

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

THE
CANADIAN PRESBYTER.

MAY, 1858.

PERSONAL CHRISTIAN EFFORT.

In many parts of our country prayer meetings are being held daily to invoke the presence and the power of the Holy Spirit among the Churches of Christ. God's people have shown some earnestness in this matter. They believe and feel that there will be no saving revival or conversion of souls unless by the agency of the Holy Spirit; therefore they pray. They are sensible of a want in the Churches—a general apathy and deadness in the religious community—for which no remedy can be found but the power of Divine grace. These are hopeful symptoms. They are in themselves a *revival*. We trust that they are the first breath of that gale of spiritual influences which shall yet pass through our land. The work is spreading apace; interest is awakened in regard to religion among many who had never before given a serious thought to the claims of eternity. By all means, therefore, let prayer meetings be everywhere multiplied, and let the Churches give every facility and aid to the increase and intensity of religious desire and to the public expression of Christian affection. Such efforts will assuredly be blessed. They have so far already in many places produced impressions of deep solemnity, with great tenderness of heart and conscience, among professing Christians, young and old; they have led some sinners to enquire what they must do to be saved. True, nothing so striking as that which has been witnessed in the United States has yet occurred among us. Solemnity and tenderness have been more characteristic of our movements than vivid awakening or extensive conversion; yet should we give God thanks for the measure of grace he has vouchsafed to us, and instead of relaxing, increase our efforts for the advancement of the glorious work.

While however we aid these union meetings for prayer, and rejoice in them as a fruit of the Spirit, let us not think that in them our Christian work is exhausted. Much more than this of *personal effort* is yet required of Christ's disciples. We may despair of the work of grace and salvation greatly advancing,

if while we pray we stand idle, with folded hands and closed lips. Other works than that of praying and enjoying Christian fellowship, are required of the faithful. They are the ministers of God for good to a lost world. God works *in* and *through* his Church when he would confer blessings on the ungodly. To stand by and wait till God's Spirit will convert and save sinners is not certainly to be a good steward of the mysteries. It ought to be remembered by professing christians that this is not an age of miracles. Extraordinary manifestations of Divine power are not now to be expected; the wonders of Divine grace are not now wrought without the intervention of human agents. The Gospel dispensation is one that, more than all that went before it, requires personal, individual activity. There are in these days no prophetic or priestly castes who shall be spokesmen and actors between God and the people. Every converted man is now the commissioned mouth-piece of God, and his anointed priest to make sacrifice and intercession for the people. If believers will not speak for God, the sinner will not hear the glad tidings of salvation; if they will not intercede for man, the promised blessing will not be sent to the Church and the world. Where the Word is not spoken, and the prayer of faith is not offered to God in the name of Jesus Christ, there the Devil is sure to reign with absolute dominion. As it is God who worketh *in us* to will and do *in us* of his own good pleasure, so it is God who worketh *by us* to perfect his grace in the world.

That every converted person should be personally,—not merely collectively as part of the Church,—a fellow-worker with Christ for the salvation of sinners we believe to be an indisputable doctrine of scripture. The terms in which the christian life is described in the Bible, and the figures by which it is there illustrated, demonstrate this. The new nature, for example, into which the Christian is born, is spoken of as a new life—life from the dead—the life of Christ himself—a life with all its vitalities of thought, feeling, and action—a life not paralysed or powerless; but which walks, and runs, and speaks, and wrestles, and fights. For a christian therefore to lack *personal* activity for Christ, is for him to be without the marks and evidences of his own conversion. He besides exposes himself to the just rebuke and chastisement of God as an unfaithful servant.

Again, the Christian life is represented as a sacrifice to God of soul, body, and spirit—a self consecration of all powers and possessions to the service and glory of God. This is the true ideal of Christianity. Less than this will not be accepted as an offering to Jehovah. But how, let us ask, can this be done without a personal activity, the direct aim and tendency of which is to promote the divine glory in the salvation of souls? The true believer should be able to say, “the life that I now live I live to Christ, my Saviour—all that I am and have is and shall be devoted to his honour and glory.” The Church greatly wants such followers of Christ as this. A few such men would produce a marvellous influence upon the public mind. God would bless their labour, and a great enlargement of the Church of Christ would be their reward.

The same truth is also declared in such expression as "Ye are the lights of the world,"—light which does not concentrate itself within itself, but radiates all outward, penetrating everywhere, and clothing all things with beauty.

The Kingdom of God is besides likened to leaven—a little leaven. Leaven contains a most active and self-assimilating principle, with which there is no rest—no cessation from working, until the whole lump in which it is enclosed be leavened.

The examples of Christ and his Apostles strikingly confirm these teachings of their words. They were eminently men full of life and energy, fighting the good fight. They all consecrated themselves to God for man; they shone as lights in the world; and they worked as long as life lasted to conform men to the likeness of God.

But why should we press further this manifest truth and duty? Who can deny that true religion can only condition itself by a life consecrated to the personal service of Christ? All this is generally, if not universally accepted by Christian men and women; and under the influence of such a conviction many devote themselves with zeal to the work of God. Still it is to be lamented that we have so few working Christians,—so few who will deny themselves much or anything at all to help on the salvation of sinners. Many know the right and approve it, disprove the wrong and yet do it. There must be some delusion in the minds of such in regard to this matter, else why this apathy and idleness that we find so common a feature of much of the Christianity of our day?

We can only suppose that in the case of many apparently sincere and warm-hearted believers the "fruit meet" is wanting in their lives, from a misconception of what the Christian life ought really to be. There is a kind of *pietism* in the Church in which many good people indulge to the detriment of personal activity. They confine their attention to inward experiences—to the world of ceaseless activity, which may be found on reflection within their souls. Here, there are temptations, trials, and conflicts, times of darkness and of light, of shadow and sunshine, with constant calls to vigilance and humiliation, to sorrow and rejoicing. This contemplative kind of experience may often pass for personal activity, and give an *idea* of work, when in fact nothing has been done outwardly for Christ at all. The subject of it may on the contrary be all the time living a very defective Christian life. We are tempted to think that some such delusion as this may account for the apathy and indifference which we often find in good christian people, to the personal work for Christ which the Church has to do in the world.

It may also be that some sincere believers have false conceptions of the kind of christian activity which is really required at their hands, and have thus fallen short of that devotement of person which Christ demands. Such persons are often satisfied with a passive, or, at most, an unobtruding christian deportment,—a life in which there is nothing to which any one can well take exception. They do many things that are good, and may give liberally of their substance for the cause of Christ. It cannot be said of them that they *commit* any sin.

So far as they go it is well. Their lamps are burning; but, on scrutiny, it will be found that they *come short*, and sin by reason of defect: they have no oil in their vessels. They have no individuality of Christian character, and only form part of the general Church membership. Members, but not persons, they appear only as part of the army in aggregated array; and while not unwilling to go with the crowd to battle for God they yet sadly lack individual prowess, and never, or seldom engage in single combat, as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. From such persons the Sabbath-school, or prayer-meeting, or district visitation, gets little or no aid. Their standard of Christian life does not contemplate *personal* Christian effort for the salvation of sinners.

These are grievous defects in christian character, and greatly mar the living beauty of the Church of Christ. When they prevail to any extent, as they too often do, they make the Church lethargic; they contract its spiritual life into a narrow circle, instead of expanding it to the circumference of the world. How different from this is the character of the Apostles! or of the converted at Pentecost! or of the Reformers whose names are written among the faithful! Whitfield and Wesley, Wilberforce, Clarkson and Howard, were men of a different stamp from this. Their inward life was powerful enough to manifest itself outwardly. They nobly displayed the virtues of the new nature which God by His Spirit had given them, by a life of *personal* christian activity. They were not absorbed in the general aggregate of the christian community, but stood out in bold relief as *features* in the christian Church. Such also are our devoted Sabbath-school teachers, and other zealous labourers in the Lord's vineyard in these days. Why should it be otherwise? If you, my reader, have knowledge of divine things, can you give any reason why you should not make it known to others? If you have saving faith, is there any reason why you should not strive to make others partakers of the like precious gift? If you have the graces of holiness are you faithful to the trust committed to you if you do not urge them upon the acceptance of others? If, in short, your own soul is saved, how can you without sin be personally and individually indifferent to the salvation of others? Say, for example, that you have unconverted children, will you be guiltless of their blood if you do not make *personal* efforts for their salvation? If you have unconverted friends, are you not unfaithful to them as well as to God if you do not press upon them the interests of their souls? Every one whom your voice or example can reach has claims upon you. You are debtor to the Jew and the Greek, to the barbarian, the bond and free, the young and old. Whatever of christian life you possess, it is given you that you may impart it also to others. Your light is to shine, that others, seeing it, may be attracted to the crucified Saviour.

Some may be disposed to say, "Oh! you wish us all to become ministers of the Gospel: that which you describe is the work of the pastor. We appoint and pay him for that purpose. He has been specially educated and trained for that particular work, and it is no part of our duty to attend to those matters of which you speak."

In reply, we would say, that we do not call upon every professing christian to give up the business or profession in which he is engaged, and to become a pastor or minister. It is enough that in the sphere of life in which, by Providence, a man has been placed, he should both speak and act for Christ as opportunity offered or occasion demanded. It is with stolid, timid and silent christians we would remonstrate—men and women who are ashamed to be seen with Christ, however much they may love him in their hearts. Why should it be thought a thing impossible for any one to be a christian in every walk and rank of life? Every one is not called, neither is he fitted, to be a minister of the Gospel; but every one may put on the "whole armour of light," and acquit himself as a faithful follower of Jesus. It seems to be too generally thought that ministers are the Church's deputies and *proxies* in the matter of *personal* effort for the conversion of souls. This is a great delusion—as great a delusion as for an army to suppose that its officers are its deputies, and that they only were to fight with the enemy. The minister is nothing more than an officer of the Lord's Hosts. He must watch over their welfare, marshal and train them aright, lead and direct them in the field, and be an example to them of personal devotion and courage; but he can only do his own fighting. Against the enemy, the arms of the least member of the Church may be as powerful through the Spirit as his. Let no man, therefore, imagine that his helping to appoint and to pay a minister exempts him from personal exertions for Christ's cause. Ministers in these days have more than enough to do of the Church's work. In general they are burdened with much that ought to be done by members. Unreasonable demands are too often made at their hands, and unreasonable expectations entertained as to what they either can or ought to do. Unless the members of the Church will faithfully do their own ministry, and come cheerfully to the help of their pastors, we despair of any great progress of religion amongst us. Personal christian effort is what the Church wants at this time. Personal effort has always been blessed, and it will always bless both the actor and the object. "He which converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins," (James v., 19.)

Care must, however, be taken that christian activity be not zeal without either knowledge or prudence. Inconsiderate and unwise activity may do as much evil to the Church as lifeless in difference. A Diotrephes who seeketh the pre-eminence is a bane to any community. Those whose actions in behalf of religion are stilted, formal, unnatural and without heart, are more likely to pour water upon the embers of grace than to fan them into a flame. Heartly spontaneity, accompanied by the humility and simplicity of true spiritual wisdom, is the kind of action that we require. In the public prayers of both ministers and people we want less of formal phrasing. There are a set of expressions which we always hear in prayer-meetings and at public worship, which have, to our mind, become so stereotyped as to have lost much, if not all, of their force and signification. We want these *current* forms of speech exchanged for hearty utterances of spiritual desires, in just such simple words as those in which we

speak to our fellows. When the Spirit of God comes into the Church we believe that one most distinct mark of His presence will be, that the act and expression of prayer will be spontaneous and simple—that both the heart and lips will lose their stilts, and walk, and leap, and rejoice. We would say the same regarding other actions of the christian life. Let them be done heartily as unto the Lord, and there will be an indescribable charm about them that will attract. We do not wonder that some men's actions produce no salutary impression upon the minds of others. They are sometimes done with such a patronizing air as to repel. Their words, too, have a tinge of unsympathizing censure which excites antagonism. No people have a keener perception of insincerity and want of heart than the ungodly. They will at least *listen* to the voice of love and disinterested sincerity, but at a glance they will detect a formal man whose heart is little better than their own, and from the admonitions of such they will turn with scorn. If Christian men will only act and speak as they believe, know and feel, whatever be the measure of their faith, knowledge and love, their labours will not fail to meet with a corresponding influence.

