preach the gospel, "He that believeth and is baptized," should be saved, and we necessarily infer that none else were to be baptized or saved? The words do not refer to children at all, but describe an adult who should take place among those adults to whom the gospel should be preached for the first time. Had Abraham, after his receding to version, seen the instruction which he receded to version, and to administer this ordinance to his children, been commissioned also to preach that gospel whereby himself had been saved, among the Gentile nations, we know of no more cheering words that could have been addressed to him than these, "He that believeth and is circumcised shall be saved" but such an affirmation, necessary as it must have been for his direction and support of his faith, would have been liable to the construction, that the infant children of his converts were to be deprived of that rite. Elsewhere he had directions respecting them; and, as we have shewed elsewhere in the oft quoted text, which makes no reference to infants, and which of course does not exclude them, their introduction to the church is fully warranted.

Besides, if this text is asserted to exclude children from baptism because it says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," by a parity of reasoning it must exclude females from baptism, for it makes no mention of "She that believeth." Nor is this the only, or the worst conclusion, to which such a rash mode of drawing inferences inevitably leads. If because "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," therefore, he that cannot believe cannot be baptized, it follows that neither can he be saved. And not only so, but there is no mention made of "She that believeth," and only those who are mentioned obtain the rite and get salvation, it must follow, if the objection which we are now considering be good for anything, that neither children, females, nor heathen, all such are lost, and must perish forever!

But, further, this objection, when equal justice has been urged by "the father of the faithful," or the long line of his descendants, against the divinely appointed ordinance of circumcision. Why was it not? Have the simple ordinances of Christianity become "a yoke which neither we nor our children are able to bear?" Or have we such a plethora of blessings, under the present dispensation, that we must needs diminish them?

And then, who will undertake to prove, that because children are ignorant, or even unconverted, of the nature of a religious service in which they are engaged, they cannot be blessed? Did not Jesus, in the days of His flesh, actually bless little children, infants, whom He took up in His arms? And is His heart less loving to-day? Is His power to bless, even unconscious babes, contracted or impaired? We trust not. In answer to the prayers of his people, and without doubt, in proportion to the faith which is exercised for the child, in this means of grace, and which passes through the means to Him who has said, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not." He will give his blessing, and that to all concerned. The ordinance is most significant, when administered, not only to the parents and the child, but to the minister and the whole congregation as well as instructed and edified.

When Brother Allison made reference to this ordinance on giving the oral Certificate of Graduation, there was scarcely an eye in the vast multitude not dimmed by a tear. In the afternoon the boys had "held to themselves," and lauded them in all the "songs of youthfulness." Some of them were "very successful" in catching the sympathies of their "disinterested and at times fairly brought down the hood."

The Salutatory (Latin) was by Mr. J. A. Sprague—the valedictory by Mr. Josiah Wood. Mr. Narway chose for his theme—"Our Country, its Resources, its Destiny." I could not speak of his production without praising it—but he had extemporized instead of using the manuscript, the effect would have been more decided. He evidently manifested no Republican tendencies, and our American friends present showed their good sense and piety by possessing their souls in patience. The Hall was crowded to excess both afternoon and evening, and by six o'clock the vast crowd had dispersed, wearing in body, but thankful to God for mind, for education—for academies—for religion—and for immortality.

Your affectionate Brother, CHAS. DEWOLFE. Sackville, N. B., May 16, 1862.

The Colonial Empire possesses a despatch from the Duke of Newcastle to Sir A. Bannerman, Governor of Newfoundland, in reply to the letter of the Roman Catholic Bishops and clergy, and other inhabitants of Newfoundland, praying for His Excellency's recall. The petition was not sent through the Governor; but that His Excellency was given an opportunity to make his own observations upon it, but he did not feel it to be his duty to advise Her Majesty to take any steps on the contents of the petition.

Letter from England. (From our own Correspondent.) ENGLAND, May 2, 1862. Yesterday, under a glorious sunshine and in the presence of a vast multitude representing the wealth and splendour and genius of every enlightened nation in Christendom, and out of it, the International Exhibition of 1862 was opened to the world. From the earliest hours of the morning the long thoroughfare of many streets was thronged with people bent upon seeing one of the glories of the day as they were realized by an outside standing. Indeed the appearance of many groups, unquestionably agile and sleepy, seemed to intimate that they must have "amped out" for the night. Every available square foot of ground, every lamp post, tree, and window ledge on the line of the procession, had its occupant. Streamers and flags of all nations and all hues vied with the sunshine in glorying to the day.

