

THE CHRISTIAN.

VOL. IV. } SAINT JOHN, N. B., NOVEMBER 1848. { No. 11.

CONDUCTED BY W. W. EATON.

Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.—*Peter.* On this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.—*The Lord Messiah.*

NEGLECT OF A CHRISTIAN DUTY.

BROTHER EATON—There appears to be a part of the primitive order of Christian duty lying dormant in Apostolic ruins, and not as yet fully comprehended by the people who claim the New Testament for their articles of Faith, and Messiah for their Lord and leader. The thing to which I allude is the primitive order of supporting and spreading the primitive gospel. We find it first, in the germ, clearly elicited in these words of the Messiah, "Occupy till I come" (Luke xix. 13, Matt. xxv. 14): from which parable it appears that the Lord Jesus has committed to his servants, the disciples (his goods)—the whole Gospel economy, with this express command, "Occupy till I come;" and if a Paul must say "who is sufficient for these things," how much more should we feel our infirmity in executing a trust so fraught with the weal or woe of all mankind. But, returning to our subject, we find this Paul disciplining the Churches, like so many regiments of the soldiers of the Cross, in this primitive order, while he admonishes them thus, "Holding forth the word of life;" and again enjoins on the Corinthians to imitate the churches of Macedonia in their liberality, who had "out of much affliction and deep poverty," "given themselves first unto the Lord and then unto the Apostles by the will of God." Here we have a full development of the thing alluded to above, that the disciples each one, as in proof of their sincerity, co-operated with the apostles—gave themselves unto the apostles by the will of God. If, therefore, it was his will that the Macedonians should give themselves to the apostles, in order to carry out the principles of order; if Titus was admonished to finish or perfect this grace in the Corinthians, as a proof of their professed subjection to the Gospel of Christ (2 Cor. ix. 13); and if the contribution of the Philippians (iv. 17, 18) was a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing unto God—then it is clearly elicited to be the duty of all disciples, even at this present time, to give themselves unto the apostles by the will of God. But some may inquire, how can we give ourselves unto the apostles by the will of God as in primitive times, seeing that the apostles have slept in death! I answer by devoting ourselves to the same service, which the

apostles called the primitive disciples to perform for them, viz., in accordance with our ability to assist them in the spread of the pure Gospel of Christ; and this a willing sacrifice, not by constraint but of a willing mind. "Behold I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." This proves the Apostles' commission and authority yet valid—to be continued by the labors of the saints in promoting the same cause; such as proclaiming the gospel to every creature, baptizing believing penitents in the name of the Lord Jesus (or by his authority) into Christ, thus admitting the contrite, as the lambs of the flock, into all the privileges of Church society, by organizing them into Churches, and ordaining elders in all such Churches. But it may be objected that every disciple cannot teach the christian religion. "When for the time they ought to be teachers, have need that some teach them again." True; but where is that brother or sister to be found who cannot minister of their carnal things in support of those who may be qualified for such a work? If every brother and sister in these Provinces only, believing and understanding the will of the Lord and the charge committed to their trust in this one particular, would come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty tide of opposition and apostacy, we should be able to keep THREE labourers in the field even at the present time, while there is none as yet settled down among us; and by the faithful labours of three, in one year, we should find the Lord's work more revived in these Provinces than by all the protracted meetings in the land, while we should experience so much of the divine faithfulness of his promises, that we should become strong in the faith, and have our confidence fixed in the Lord's ways.

I propose no new scheme to carry into effect the foregoing propositions, and would only remind the Brethren that all things are perfect in Christ Jesus. Paul has fixed the scheme of Christian co-operation (1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2), "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gathering when I come." Thus should the Churches, by their deacons, take in on every Lord's day that which we lay by us for this purpose; and so long as there is a willing mind, there will be found in the Church that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel. But as it now is, might not the Lord say of the Gentile Church as he has of the Jewish (Malachi iii. 9), "Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation." (10), "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it." Moreover, in throwing off the hireling system we may hope to be delivered from the ravages of the *hireling*, who cares more for the fleece than the flock.

I would not be understood to have any design of fostering clerical pride, but as strengthening the uplifted hands of those who would preach the Gospel from city to city, and from house to house, warning every man and teaching every man, in order to present every man perfect in Christ Jesus.

STRICTURES ON THE REVIEW OF JOHN M'CARTNEY'S PAMPHLET

WE solicit for the following articles, not only a patient reading, but also a careful review of all the pages referred to by the writers. They are excellent brethren; zealously and perseveringly devoted to the truth. They are not opposed to literary attainments on the principle that "ignorance is the mother of devotion:" they consider literature and science, under some circumstances, useful handmaids to the cause of the Lord; but not indispensable qualifications of the preacher or the pastor. They hesitate when asked to bestow a fixed salary on preachers and overseers of the congregations of the Lord—not in consequence of an inordinate love of money possessed by themselves, but because they think such a course is opposed to the "ancient order of things." Few in the Provinces contribute more readily of their substance than they, when they believe the cause of God and humanity require it. Reader, whatever therefore may be *your* conclusions, hear these brethren patiently.

W. W. E.

REMARKS UPON BROTHER EATON'S REVIEW OF JOHN M'CARTNEY'S PAMPHLET.

WE have received, in the 7th No. of *The Christian*, your review of John M'Cartney's pamphlet, and we are of opinion that it contains a variety of objectionable matter, and things altogether uncalled for. I purpose taking a glance at some of them; but before proceeding, I would make a few remarks.