When we thus insist on wise, prudent, and spontaneous christian activity, we do not ask that all christian men will take a public or prominent part in Church business or in religious societies. These are not the fields of action to which we would invite special attention. The great, leavening, Christianizing work within the circle of a man's own relations is that which we deem of much greater importance. It is comparatively an easy thing to join in public work in which there is high sounding reporting and applauding. The unostentatious, constant, persevering effort which meets with few spectators but God, is the leavening work which it is most difficult to do, which tests a Christian disciple, and for which we stand most in need of labourers. If any one says to us, "What would you have me to do?" "My brother," we would reply, "If you know of an unconverted friend, go, try and convert him to God; shape your thoughts, your feelings, your words and your actions all to this end. In doing these things, you will be personally engaged in the work of the Lord, and accounted his faithful servant at the great Assize."

ROMISH BAPTISM, IS IT VALID ?*

To many this question seems susceptible of only one answer, and that is readily given in the negative. We however regard the question as somewhat difficult of solution, and of some importance both in itself and in its bearing on such practical questions as Sacramental Grace, Apostolical Succession, and Hierarchical Churchism,—questions which in our day are not allowed to rest unnoticed. Feeling the subject to be one worthy of attention, and the more so that it has been sent down for consideration to Presbyteries from our Supreme Court, we have endeavoured to investigate the subject somewhat deliberately and carefully, and after doing so have been led to take the affirmative view and to maintain that Romish Baptism is valid.

* We hope to present our readers with an article on the other side of this controversy in our next number.

In attempting to vindicate this position, if we may judge from the discussion of last Synod, we find ourselves opposed to the views of many of our brethren. However much our confidence in our own judgment might be shaken by finding many eminent living divines and missionaries, besides an overwhelming majority of 169 to 8 in the General Assembly of the United States, arrayed against us, we feel confirmed in our position by finding ourselves in company with such names as Luther, Calvin, Knox, Turretine, and many other eminent theologians in the French, Dutch, German, English, and Scotch Churches. Many living authors also who occupy no second place in the Church of God, hold the same views. In our limited space we cannot give references, but we may mention the Princeton Review, July 1845 and April 1846, as presenting a very full and satisfactory defence of this side of the question.

In addressing ourselves to the subject before us, we would first try to obviate the two principal objections made to Romish Baptism; for unless these are satisfactorily set aside, the positive proof to be adduced will appear much less forcible, if not altogether powerless.

1. The first objection may be stated thus:—The Church of Rome is Antichrist, the Man of Sin, the Synagogue of Satan; she is no part of the Church of Christ; her ordinances are not Christian ordinances; and consequently her baptism is not valid.

Let us examine these successive propositions.

1. The Church of Rome is Antichrist, &c., that is, opposed to Christ, and how, it is defiantly asked, can she be part of Christ's body? The question put thus, has, at first sight, the appearance of great weight; but may we not ask in turn, was not the Jewish Church called *Aholah* the harlot; how then could she be the beloved of God, his chosen people, and compared to the wife of one's youth? or, may not a Roman Catholic be a child of God, but "how can a man be a member of the Synagogue of Satan and of the body of Christ at the same time"? If there is no inconsistency in these things, then the Church of Rome may be in one respect Antichrist and in another respect part of the Church of Christ; but it does not follow that because she is Antichrist she is therefore no part of the Church of Christ. We must distinguish between Antichrist and the Church of God in which Antichrist exists,—in other words, between the Papacy as a hierarchical system, and the christian community connected with it.

This distinction between the Church of Rome and that antichristian system which has corrupted and enslaved it is found both in Scripture and in the Westminster Confession. The man of sin, the son of perdition is said to sit *in the temple of God*,—that is, to be *within the Church*, but distinct from it. The whore of the Apocalypse is a *woman* defiled, that is a *Church* apostate; and our Confession carefully says, "The Pope of Rome, not the Church of Rome, is that Antichrist, &c. that exalteth himself *in the Church* against Christ."

Connection with the Church is *essential* to the Papacy; this is characteristic of Popery, distinguishing it from other systems opposed to the true religion, such as Buddhism, Mohammedanism, Infidelity, &c. Separate Popery from the Church, and its nature is changed. This connection constitutes Popery, Satan's masterpiece; it is opposed to Christ, yet in some sense worships him; it contains part of God's Church, but seeks to rob her of her privileges; it holds all the truth essential to salvation, and yet destroys souls by its lies. Let us, then, bear in mind that the mystery of iniquity is both Christ and Antichrist. "The terms Antichrist, Synagogue of Satan, &c., refer not to the mass of the people, nor to the presbyteries of that communion, nor to the Word of God, nor the saving truths which they profess; but to the Popish hierarchy and its corruptions."

2. It is said that the Church of Rome is no part of the Church of Christ. In this expression we cannot be mistaken when we understand the terms Church of Christ as meaning the *Visible Catholic Church*, including Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Baptists, Methodists, &c. Each of these denominations may be called a Church of God, and for this reason, that although the degrees of knowledge and purity existing in each may be very various, yet they each have *all the essential characteristics* of a Church of Christ. Now what is essential to a church, or what is there which existing necessarily is a Church, and which being wanting no Church can exist. The following definition, given by Dr. Hodge, seems to us to contain all that is essential, and nothing more:—"An organized Society, professing the true religion, united for the purposes of worship and discipline, and subject to the same form of government and to some common tribunal."

Does the church of Rome meet this definition? The only point in which difference of opinion can arise is, does she profess the true religion? Now observe the question is not, is she pure or corrupt in practice; orthodox, or erroneous and superstitious, in doctrine; free, or deceived and enslaved by a spiritual tyranny? But is the true religion professed by her? are the essential doctrines of the Gospel held by her *along with* all her abominations, errors and delusions? What says her Bible? what say her creeds? Her Bible unquestionably contains God's truth, and her creed must be pronounced orthodox. In them the true religion is professed.

But it will be said, her explanations according to the Council of Trent vitiate her creeds. By no means: these explanations while construed so as to teach error, may be construed so as to teach the truth; besides the knowledge of them is confined to a very small number, and to the Roman Catholic community generally the creeds, and not these explanations, form the profession of their faith. It cannot therefore be fairly denied that the Roman Catholic Church holds all the truths essential to salvation as firmly and decidedly as any Church on earth, though they may be mixed up and overlaid with erroneous dogmas.

If the above definition is good, then, inasmuch as the Romish Church meets it, we must allow that she (not the Hierarchy as a system) forms part of the Church of God.

3. Her ordinances are not Christian ordinances. Does, then, the character of ordinances depend on the character of the Church in connection with which they are administered? Scripture saith not so, Phil. i. 15—18. Gospel preaching is Gospel preaching, whether Jew or Gentile, Protestant or Catholic, Calvinist or Arminian preaches; so also the sacraments do not belong to any particular denomination, but to the Church Catholic. They are ordinances instituted by Christ, and, when administered according to his appointment, they are means of grace, by whomsoever they are administered; they are *christian* ordinances, belonging to Christianity, and not to any particular branch of the Church.

4. Another strong proof that the Church of Rome is part of Christ's Church and her ordinances christian ordinances, is derived from the acknowledged fact, that within the pale of that Church many of God's spiritual seed have lived, grown in grace, laboured and died. "Wherever the Spirit is, there is the Church." *Ubi Spiritus, ibi ecclesia.* Now the Holy Spirit has dwelt in all ages, and still dwells, in believers within the pale of the Romish Church; and Gospel ordinances, as administered in that communion, have been made, and are still made, effectual to salvation. Where therefore God has by his Holy Spirit sealed a chosen people for himself, and builds them up in their most holy faith by ordinances administered, however much we may lament the ignorance, error, and superstition that

prevail, we cannot deny that *there* God's Church is, and these ordinances are christian.

It seems therefore quite evident, that though the Pope be Antichrist, &c., still the *people* constituting the Church of Rome form part of the Visible Church; and the ordinances of the Gospel, though corrupted, are yet owned by God's Spirit, and so must be considered Christian ordinances. Hence we infer that notwithstanding this first objection, Romish baptism *may* be valid.

II. The second objection is, Baptism can only be administered by ministers lawfully ordained; Popish priests are not lawfully ordained ministers; therefore Popish baptisms are not valid.

1. Without entering on the question of lay baptism, our first answer is that this objection is opposed directly to the teaching of our standards, which declare that the sacraments become effectual *not by any virtue in him who administers them*, whereas the objection makes the validity and so the efficacy of baptism depend on the lawful ordination of the administrator.

To settle the question, what is lawful ordination, were no easy matter. We might determine what regular or orderly ordination is, but we every day acknowledge by our practice that ministers not regularly ordained according to the Presbyterian mode are competent to the discharge of ministerial functions, and particularly to the administration of baptism. Hence even were it determined what *regular* ordination is, it might not be determined what lawful ordination is. The following definition, taken from the Princeton Review, will fully answer our present purpose:—"Any man is a minister who is recognised as such by a christian community," whether, we add, this recognition be made through a presbytery, a prelate, a conference, or a particular Church. This definition is as far as we can safely go. If we add any *specific mode* of ordination as essential, we add to Scripture, which lays down no specific rule; we deny the validity of acts, which may be irregular, and yet are performed by the Church in virtue of a constitutional power granted directly by her Head; and we make ordination dependant on something apart from the call and warrant of the Church, or something akin to apostolic succession.

If, then, we accept the above definition, we must ask, Are Popish priests ordained ministers in this sense? If the Roman Catholic community be a christian community, as has we think been shown, it does unquestionably *recognize* its own priests as ministers, and therefore by our definition they are ministers of the Church of Christ.

3. But thirdly, even if it could be shown that Popish priests are not regularly ordained, and Romish baptisms irregularly administered, it would by no means follow that these baptisms are not valid. Regularity and validity, or rather irregularity and non-validity, are two distinct questions. A marriage may be irregular and valid, and again regular and not valid; and so the validity of baptism must be considered apart from its regularity, unless indeed it can be shown that regularity of manner is of the essence of baptism. We therefore dismiss the second objection as not affecting the question of validity.

A word now as to our agreement. We do not think that anything has yet been established in proof of the position we have taken: we have only been trying to clear our way; we have only shown that Romish baptism may be valid though the Pope be Antichrist and though Popish priests be not regularly ordained. We now proceed to give our proof that it is valid.

When we assert that Romish baptism is valid, what do we mean? As we have already said, we do not mean *orderly* or *regular*, for we readily admit the validity of baptisms not orderly administered according to our views of Presbyterian order; neither do we mean *efficacious* or attended with the spiritual blessings

signified in baptism; but we mean that "Romish baptism avails to the end for which baptism was instituted: it avails to make the recipient a professing christian." And we maintain that if a real convert from heathenism, trusting to the Saviour, and believing it to be his duty to obey the command of the Saviour, should ask for and receive baptism for himself and family at the hands of a Popish priest, both he and his children would be really baptised, and should not be re-baptised; and for this reason, that, being within the covenant, the baptism which he received was a sufficient recognition of him and his family as professing christians. To deny this would in our view be to put such a convert on the same level, as regards Church standing, with unbelieving idolaters.

