

degree of polemic hardness and strictness by which some are pleased to style them. We are all acquainted with the history of the tower of Babel. Some of the more ignorant people imagine that the idea those people had in mind in building that immense structure was thereby to escape another flood if ever one should come. If that were their idea, it is strange that they should begin by laying its foundation in a low-lying district. Their idea, however, was to make that tower serve as a grand rallying place of all the tribes. There was a tendency among them to cluster together and leave large tracts of country unpeopled. They sought that sort of union and centralization which God has never permitted in the church or in the world, inasmuch as it hinders progress.

We know how the present system of denominationalism stirs into definite action the respective bodies. If a minister is inclined to be lazy—and this is a charge from which all ministers are not free—if “of all he surveys, there is no one his right to dispute,” he may be tempted to neglect his duties, and even yield to that temptation, and so let the truth suffer, but let some one of an opposite persuasion appear on the field to dispute his right, and at once he arouses to a sense of his duty: he labors energetically, he sows the good seed more carefully, and though a few skirmishes may take place, they are only like lovers’ quarrels, which serve to bind the parties more closely together afterwards: the people are instructed and enlightened in new truths, a holy rivalry is excited among them, and they go on provoking one another to love and good works.

Thirdly, denominationalism is not obstructive to the progress of Christianity, because of its *adaptability* to further it. Our physical constitutions are not all alike, neither will the same article of food prepared in the same way be equally pleasing to all; but, change your cook, or get your present cook a new receipt, and that article of diet which was once very offensive to the alimentary canal may become very palatable. Neither are all our mental constitutions fashioned alike. We have the emotional and the stoical; the authoritative and the passive; the poetic and the prosaic. Now, whether this be owing to natural predisposition or to early education, the writer does not need to prove; but this much we know to be a fact, that all minds cannot think alike. One man revels over a Greek or Latin author, while his friend rejoices that there are more than Greek and Latin books in the world. Another dotes over a mathematical problem, and declares most solemnly that there is