As J. M'C's. pamphlet appears to have created a good deal of speculation, and as it seems there is a desire to know something about the author, I would say here, that although I forwarded it to be printed in *The Christian*, we know nothing about the author more than any other of the readers of *The Christian*: we are still ignorant of his country, place of residence, station in society, or whether he is dead or alive; neither do we know the religious body he belongs to, any farther than the four propositions he advocates were always believed and acted upon by the body called Scotch Baptists, but this does not make it certain that he belonged to them, as there were other bodies in Scotland agreeing in these propositions. The pamphlet in question was sent to me from Scotland a good many years ago among other pamphlets, and although I afterward requested my correspondent to say something about John M'Cartney, he never did so: I suppose he forgot my request, as he writes to me every year. I would here remark that J. M'C came out boldly before the world like a man that felt confident in his cause; and like one who knew how to argue and convey instruction to his readers, he divides and arranges his subject under four heads or propositions; he then takes up each of his propositions in turn; he makes a bold attempt to prove them from the scriptures, and if he has not succeeded I think no one ever will. He also defines his propositions so clearly that no person can mistake his meaning;* and I have no hesitation in saying that it is my humble opinion you have not undermined one of his pillars. I see nothing in this pamphlet but what I have believed and have seen acted upon for above forty years, and my coming forward at present in opposition to your re-

* See *The Christian* pp 14 71 72 165

view is not to defend J. M'C., but to defend doctrine that I believed some thirty years before I heard his name.

Now, Brother E., it appears to me that in reviewing J. M'C.'s pamphlet the following rules ought to have been observed—1st. You ought to have told us to which of his propositions you objected (in whole or in part). 2d. Quote his own words to which you objected, and give us the page. 3d. Define his errors. 4th. Shew that the proofs he attempted were not applicable. 5th. Overturn him, if possible, with scripture language. 6th. Keep to the point in debate, not mixing up other matter which had nothing to do with the point in dispute. By mixing up other matters not connected with the point in hand, mystifies and leads away the mind from the point; it also perplexes and bewilders simple readers, who may not have abilities to follow a disputant through subtle and circuitous reasoning. I think the above rules have been too much neglected by you.

In page 194, you say "But on two points we are compelled to record our dissent." You do not tell us to which of his propositions your points of dissent refer: I have come to the conclusion your first point had reference to his first proposition, namely, "Classical learning is not necessary to qualify for preaching the Gospel, or discharging pastoral duties."* Now, Brother Eaton, have you the courage to take the affirmative against J. M'C., that is, are you ready to say classical learning is necessary for preaching the gospel &c. This I consider to be the very pivot of the dispute. J. M'C. says classical learning &c. is not necessary, and he brings forward seven reasons to prove his proposition.† Now it would seem to me from what you have said‡, that you admit classical learning is not necessary in some circumstances, but in other circumstances it is necessary: if this be your view, just say so; but it is incumbent upon you if this is your view, to draw a clear line of demarcation between those circumstances where classical learning is necessary and those circumstances where they are not. This line of demarcation must be proved from the scriptures, otherwise it has no claim on our credence; but in place of quoting J. M'C.'s own words to which you objected, and defining the error they contained, and bringing scripture to bear upon them (and which seems to me to be the only way you could expect to overthrow him), it appears you have only imaginary difficulties to bring against him. Your reasoning in page 194, reminds me of the conduct of Pædobaptists when opposing immersion—not having confidence in any thing they can bring from scripture, they have recourse to imaginary difficulties; such as, that the three thousand could not be immersed in one day, and that it would be imprudent to plunge delicate females over head and ears in cold water in winter. I leave it to the reader to say if it is not in such small ware you deal in the last quoted page. In the same page you labour hard to get J. M'C. into a *supposed* difficulty! I request the reader to turn to the last quoted page, to examine this difficulty, and save me the trouble of quoting it. At your request (same page) I step in to see if I can relieve him out of this supposed difficulty;

* See page 14.

† The reader is referred to the 1st and 2d Nos. of The Christian, for the reasons brought forward by J. M'C. in support of his proposition

‡ Page 194

and first, I would say that the Lord Jesus before he ascended up on high promised to be with his apostles, even to the end of the world. Now I can rely with perfect confidence on this promise, that the Lord Jesus will always provide a sufficient number of learned and unlearned men to defend the apostolic writings, and remove every real difficulty. I never knew any pastor in such a dilemma as you suppose J. M'C. to be in, neither do you say you ever knew such; and is not sufficient for the day the evil thereof? and when every sect in Christendom has their learned men to defend them, is it to be supposed that the advocates of truth will be less fortunate than their neighbours? For my part I think I would have more* difficulty to find a man that studied the classics to make merchandize of souls, than I would have to find men that made great sacrifices for truth. Away then with imaginary difficulties; for it was such that was the cause of the ruin and overthrow of the house of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin. See the history of that ancient King.

Your second point of dissent would seem to refer to J. M'C's. fourth proposition, namely, that it is the duty of pastors to support themselves.† You say (p. 195), "The other point wanting in proof—not fully sustained by either the example or precept of the New Testament—is that of ministerial support." I must say that I am somewhat at a loss to know what you mean by the above. I did not understand that J. M'C. undertook to prove ministerial support: his proposition is "that it is the duty of pastors to support themselves" Now, Bro. E., do you mean to say that this proposition is not sustained by either the example or precept of the New Testament? If you do mean this, I earnestly and respectfully request you and the reader to examine the scripture proofs brought forward by J. M'C. in the 4th and 5th Nos. of *The Christian*. One passage I cannot help transcribing, "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities and them that were with me. I have showed you all things, how that so labouring you ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive." Acts xx. 33–36. Now, Bro. E., this one passage triumphantly proves J. M'C's. proposition, although there was not another text in the Bible upon the subject, for the above passage was addressed to the pastors of a christian church. Let the candid reader examine and compare what you have said in your review, and what J. M'C. has said in the 4th and 5th Nos. of *The Christian*, and say then which of you have made the most successful attempt at sustaining your propositions.

In examining what you say, pages 195, and 197, it would seem to me that you hold the popular notion of two classes of elders—one class to support themselves, and the other class to devote their whole time to preaching and study, and receive a comfortable maintenance: this is the only way that I can reconcile what you say in the above pages. If this is your view, it is incumbent upon you to draw a line of demarcation between these two classes of elders, that we may be able to discern be-

* We do not understand Brother S. here: we suppose however that he intended to say "less difficulty"—J.D.

