

sheets of paper over little crevices in those walls lest any of the salubrious air should get through to the other side." My brethren, these things ought not so to be. By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, said the Master, because ye have love one for another. The religion of Jesus is a life. Christianity is a practical system. The inspirations of the holy Christian life is love which manifests itself in service to God, and in service to man for Christ's sake. Dr. Parker puts this thought in this way. "I now ask a man to put down on paper what he believes, then I take it up and examine it, and I say, 'You are orthodox.' To another man I say, 'Put down on paper what you believe,' the man writes it. I examine it, and say, 'Heterodox.' The orthodox man has gone out of Church. I ask him to bring in his week's report of work done, and he says, 'I bound your certificate on my forehead. I went amongst men as orthodox, and I have sent at least two hundred people to hell for not believing what I believe. I got them to put down on paper what they believed, and I found that they did not know what they did believe, and so I sent them all to perdition, and I have waked up the church; and I will do the same next week.' Heterodox man, bring in your report. How does it read? 'Visited ten poor families, gave each of them five shillings and a word of encouragement, and told them to send for me if I could be of any help to them at any time. Saw a poor woman sitting on a door-step, without a friend or home in the world—

"O it was pitiful,
Near a whole city full;
Home she had none."

Made an appointment with her, gave her something to be going on with, and I intend to see this woman as often as possible until I get her established in life." Then Dr. Parker exclaims, "Who is the Christian?" James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, says in the New Testament that, "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." Good old Adam Clarke, the Methodist commentator, says:

"Ye different sects who all declare,
Lo! Christ is here and Christ is there;
Your stronger proofs divinely give,
And show me where the Christians live."

Human creeds do not tend to produce such lives as are commended by Dr. Parker and Dr. Clarke. It is faith in Jesus as the Son of God and the Saviour of man, and not the belief of theological dogmas, which produces such characters as are most like the character of our Lord Jesus Christ. It was affirmed by our eminent Christian teacher in the United States in 1843 that "human creeds, as bonds of union and communion, are necessarily heretical and schismatical". In the meeting of the American Congress of churches in 1885, president Noah Porter, D. D., LL. D., of Yale College, said in discussing the topic: The historical Christ considered as the true centre of theology. "I honor very greatly the memory of one Dr. Tuckney, a prominent member of the Westminster Assembly; and one of the most positively Calvinistic, having been active in formulating the confession, who says of himself, 'In the Assembly I gave my vote that the confession of faith put out by authority, should not be sworn or subscribed to, we having been burnt on the hand in that kind before.' That man's name, said Dr. Porter, deserves to be immortalized. Then he continues: "What mischief and division would have been spared the Christian church if every scholastic and theological creed had been uttered and received simply as a declaration of the opinions of those who sent it forth, instead of being imposed by authority on other men and other generations. What frightful fashions and desolating divisions and sects and schisms would have been avoided!"

"Prof. Schaff says in his great work, the Creeds of Christendom, that "the church is not founded on symbols but on Christ, not on any words of man, but on the word of God, yet it is founded on Christ as confessed by man, and a creed is man's answer to Christ's question, man's acceptance and interpreta-

tion of God's word. Hence it is after the immovable confession of Peter that Christ said, 'Thou art Rock, and upon this rock I shall build my church,' as if to say, 'Thou art the confession of Christ, and on this confession, as an immovable rock, I shall build my church. Where there is faith, there is also profession of faith. As faith without works is dead,' so it may be said also that faith without confessions is dead."

"But," Dr. Schaff says, "this confession need not always be written, much less reduced to a logical formula. If a man can say from his heart, 'I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ' it is sufficient for his salvation. (Acts xvi. 31). The word of God, apprehended by a living faith, which founded the Christian Church, was at first orally preached and transmitted by the apostles, there laid down in the New Testament scriptures, as a pure and unerring record for all time to come."

With this original, divine creed, and this 'pure and unerring record' let the Disciples of Christ be content. Thus will we know God, and secure the salvation of our own souls, and the salvation of the souls of the people. It was this creed which made the multitude of Christ's disciples in the Apostolic age of one heart and one soul and filled them with such a spirit of unselfishness as to hold their earthly possessions in common so that there were none in that holy community who lacked.

FOR THE MESSENGER AND VISITOR.

My attention has been called to an extract from your paper, headed "jottings from P. E. Island." The writer says, "it is a pity the Disciples on the Island would not join with the Baptists, in the belief that, 'baptism is an act of obedience for one already saved,' thereby effecting a union which would strengthen several weak interests."