But let us examine more closely for what end baptism was instituted. The Scripture says, "So many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ were baptised into his death. As many of you as have been baptised into Christ, have put on Christ; and again putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him," &c. Our standards teach, that baptism "represents, seals, and applies the benefits of redemption to those who are within the covenant; that thereby they are solemnly admitted into the Church visible; distinguished from the world and dedicated to the service of God." Without refining, it will probably be sufficiently explicit for our present purpose to say that the design of baptism is to set a seal on professing christians in order to denote their relation to Christ, and dedication to his service.

And now let us notice that this design may be fulfilled even where the sacrament is not effectual to salvation. Efficacy depends on the right use of the ordinance and the working of the Holy Spirit; and while in some instances baptism is never effectual, in others, though long ineffectual, yet in God's appointed time "Christ will, by the power of the Holy Spirit, effectually work in the hearts of his elect, all that is meant and signified by the same." See Confession, chap. xxviii. 6.

In like manner, Knox, speaking of his own baptism (Romish), says: "It was ministered to us in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; and yet, for that time, I confess, by reason of our blindness, it did not profit us, because it was adulterate and mixed with men's dreams and fantasies. I confess for the time it did not profit us; but now, as said is, the Spirit of Christ illuminating our hearts, hath purged the same by faith, and maketh the effect of that sacrament to work in us, without any iteration of the sign."

Thus we see that the proper end of Baptism may be fulfilled while it is not efficacious; and we must distinguish between these two things. This brings us to a point of difference between the Romanists and ourselves. While we agree in the design, as we shall hereafter see, we differ as to the efficacy. The Church of Rome holds the dogma of Baptismal Regeneration. We, on the other hand, regard it as a monstrous error to teach the absolute necessity and uniform efficacy of Baptism; and to say that the *opus operatum* saves, we denounce as a horrible abuse of Christ's ordinance. Still, neither that error nor that abuse affect the design of the ordinance: the design may be attained notwithstanding both. This design we have defined as being "to set a seal on professing christians, in order to denote their relation to Christ and their dedication to his service." This the Romish Church holds, while she also holds more. Dens thus defines a sacrament: "A visible sign of an invisible grace divinely instituted for our sanctification"; and Baptism, as "a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord, in which, by the external washing of the body, under the invocation of the Most Holy Trinity, the man is spiritually regenerated"; and again he says: "Anything is a sacrament, inasmuch as it is a sign, not as it is a cause, or, it is

having a signification (quod significat) and not being a cause that makes a sacrament." Bellarmine says on Acts ii. 41, where we see that to be baptised is nothing else than to enter the Church: "Baptizari nihil esse aliud, quam ecclesiam intrare."—Controv. de Bap., lib. i., cap. 8.

From this, then, it appears that the *design* of Baptism, as administered in the Romish Church, is the same as that of Baptism with us, and as we believe it is laid down in Scripture and in our standards; and we must admit, that, in so far as it fulfils the proper end of Baptism, Romish Baptism is valid.

Indeed, to reject Romish Baptism because it teaches too much as to the design, would, if consistently carried out, necessitate the rejection of Baptism by the Church of England, strict Lutherans, and most of the Eastern Churches; as well as that of other Churches, which, holding too little as to the design of Baptism, maintain that it is a naked sign. But surely the most strenuous advocate for re-baptism will not go that length.

But let us next inquire, Is Baptism administered in the Church of Rome according to the ordinance of Christ? And here two points must be considered: 1st. The matter; 2nd. The form of Baptism.

Here observe, that this is the great question on which the validity of any ordinance, and particularly the ordinance of Baptism, depends. Is it Christ's ordinance? Is it administered according to his appointment? For being thus administered it has Christ's promise, "Lo I am with you," and so it is valid. We repeat it, *the validity of any Baptism may be determined by answering the question, "Was it administered according to the institution of Christ?"*

1. What is the matter of Baptism? Washing with water,—with nothing but water? Is this, then, the matter of Romish Baptism? Let Dens speak for his Church: "What is the matter of Baptism? Est omnis et sola aqua naturalis, seu elementaris. It is *wholly and only natural or plain water*. What kind of water may be used in Baptism? Sea-water, rain-water, water from a spring or river, or mineral water; whether muddy or clear, cold or warm, blessed or not blessed. On the contrary, Baptism cannot be administered with clay, or mire, or ale, or milk, or oil, or spittle, or swat, or tears." This is plain language, and Romish Baptism is evidently right as regards the matter of it.

But, we are told, the rite is corrupted. The sign of the cross, anointing, application of a spittle, tasting of salt, &c., are introduced into the simple ordinance, so that it is destroyed. That these and many other such vain ceremonies accompany the administration of Baptism, we admit; but that they enter into the nature of Baptism, or form part of it, we deny. Even their own theologians distinguish, and speak of certain ceremonies which go before, certain which accompany, and certain which follow. But they are not Baptism: Baptism is the washing with water alone.

2. What is the form of Baptism? "Baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,"—such is Christ's commission. The use of this formula forms part of the sacrament. Augustine says, "Baptism is the washing with water by the Word; take away the water, it is not Baptism; take away the Word, it is not Baptism." This formula of institution, when applied to the person baptised, implies a solemn recognition of the authority of God in the ordinance; of the salvation of God as the work of the glorious Trinity; and of obligation lying on the recipient to serve God as Father, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. It is thus essential to baptise in the name of the Triune God.

For this reason we unhesitatingly reject, as all the Reformers and most of the Christian Fathers did, the baptism of heretics who deny the doctrine of the Trinity, such as modern Unitarians; because there cannot be in such baptism a

recognition of Gospel doctrines and God's authority. But this cannot apply to Romish baptism.

When we ask, Do Roman Catholics baptise with the proper form? we find that the form prescribed by the Council of Trent is: "Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti." Nor is there a Church on earth whose authoritative statements on the doctrine of the Trinity are more explicit and orthodox than those of the Church of Rome; while all the other *essential* doctrines of Christianity are held by her. There cannot, then, be a doubt that in Romish baptism the form is strictly in accordance with Christ's appointment.

Thus, then, to sum up, we find that in Romish baptism we have the proper design, the proper matter, and the proper form. We know of nothing else that is essential to baptism as laid down either in Scripture or in our standards; and having all that is essential to baptism, we maintain that we have Christian baptism, and that Romish baptism is valid. To use an illustration of Calvin's: "Just as among men, if a letter is sent it is quite sufficient to recognize the hand and the signature, and it is of no importance whatever who or what like the letter-carrier is; so it ought to be sufficient for us to recognize the hand and signature of our Lord in his sacraments, by whomsoever, as by a letter-carrier, they are brought to us."

Not to recur to the two objections considered in the outset, we will be told that the ordinance is so corrupted, and so overlaid with superstitious observances, that it is of no avail. Was God's law, then, of no avail among the Jews, because overlaid by doctrines and traditions of men? By no means; for while our Lord denounced the Scribes and Pharisees, in terms not less severe than are applied to Popish teachers, he at the same time said: "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works." That is, their teaching, being according to God's law, was binding; and the ordinance of baptism, being according to Christ's institution, is valid, and has not lost its power. As the great Scotch Reformer has it: "Christ's institution could not be utterly abolished by the malice of Satan, nor by the abuse of man: the Spirit of Christ purgeth and removeth from us all such venom as we received of their hands, and superstition maketh not the virtue of Christ's institution to be ineffectual in us."

When we have all the parts of any thing, all that is essential to that thing, we have the thing itself, though we may have much more; and so in Romish baptism, if we have, as we have shown, all that is essential thereto, we have baptism, though we may have much error and superstition besides; and Romish baptism is valid, corruption and superstition notwithstanding.

Such, then, stated perhaps somewhat too briefly, as our limited space requires, is the argument for the validity of Romish baptism; and we shall now only drop a single paragraph regarding opposing views.

The opinion that Romish baptism is not valid, and that converts from Romanism should be re-baptised, will be found ultimately to rest on one of two things: either the assumption that the validity of baptism depends, in some sense, on the character of the administrator; or on the opinion that baptism is some other thing than a sign and seal of the blessings of the new covenant. The first of these positions is directly opposed to the Scripture and to our standards. It is the ground taken by Puseyites, on which, with perfect consistency, they re-baptise all who have not received the sacramental grace of baptism from hands duly ordained by a prelate in the line of Apostolical succession. The latter of these views is the ground taken by Baptists, on which they consistently

re-baptise all who were baptised in other Churches, seeing that they hold baptism to be *our act of obedience* to a command of Christ by a responsible agent, and also *immersion to be essential* to baptism. Holding however neither of these opinions, but those laid down in our own standards, we cannot consistently *re-baptise* any. "The sacrament of Baptism is but once to be administered to any person."—Confession, chap. xxviii., sec. 7. And as baptism has been administered according to Christ's ordinance, and the party baptised in the Romish Church has been initiated into the professing Christian Church, it would be absurd as well as irreverent to repeat the outward sign.

For the same reason, it is evident that the decision of a Session or the opinion and feelings of the applicant cannot avail to make re-baptism proper. The matter therefore is not to be left to the discretion of Sessions.

We will perhaps be told that views such as are here advanced will make converts stumble, and give great strength to the argument of Baptists. If they do so, it will be because the converts have not been sufficiently instructed in the spiritual nature of the Christian religion, and because they and Baptists are disposed to lay too much stress on the external or bodily part of the rite. Men are all inclined to a human and a self-righteousness. Puseyites show this tendency by putting a priest, consecrated by man, between the sinner and God, and holding him up as the repository of God's grace for man. Others, again, greedily seize hold of an opportunity to *obey a command*, to do something, if it only be submitting to be plunged into cold water, so that he may have some degree of merit before God. To re-baptise indeed is just a near approach to the *opus operatum*, as though re-baptism by a Protestant minister were ever more effectual or more meritorious than baptism by a Romish priest.

To the argument that re-baptism forms an emphatic testimony against Popery, we simply reply: Man has no right to alter or touch God's ordinance. In order, as he thinks, to bear witness more emphatically for the truth. If Romish baptism be valid, however *good the effect* may be it must be *wrong* to re-baptise. The Scriptural way to testify against Popery is not by baptism, but by coming out of her and being separate, not touching the unclean thing; and regular connection with some Evangelical Church, together with a consistent walk and persevering endeavours to destroy the errors of Popery, and bring others out as God gives a man opportunity, will be a sufficiently emphatic testimony against Popery and for Christ, without being re-baptized.

We simply append the opinions of three good authorities on the point we have been considering.

"The question is: Whether a man baptised in papistry ought to be re-baptised when he cometh to knowledge? And I answer, he ought not. First, because Christ's institution, as said is, could not be abolished by the malice of Satan, nor by the abuse of man. Secondly, because the Spirit of Christ purgeth and removeth from us all such venom as we received from their hands; and superstition maketh not the virtue of Christ's institution to be ineffectual in us. We have some respect also, that no more be given to the external sign than is proper to it."—*Knox's Select Writings*, p. 256.