† See page 105.

tween the elder we are to support and the one who must support himself. This is a practical question, which requires to be settled immediately: I want to know which of these two classes I belong to, that I may govern myself accordingly. You say (p. 194), "Men wholly devoted to study and the proclamation of the truth, are just as necessary in every community of one or two hundred families, in order to its success, as the undivided labour of the schoolmaster." Now, Bro. E., it seems you expected us to receive the above assertion without any scripture proof: I can see no proof even attempted. Now I feel disposed to make an assertion in opposition to yours, but I am not disposed to have mine without proof. I say men wholly devoted to study and the proclamation of the truth, are not necessary for every one or two hundred families; and I go for proof to the 19th and 20th chapters of the book of the Acts. There we find the Apostle Paul arriving at Ephesus, where he labours extensively and successfully for three years; he testified to Jews and Greeks repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ; he also testified the gospel of the grace of God—he even declared the whole counsel of God—he taught publicly from house to house—he warned every one night and day with tears. Did the apostle during these three years spend his whole time in studying and preaching? No such thing. Hear his own words: "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel; yea, ye yourselves know that those hands have ministered to my necessities, and to those that were with me." Let us now inquire what instructions he gave to the elders of Ephesus: did he say to A. and B., ye must spend your time in preaching and study, and receive a comfortable support; and to C., D. and E., ye must support yourselves the best way you can. No, he says to one and all of them, "I have shewed you all things, how that so *labouring* ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive."

You say (p. 196), "Did not Paul appeal to his own zeal, devotion, and labours, as a pattern worthy the imitation of the Ephesian elders." Very good. I ask then, why did you not quote the apostle's address to these elders, and echo answers why! No doubt the reason was that you saw that the apostle's words were in direct opposition to your system of devoting men wholly to study and preaching; but I have quoted them, and it is incumbent upon you, and the readers of *The Christian* has a right to demand of you an explanation of the apostle's words here and elsewhere, in consistency with your plan of men devoting their whole time to study and preaching. J. M'C., after fortifying himself with the armour of righteousness—so much so, that Brother E. with all his abilities does not even make an attempt to take from him one part of his armour wherein he trusted (for I do not find in your review one sentence quoted from him to define its error)—sallies out of his castle like one confident in his cause: he attacks his opponents on their chosen ground; he takes up the texts they build upon; he examines these in their connexions (a rational way of going to work), and he gives explanations of these texts in perfect harmony with all he had said.* I now ask why you did not follow in example in your review? The reader is respect-

* See pp. 141-145

fully requested to examine what J. M'C. has said in the pages just now referred to, as explanatory of our views and the views of all the other bodies in Scotland, who agree with him on his fourth proposition, as it would be improper for me to occupy the pages of *The Christian* with the same evidence produced by J. M'C. in the 4th and 5th Nos. of the present volume.

Now, Bro. E., I have several objections to your plan of devoting men wholly to study and preaching: 1st. Because it is in direct opposition to the example and precept of the apostle Paul, which he urges upon the Ephesian elders and others; 2d. Because of the difficulty of reducing it to practice. I do not believe that any ordinary man is able to devote twelve or fourteen hours a day for a whole year to study and preaching; neither did I ever know any community that could afford to listen to preaching every day. Small churches are not able to bear the burden of such men, and in large churches (if constituted according to the primitive order) such men are not needed—for in such churches there will be such a supply of gifts as to render such men unnecessary. In the plan of education you gave us in the first few Nos. of the present volume of *The Christian*, you seem very much to approve of students working five or six hours every day; can you see any good reason why the same rule should not be applied to pastors and preachers? I think they might work six or eight hours every day, and have plenty of time to study and preach.

But although we have hitherto believed that John M'Cartney's four propositions were founded in scripture, yet we are willing and even desirous to see any thing brought from scripture against them. We have no interest, even in a pecuniary point of view, to hold error; for we are not hireling preachers, but only humble advocates of what we believe to be truth. We say then to you, and to all readers of *The Christian*, sift these propositions to the bottom: if they contain errors, let them be defined and condemned by scripture; observe the rules laid down in the first page of this paper, and we shall hear what any one has to say, but we are not to be imposed upon with quibbling, sophistry, circuitous or subtle reasoning.

I remain your dear brother and fellow labourer in the Lord's vineyard,

JAMES SILLERS.

P. S. I hope that the readers will excuse my homely way of expressing myself in the foregoing remarks, as I received but a small portion of education. Moreover, I knew nothing of the language I am writing in until I was grown up to manhood; and this is the first article that has ever appeared from my pen in print; neither would I at this time come forward, did I not consider that truth required it.

J. S.

River John Road, Pictou (N. S.), Sept. 30, 1848.

REMARKS ON THE REVIEW OF JOHN M'CARNEY'S PAMPHLET, IN THE SEVENTH NUMBER OF THE CHRISTIAN.

Though there are some things in the review with which I am pleased, at the same time there are others with which I am not satisfied. As it would occupy both time and space to point out the beauties, I hope the author will pardon me for adopting a contrary course (though it may be

