

ANOTHER SENEX.

The following was sent to us after the note which was inserted in our last was printed. When the writer did not see his note in the October Number, the subjoined was written:—

Nov., 1852.

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT:—Had I anticipated the position in which I find myself now in relation to Senex and the Marriage Question before I wrote what he calls my essay, I would not have written it. I am sure that any intelligent disciple must have discovered the weakness of his arguments, so as to render any attempt unnecessary in his or her behalf, and I have only provoked him to go on to more extravagant aberrations.

There is no reasoning with such an opponent as Senex, who, in order to carry a favourite point, can deliberately affirm "that the words 'only in the Lord' is(are) unconnected with any part of the chapter," and then connect them with marriage himself: but a marriage of which he confesses Paul does not speak throughout the Chapter. (*Banner*, March, page 83.) He can easily dispose of the like of me, dress me in a fool's cap, make me affirm what I never said, and with a convenient supply of 'things and their opposites,' temporal marriages, spiritual marriages, marriages only in the Lord, marriages only out of the Lord, shew me off to his satisfaction; but how can he answer for charging Paul with giving us scripture *out of connexion*?

If you and your readers will exercise patience with me, I will endeavour to show in this my final letter that Senex' assertions ought to be received with caution on the important subject on which he writes; and if after this some of your readers conclude that "no where the smallest restriction is laid on the freedom of choice," and therefore marry infidels, and become infidels, and bring up infidel families I will be no partaker in their guilt.

As a reasoner, Senex is not to be trusted. Of this I was satisfied since I read with astonishment his critique on Mathetes. I wondered that you published it. Mathetes, speaking of a believer, says, "the condition of his being a son of God is his being separated from the world." On this Senex remarks, "Now according to Mathetes, if a member of the church marry a member of the church, they are separated from the world; consequently they are a son and daughter of God; but so it is that they may be thus married and not be a son or daughter of God—so that temporal marriage cannot be the condition of his being a son of God." After such a display of logic as this, and it is but a specimen, what subject can be safely trusted in his hands? He contradicts himself. On page 84 of the *Banner* for March he says: "The next quotation is the law that prevailed among the Jews where intermarriage with the nations round them is PROHIBITED," and on the next page he produces "three credible witnesses," one under the Patriarchal dispensation, another under the gospel, and the daughters of Zelophehad *under the law*, to prove that there was NO PROHIBITION, but that in harmony with the *law* and the gospel the whole of Adam's posterity have the liberty of being married to whom they will.