"By these considerations the error of the Donatists is finely refuted, who measured the virtue and the value of a sacrament by the dignity of the minister. Such are the Katabaptists of our day, who utterly deny that we are properly baptised, because we were baptised by impious and idolatrous men in a papal kingdom; and therefore they furiously demand anabaptism (re-baptism),—against whose nonsense we may be fortified by a sufficiently strong reason, when we consider, that by baptism we were initiated, not into the name of any man, but into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and so baptism is not of man, but of God, by whomsoever at all it may have been administered."—*Calvin, Instit.*, lib. 4, cap. 15, sec. 16.

"The truth of the doctrine concerning baptism may be looked at either as to its *essence* or as to its *accidence*; that is, rites and ceremonies made use of in it. In the

former sense we acknowledge that by the singular providence of God the true doctrine concerning baptism remains in the Church of Rome, because in it are retained the matter of true baptism, namely, water, and the formula prescribed by Christ, according to which it is administered in the name of the Trinity; for which reason baptism administered in that Church is considered valid, and is not repeated. But in the latter sense we deny it."—*Turretine*, tom. iii., quæst. 18, sec. 1.

* *

THE UNION QUESTION.

To the Editors of the Canadian Presbyterian.

TORONTO, April 23, 1858.

DEAR SIRS,—I had intended sooner, but for more urgent and engrossing duties, to ask you to insert in the "Presbyter" a few words on the "Union" question. Being desirous to see so good a cause forwarded in every right method, I regretted some of your arguing against it as not likely to operate favorably. I partly refer to a certain dirge-like lament over a chapter of our venerable Confession, which I must differ from you in thinking unworthy of so excellent a position; nay, think it should be inserted now—perhaps with some explanatory clause additional—had it not already been inserted in the Church's testimony.

But not caring to go into a long dissertation on a subject so often discussed, I am contented at present to request some qualifying notes on a historical statement which you made in close connection (I think in the same article although it is not by me at this moment) with the said apostrophe to the "mis-begotten twenty-third." You there speak of Luther and Melancthon as having evinced good discernment in refraining from going into such particular statements on "national responsibility" or the duty of the civil magistrate, *circa sacra*, unhappily incorporated into our Westminster Confession.

You seem pleased with the Presbyterian Churches of America in discarding these dividing paragraphs—though I think you must allow that these Churches have not been more successful in avoiding the calamity of divisions than our Scottish Presbyterian Churches. But it is of Luther and Melancthon and the Augsburg Confession I wish to speak. Though not in the earliest editions of that celebrated document, I am sure you will allow that in the later edition of 1540 we have the deliberate opinion, both of one and the other of these distinguished Reformers, to the value of these articles of testimony. They do, with the other leading Reformers, in their appeal to the Emperor quote the example of the reforming Princes of Israel just as our Westminster divines do; and while careful—as our Confessions also are careful—to claim the liberty of internal jurisdiction, and the immediate charge of spiritual things, *in sacris*, for the ecclesiastical judicatories which Christ has put in charge with them, they represent, in almost as decided terms as our venerable standards do, the responsibility laid on the State, or its civil heads, to protect the profession of God's truth and the blessed gospel—not only not permitting it to be persecuted, but also furthering its influence as of essential value to the social well-being. No matter that the earlier Confession of Augsburg—a briefer document—does not contain such statements or deliverances on these heads of ecclesiastico-civil policy. That those Reformers included them in the maturer document we are entitled to regard as a proof of their sense of their importance and necessity. No one could expect that in every representation made to their contemporaries generally, or to the Emperor in the assertion of their claim for protection, and in the vindication of their cause from the misrepresentations of the enemies of truth, they should give definitions of the difficult relationships of Church and State. But the fact that they are in

any document approved by these eminent men, you will see to be opposed to the allegation in your paper that they did not attempt to include more in a Church Confession on these points than the assertion of the right of christians to use the civil sword, wage defensive war, &c., which I think are the matters you allude to, and rightly assert to be almost all which we find directly under the head of the "Civil Magistrate" in the primitive document or edition. Neither does it affect my estimate of the historical accuracy of the allegation above referred to, that the Lutheran Churches have not so generally adopted the later as the earlier instrument, unless the objection to those parts of the Confession constituted the reason of the less general acceptance of the larger and later Confession of 1540, of which I can find no evidence. This circumstance would not weigh at all in favour of the sanction supposed to be found in the example of the Lutherans, for laying aside such articles of testimony. And especially it would be no reason for pleading the example of Luther and Melancthon against the policy of the Westminster divines and our Scottish deputies, which in fact those heroes of the reformation, by anticipation recommended and authenticated.

With all respect, I am yours, Messrs. Editors, in the service of religion and union,
M. WILLIS.

We agree with the Rev. Principal in his statement of historical facts. It is certain that the German Reformers in their later days held views regarding the power of the civil magistrate, *circa sacra*, akin to, if not more extreme than those expressed in the 23rd chap. of our Confession. But it is equally true that the Confession of Augsburg of 1530, which alone has a true title to the name, as that which the reformers presented to Charles V., and which Luther read with such remarkable power in the Diet—this Confession, contains not a word against the power of the civil magistrate, either *about* or *in* the Church. This instrument was carefully prepared and maturely considered by the reformers. It is not, we conceive, a hurried or incomplete document. In the judgment of Christendom it has ever been regarded and quoted as the Augsburg Confession, and it is now the Symbol of Lutheran Protestantism throughout the world. What we mean to say is, not that Luther, Melancthon and others did not concede large powers to the State in matters of religion, but that in the year 1530 they do not appear from any of their writings to have then done so, and that they did show much wisdom and discretion in not cumbering or entangling the earlier Confession of Augsburg with definitions of the Church's relation to the State. We may account for the later views of the reformers by considering that after the Diet of Augsburg they entered into more intimate political relations with the Protestant States of Germany—they became involved in the Smalkaldic league and the war in which it resulted. It was, therefore, of consequence that they should declare it to be the duty of Princes to protect, defend, and advance the true religion. That this indicates a development in the reformers views we think is manifest. That which they would not have granted and did not grant to the Emperor they now freely grant to the Electors. They found their position in relation to the heads of the State somewhat changed after 1530, and a corresponding change or expansion of their opinions on religious-political points of faith was the result. We do not think that the results of the Protestant wars justify the wisdom of this change. On the contrary we believe that the effect of those concessions was to bring the German Protestant Church entirely under the bondage of State control. On this ground also we deem ourselves entitled to allege that Luther and Melancthon were wiser and more discreet in 1530 than in 1540, and that the Confession of the latter date is marred and not mended by the ill-adjusted additions, if not interpolations, which it contains.

It is unquestionable that the "twenty-third" chapter of our Confession is a knotty subject. The most conservative of our adherents must acknowledge that it is surrounded with difficulties which gender "doubtful disputations." Many, besides, whose moral convictions would lead them to wish it modified, still defend it from a fear lest in touching this point, the integrity of the *testimony* should be violated and a breach made in the walls of Zion. Even the learned Principal whose orthodoxy on every point of the Confession is so thorough and explicit, is yet constrained to admit—in the most guarded way we grant—that in admitting the "Article" into a Confession of modern construction, "it should be inserted perhaps with some explanatory clause additional." An explanatory clause would, we believe, be as difficult to construct as an article entirely new which would express in explicit terms the moral convictions of the Church as regards its relations to the State. Our anxiety on this matter has arisen from a fear lest, either conceptions, or misconceptions, of this Article, with others of a similar kind should hinder the union of the United Presbyterian Church and ourselves. If any one will devise a scheme, or a platform, by which the parties concerned can conscientiously unite in subscription to the grand Calvinistic doctrines of our Confession, and to its testimony on behalf of a Holy Life we shall be satisfied. Upon the questions now under debate between the two Churches, each party may and ought to act on the Scriptural rule

Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations," (Rom. 14. 1.) The points on which we differ as compared with the great matters on which we are agreed, are such that we may permit every man to be "fully persuaded in his own mind." The importance which many on both sides attach to the former is not native to us as Churches. In our relations to the State, per se, they never could be questions of serious debate. Hence we find that ministers born and educated in this Colony are not those with whom there is much or any debate. The practical details of the Church's relation to the State are imported questions, and rise into sufficient importance for serious discussion only when viewed in their bearings on the state of things in Britain. It cannot be doubted that to the State Church party there, the voluntary question was and is one of vital importance—it is a matter of life and death with them. Let it be a generally accepted truth that the State ought to have nothing more to do with religion than simply to promote it by securing and protecting its just liberties; then the practical result will be that the State Churches will be deprived of their civil dignities, privileges and emoluments, and be brought down to, in their eyes, the humble position of the much despised dissenters. It must besides be acknowledged that the religious blessings which accrue to a community from the State support of religion furnish good *prima facie* reasons why Christian men should regard the voluntary question at home as of the first importance. From these considerations we can understand how it is that religious civil questions bulk so large in the estimation of our father. In their eyes the maintenance of the *status quo*, was the maintenance of the pillars of the temple. They connected the continuance of a preached Gospel in the land with the integrity of the legal establishment of their Church. To have conceded, therefore, one iota to voluntary principles, or to have shrunk from the defence of their own chartered position, would have been, in their view, to have betrayed the cause of true religion and the doctrine of Christ's Headship over the nations.

Our position is very different now. The rise of the Free Church together with the continuance and prosperity of other non-established Churches, has shown that the maintenance of a preached Gospel in the land does not depend upon the existence of a State Church. The position of all Churches alike in this colony is equally conclusive on this point. With us the existence of any Church is not hazarded by the practical results of questions concerning the Church's

relation to the State. The controversy therefore ceases with us to be practically vital. One party has nothing to pull down, the other no privileged fort to defend or to reconstruct. The only point on which there is or can be any serious debate is regarding the Church's testimony to the Headship of Christ over the nations. This doctrine we grant ought not to be lightly esteemed. It is the simple belief in the words of Scripture, that the "Father of Glory" "hath put all things under his (Christ's) feet, and gave him to be the Head over all things to the Church." But who denies this doctrine? Not certainly the ministers, office-bearers, or people of the United Presbyterian Church. To suspect them of any such thing would not be charitable. Were they called upon to express their sentiments on this particular point, we are persuaded that their definitions of the doctrine would satisfy the most orthodox. True, they may differ with us, just as we differ among ourselves, and as they differ among themselves, as to the practical developments of the doctrine. We would perhaps say that the State should or may support the Church; they would say that such was no part of the functions of the State, and that the tendency of such a thing would be to corrupt and enslave the Church. But surely we may differ upon such a point without the one party being held as maintaining and the other as denying the Headship of Christ over the nations! We would again perhaps say that the State is bound to promote and maintain the sanctity of the Lord's day, they would perhaps prefer to say that the State is bound to put down public scandals on that day, that interfere with the public well-being; but does it follow in this, either that one is maintaining while the other is denying the Headship of Christ? We think not. Both would equally be prepared to unite in enforcing upon rulers as well as upon subjects the principle that in all things, whether public or private, their minds, hearts, and lives, should be subject to Christ and directed by the principles of His word; that in short, Christ should be practically as well as doctrinally acknowledged to be Head over the Church and the nation.