worldly), that of endeavoring to show part of the fallacies it contains. This may be done by adhering to a practice of the Roman law, that of having the review and the pamphlet face to face, with liberty to answer for itself. On two points then, dissent is recorded with the admission that it is but in part. First, "That under no circumstances a classical education is necessary in order properly and scripturally to fill the pastoral office." Second, "The other point wanting in proof, not fully sustained by either the example or precepts of the New Testament is that of ministerial support." I would here preface my remarks on this point by two passages of scripture. Gen. iii. 19, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread. 2 Thess. iii. 10, "For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat." From the above quotation from your review, I think it may appear evident to even a casual reader that you have introduced matter into it in several places, and in the present instance not treated on by John M'Cartney in the pamphlet under consideration, it being only incidentally mentioned while illustrating the qualifications, duties, and rewards of Apostles, and endeavouring to sustain his position, and clear it of every thing not immediately connected with his subject: "That it is the duty of pastors to support themselves." Thus in p. 107, "If this right is still to be appealed to, it must be for the same or similar labour as that for the performance of which it was originally granted." A right is here acknowledged that similar labor as that of the Apostles' entitles to the same hire. Again, he admits "this right may be plead with propriety" (p. 141). That labourers in the word should be enlarged by the churches to preach the gospel in the regions beyond, is evident: women ministered unto Jesus of their substance. That the Apostle and those with him were loaded with such things as were necessary, the scriptures show: 2 Cor. x. 16; Acts xxviii. 10. The same Apostle tells the Corinthians, we have not used this power (that he had as an apostle of Christ) that I may make the gospel of Christ with out charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel. The costly array and fashionable luxuries of many of the professed followers of Jesus, but ill accords with the example set by his apostles, likewise of the meek and lowly Son of God, the Captain of salvation, who was made perfect through sufferings, and who on another occasion said, gather up the fragments that remain that nothing be lost. But to return to what follows, "That every congregation of the Lord should have three or more elders, bishops, overseers, pastors. * * * That all these overseers should be sustained in ease and affluence by the congregation over which they preside, is an idea not to be entertained by any one having any respect for his own judgment, or any general knowledge of the christian scriptures." The phrase "ministerial support" coupled with a sentence in your review (p. 196), where you say, "or did he, Paul, utter an unchangeable truth, applicable to all labourers in general, and to those who labour in word and doctrine in particular. That the latter is the fact appears to us as plain as a sunbeam." I would observe here that the design of this passage seemingly to me is, that pastors being a part of the ministry, consequently they have a right to ministerial support. This appears to me not particularly called for at the present time in your review; as John M'Cartney in the pamphlet under consideration, has not denied their scriptural rights. See p. 108, "Another reward is the

high esteem in which churches are to hold their pastors, and which is to manifest itself by submitting themselves to them in the Lord, and counting them worthy of double honour, one way of expressing which, is by ministering to their temporal necessities, &c." Again in p. 110, "And the poor, not from any consideration of the christian law in his favour." We have here then a pretty full acknowledgment that the law with the authority of the lawgiver is in the favour of the pastors in his churches. But again, if I comprehend your meaning, you say in p. 197, "Bishops while they rule in the fear of the Lord must receive a liberal support." If this is not ease and affluence, it certainly is but a small remove from it. So that it is high time we examine ourselves with respect to our general knowledge of the christian scriptures, and see what respect we can have for our own judgment. The principal scripture evidence for this support, is that of Paul to Timothy. "The labourer is worthy of his reward." That this passage is highly figurative, I think will appear when we consider the following scriptures, Lev. xix. 13; Deut. xxiv. 14—xxv. 4; and respecting temporal things may mean nothing more than in these parallel passages, Matt. x. 10; Luke x. 7. The hypocritical scribes and pharisees had their reward in the glory of men; not so with the faithful follower of Jesus the Son of God; the principal reward of the christian teacher is future—a crown of glory that fadeth not away. The present age and generation is fruitful in men with the desires after temporal things that Baruch had, seeking great things for themselves. The scriptural answer to such is, seek them not. If they take our Lord's counsel it shall be well with them: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you"—that is all necessary things.

The other or first point according to the review, not fully sustained, is "that under no circumstances a classical education is necessary in order properly and scripturally, to fill the pastoral office." Now, respecting this, I remark that having read the pamphlet, I can find no passage in it with the idea conveyed in the above quotation. You represent this as an ultra view; permit me to ask what makes it so; do not the words "under no circumstances?" You are aware that men professing christianity have made the acquisition of classical learning, divinity, and science, indispensably necessary; and John M'Cartney advocates that they are not necessary in order scripturally to discharge the duties of the pastoral office. He says, "But the question instantly occurs, does classical learning constitute any part of this fitness? If it does, let those who say so produce the passage from the law and the testimony which demands its acquisition, and the question is decided" (p. 56). As this course has not been adopted, after what has been written both for and against these different modes of procedure, I deem it unnecessary to enlarge farther on this point at present.

It is my belief that human learning should be considered as secondary, that a church of Christ in the selection of office-bearers is to be guided only by scriptural precept. The qualifications specified by the apostle Paul are partly natural, the greater part spiritual gifts, and others acquired. We should always consider the Holy Spirit the teacher, the word of God the rule or laws, and the means of acquisition to be the

diligent and prayerful study of this book. The man who waits upon the Lord in this way is likely to attain an aptness in teaching, which the man trusting to his great classical attainments knows nothing of. I have now endeavored to shew that on this point you have gone beyond what he did say; and in your second, connecting the pastoral office with that of the preacher of the gospel who labours in the word and doctrine, not treated on in the pamphlet under review. There are some expressions I regret to see in the review, such as, a professor who has only the talent to make money. I fear that such professors have not the love of God in their hearts, or the well being of the souls of their fellow-men. Again, the names of Macknight and Wesley are personally mentioned, and other doctors and teachers, and the language as if from John M'Cartney, applied, "they have studied the classics to prepare them to make merchandize of souls." After having stated a question, you ask "will his admirers give us an answer for him." As I do not avow myself the particular admirer of a brother man. I feel exonerated from going into the question you have propounded, leaving it to those who with unwearied eye explore the latent depths of dark philosophy; but would say that there may be brethren in churches with gifts for the acquisition of languages and other learning, who at the same time may be very deficient in the requisite qualifications for the Elder's office. Again, I think there can be no circumstances by which a man may be surrounded that will warrant him in going into any extreme, or beyond the authority and word of the Lord.

In conclusion permit to say, and intreat christians not to construe what I or any other man may seem to have said, into a disrespectful neglect of those christian duties commanded by our Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him. James says, "If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit?" Our Lord also says, "Sell all that ye have and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old; a treasure in the heavens that fadeth not." The dissemination of the word of life, the proclamation of the gospel of peace and salvation, the necessities of the saints, demand the honoring of the Lord with our substance. That we may glorify God in our bodies and in our spirits, which are God's, is the prayer of your's in the bond of truth.