An English pageant is different from that of a continental nation. We never attend the draperies of a French gala day. We do not believe in acres of crimson cloth on the streets, and miles of parti-coloured ribbons festooning the windows. We rely rather upon the simple dignity and unadorned grandeur of high names and deeds. To the fore, the procession of yesterday must have seemed somewhat tame. True there were state carriages and trappings enough to satisfy the greediest taste. Ambassadors glittered in their stately equipages. Lord Mayors shone resplendent in their antiquated vehicles, and there were red coats, blue coats, green, white, purple, gray, and even yellow,—stared, bejewelled, embroidered. But to the English eye the occupant of the coach has a greater charm than the coach itself,—and whatever foreigners might think of yesterday's procession, it was enough to the Englishman that he could look upon Palmerston and Derby and Russell, statesmen and heroes and philosophers whose life and genius have covered the nineteenth century with glory.

It would be absurd to attempt a description of the opening ceremony in full. One would require two or three weeks impressions of the Provincial Wesleyan for such a purpose. The stately structure, the fabulous wealth of its contents, the blaze of its trophies, the sweep of its aisles, the grandeur of its dome, larger far than the world-famous dome of St. Paul's,—the tastefulness of the company, the perfect sea of faces, black, swarthy, olive,—the richness of costume, robes, coronets, stars, chains, military accoutrements,—the flashing cuirass and the episcopal lawn,—the waving plumes and the shaven crowns all these things would require columns for themselves. But there were some of the funniest costumes. To say nothing of that of the Lord Chancellor and that of the Archbishop of Canterbury,—there were the Japanese ambassadors,—there were representatives from almost every nation under the sun, in all their national costumes,—there were queer little old men in alarming spectacles and the oddest dresses: there was one especially, a member of the Royal Institute of France, in a sort of spatch coloured coat that made him look like a "Jack in the Green."

When His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge had taken his seat on the throne, prayer was offered by the Bishop of London, and an address was presented by Earl Granville, to which the Royal Duke read a reply, which, of course, nobody heard. Then the orchestra of two thousand voices struck up, and held the vast audience in a spell which never broke. Nothing could have been grander than the musical scene. The beautiful ode of the Poet Laureate, set to music by Sterndale Bennett, excited the greatest admiration. The marches of Meyerbeer, Auber, and other composers who all rendered their contributions to the ceremonial were all rendered with great effect. At the close of the orchestral performance, the shrill flourish of trumpets declared that the pageant was at an end. There was but one drawback to the day. It appeared everywhere that the eye saw it in the deep-mourning liveries of the Royal carriages, and crapes scarves of the members of the Royal family,—the ear heard it in the solemn chant of the Laureate's ode, and the occasional funeral notes of the grand march of Meyerbeer,—the heart felt it in every thing. There was scarcely a heart in the crowd, inside and out, that was not a thought of the Duke of Cambridge, and the saddened home of Balmoral. Everything was there in yesterday's pageant, but there was the building, the rich store, the countless crowd,—but the master-spirit which had designed it all was absent. Few eyes were tearless, few hearts unmoved, when the solemn cadence of the Laureate, beautifully translated into music by Professor Bennett, fell upon the ears of yesterday.

4th. It may, in conclusion, be said that no parent can by any spiritual obligation upon his children—their baptism or with it they are alike answerable to God.

This again is no proper objection to the ordinance, for if that be a duty, it ought to be performed, whether it adds to the responsibility of the child or not. But if a blessing be connected with it, and what ordinance has not a blessing annexed to it?—then there is with increased blessing increased obligation, and that is imposed upon the baptized child.

And then our Scriptural instance, which furnishes not only an apt illustration, but also an excellent precedent of a parent's duty in this respect. In addressing Israel by Moses, shortly before the death of that eminent man, God said, "Ye stand this day all ye before the Lord your God, your captains, elders, officers, with all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives, &c. That no shouldst enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into His oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day." And after affirming that this covenant and oath was entered into not only with the parents and the little ones then present, but also "with him that is not here with us this day," the Lord shows why even the unconscious children and the infant were included in this solemn engagement. "Last there should be among you man, or woman, or family or tribe whose heart turneth away this day from the Lord our God—and come to pass when he heareth the words of this curse that be blessing in his heart saying, I shall have peace, though I will sin in the imagination of my heart." (Deut. xxi. 10-19.)

But here we must reaffirm our first stated principles. We do not write controversially. Our design is not to proselyte the members of other churches to an adherence to our faith. We write for the benefit of our own people and their families. And if it should seem that we are endeavouring to refute certain opinions which are tenaciously cherished by some of our fellow Christians, let it be remembered that our only other alternative is tacitly to yield up the Scriptural authority of this rite, to throw discredit upon the membership of the great majority of our communicants, and leave them exposed to be "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine." Of such procedure and its consequences, it is sufficient to say that we are quite unprepared to bear the responsibility.