We trust that on such questions each may have grace given him to say from the heart, "We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let every one of us please his neighbour for his good to edification." (Rom. xv. 1.) We rejoice to hear that progress has been made in this matter of Union. The Committees have recently met and have arrived at a substantial adjustment of some moot points. It has, we understand, been agreed that the relations of the United Church to the Churches at home shall be such as may be determined upon by the Supreme Court from time to time or at any time—the probationers of the Free and United Presbyterian Churches to be received on equal terms. The Committee further recommend that the Colleges be amalgamated. The name they have coined for the new organization is, after much taxing of their inventive faculties, that of "The Canadian Presbyterian Church." If any brother can invent a better, and one less liable to objection, let him do so. The provoking matter is that each Church has already a choice name; if neither had been called by their present titles, either of them would have been better than the one selected. The difficulty is to find a title that shall be neither of those existing, and yet shall be elegant, descriptive, and brief. Some might prefer to drop the word "Presbyterian" altogether, and to say "The United Church of Canada." This has the merit of being an elegant amalgamation of the present titles, the initial letters of which, U. C. C., are neither grotesque nor fair game for the punster. All hail, then, to the Union! May it be consummated ere another year roll over. The sooner the better. There is work waiting for us. Our own land needs to us for a more thoroughly organized system of evangelistic and missionary enterprise than either of us have been able to overtake. The heathen

abroad summon us to their aid. God will undoubtedly bless the union of his people. Hearts will glow with brotherly love, from which the incense of sweetest praise will ascend to the throne of the Father. The result cannot fail to be a great increase of the Church's zeal and a great enlargement of the Redeemer's kingdom.

EIGHT DAYS IN BOSTON.

WITH SOME REMARKS ON THE AMERICAN REVIVAL OF RELIGION.

I went to Boston to fulfil an old promise to the congregation of Knox's Church there, and to assist their pastor, the Rev. Wm. MacLaren, in the services connected with the administration of the Lord's Supper. During the few days I spent in the city, I was enabled to preach eight times to deeply interesting congregations, and to attend various prayer meetings. From my own observation, as well as from conversation with some of the leading orthodox pastors and deacons, I endeavoured to form an estimate of the religious movement in the chief city of New England.

The Knox's Church congregation, in connection with the Presbytery of Montreal, is composed almost entirely of Scottish and Nova Scotian Presbyterians. It is therefore regarded as a foreign rather than native Church, and is little understood by the Americans; nevertheless, under the sound and able ministrations of Mr. McLaren, it makes sure and steady progress. Forty names were added to the Communion Roll before the recent celebration of the Lord's Supper. One of the new communicants, a Frenchman who had received in infancy Popish baptism, was baptized in presence of the congregation on profession of faith. The members of this Church are diligent in conducting Sabbath Schools and prosecuting other good works in the city. They worship in a commodious edifice formerly occupied by Unitarians. The stranger in Boston who loves sound doctrine and reverential worship will find what he wants at Freeman Place, Beacon Street.

The Annual State Fast was observed during my stay at Boston. The services of the day were happily begun by a union prayer meeting at the Tremont Temple, from 8 to 9.30 a.m. The building was densely filled with an assemblage of not fewer than 2500 persons. The Rev. Dr. Kirk presided, delivered an earnest address on the necessity of individual and thorough repentance, and at the close of the meeting offered up a solemn and touching prayer, making open confession of national degeneracy and abounding sin. In the management of this meeting Dr. Kirk was assisted by the Rev. Mr. Stone, the popular pastor of Park Street Church. The venerable Dr. Jenks, the compiler of the "Comprehensive Commentary," stood at Dr. Kirk's left hand on the platform, using a large ear trumpet to catch his words.

Sermons appropriate to the day were preached in all the churches of the city. None attracted so much attention as the discourse delivered by Prof. Huntington in one of the Unitarian places of worship. Dr. Huntington is well known as the author of a volume of "Sermons for the People," remarkable for a certain evangelical tone unexpected from such a quarter. Not only as Professor, but as "Preacher to the University at Cambridge," he wields great influence over young and rising minds. He is in the prime of life, and is regarded as one of the chief expounders of the more evangelical sentiments that are avowed by a section of the Unitarian body in New England. At the Church in which he preached, which is under the pastorate of the Rev. Mr. Robins, crowded prayer meetings have lately been held. Dr. Huntington's sermon, which has been published, contains a striking vindication of revivals of religion against

the jibes and the more formal objections of sceptics and worldlings. Theodore Parker and Starr King, two so-called ministers in Boston, have preached elaborate sermons against the revival of the present day, and the "popular religion." Dr. Huntington combats these scoffers in masterly style. "The outbreak of uncommon religious earnestness will probably stir up, in some quarters, the worst elements of human nature. If there is a clerical banterer any where, who seasons his generous exhortations to rectitude, for flagging appetites, with slurs and sneers, he will find the temptation to special smartness too much for him, and intermix in unusual proportions, raillery with religion, low comedy with lessons in virtue, irreverence with maxims of moral progress. All this will not seriously interrupt the Almighty, nor hinder truth, nor affright the deeper intuitions of man. More probably, it will serve to expose the exigencies of a Christless theology, show how a denying habit vulgarises, at last, both intellectual self-respect and a chaste heart, and, by making the excess of offence disgusting, correct its own damage."

I had the privilege of attending the following union prayer meetings, which were held daily, and attended by large numbers; a morning meeting at the Central Church, conducted chiefly by city pastors, the noon meeting of business men at the Old South Church Chapel, and an afternoon meeting in the Lecture Room of Park Street Church, both the latter led by experienced Deacons of Congregationalist and Baptist Churches. On entering each of these meetings, I was painfully surprised at the undevout appearance and deportment of the people. During prayer, no one bowed the knee to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Only the individual who prayed stood up, while all the meeting, including the leader, continued sitting at ease, generally with their eyes open. I trust this irreverent habit will never be introduced into Canada. The prayers offered were, in general, appropriate, pointed, and earnest. They consisted largely of thanksgivings, petitions, and intercessions, but were deficient (as I thought) in the elements of adoration and confession. Between the prayers, short addresses were delivered. One rose and rehearsed his own spiritual experience; a second exhorted to brotherly love; a third told of the conversion of his children, and encouraged parents to pray for their families; a fourth communicated information regarding the progress of the good work in other parts, in a college, in a village, or in a county; while a fifth described how he had been led to "quit rum-selling," and found forgiveness of his sins. Of course some spoke who had better have held their peace for a season; but the addresses in general had an obvious stamp of sincerity; and the prompt unbosoming of inward thoughts and feelings before a multitude seems to be congenial to the American character. At the large meeting in the Tremont Temple, and at the business men's meetings, the singing was glorious. Any one was permitted to "start the hymn," and though the liberty seemed to involve some risk, I am bound to say that the hymns were always well selected, and fervently sung. As I heard the people pealing forth the hymn, "All hail the power of Jesus' name!" or "There is a fountain filled with blood;" or "Am I a soldier of the Cross?" or "Come Holy Spirit, Heavenly Dove,"—I felt it good to be with them, and could not help wondering why these very people retain the cold formal choir-singing in their Churches. Another reflection arose, how much do we, Scottish, Irish, and Canadian Presbyterians, lose by continuing to exclude from our collection those spiritual songs, (such as I have named above), which are dear to the heart of evangelical Christendom! I love the psalms more and more, but I would readily select ten "paraphrases," and give them away in exchange for the four hymns to which I have referred.

In many respects the most interesting meeting I attended was that which is held daily from 11 A. M. to 1 P. M., at what is sometimes called the "Black

Sea," the most vicious and degraded part of Boston. Father Mason, who conducts the meeting, is himself a Methodist; and, though the meeting is of a "Union" character, it is managed chiefly by active Methodists. The Hall in which it is held is over "dance-cellars" and other vile haunts; as one said, it is "hung over Hell." I saw it almost filled with a strange congregation, comprising a number of thieves, drunkards, and harlots. It is to the recovery of these classes that Father Mason's labors are devoted. The meeting was conducted with rather more excitement than I had seen elsewhere, but a general decorum was preserved. While a few tittered, many more seemed to be deeply serious, and several wept. Penitents were encouraged to speak, and many rose in their places successively to declare what God had done for their souls. Some of these spoke in a foolish, self-confident way; but the majority, especially of the young women, seemed to be contrite, and to know the grace of God. More than twenty of these unfortunates have lately been rescued from their sin and misery, and, after probation in a reformatory home, will be sent to good situations in the country. Mr. Mason assured me that some of the most abandoned women in the district had given the most satisfactory evidence of a saving change.

The interest of the "Black Sea" meeting, at which I was present, was enhanced by the appearance of Father Taylor—an old man eloquent, in early life a sailor, who for the past twenty-five years has labored among the seamen in the port of Boston with excellent spiritual effect. Like Father Mason, he is a Methodist preacher. At his chapel, there is always some liveliness, even in the most dull seasons. As he expressed it to me, "We never have low tide." When six or seven rose in the meeting, silently to express their desire to forsake their evil ways, Father Taylor knelt and poured out a very solemn and striking prayer in their behalf. Some of the phrases used were indeed quaint and rough, but exactly suited to the place and company. When, after confession of sin, he prayed against self-righteousness, he exclaimed, "Lord! take off the whitewash." The inward propriety of the expression took away the sense of its outward grotesqueness, and the Hall resounded with loud cries of "Amen!"

At the door stood a Policeman, who, himself a religious man, had taken part a few days previously in the meeting, and stated that the prayer-meeting had greatly diminished the number of prisoners at the district police-office. Even those who still deride religion feel a certain restraint; and iniquity, ashamed, hides its head.

To form a just estimate of the great American Revival of the present year, one would require large observation, experience of spiritual life in various phases, a willingness to allow for national and ecclesiastical peculiarities, and an ability to separate accessories from essentials. I do not pretend to have a competency to form such an estimate, but the convictions I have on the subject are the following:

Essentially and substantially, the work is sound and great. That it is without excitement is no objection to it, but rather a commendation in the eyes of all judicious men. I have my fears that in many quarters it is shallow, and that there is not sufficient grounding in the truth. At the meetings I heard tidings and experiences in abundance, but not enough of the truth as it is in Jesus. Surely a great responsibility now lies on the American Pulpit, to instruct and form the minds of listening multitudes. Let us hope that the New England preachers will for this end put away the artificial essay-reading of which I heard many complaints from pious men, and preach the Word, open the Scriptures, and give green pastures, living grass,—not, dead, dried hay,—to the hungering flock of God.

The genuineness of the work is attested by the zeal of the professed converts, their renunciation of open courses of sin, their delight in religious exercises, and the manifest rousing of many who have been "at ease in Zion." The extent of the work may be guessed at from the reports that are given, with various degrees of caution, in the religious newspapers of the day. Of course the real extent will be known only in that day when the books shall be opened, and among them that book of life in which "the Lord writeth up the people."

If it be asked, why the same religious manifestations have not been witnessed in the same degree in Canada, I remark that it is a mistake to demand in all places the same manifestations. This would be both to limit the sovereignty of the Holy One, and to overlook the fact that the Spirit of God is pleased to work in harmony with the peculiarities of national and even individual character. It is an error to insist on copying in one community certain forms and measures, because they have been found useful and appropriate in another community of a very different type. The American churches have always advanced by great movements or revivals after periods of depression and spiritual lethargy. It does not follow that this is the best type of Church experience for other communities to desire. One reason, perhaps, why Canada is not at present so much moved and startled as the United States, is that the Churches in Canada have generally not been in so dull a spiritual state as many of the Churches seem to have been among our American neighbours. Another reason is, that our people in general have a good deal of the British instinct of reserve, and cannot be brought to unbosom themselves to public assemblies, and so to manifest their religious convictions, in the mode that seems so natural to Americans. Many of us too have a distaste for statistics of new conversions, and are slow to publish the spiritual results that we know. Yet, making allowance for all this, I do not dispute—indeed I assert—that we have cause for deep humiliation before God. Let us take the good old method for revival: let us pray—pray for the intrinsic blessing, leaving the God of all grace to determine the modes of its extrinsic manifestation. "There are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all."