D. F.

Pictou, October 19, 1842.

REMARKS ON THE LETTERS OF J. SILLERS AND D. F.

I am apprehensive that neither John M'Cartney's pamphlet, nor my remarks on it, have been fully understood by brother Sillers. I do not say that this is the case, but such is my opinion. I will, however, recapitulate Mr. M'C's. main positions, and then state in what we agree and where we differ.

I. "Classical learning is not necessary to qualify for preaching the gospel, or discharging pastoral duties."

By the phrase "classical learning" here, it is not easy to ascertain how he wishes to be understood. It may mean the entire circle of sciences

taught in the Universities of Britain. "Classical" may mean a knowledge of authors "first in rank," or it may mean no more than "elegant." Mr. M'C. has not defined his meaning. We are left to conjecture. Of the elders of the churches ordained during the labors of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas, he has said (p. 55) they could not have had classical learning because they had not time to obtain such knowledge, and if they had "there were no academies, colleges, or universities" in those days in which they might study. By this we should conclude that he means that it is not necessary that a man should have been a graduate of a literary and theological institution, in order to preach the gospel or oversee a congregation of the Lord. If this is his position, I agree with him perfectly, providing he will allow me to supply one word to his proposition—"ordinarily:" "Classical learning *ordinarily* is not necessary" etc. For not only such cases as that suggested in my review may occur, but for missionaries going to heathen lands; for preachers of the gospel going from Britain to France, Italy, Germany and other European nations; to give correct translations of the Oracles of God, and to meet the numerous cavilling opponents of the truth, a good general and even critical knowledge of the word of God in the original Greek and Hebrew, would be indispensable. No intelligent christian would dispute this, I trust, though I should not quote the chapter and verse where such qualifications are recorded!

It is as much the duty of the church now to do all in its power to save sinners, as ever it was. That company of disciples which is not endeavoring to convert the world, has not the spirit of Christ—is not imitating that congregation commended by the Apostle (1 Thess. i. 5) for "sounding out the word of the Lord." Its light has already become dim, and will doubtless soon be removed out of its place.

If a church, then, desire to send the gospel to Greece, or Arabia, or China, will they wait and pray for God to call and qualify a Greek, Arab, or Chinaman, or will they do what they can by human means to qualify some of their number for the work? For a knowledge of original Hebrew and Greek, as well as these languages, would be essential to such a missionary. Brother Sillers says, "the Lord Jesus, has promised to be with his disciples, to the end of the world;" and he is confident "that the Lord Jesus will always provide a sufficient number of learned and unlearned men to defend the Apostolic writings" &c. Has the Lord, since the Apostles, raised up men miraculously to defend his word? Brother S. will not so affirm. It is true the Lord will be with the Apostles in the word of truth which he committed to them, but that word must be understood. And unless the congregations of the Lord do what they can to educate their members who have the other qualifications for teaching the gospel, they have no assurance that the church will possess such men. What reason have we to believe that the Lord will convert some educated infidel or opposer of the truth to do his work? The Lord *may* do so—I doubt not his power; but I know not where such a promise is recorded. To wait for him to do so, would be little short of presumption. He might cause oaks to grow without the acorn, as he did in the creation, but he does not; and we say he will not. His word is the seed which he has given his church. This seed must be sown, or man will

not be converted to God. Men must "hear the word of the Lord and understand it" or they cannot be saved. Now, I cannot quote the chapter and verse where God commands us to translate the Scriptures from the Hebrew and the Greek; but I know it must be done, or men cannot "hear and understand" the truth. The conclusion then, to me is irresistible, that it is the duty of christians either to prepare themselves to proclaim the truth to all men in their own language or aid those who can. But I presume that I have followed this thought far enough. Neither of the brethren who have addressed me, nor yet Mr. M'C., would differ with me in these things. And yet to take his first proposition without qualification, it might be fairly inferred that he contended that a knowledge of the original languages were under no circumstances necessary. In my review I have called this an "ultra" view of the subject. Brother F. thinks that the substitution of "under no circumstances" to his proposition has made it ultra! But I would ask, has not Mr. M'C. labored to establish that view? Has he not endeavoured to shew that in no case were these qualifications necessary? He appears to have lost sight of the fact, that the Lord Jesus when he sent down the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, communicated to the church a knowledge of all the languages, and hence it was not necessary for the Apostles to study them.

But in Britain and America, classic qualifications would seldom be necessary to enable an intelligent English scholar to proclaim the gospel, or (possessing the other prerequisites) to teach the disciples the "all things" commanded by the Lord.

After these very desultory remarks, I hope the brethren will understand me, and conclude that I am not so very far removed from their favorite author, or from their own views of the qualifications of pastors, and preachers of the gospel. But, I ought, perhaps, to give them a *reason* for noticing this proposition in my review. The Christian was being represented by its enemies as opposed to education—that it exerted a "deleterious influence upon the ministry." Garbled extracts from Mr. M'C.'s pamphlet were made to prove this. I chose, therefore, to say that I did not favor even that *apparent* leaning of his towards a contemptuous appreciation of a thorough knowledge of the languages in which the Holy Spirit first revealed the mind and will of Jehovah.

Proposition II. That "no Church can be complete without a plurality of pastors" meets my entire approbation; for it is proved by the word of God most conclusively. That any society calling itself a church of Christ should lose sight of this, is to me most astonishing. How such a people can revere the word of God as a sufficient rule of faith and practice, is most marvellous.

Proposition III. That "it is the imperative duty of the ordinary members of the church to contribute, according to their respective abilities, to promote its public teaching," is also worthy of all acceptance. I would rejoice to see all the teaching, preaching, exhorting, praying, singing, and alms-giving talent in the church, brought fully into requisition both in public and in private, on all suitable occasions.