I was not aware that the Disciples had advanced so far in the esteem of a Baptist writer, that the only bar to their union with Baptists, is, to believe that a sinner is saved before baptism. The only thing that I know, to prevent the Disciples from believing that statement, or any other, is want of evidence. We think that the promise of salvation is plain, and the conditions clear. Moreover, we find the way of approach to God unchangeably stereotyped in the Jewish Tabernacle. And we deny the authority of Baptists or any others, to remove the brazen laver from its place in the "court," and put it in the "Holy Place."

But how does a Baptist preacher know when a person's saved? It must be either by the testimony of the candidate, or by the spiritual discernment of the preacher.

I have heard persons whose sincerity I had no reason to doubt, declare their assurance of acceptance with God, and of present and eternal salvation. But I would be ashamed to occupy your paper with the grounds which they gave for that assurance, much less to accept those grounds as evidence. When Baptists occupy such ground, they destroy every argument for their own existence, and assist in raising up a class of proud presumptuous boasters; who are fitly represented by a captain in the "Salvation Army." It will be a dark day for the Disciples when they leave the solid foundations of Divine promise, to wander in the dreary regions of doubt and uncertainty.

But I happen to know too much of the genuine piety, and love of Divine truth, among the Baptists to accept such "jottings" as a representation of their views. And in this connection I would say, God forbid, that the "perverse disputings," and inconsistent conduct of so-called Disciples, should represent the numerous and noble workers who have successfully contended for a return to the faith and practice of the first churches. But unless I am greatly astray in my observations, the Baptists have advanced at a rapid rate towards the views of the Disciples within the last forty years. At that time more was frequently preached about unconditional election and reprobation, than about "Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." And more appeared to be known about the secret decrees of God, than

about His revealed will. As far as my acquaintance goes, that kind of teaching among the Baptists is among the "things that were." I rejoice in their progress towards the standard of perfection revealed in the New Testament. I would even be glad to see them outrun the Disciples. This they might do, if they would lay aside their human rules, and party name, as needless encumbrances. My hope and prayer is, that it may happen to Baptists and Disciples, as it did to the disciples on the mount: "When they had lifted up their eyes, they saw no man but Jesus only."

Yours in the truth,

ROBERT STEWART.

Lot 48, P. E. I.

[Accompanying the above was a note saying—that the enclosed article was sent to the *Messenger and Visitor* for publication, but for some reason unknown to the writer, no notice had been taken of it.—T. H. C.]

WOMAN LECTURERS AND PREACHERS.

To ED. CHRISTIAN.—

Dear Bro.: After having heard many ladies lecture and preach, I have asked myself the question,—do these women accomplish as much good as if they remained at home and attended to making it as attractive as possible for the husband and growing family?

We hear but little said in public about retiring, modest, loving mothers, who remain at home endeavoring with their husbands, to "bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Have these women missed their calling? Are they not doing a great work? However, while listening to these lecturing women you would be led to think that our mothers—those women who labor in their homes—have been all these years lying dormant and useless, because they have not taken the public platform. Are these politico-religious lecturing women alone in the path of duty? Alone revolutionising the world? Alone to be admired for intellectual brilliancy and courage sufficient to dictate on the great issues of the day?

We were not a little amused a few evenings ago, by a female temperance lecturer (and they are legion in this country) who would relegate all the evils in the land to the male sex and have us know the "dear things"—the lecturing class of course,—were better calculated to legislate for the public good than the men whom she seemed so much to despise.

It is pleasing as well as commendable in a lady, to find her kind and gentle in her manner instead of being guilty of much sarcasm, tinged at times with that which approximates rudeness.

Did Solomon make a grievous blunder in his description of a noble woman? Perhaps had he lived in our times he would have spoken very differently (?)

He says, "Her children shall rise up and call her blessed," but how can they do this, if she is found away from home trying to act the man?

Again he says, "She looks well to her household." This would be an impossibility while away peregrinating the country. Neither could she make "fine linen" while riding along with strangers. How can "her husband be known in the gates among the elders of the land," if he is compelled to be at home attending the children and doing the housework by reason of the wife being away lecturing or preaching, or both, as the case may be.

Is she not leaving him to such influences as may be the ruin of that union made by God, when they joined hands and plighted vows to be true to each other until death would cause a separation.

Has the apostle Paul spoken incorrectly to Titus? He there orders the "young women to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed."

It is more becoming in a woman to be engaged at home than in our legislative halls. Nevertheless we were informed by our lady lecturer that several women now occupy that position in the country. Where are their husbands, if they have any. Perhaps they are not blessed with them. But if among the fortunate, then they should love and respect.