

true. Did not the Jews "preserve the symbols" of the Old Testament economy to the utter forgetfulness of "the thing symbolized"?

Again,—if "correctly preserving the symbol" is the safeguard against all heresy, how is it that Campbellites and Christadelphians, and Millerites and Mormons, and a host of other errorists, make immersion the key into their Kingdom of Heaven?

Once more,—*"The whole life of Christ was symbolic."* Where does our friend find that in his Bible? Had he said that the whole Levitical economy was symbolic of Christ, he would have come much nearer the truth. But he has a reason for reversing the matter: he wants to exalt baptism, and so he declares more than one half of our Saviour's life "a huge blank," for the sake of contriving some fanciful resemblance between the Lord "putting the river Jordan between Him and the natural life at Nazareth," and the sinner turning his back on his sins at his baptism! Christ's spotless life the "symbol" of our sinful life!

We are glad to observe that this symbolism run mad did not escape without at least a mild protest against it, on the part of several brethren.

One other statement, however, which we are surprised and pained to see was allowed to pass without remark, we must briefly notice. The Baptists—that is, Immersionists, for it is pure arrogance on their part to claim the name "Baptists," as if they alone baptized—are, according to Mr. Cameron, "*the only evangelical body in Christendom to-day*;" and the reason why they are, is, "that

they had preserved the symbols as they had been delivered to them by Christ, in their entirety." Well now, that is frank at least, if it is not very modest.

We do not know how our friend would define his terms, but it is evident that humility and charity form no part of evangelical religion, as he understands it. The Lord once said of some such "evangelical" people, "These are a smoke in my nose; a fire that burneth all the day." We should not have noticed this little piece of bigotry, however, had it not been allowed to pass unchallenged by the Convention. Does silence give consent?

As an offset to all this foolish talk, however, we are glad to observe one very sensible and practical remark from the Rev. W. Stewart, of Hamilton, who "advised his clerical brethren in their preaching to set forth the doctrine of the ordinances, before giving correct views as to the modes."

One of the speakers at the Baptist Convention defined a true Baptist as:

"First, one who was a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, and acknowledged Him as his only authority; second, one who, on the confession of such faith, was immersed in the name of the Trinity; third, one who took the Word of God and obeyed it, without allowing any person to come between his conscience and the Lord Jesus Christ; and fourth, *one who granted to every believer the same privileges he claimed for himself.*" (The italics are ours). We are astonished and delighted with these definitions,—especially with the *fourth*. We do not know, indeed, whether we may regard it as *ex cathedra*, but if so, it surely indicates a most gratifying progress in the denom.