And here, I would remark by the way, is in my humble opinion, the great fault in our brethren's favorite Scotch Baptist churches. Their gifts and talents have been confined mainly to the order of worship, and

the regulation of the internal affairs of the church. Preaching and exhorting as well as teaching has been confined mainly to the church. Faint and feeble have been the efforts, in too many churches, to convert sinners from the error of their ways. They have been careful to contribute of their substance to help and comfort the bodies of the poor and needy disciple, while meetings have seldom been held for the purpose of converting sinners. To take efficient, talented brethren from their secular employment, to go into the highways and hedges to call sinners to repentance, formed but a small part of their plan, and hence they have made slow advances; and unless they do more towards enlightening and converting the world, in the common course of events, their societies must soon become extinct. I heard, however, a few weeks since, that the church in Edinburgh, which so long enjoyed the labors of Archibald M'Lean, now maintains one of its pastors, whether for the purpose of "sounding out the word of the Lord" to convert sinners, or for the better care of the church, I am not informed. In conclusion on this head, I would remark: from all I have learned in the good word of God, from history and observation, I have no hope of the continued prosperity of any body of people, professing to take God's word as their only rule of faith and practice, unless they use *all* their talents in God's service. The church must live well before the world, they must *every man* of them acquire all the knowledge he can, and then according to his ability, both in public and in private, teach, preach, and exhort saints and sinners, and also contribute as the Lord has prospered him, to sustain those who are capable and willing to go where Christ has not been named. Show me a church of this character, and I will show you one that enjoys continued prosperity at home; and one too that is blessing the world at large: and this brings me to Mr. M'Cartney's

IV. Proposition: "The duty of Pastors to support themselves." This is the point on which my dear brethren are so sensitive. This subject has called forth many an essay, and many contradictory volumes. Were it not for the well-fed, and well-paid parsons that surrounded friend M'Cartney, we should, in all probability, never have had this, or the other propositions so carefully and methodically stated, and so fully elaborated. I am pleased that one so competent has argued the question; and although in some things, I differ from him, yet I think not much more than my worthy brother Sillers! But the great question is not, what is the opinion of this or the other writer, but what says the word of God relative to supporting, pecuniarily, the pastors of the congregations of the Lord. This is Mr. M'Cs. proposition. But, if I understand brother Sillers, he includes in the proposition not only the elders of the congregation, but all who labor in word and doctrine. Brother S. would give to no man a farthing or a loaf of bread as a teacher of the christian religion, unless he were absolutely in want—he then would contribute to his support—not as a remuneration for his labors, for the benefit of the church or the world, but as he would to a pauper; to one of the poor of the flock, that actually needed the alms of the church to save him from starvation. This is also the doctrine of Mr. M'C., *not*, however, in reference to preachers of the gospel, who go abroad to announce the glad tidings of salvation, or to missionaries, but in reference to pastors. Hear him (p. 130):

“The words, therefore, ‘let the elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double honor,’ include maintenance, only when that is necessary to the proper expression of the church’s esteem; exactly in the same sense in which children are to honor their parents, by supplying their wants when they are *unable* to maintain themselves!” What Mr. M’C. says of pastors, brother S. would say of all proclaimers of the gospel! The latter introduces Paul’s address to the Ephesians as an example, not only to pastors, but to all others. If I understand brother S., he is opposed to bestowing “wages” upon any man laboring for the spiritual benefit of either saint or sinner. Not so Mr. M’C. He admits the right of the Apostles, and of preachers *when their work bears a similarity to that of the Apostles*. And this is all that I have ever contended for! But to please brother Silvers, I must give the “page” where he has made this admission! P. 143, “The Apostle having disposed of these two classes, alludes to a third, whom he styles ‘laborers in word and doctrine,’ or missionaries; men devoting their time and talents to the conversion of sinners, and the spread of the gospel, and have left their homes and secular callings for this important work. In support of the special honor due to such, the Apostle quotes the Old Testament injunction, not to muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn; *this rule having a similar application to LABORERS IN THE GOSPEL, AS TO APOSTLES, from the affinity of their work.*” Mark these words of Mr. M’C., and then see the conclusion forced upon him! When men “labor in word and doctrine” and in doing so have to neglect their “secular callings,” they have the same right to a maintenance that the Apostles had, in consequence of “the affinity of their work.” Again on the same page, Mr. M’C. says, commenting on Gal. vi. 6, “Nothing can be more reasonable, than for those, who have received the knowledge of the truth, to *communicate to the temporal necessities* of those who, for their spiritual benefit, have deprived themselves of the means of ministering to their own wants.” And again (p. 114), after examining several passages of scripture, adduced by those who advocate the claims of pastors for support, he says: “They clearly teach christians their duty towards those, whose zeal for the conversion of sinners, and whose labors in spreading the gospel, have deprived them of the means of ministering to their own necessities. While on the other hand, such laborers in the gospel, and teachers of the word, are bound by the precepts and examples recorded in scripture, to guard against any abuse of this *christian law*; and as far as possible, keep themselves from being burdensome; and in every instance to manifest, that they are actuated by the same spirit breathed in these apostolic words, ‘we seek not yours, but you.’”

These quotations are all sufficient, I trust, to settle the point before us, namely, that Mr. M’Cartney admits the claims of those who “labor in word and doctrine” to a reasonable compensation for time thus employed, and also that it is a “*christian law*,” and that it is the duty of those who are “taught in the word” to “communicate to him that teacheth, in all good things.” Here we are agreed. I ask nothing more for the heralds of truth and righteousness; they ask nothing more for themselves than that their brethren shall bear their part of the expense of carrying the truth to those who are in darkness and in sin. But will my brother Sil-