It has been objected that there is no connection between the ordinance of circumcision and that of baptism, and that consequently no principle involved in the one belongs to the other. The latest form of the objection which we have seen declares, that it cannot be shown that circumcision was ever a moral obligation, and therefore to be continued, either itself or a substitute.

We are much mistaken if the refutation of this objection has not already appeared in these articles, so that it will now only be necessary to recapitulate our argument, and to add a passage or two, which we have not yet quoted from the New Testament.

Circumcision, then, according to the teaching of St. Paul, was both a "sign," and a "seal of the righteousness of faith" (Rom. ii. 11). As such, it was appointed first to Abraham, an adult, and a believer. "He received the ordinance of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." Its nature is thus clearly defined. It was a seal of that covenant of grace, by the provisions of which Abraham's faith was counted to him for righteousness; and it was a sign of that covenant, rather spiritual than carnal, which that covenant aimed, and which the believer it always imparted. "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." Deut. x. 1.

But while this ordinance was appointed in this manner to Abraham, and that because he had believed "with the heart unto righteousness," it was not confined to him, or to adult believers like him; it was ordained for his infant posterity also, and positively enjoined upon him. As the promise "to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee," was intended for him, and his descendants in all their generations, and as they all required that circumcision of heart which was signified by this rite, so God said, "This is my covenant which I shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised."

Now as to the identity—not the analogy, that is far too weak a term, and is indeed foreign to our purpose—between the ordinance of circumcision and that of baptism, as the initiatory rite into a visible covenant relationship with God, that will easily, and we think indisputably appear. The covenant of grace itself, is the same through all its dispensations. Its aims and provisions, its claims and conditions, its promises and privileges are substantially now what, since the first intimation of divine mercy, they have always been. But while principles are unaltered, it benefits according to man have been largely augmented by the introduction of Christianity, while various circumstantial matters have been modified or changed. Circumcision has been abolished, but that was formerly implied in that fact is now transferred to baptism. It is on this account that an inspired authority designates the latter by the name of the former. "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism," &c. (Col. ii. 10, 12). "Unto us," says an able expositor, "the Apostle here calls baptism 'the circumcision of Christ,' because that we put off the body of the sins of the flesh, that is, become new creatures, by virtue of our Lord's own personal crucifixion; but if this be absurd, then the only reason for which he can call baptism 'the circumcision of Christ,' or Christian circumcision, is, that it has taken the place of the Abrahamic circumcision."

To the same purpose—as establishing the identity of the two ordinances as the initiatory rite into a visible covenant relationship with God, under the two dispensations—may also be cited, Gal. iii. 27-29. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

If, then, circumcision was a "sign" of that spiritual purity which the covenant of God requires and confers, so is the washing of baptism. If it was "a seal of the righteousness of faith," so is baptism. If by it men were formerly admitted into formal covenant with the Lord; by baptism alone are they now admitted to that relationship. Or, if by baptism we are now "circumcised with the circumcision of Christ," and become "Abraham's seed," formally, and as a means to an end; it follows that the objection falls to the ground, and as believing Abraham was required to administer the sign and the seal of his dispensation, to his infant children, we are required to administer the sign and seal of our dispensation, to our infant offspring. From this also the fallacy of another remark will appear.

It has been said that circumcision was a positive institution, under the law, and intended to pass away with the ceremonial law of Moses. Now the fact is, that it dates in its appointment long before Moses; that, like the Sabbath, it was only adopted into the Mosaic economy, and that, again, like the day of rest, though changed in its circumstances by the establishment of Christianity, yet in its principles, as "the circumcision of Christ," it was to remain unaltered to the end of time.

It has also been objected against infant baptism, that our Lord's words, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," necessarily excludes children, as incapable of properly receiving this ordinance. But to assume, as this view of the matter does, that this affirmation or promise of the Redeemer, includes the whole ground on which our ordinance is to be administered, is simply to beg the question. Seeing that of "every creature" whom a reasonable sinner, the Apostle and his successors should preach the gospel, "He that believeth and is baptized," should be saved, and we necessarily infer that none else were to be baptized or saved? The words do not refer to children at all, but describe an adult who should take place among those adults to whom the gospel should be preached for the first time. Had Abraham, after his receding to version, seen the instruction which he receded to version, and to administer this ordinance to his children, been commissioned also to preach that gospel whereby himself had been saved, among the Gentile nations, we know of no more cheering words that could have been addressed to him than these, "He that believeth and is circumcised shall be saved" but such an affirmation, necessary as it must have been for his direction and support of his faith, would have been liable to the construction, that the infant children of his converts were to be deprived of that rite. Elsewhere he had directions respecting them; and, as we have shewed elsewhere in the oft quoted text, which makes no reference to infants, and which of course does not exclude them, their introduction to the church is fully warranted.