I attach no importance to the objection that Revivals are always spoilt by indiscretions. There is a measure of truth in the statement; but no impartial person, competently acquainted with the facts, will allege that the indiscretions committed in connection with the present movement are such as to over-balance the mighty and holy benefits that have been received. It is well for the leaders of public religious opinion to check indiscretions; but it were well also for the objectors to remember that "the greatest indiscretion we can possibly fall into about Religion, is to let it alone."

But will the Revival leave permanent effects? is the anxious question of many, who are not scoffers, but who attach little value to vivid ephemeral impressions. It is a question, the answer to which must depend very much on the faith and prayers of Christians. There is a rousing of the physical and emotional nature at frequent and crowded meetings which cannot always continue. The danger is, that in the natural re-action, the spiritual life may be hindered, and the Church again discouraged. What is now needed is for the Church awakened to keep awake, revived to enrich and develop its God-given life, that it may not need awakening and revival again. After Pentecost, the Christians did not relapse, but "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." Nor was it then dreamed of that a succession of revivals and declensions was to mark the Church's history, and that conversions were scarcely to be expected but in Revival times. "The Lord added saved ones DAILY to the Church." Doubtless the modern Church must have special seasons of quickening and enlargement; but that which is rather to be desired as her habitual condition is the daily ingathering of souls to Christ under the ordinary, but, through God, all-powerful means of grace. D. F.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION UNSCRIPTURAL AND ABSURD.

II.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you — JOHN VI. 53.

We know of no more melancholy exhibition of the power of prejudice over a great mind, than that which is afforded by the scene which took place at Marburg, when Luther and Zwingli met to discuss the doctrine of the real presence. "HOC EST CORPUS MEUM" wrote Luther with a piece of chalk before the conference began, on the velvet cloth that covered the table, in the Knight's hall of the old castle of Philip of Hesse. And this he did that the sight of the words might strengthen his own faith, and be a sign to his adversaries. From the literal meaning of these words, the great German doctor would not be driven. "Christ has said, *'this is my body,'*" said he. "Let them show me that a body is not a body. I reject reason, common sense, carnal arguments, and mathematical proofs. God is above mathematics. We have the Word of God; we must adore it and perform it!" The spirit of these words we reverence; they do not, however, come with a very good grace from Luther, who spoke of the epistle of James as one of straw, because he thought that it militated against the glorious doctrine of justification by faith alone. Let us yield the most perfect reverence and submission to the Word of God; but the more cordially we bow to its teachings, the more diligently ought we to endeavour to ascertain what meaneth the Spirit in the Word. Diligent as Luther was in the study of Scripture, and deeply as the Church and the World are indebted to him, for his clear teachings on many points, he would not allow himself to listen to reason, on the correct principles of exegesis as applied to the words of sacramental institution; but with dogged resolution he determined to adhere to his old prejudices regarding them.

It was in vain that Cœcolampadius showed that the words were figurative, and to be understood in the same way as the kindred expressions — "*John is Elias,*" "*The rock was Christ,*" "*I am the vine,*" and that Zwingli plied him with his unanswerable logic. He could not rationally expound the words, nor defend his views on correct principles of interpretation; and when Lambert, one of the professors of the University of Marburg, convinced by the reasoning of Zwingli and his friends, renounced the doctrine of the real presence, Luther remained inflexible. "*This is my body,*" repeated he, pointing with his finger to the words written before him. "*This is my body.* The devil himself shall not drive me from that. To seek to understand it is to fall away from the faith." And this affords a very fair specimen of the mode, in which Roman Catholics and Puseyites deal with this text to the present day.

The text, "*This is my body,*" we endeavoured to expound in our former article; but there is another, to which the advocates of Transubstantiation appeal with almost equal confidence — "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." And now we shall endeavour to show that these words, properly understood, give no countenance to the Popish dogma of Transubstantiation.

That any person of common sense should believe that a man can take a little flour and water, make them into dough, and, by placing the dough thus made in a mould, form it into a round shape, and impress upon it the figure of a crucifix, or the letters I. H. S., that then, after having baked it in an oven, and pronounced certain words upon it, the thing thus formed, and used by a poor frail man, should become God, — the creator of all worlds, — the body and blood, the soul and divinity of the Lord Jesus, — that this wafer of bread, thus formed by man, should become the Lord Jesus, whole and entire, all that he is,

perfect God and perfect Man; that any person of common sense can believe this, might be regarded as a miracle of folly, were it not, alas, so common. It appears to us that this argument is a greater prostration of the intellectual powers, than the idolatry of the ancient heathens. They worshipped, to be sure, images, which their own hands had made of wood, or metal, or stone, but they regarded them not as the gods themselves, but only as the representatives of the gods. Romanists, however, believe that after the wafer has been consecrated, the substance of the bread no longer exists, that it is entirely changed and becomes the body and blood, soul and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and they believe besides that nothing of the bread remains, after consecration but the accidents, or species, or forms, as they are called, by the Schoolmen, that is, the color, size, weight, taste, and other qualities; and these accidents, or qualities remain, without a substance. The man who can seriously believe this, may believe anything. Is it not clear that we can know substance, or matter, only from its qualities? and that color, size, weight, taste, form, are essential properties of matter, attributes without which matter cannot exist or be known. But the climax of the folly of these deluded men consists in believing, that they eat the God who formed them and created all the worlds. For this they suppose that they have indubitable evidence in the words of Scripture which we are now considering.

In reply to their statements, we would remark,—

1stly. That these words were spoken by our Lord at least one whole year before he instituted the sacrament of the supper, and without any reference to it; and that they refer to an intellectual process which the believer may perform at any time, and in any place. Not the slightest evidence can be produced, that these words refer to the sacrament of the supper, and it is absurd to refer them to an ordinance which was unheard of, at the time of their being uttered, and not instituted till at least a year after.

2ndly. It is abundantly evident, that the language here employed by our Saviour is figurative, that it arose naturally out of the occasion, and was employed by him to impress upon the Jews the necessity of seeking after that, which alone can sustain the life of the soul. That much of the language employed by our Lord, in this chapter, is figurative may be shown from internal evidence so clear, that it admits of no dispute. In the 35th verse, for instance, Jesus says—"He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst." Now we know that all who come to Jesus, and become his disciples, hunger and thirst in the natural sense, just as they did before; but they no longer hunger and thirst after the vanities and follies of the world, and they no longer yearn with unsatisfied longings after a happiness which formerly they could not obtain. Now their longings are satisfied, their hunger is appeased, their thirst is quenched, and they rejoice in the abundance of spiritual consolation, which their heavenly Father has provided for them.

Again, when many of the disciples were offended with the words which we are considering, and regarded them as a hard saying, which they could not hear, and murmured at it, Jesus furnished them with the true principle of interpretation. "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" The word "*what*" is not in the original, and I would rather put the sentence thus—"If ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before," what then? Ye will be satisfied that my body, my literal body has not been eaten. Ye shall then have the fullest proof that this is figuratively spoken; for I shall ascend with the same body, with which I shall arise from the dead. That this was our Lord's meaning is plain from what follows—"It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." This means, says Dr. Clarke—"It is the

spiritual sense only of my words that is to be attended to, and through which life is to be attained, the mere literal sense would not avail. Even if you could eat my flesh literally, it would not profit you. The words that I have spoken to you are to be spiritually understood; and it is in this sense only that they can give life to the soul."

3rdly. It is clear that the words of our Saviour were not meant to be literally understood, from the consequences which would follow, if this were the case. It is plain that whatever we are to understand, by "eating the flesh, and drinking the blood of the Son of man," it is something that is indispensable to salvation; for unless we "eat the flesh, and drink the blood of the Son of man" we have no life in us. If this then refer to partaking the Lord's supper, the partaking of this ordinance is indispensable to salvation; and in that case, unless we partake of it, we must inevitably perish. Nothing in the way of excuse would then avail a man. Want of opportunity would not mend the matter. The doing of a certain thing is here declared to be indispensable to salvation; and if that thing is not done, if we do not partake of that sacred food, which alone can give life to the soul, we must be lost for ever. What a dishonoring view does this present to us of God! Let us suppose a person well instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, a firm believer in the necessity and sufficiency of the atonement; and exhibiting in his whole conduct the beauty of holiness, and the graces of the Christian character; but that from the remoteness of the locality in which he lived, in some new settlement, he died without ever having had an opportunity of partaking the Lord's supper; according to the Roman Catholic interpretation of this passage, consistently carried out, that man must inevitably perish; for except we "eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood," we have no life in us. I believe many an honest, kind hearted Romanist would shrink from such a conclusion; but to this their own principles consistently carried out inevitably lead.

Again, it is equally plain that, if any man do the thing that is here spoken of, he will certainly be saved; for "whoso eateth the flesh, and drinketh the blood of the Son of man hath eternal life." Whatever this eating and drinking may be, it evidently is sufficient to secure salvation. We have already supposed the case of a person possessed of firm faith in Jesus, and beautified with all the graces of the Christian character, dying without ever having enjoyed an opportunity of partaking the Lord's supper, though he might earnestly desire to do so; and we have seen that, according to the Papal interpretation of this passage, he must inevitably perish. Let us now suppose an opposite case. Let us suppose a person of very questionable character, and grossly ignorant, but of gloomy disposition, and blindly obedient to his Church, and that he has an opportunity of partaking of this holy ordinance, and avails himself of it, this person, according to the Popish mode of interpreting this passage must certainly be saved. Now whether a mode of interpretation, which leads to such conclusions, can be the correct one we leave our readers to determine. "We speak as unto wise men, judge ye what we say."

Having thus endeavoured to expose the folly of the Romish mode of interpreting this passage, let us now address ourselves to the task of explaining its true meaning. We have seen that the language employed by our Saviour, on this occasion, is figurative; so that in order to understand its true meaning, we have just to translate the figurative into plain, or literal language.

The Jews used the word "eat" in a metaphorical sense, just as we use the word *digest*. The word *digest* literally denotes the function of the stomach, in preparing the food received into it, so that it may be fitted for the nourishment of the body. Metaphorically it is used to denote the function of the mind, by which the ideas communicated to it, are made to enlarge its knowledge, and

develope its powers. Hence we talk of *digesting* a sermon, or any piece of instruction which may be communicated to us. The Jews, as we have said, used the word *eat* in the very same way. Thus Ezekiel (III. 1.) was commanded to *eat* the roll of the book, that was spread before him, written within and without, with lamentation, mourning and woe. And so John was commanded to go, and take the little book which was open in the hand of the angel, which stood upon the sea and the earth. And he took the little book, we are told, out of the hand of the angel, and ate it up, (Rev. 10. 9, 10.) Again, in the Apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus (24 21) which, though of no authority doctrinally, is yet of sufficient authority as to forms of expression used by the later Jews. Wisdom is there introduced saying—"They that eat me, shall yet be hungry, and they that drink me shall yet be thirsty." The word *eat* is not used in this sense among ourselves; but a similar word—*devour*, is often employed precisely in the same sense. Thus we talk of *devouring* an intensely interesting book, when we read it with great avidity. These examples may, it is hoped, be sufficient to convince our readers of the propriety with which the word *eat* may be applied to a mental process.

