

heart and doctrine" which at present exists among us? The imposition of any other test is, in such a case, as needless as it is unscriptural. It would look to us very un-Protestant to say the least, something not very unlike the assumption of infallibility, on our part, thus to "judge," and "set at nought" a brother, whose ministry has been graciously owned of God in the salvation of souls, because he did not come up to our notion of the amount of Calvinism he ought to hold.

We speak with diffidence on a subject which has taxed the powers of the ablest minds among us, and which has so much to be said on both sides concerning it. But it appears to us that we must either abandon all doctrinal tests with regard to "non-essentials," and rely exclusively on the evidence of spiritual life in the applicant, and the amount of orthodoxy of which that is a divine guarantee, or that we must make more of them than we are doing. There is no logical resting-place between these alternatives. Our present position is a kind of compromise, and, like most other compromises, is not very satisfactory. If it be wrong in Episcopalians to demand subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, or for Presbyterians to enforce a similar acceptance of their Confession and Catechisms, it is equally wrong in us to call Dwight or Wardlaw "Master," and require brethren to sit at their feet. The principle, in our judgment, is the same, whether we insist on their accepting of *our formulary*, or on their furnishing *one acceptable to us*. The prayer of the Great Intercessor, already overshadowed with the gathering gloom of Gethsemane and Calvary, "that they all may be one," points to a visible unity among his followers,—“that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me.” That prayer, however, can never be completely fulfilled so long as each sect maintains its own "middle wall of partition," and withholds fellowship from any true disciple, on any minor ground of difference whatever.

We shall be told, of course, as Mr. Fenwick does tell us, that "the standard of doctrinal unity applicable to church-members, and that which should be adopted in reference to church-teachers, should somewhat differ." We confess that we fail to see it. A man can't be very far astray in his teaching, if he be a true christian, and the Holy Ghost be blessing his ministry. If God "give him the like gift as he does unto us, who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, what are we that we should withstand God?" What is there but our prejudices and uncharitableness to prevent the most hearty coöperation with such brethren in every good work? We love them, and exchange pulpits with them, and plan and pray with them, *out of the Union*; is it possible that seeing in them the evidence of the same heavenly calling, and conformity to the image of God's dear Son, we should love them less, and have less confidence in their work *in the Union*?

Let there then be one fold at least where Christ shall keep the door,—one communion where all who love Him shall hear the cordial welcome, "Come in thou blessed of the Lord; wherefore standest thou without?"