Besides, if this text is asserted to exclude children from baptism because it says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," by a parity of reasoning it must exclude females from baptism, for it makes no mention of "She that believeth." Nor is this the only, or the worst conclusion, to which such a rash mode of drawing inferences inevitably leads. If because "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," therefore, he that cannot believe cannot be baptized, it follows that neither can he be saved. And not only so, but there is no mention made of "She that believeth," and only those who are mentioned obtain the rite and get salvation, it must follow, if the objection which we are now considering be good for anything, that neither children, females, nor heathen, all such are lost, and must perish forever!

Letter from England.

(From our own Correspondent.) ENGLAND, May 2, 1862.

Yesterday, under a glorious sunshine and in the presence of a vast multitude representing the wealth and splendour and genius of every enlightened nation in Christendom, and out of it, the International Exhibition of 1862 was opened to the world. From the earliest hours of the morning the long thoroughfare of many streets was thronged with people bent upon seeing one of the glories of the day as they were realized by an outside standing. Indeed the appearance of many groups, unquestionably agile and sleepy, seemed to intimate that they must have "amped out" for the night. Every available square foot of ground, every lamp post, tree, and window ledge on the line of the procession, had its occupant. Streamers and flags of all nations and all hues vied with the sunshine in glorying to the day.

An English pageant is different from that of a continental nation. We never attend the draperies of a French gala day. We do not believe in acres of crimson cloth on the streets, and miles of parti-coloured ribbons festooning the windows. We rely rather upon the simple dignity and unadorned grandeur of high names and deeds. To the fore, the procession of yesterday must have seemed somewhat tame. True there were state carriages and trappings enough to satisfy the greediest taste. Ambassadors glittered in their stately equipages. Lord Mayors shone resplendent in their antiquated vehicles, and there were red coats, blue coats, green, white, purple, gray, and even yellow,—stared, bejewelled, embroidered. But to the English eye the occupant of the coach has a greater charm than the coach itself,—and whatever foreigners might think of yesterday's procession, it was enough to the Englishman that he could look upon Palmerston and Derby and Russell, statesmen and heroes and philosophers whose life and genius have covered the nineteenth century with glory.

It would be absurd to attempt a description of the opening ceremony in full. One would require two or three weeks impressions of the Provincial Wesleyan for such a purpose. The stately structure, the fabulous wealth of its contents, the blaze of its trophies, the sweep of its aisles, the grandeur of its dome, larger far than the world-famous dome of St. Paul's,—the tastefulness of the company, the perfect sea of faces, black, swarthy, olive,—the richness of costume, robes, coronets, stars, chains, military accoutrements,—the flashing cuirass and the episcopal lawn,—the waving plumes and the shaven crowns all these things would require columns for themselves. But there were some of the funniest costumes. To say nothing of that of the Lord Chancellor and that of the Archbishop of Canterbury,—there were the Japanese ambassadors,—there were representatives from almost every nation under the sun, in all their national costumes,—there were queer little old men in alarming spectacles and the oddest dresses: there was one especially, a member of the Royal Institute of France, in a sort of spatch coloured coat that made him look like a "Jack in the Green."

When His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge had taken his seat on the throne, prayer was offered by the Bishop of London, and an address was presented by Earl Granville, to which the Royal Duke read a reply, which, of course, nobody heard. Then the orchestra of two thousand voices struck up, and held the vast audience in a spell which never broke. Nothing could have been grander than the musical scene. The beautiful ode of the Poet Laureate, set to music by Sterndale Bennett, excited the greatest admiration. The marches of Meyerbeer, Auber, and other composers who all rendered their contributions to the ceremonial were all rendered with great effect. At the close of the orchestral performance, the shrill flourish of trumpets declared that the pageant was at an end. There was but one drawback to the day. It appeared everywhere that the eye saw it in the deep-mourning liveries of the Royal carriages, and crapes scarves of the members of the Royal family,—the ear heard it in the solemn chant of the Laureate's ode, and the occasional funeral notes of the grand march of Meyerbeer,—the heart felt it in every thing. There was scarcely a heart in the crowd, inside and out, that was not a thought of the Duke of Cambridge, and the saddened home of Balmoral. Everything was there in yesterday's pageant, but there was the building, the rich store, the countless crowd,—but the master-spirit which had designed it all was absent. Few eyes were tearless, few hearts unmoved, when the solemn cadence of the Laureate, beautifully translated into music by Professor Bennett, fell upon the ears of yesterday.

It may, in conclusion, be said that no parent can by any spiritual obligation upon his children—their baptism or with it they are alike answerable to God.

This again is no proper objection to the ordinance, for if that be a duty, it ought to be performed, whether it adds to the responsibility of the child or not. But if a blessing be connected with it, and what ordinance has not a blessing annexed to it?—then there is with increased blessing increased obligation, and that is