To "eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man" then just means to receive into the mind, the truth of Christ's sacrificial death. To speak of eating the flesh, and drinking the blood of any one implies that a violent death had first taken place. Now, as Christ spoke in the 51st verse, of giving his flesh for the life of the world, this clearly implied that his death would be a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men. What else, therefore, can these words mean than to receive into the mind the glorious truth, that Christ's death was a propitiatory sacrifice for sin?—in other words, to receive the great truth of Christ, crucified for sinners, into our inmost soul, to feed upon it, and repose in it an implicit confidence.

From this then, it is plain, that, eating the flesh, and drinking the blood of the Son of man, implies something more than merely believing the great truth regarding the sacrificial death of Christ; it implies an acceptance of Christ as our Saviour, an appropriating to ourselves of the benefits of his sacrificial death,—the lively exercise of faith in him as our Redeemer. Thus, when we eat the flesh, and drink the blood of the Son of man, we receive Christ into our hearts, as our Saviour, we meditate with gratitude and affection on the greatness of his love and of the work of redemption, till our hearts burn within us. All the graces of the Christian character are thus nourished and strengthened, and by receiving Christ spiritually into the most intimate union with us, we become one with him in the eye of the law, as food by assimilation becomes one with the body into which it is received. At the same time, just as food nourishes and strengthens the body, so our souls are nourished and strengthened, by meditating upon these truths, and by the communication of the influences of the Holy Spirit which generally accompany this act.

Since then, this eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man is purely a mental act, it is obvious that it may be done anywhere, in the secrecy of our own closet as well as in the company of fellow believers;—in the lonely glen, or far off moor, as well as in the crowded Chapel, or magnificent Cathedral. It has been already shown that these words had no reference originally to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and it is not necessary to sit down at the Table of the Lord, in order to exercise this faith in him; though it must be admitted that, at the Table of the Lord, there is much that is fitted to enable us vividly to realize Christ's propitiatory death, and call forth the liveliest emotions of gratitude and love to him, to say nothing of the more copious influences of the Spirit, which may be expected there. And it must be plain to all, who know any thing of the subject, that we do not communicate worthily, if we do

not, at the Table of the Lord, exercise appropriating faith in Jesus, and thus spiritually eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man.

We have known professing Protestants, and even Protestant ministers, who believed that these words referred to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and we have known of dying persons, who had never partaken of that ordinance, in great distress of mind, from the idea arising from the misapplication of this text to the Lord's Supper, that it was needful to salvation; and dreading that they would be lost, because they had never partaken of it. And so we doubt not there are others, who take undue comfort and confidence, in a formal partaking of this ordinance, from a misapplication to it of the words—"Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life." Let all such, however, be assured, that such fears and such confidence are equally unwarranted by the words of this text, which apply not to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but to the simple act of exercising faith in the sacrificial death of Christ, and its application to our souls that we may live, and be nourished and comforted thereby.

W. B. C.

EDITORIAL NOTE.—In the article on "Religious Societies," in the March number of this Magazine, a statement was made regarding the relations of the Reformed Dutch Church in the United States, to the American Board of Foreign Missions. We believe that this statement has been disputed in the 'Canadian Independent,' a paper which we do not see. Before we heard of the question raised in the 'Independent,' we received a letter from the esteemed missionary to whom we alluded as our informant, containing a modification of the statement given by us. We regret that this letter arrived too late to be noticed in our last number.

Our correspondent assures us that the 'Classis' of the Dutch Church in a district of British India was actually formed, and now exists. We were already aware of this, and only intended to say, that the American Board, not loving Presbyterian order, discouraged and impeded the formation of the classis. On this point our informant writes:—"The very nature of such a Catholic Society as the American Board constrains those who have the direction of it, to regard with jealousy the organization of ecclesiastical bodies in their missions. When we were about to form our "Classis," we received a communication from the Secretary of the Board, giving his views on the subject, viz.: that there was no need of ecclesiastical bodies on heathen ground; that the mission as such had all necessary power to perform ecclesiastical acts; and that it was one of their 'principles of belief, that Churches formed among foreign nations should not be subjected to the ecclesiastical rule of any bodies whether voluntary or ecclesiastical in the United States,'" &c., &c.

The second point touched by our worthy correspondent relates to our statement of the withdrawal of the Dutch Reformed Church from connection with the American Board. We did not mean to affirm, and gave an erroneous impression if we implied, that the separation took place on the ground of the particular difference regarding the Classis in India. This difference or difficulty was not openly discussed in the Dutch Church. The following are the words of our correspondent.—"The ground on which that separation was advocated is the broad one, that the Church should do its own work, and that an Ecclesiastical Board is the most efficient instrument of developing the resources of the Church at home and of conducting missions abroad. The separation took place with the kindest feelings toward the American Board."

It will be seen that these additional explanations very slightly modify our original statement—while the wise views of the Dutch Reformed Church are precisely those which we have thought it our duty to maintain.

WORDS OF THE WISE.

GUTHRIE'S SAVING INTEREST IN CHRIST—1650.

THE PROPERTIES AND NATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF TRUE BELIEVING.

The fourth thing we proposed to speak to, is, the properties of this duty, when rightly gone about. I shall only hint a few.

I. Believing on Christ must be *personal*; a man himself and in his own proper person must close with Christ Jesus; *The Just shall live by his Faith, Hab. 2, 4.* This saith, that it will not suffice for a man's safety and relief, that he is in Covenant with God, as a born member of the Visible Church, by virtue of the parents' subjection to God's ordinances: neither will it suffice, that the person had the initiating seal of baptism added, and that he then virtually engaged to seek salvation by Christ's blood, as all infants do: neither doth it suffice, that mer are come of believing parents, their faith will not inflate their children into a right to the spiritual blessing of the Covenant: neither will it suffice that parents, did in some respect engage for their children, and gave them away unto God: All these things do not avail. The children of the kingdom, and of godly predecessors are cast out; unless a man, in his own person, put out faith in Christ Jesus, and with his own heart, please and acquiesce in that device of saving sinners, he cannot be saved. I grant this faith is given unto him by Christ, but certain it is, that it must be *personal*.

II. This duty must be *cordial* and *heartly*; *With the heart man believeth unto Righteousness, Rom. 10, 10.* A man must be sincere, and without guile in closing with Christ, judging him the only covering of the eyes, not hankering after another way. The matter must not swim only in the head of understanding, but it must be in the heart; the man must not only be persuaded that Christ is the way, but affectionately persuaded of it, loving and liking the thing, having complacency in it; so that *it is all a man's desire*, as *David* speaketh of the Covenant, *2 Sam. 23, 5.* If a man be cordial and affectionate in any thing, surely he must be so here in this *one thing that is necessary*. It must not be simply a fancy in the head, it must be a heart business, a soul business; yea, not a business in the outer court of affections, but in the flower of affections, and in the innermost cabinet of the soul, where Christ is loved. Shall a man be cordial in any thing, and not in this, which doth comprise all his chief interests and his everlasting state within it? The heart or nothing; love or nothing; marriage love, which goeth from heart to heart; love of espousals, or nothing, *Prov. 23, 26. My Son, give me thine heart, 1 Cor. 13, 2 3.*

III. The *third* property or qualification of believing, as it goeth out after Christ, it must be *rational*. Hereby I mean, that the man should move towards God in Christ, in knowledge and understanding, taking up God's device of saving sinners by Christ, as the Scripture doth hold it out, not fancying a Christ to himself, otherwise than the gospel speaketh of him, nor another way of relief by him than the Word of God holdeth out. Therefore we find *knowledge* joined to the Covenant between God and man as a requisite, *Jer. 24, 7. And I will give them an heart to know me, that I am the Lord; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God.* I mean here also, that a man be in calmness of spirit, and, as it were, in his cold blood in closing with Christ Jesus; not in a simple fit of affection, which soon vanisheth. Nor in a distemper through some outward distress, as the people were, *Psal. 78, 24. When he slew them, then they sought him.* Nor under a temptation of some outward temporary interest, as *Simon Magus* was when he believed, *Acts 8.* A man must act here rationally, as being master of himself, in some measure able to judge of the good or evil of the thing as it stands before him.

IV. As faith goeth out rationally, so it goeth out *resolutely*. The poor distrest people of the gospel did most resolutely cast themselves upon Christ. This resoluteness of spirit, is in order to all difficulties that lay in the way; violence is offered to these. The man whose heart is a shaping out for Christ Jesus, cannot say, *there is a lion in the street*, *Prov. 26, 13*. If he cannot have access by the door, he will break through the roof of the house with that man, *Luke 3, 19*. He often doth not regard that which the world calleth discretion or prudence, like *Zaccheus* climbing up on a tree to see Christ, when faith was breeding in his bosom, *Luke 19*. This resoluteness of spirit looketh towards what inconveniences may follow, and waiveth all these; at least resolving over all these, like a *wise builder who reckoneth the expense beforchand*, *Luke 14, 28*. This resoluteness is also in order to all a man's idols, and such weights as would easily beset him, if he did not bend after Christ over them all, like that *blind man* who did cast his garment from him, when Christ called him, *Mark 10, 50*. This resoluteness in the soul, proceedeth from desperate self-necessity within the man, as it was with the *jailor*, *Acts 16, 30*, and from the sovereign command of God, obliging the man to move towards Christ, *1 John 3, 23*, and to adventure over the greatest difficulties, *as the woman of Canaan*, *Matth. 15, 28*. But above all, this resoluteness doth proceed from the arm of **JEHOVAH**, secretly and strongly drawing the sinner towards Christ, *John 6, 44*.

 POETRY.

THE DEATH OF THE RIGHTEOUS.

"Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace."

His end is peace—no more distrest
 By cares that harassed him before;
 The sunshine of the land of rest
 Steals brightly through its open door.
 And even upon his dying bed
 That glorious light is softly shed.

Ah! happy he who early gives
 To God the offering of his heart;
 For, stayed on Him, in peace he lives,
 And hails the summons to depart.
 And journeying to so bright a bourne,
 For him we cannot, dare not mourn:

The rich man's pomp, the poor man's fare,
 Alike are tending to decay;
 All earthly pride, all earthly care,
 At death's dark hour must pass away.
 But happy those, when all is past,
 Who gain the peace of Heaven at last.

The perfect man, whose soul refined,
 By long communion with the sky,
 Has left the aims of earth behind,
 And placed his wealth and hopes on high.
 How glorious is his parting hour
 When sin and death have lost their power.

When Jesus, crucified for men,
 Was hanging on that dreadful tree,
 He blessed the dying thief, who then
 Pleaded, "Oh Lord! remember me."
 The Saviour bid his sorrow cease,
 And his last breath was breathed in peace.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF SIR HENRY HAVELOCK, K. C. B. London: Messrs. Nisbet & Co.

(From the *English Presbyterian Messenger*.)

On the 15th of January last, the *Persia* was nearing Liverpool on her homeward voyage. Eager and anxious were her passengers to learn what news the pilot might bring us, as he came on board off Holyhead. The eight days of our voyage represented three weeks' intelligence—and the tidings that met us in the channel were felt by every one to be good tidings indeed. Yet were they not all unmixed. There were favourable reports from India, for Lucknow was relieved. But there was a shade in the bright colouring—Havelock was dead! The hero of so many fights; the man who amidst so many dangers had avenged the massacre of Cawnpore, and carried succour to the beleaguered garrison of scarce 500 fighting men, who had for months withstood the odds of 50,000; the veteran hero was no more. On board that ship, there were the representatives of nigh half the nations of the world; but amid them all, there was scarcely one who did not feel somewhat sad that so brave, so good a man was lost to his country and his kindred.

'Tis but a few short months since he breathed his last, and already his character and his deeds have been enshrined in more than one passing tribute to his praise, while a more elaborate biography of the Christian soldier is in preparation by his brother-in-law, John Marsbman.

