

May 31 64
in ...

(a ...)

THE ADVISER.

“LIGHT AND LOVE.”

VOL. IV.

TORONTO, AUGUST, 1864.

NO. 2.

CONTENTS.

First Principles.....	17
Overseers.....	18
Are we Drif.ing.....	19
Upside Down.....	20
The Evidence of Feeling.....	25
Paul and the Clergy.....	26
God gave the Increase.....	26
Mere Formality.....	27
Ordinances Divine and Human.....	27
Words from the Work-table.....	28
Camden Town, London.....	30
Evangelists' Advices.....	30
Items.....	32

FIRST PRINCIPLES.

Professors of christianity have formed themselves into some hundreds of parties. Among them all we find many ranged on each side of two ideas—"essential" and "non-essential." On one side of the fence they say they agree, that is, on "essentials"—on the other side they say they disagree, that is, on "non-essentials." Only think of Protestants, after boldly opposing what they call human traditions, innovations, anti-Bible or anti-christian doctrine—then differing about "non-essentials." Set half a dozen parties in one little town building half a dozen "places of worship"—supporting six clergymen, some of them scarcely knowing how to raise the "one thing needful" for the minister—all this connected with strife, jealousy, contention, and a state things which has a tendency to multiply infidels, and all, all for the sake of, or on account of nothing in the world but *non-essentials*. Who can credit it? Who can suppose that they differ so widely—so zealously—so expensively, about mere "non-essentials!" I am always ready to give them credit for better judgment, more sense, good, common and uncommon, than that all this labor, toil and self-sacrifice is simply the result of a difference about non-essentials.

True they differ. 1. About what is not in the Bible. 2. About (themselves being judges,) what interferes not the slightest with a man's salvation. Looking at it from this angle, is it not expensive folly? There names are not in the Bible and they all say there is "nothing in a name." Now if their party names were all thrown overboard, sinking, never to rise again, it would make a wonderful difference. If the various offices obtaining amongst them, not found in the Bible, were abandoned, (and they say there is nothing essential in church government), it would help to smoothe the surface. And if the various organizations ecclesiastical, which are not mentioned in the Bible, were by them rendered null and void, things would wear a more hopeful aspect. And if they would teach for doctrine nothing but what is taught in the Bible and all that is taught in the Bible, lovely union would soon prevail. We say then, if there be no value in non-essentials, why not dispense with them and try to be of one heart and one soul? But 2. They differ about things which are *in* the Bible, but still regarded by them as non-essential. Ah, here is a serious matter; let us look at it. Oh! that the children of men could see that there are *no non-essentials* in the Bible. Who can point out one? Did Moses ever teach one? Did David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, or any other Prophet of God teach *one* non-essential? Which of the Apostles of Jesus taught *one* non-essential? Did they so trifle with man's eternal destiny? No, no. But if we admit that the Prophets or Apostles taught non-essentials, with what are we charging the Holy Spirit of God!! Oh, who shall stand in the day of judgment and charge the Almighty with folly! Well, did Jesus, the adorable Redeemer, the embodiment of all wisdom, teach the people non-essentials? Forbid the impious thought! Ah, kind reader, there are no non-essentials in the Bible. But