lers agree with us? I fear not! On a reconsideration of the whole premises, however, I hope he will find that this view accords with the oracles of God. But he must bear in mind that these conclusions militate against his interpretation of Acts xx. 33-35. Paul addresses this to the bishops (the word rendered "overseers" verse twenty eight, is the same that in other places is translated "bishops"), having the oversight of the congregation in Ephesus, and so does Mr. M'C. apply it; but brother S. uses the passage as applicable to all who labour in word and doctrine to prove an assertion, as an offset to mine, that one individual laboring constantly in study and in word and doctrine, in every community of one or two hundred families, was not necessary. If, as Mr. M'C. says, that passage refers only to the pastoral office, why then introduce it to disprove the utility of a congregation of the Lord sustaining a competent evangelist in every community large enough to employ all his time in teaching, reproving, exhorting, with all long suffering and doctrine. In this degenerate age, are not such laborers as necessary as were Timothy and Titus? Evangelists like them are greatly needed; and if Timothy, after being for some time associated with the Apostle Paul was, by him, admonished to give himself "to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine"—to "meditate upon these things—to give himself wholly to them"—that his "profiting might appear to all"—or in all things—how much greater the necessity for such laborers now! But this deficiency of the congregations of the Lord is, to me, so obvious, that they demand rather a series of essays than a passing remark.

But to return. I have alluded to the points of agreement with Mr. M'C's. *fourth* proposition, and in which we appear to differ with brother S. I now come to examine what I consider a wrong position of our author. I cannot admit that overseers of the congregations of the Lord have no claims on their brethren for a maintenance in whole or in part except as paupers. This is in fact Mr. M'C's. proposition. If pastors whenever physically able, are to support themselves and families; if this is an ordinance of God, then is it wrong to contribute any thing towards their support while they possess this ability. If "he that will not work, neither shall he eat," is to be applied to pastors, and if "in the sweat of his face he shall eat his bread," applies exclusively to physical effort for a maintenance, then have I entirely misunderstood the word of God on these points. If the reader will again examine these passages in their connexion, and shew that they have the most remote bearing upon the question now under consideration, I will give his exposition a most conspicuous place in *The Christian*, and send half a dozen copies of the third and fourth volumes of this work to any one he shall name.

As it would occupy too much space in one number to go into an examination of all Mr. M'C's. arguments, and the strictures of brethren S. and F. likewise, I will endeavour to ascertain the true and full value of the testimony on which brother S. so confidently relies, and in reference to which he has attempted to lay the rod on me so severely. I shall, however, attempt no reply to the reason that brother S. assigns for my silence on this passage, viz. "That I saw the Apostle's words were in direct opposition to my system" &c. A christian's heart must have become corrupt indeed, who will profess to take God's word for his only

guide, and then advocate a system which he *knows* to be in "direct opposition" to it! It would not do for me to comment on an expression of this kind, coming from a brother I so highly esteem as brother Sillers! But it may be that Paul's address to the Ephesian elders is in opposition to what brother S. is pleased to call my system. If so, it will fall, and fall too with my hearty approbation. "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered to my necessities, and to them that were with me. I have shewed you all things, how that so labouring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive." Acts xx. 33-35. This address is an excellent one—most pathetic; one on which I dwell with inexpressible delight. In my review I merely referred the reader to it in proof of the position that the Apostles were models in every thing. They acted not only in the capacity of ambassadors of the Lord Messiah, but they were model bishops, deacons, evangelists &c. To say that the Apostles had claims upon the churches, because they were the sent of God, for a temporal support, and that those who are preachers, evangelists &c. like them—bound by the authority of God to be as near like them as they can be, and yet not have the same claims on the Church for a subsistence while they are endeavoring to carry forward the work which the apostles began, is to say the least very poor logic. Now there is one, and only one interpretation of this address to the Ephesian elders, which will make it correspond with other portions of the divine record. It is this. Brother S. admits that as an apostle, Paul had a right to a maintenance from the church at Ephesus. Mr. M'C. admits that were the church to call one or more of these elders to labor in word and doctrine, they ought to feed and clothe them. I take another step, and say that if Paul had a *right* to a maintenance, but for good reasons waived that right, and labored for his own subsistence and those with him—then had the Ephesian elders the same right, but were taught by the Apostle to imitate him, and waive that claim, right, or privilege; and for the better manifestation of the benevolence and self-sacrificing principles of the Gospel, labor like Paul for themselves and others. Not that they had not power, but to be willing to suffer all things, lest the enemies of the truth might say that they made a gain by their godliness. This view of the passage beautifully harmonises with Paul's address to the Corinthians ix. 1-23. In this he not only teaches the right of the Evangelist who wields the sword of the Spirit, the word of God, to food and raiment, when he says, "Who goeth a warfare at any time at his own charge?" but also of the laborer in the Lord's vineyard when he says "Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof?" And then comes the rights or privileges of an overseer, pastor, or shepherd, "Who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?" But yet Paul did not urge any of these claims, but was willing to suffer all things; "for it were better for me to die [of want], than that any one should make my glorying void." And why all this? He informs us (2 Cor. 11, 12), "But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them who desire occasion" &c. The reader should study carefully the chapters above cited, and also 2 Cor. xii, 1 Tim. v., and

1 Pet. v. In 1 Cor. ix., the Apostle plainly shows that the flock should supply the wants of the shepherd, and that they who preach the gospel should live by it. But Mr. M'C. says that this was the right of an Apostle, and that pastors cannot put in such a claim; but Paul corrects this fancy of his by applying almost the same language, verbatim, to the *Elders* of the churches, in his letter to Timothy—and what is most remarkable too, in reference to the *Elders of the church at Ephesus!* Timothy was left at Ephesus (1 Tim. i. 3), and while there Paul wrote to him, "Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in word and doctrine." That by "honor" he means here pecuniary aid is evident, not only from the meaning of the word here, and in Acts xxviii. 10, and Matt. xv. 6, but also from the whole connexion: no one than can put two thoughts together will dispute it.

When we come to the conclusion that Paul's zeal for God, and his opposition to covetousness, and his glorious unselfish disposition, determined him to labor without taking any thing from some congregations peculiarly situated—though he received "wages" of others to do these churches service—I say though he had claims upon them, yet he waived those claims, and recommended those that could, to do as he had set them an example: he at the same time taught the disciples both in Ephesus and Corinth, that it was their duty to supply the wants of their pastors; that the laborer was worthy of his hire, and that those who labored in word and doctrine, were worthy of special attention. With this view of the subject before us, every passage in the New Testament harmonizes, but on any other hypothesis we have one inspired writer against another, and the same apostle opposing himself!