The most attractive of the sketches of his life that has as yet appeared, is from the pen of the Rev. William Brock, and is entitled as above.

The son of a ship-builder at Sunderland, Henry Havelock was born April 5, 1795, at Bishop Wearmouth, in the county of Durham, but before the boy was five years old, his father migrated to the south of England; so that all the youthful associations of the future soldier were connected with Ingress Park, near Dartford, in Kent. He was placed for the first three years of his education with the curate of their parish, and he diversified his school work with frequent visits to Ingress Park. Some of his feats of bird-nesting there displayed an amount of fearlessness at which his father was surprised. "Were you not frightened," when you fell off that tree just now?" "No; I had too much else to do to be frightened. I was thinking about the birds' eggs;" and away he walked.

At school he was a boy every inch of him, and knew very well how to hold his own against all comers. He was remarkable rather for quietness than for noisiness; a steady-going, reflective, self-contained kind of boy. "Old Philos" was the familiar *sobriquet* by which his companions knew him—a contraction of the word philosopher, which in the boy described what became afterwards very apparent in the man.

In October, 1804, he was removed to the Charterhouse, where he was the contemporary and the companion of Hinds, famous afterwards in the cause of slave emancipation; Norris, Chief Justice of Ceylon and Recorder of Penang; Julius Charles Hare; Grote, the historian of Greece; MacNaughten, killed at Cabool; Fox Maule, now Lord Panmure; Eastlake, the painter, and others equally distinguished.

It was at this early period that his attention became directed to religion. Of himself he says, in a manuscript he has left, "The important part of the history of any man is in connection, through faith, with the invisible world. So of Henry Havelock, it may be recorded that there were early indications of the striving of the good Spirit of God in his soul, though Satan and the world were permitted for many years to triumph." It is known that he and some others regularly met in one of the sleeping-rooms of the Charterhouse for religious purposes.

He was destined for the law, and actually entered on its study, becoming, in 1814, a pupil of Chitty the great special pleader of the day, in whose chambers he was associated as a fellow-clerk with Talfourd; a fact he has himself recorded in the words, "He was intimate with the author of 'Ion.'"

Havelock's elder brother was a soldier, and Henry's predilections were all military. When Napoleon returned from Elba, in 1815, he yielded, as he says himself, to the military propensities of his race, by asking his brother to get him a commission forthwith. That brother distinguished himself at Waterloo, and in a month after the great battle, Henry, on his brother's application, was appointed second lieutenant in the Rifle Brigade, then the 95th.

In January, 1823, he sailed for India, on board the *General Kyd*, and he tells us that it was then, "while he was sailing across the wide Atlantic towards Bengal, that the Spirit of God came to him with its offers of peace and mandate of love, which, though for some time resisted, were received, and at length prevailed." The ship carried out the hero of Jellalabad, but "she also carried out a humble, unpretending man—James Gardner, then a lieutenant in the 13th, now a retired captain engaged in Home Missionary objects, and other works of Christian benevolence, at 13th. This excellent person was most influential in leading Havelock to make public avowal by his works of Christianity, in earnest!"

When he landed with his regiment in India, he made it from the first a solemn Christian duty to devote his time and attention to the spiritual welfare of his men, and to assemble them together, as opportunity was afforded, for reading the Scriptures and for devotional exercises. He gained, as the result of this, a wonderful religious influence over them, and though he was a strict disciplinarian, he had the hearty good-will of his men.

In 1824, he went as deputy-assistant adjutant-general to the Burmese war, and we hear of him making use of a Buddhist temple as an oratory for his regimental prayer-meeting. It was there, that on an occasion of imminent danger, when a corps which had been ordered out were found unfit for duty, that General Sir Archibald Campbell gave the memorable order, "Then call out Havelock's saints; they are never drunk, and Havelock is always ready." They were ready, and the General's purpose was accomplished.

From 1827 to 1849, two-and-twenty years, we find him in India. These years were full of events. He not only fought in the Burmese war, but on his return to India he published a Memoir of the Campaign. In 1829, he was married to a daughter of Dr. Marshman, whose name has been so long familiarly associated with the history of Indian missions. The forcing of the Khoord Cabool Pass, and the memorable defence of Jellalabad in 1841 and 1842; the battle of Moodkee in 1845, where he had three horses shot under him; the battle of Sobraon, in 1846, also fatal to three of his horses, and the occupation of Lahore, are all incidents in which Havelock was a prominent actor. Towards the end of the period, failing health sent him to England, which he reached in November, 1849.

His health restored, he settled his wife, for the education of their children, at Bonn, and he himself returned to India at the close of 1851, and was engaged for some years in ordinary duties. Arrangements were completed for his family to rejoin him in 1857, when the outbreak of the war with Persia and his appointment to a divisional command there, altered their plans. When he returned at the close of that war in May, the mutiny in India was at its height. He lost no time in proceeding to the scene of greatest conflict. It was on the occasion of their shipwreck on the passage from Bombay to Galle, that his assumption of authority was the means of saving the lives of all on board the *Erin*. Stern when necessity required, as soon as all were gotten safely to land, Havelock call-

ed upon them to acknowledge the goodness of God in their escape; and amid the most respectful attention, himself poured out the general thanksgiving for their deliverance from a watery grave.

This was on the 5th of June. On the 17th he reached Calcutta, on the 20th he was appointed brigadier-general, and set out for the relief of Cawnpore and Lucknow. On the 30th June he arrived at Allahabad, and on the 7th July began his march to Cawnpore, having to contest his way every foot, with less than 1,200 men, against many thousands of the mutineers. He fought four pitched battles, and on the 16th he entered Cawnpore, too late, it is well known, to prevent the horrid massacre of the women and children which Nana Sahib had accomplished but a few hours before.

Then came those wonderful marches towards Lucknow, through inundated fields and hovering host of enemies. Once, and a third time did he advance, and each time he had to fall back; yet each advance was a victory, and each retreat more grand than the advance.

Reinforced by General Outram, who although superior in rank, waived for Havelock's sake his right to assume the command, the relieving column again set forth on the 10th September. Through alternate pouring rain and scorching sunshine, with constant skirmishing, the gallant band pursued their toilsome march, closed on the 23rd by the hard-won battle of the Alumbagh, the firing of the artillery at which was the first signal to the garrison beleagured since the beginning of July, that relief was nigh.

There was a long day's fighting, amidst a sheeted fire of cannon and musketry, through the long, narrow, and tortuous streets of Lucknow, with its more than 50,000 armed and ferocious rebels, ere they could reach the Residency. No words can picture that march of fire and death. Every inch of the way was covered, point-blank, by unseen marksmen; at every turn, heavy artillery belched forth its fiery breath of grape and canister. Now it is getting dark, but the road is lighted up by the incessant flight of shot and shell and the furious play of the musketry. The way at last is clear; the gate of the Residency is before them, and with a cheer which only British soldiers know how to give, the vanguard of Havelock's "Column of Relief," enters in bringing to the beleagured garrison safety, at least, if not deliverance.

This was on the 25th of September. They had hard work after that to maintain their position, till towards the middle of November they were joined by Sir Colin Campbell, with a force of 5,000 men, and ultimately withdrawn, with all the women, children and wounded, first to Cawnpore and then to Allahabad.

Ere they left Lucknow, Havelock wrote home on Nov. 19:—"The papers of 26th Sept. came with Sir Colin Campbell, announcing my elevation to the Commandership of the Bath for my first three battles. I have fought nine more since. . . . I do not after all see my elevation in the *Gazette*, but Sir Colin addresses me as Sir Henry Havelock." For forty days he had not had a suit of clothes to change, but there was a prospect at last of some repose. He had been somewhat unwell; now it was thought, and fondly hoped he would presently rally and regain his health.

But no! On the 20th he was better, but worse again at night. Next day again better, he was removed to Dilkoosha, but the improvement was momentary. On the 22nd, the disease became malignant. To Sir James Outram he said, "For more than forty years I have so ruled my life that when death came I might face it without fear."

His eldest son though wounded himself, was his constant and assiduous nurse. On the 34th, the end was obviously nigh. "Come," said the heroic old soldier of sixty-two, "come, my son, and see how a Christian can die? And so Havelock died. "But he being dead yet speaketh."

SUMMARY OF INTELLIGENCE.

ECCLESIASTICAL AND MISSIONARY.

NEW-SCHOOL SOUTH.—The General Assembly of this body met last month at Knoxville, Tennessee. The chief subjects of discussion were a "Declaration of Principles," and a paper on "Union with the Old-School." These papers both contain the well-known principles held by adherents of the New-School, with the additional resolution that the question of Slavery shall not be entertained by the Church Courts; and that slave-holding shall not in any case be a bar to membership in the Church. The proposals for Union are such, and probably so intended, that they cannot possibly be acceded to by the Old-School.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN ENGLAND.—The Synod of this Church met on the 18th of last month, at Manchester. Besides the general business which belongs to the Supreme Court, several matters of critical importance must occupy their attention. The Organ question is one of these. The decision of last year by no means settled this matter. The opponents of the organ have been keeping up the agitation. Other churches are hoping to obtain the same liberty that has been accorded to Liverpool and Warrington. The Free Church of Scotland is also entering upon the controversy. Much fear is entertained of the peace and integrity of the Church in England. It is pleasing to find that the office-bearers of the several congregations in London have had a meeting of the most edifying and fraternal kind. In view of the approaching Synod, another meeting was to be held, to supplicate the Divine blessing on behalf of its members, and for the guidance of its deliberations. This is worthy of imitation.

POPISH SCHOOL-BOOKS IN ENGLAND.—Considerable astonishment has arisen in Great Britain on discovering that the Privy Council on Education have introduced into their list of books for public schools, several books directly teaching the dogmas of Popery. The religious societies and the Presbyterian Church Courts are petitioning Parliament to arrest the evil complained of.

EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.—A warm controversy has been excited in this body by a thoroughly Popish charge delivered lately by one of its Bishops,—Forbes. Several clergymen have protested against his views. Mr. Drummond, who some time ago seceded from this church but retains his connection with the Church of England, says, however, that Bishop Forbes's charge is a faithful commentary on the Scotch Communion Office, in which the Popish doctrine of the Mass is plainly asserted.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF NEW BRUNSWICK.—Considerable sympathy has been expressed for this Church at the mutilation and consequent rejection of their "Act of Incorporation" by the Legislature, through the intolerance of the State Church of Scotland party. The title which this Church has chosen for itself, and for which it has been known for now several years, is the "Presbyterian Church of New Brunswick." At this title certain State Church people and legislators were greatly offended, and adopted the ungenerous and spiteful expedient of adding to it, as the Bill passed through the Council, the words "not in connection with the Church of Scotland." This reminds us of a sign we once saw over a rival store in a thoroughfare of London, "no connection with the concern next door." Our New Brunswick friends have doubtless no objection that it should be known that they are "not in connection with the Church of Scotland" they would equally wish it to be understood that they are not in connection with the "New-School South" or with the "Pope of Rome", but that they should consent to have a *soubriquet* imposed upon them by an enemy would be a pusillanimity of which we trust they will never be guilty.

THE REVIVALS.—Union Prayer Meetings have been kept up in Montreal in the morning, midday, afternoon, and evening, with encouraging success. The evening meetings have been held under the auspices of the Ministerial Association, in the several churches in rotation. Two addresses of a practical, awakening kind are delivered by the ministers, with frequent prayer and praise, in which the laymen take a part. Meetings of a similar kind have been held in other cities of Canada.