How is it possible that Peter can be understood on the supposition that pastors never received pecuniary aid as such! He says (1 Pet. v. 2), "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind," &c. Now if the congregations of the Lord in those days were not in the practice of giving their pastors any thing for their oversight, what sense would there be in Peter charging them not to take the office for "filthy lucre's sake?"

If brother S. should say "Brother Eaton, come and see us, and again proclaim the gospel to our neighbors, but not for the money we shall raise for you;" or if brother F. should give a similar invitation, and add, "but not for the luxuries which we shall spread before you," would not any common sense hearer or reader understand that the brethren in Picton county were in the practice of feeding their guests, and paying the expenses of those whom they invited to labor among them in word and doctrine?

I have written much more on this point than I at first intended; but I have only partially examined the points introduced by brethren S. and F. Although I have made this article too long already, I cannot conclude without noticing a few items in the communications before the reader. Brother Sillers seems not to understand me because I sometimes advocate the right of pastors and teachers to receive wages in proportion to their wants, and the time spent as servants of the church,

and at other times that they ought to perform physical labor five or six hours every day! In this I can perceive no more discrepancy or contradiction than for Paul to receive "wages" from the disciples in Philippi and Thessalonica, while in Ephesus and Corinth he labored to support himself! Were we fully inducted into *all* the reasons which influenced his conduct, and his advice to the Elders at Ephesus, under the different circumstances which surrounded him, we might come to definite conclusions; and when pastors should, and when they may not support themselves. However brother S. and others may have understood us, we assure them that we are not disposed to make two classes of Bishops in the congregation. With us they are all servants of the church, and differ from each other only as the other members of the body differ. I would rejoice to see every member in the congregation, possessing the qualifications prescribed by Paul to Timothy and Titus, in a public manner ordained to the office of overseers of the church of God. Were there a score in every company of his disciples, and each one in due order took his turn presiding, teaching, and guiding the flock into green pastures beside the still waters, so much the better for the cause of truth and righteousness, while God's word was a lamp to their feet and a light to their paths. From my heart I can now, and ever have used the language of Moses, "Would to the Lord that all the Lord's people were prophets." Were there many Bishops in each congregation, they would generally be able to look after the flock without being compelled to neglect the duties they owe to their families, and consequently would not require pecuniary assistance from their brethren. But then, this expression of opinion may be deemed uncalled for. I would, therefore, remark in relation to brother S's. apparent inquiry, whether or not he belonged to the class exempt from labor! If the congregation at River John call upon him to labor in word and doctrine, whether for the conversion of sinners or the recovery of wanderers, and if in so doing it be absolutely necessary for him to give up the business by which he now gains a maintenance, they could certainly be required by Apostolic authority (1 Tim. v.) to supply his wants; but if he waive his right, as did Paul in Ephesus and Corinth, either on account of the poverty of the brethren, or to convince the world that the true gospel produced a self-sacrificing spirit, he would well deserve the commendation of all good men, and a greater reward when the Chief Shepherd shall make his appearance. This view of the subject appears to me reasonable, and in accordance with the word of God. But, as I have before hinted, the cause of God needs Evangelists, competent men to travel from place to place, proclaiming the Gospel. In reference to such laborers we wrote when we spoke of men wholly devoted to study and preaching. In some densely populated portions of the world, men may pursue some callings successfully, and on Lord's day mornings hold meetings in their own, or in some neighboring village, to sound out the word of the Lord. But this cannot be done in most parts of America. Intelligent, efficient heralds of the truth, capable of calling the attention of the world to the facts, commands, and promises of the gospel, are so few, that a large proportion of their time must necessarily be consumed in travelling from place to place, so that it is utterly impossible for the greater part of Evange-

lists to do any thing for their own maintenance. What then must be done? Shall the word of the Lord sound out from us, or will we wait for God to call those who are able to live upon their income! Do we expect men to go abroad to preach the gospel, and leave their families to the cold hand of charity for support? Paul says that such are *worse* than the infidel. Will we then call those preachers hirelings who receive "wages" from the congregation, while they devote their time to the dissemination of the truth? Then was Paul a hireling; for he took wages of one church to do another service.

Although I contend that Bishops have a right to a support from the flock of their charge when they need it; yet I have not yet become acquainted with a single overseer of a congregation, where the apostolic gospel is proclaimed, and the ordinances scripturally administered, who ever receives any salary or compensation any more than other members, unless where Elders labor in word and doctrine in addition to the discharge of pastoral duties. So far, therefore, as the "present reformation" is concerned, the practice contended for by Mr. M'C. has obtained to its fullest extent. Indeed many of our most efficient proclaimers sustain themselves, while they toil to carry the pearl of great price to others. Whether they have, under all the circumstances, done right or not is doubted by some; but I enter not into the question here. That their motives have been good, I do not doubt. If they have not fostered covetousness in others, and consequently prevented them using their talents for the good of their fellow men, these sacrifices may in the end keep a greater number in the field sounding out the word of the Lord to perishing sinners.

Brother F. thinks there are some personalities and references to men making merchandize of souls uncalled for. I did not intend to use the names of Macknight and Wesley disrespectfully. I do not think I did. I pore over the writings of the former, and the history of the latter with no ordinary satisfaction. And as to the other phrase objected to, I consider it merely as equivalent to Mr. M'C's. title page "ecclesiastical imposition." Mark; I did not say that any man, or class of men, sought an education to make merchandize of souls; but the idea I gathered from Mr. M'C's. pamphlet was that he looked upon every one who studied for the ministry as a profession, and then devoted himself to the work of the ministry for a "living," was making merchandize of souls. Thus I think brother S. also understands him.

To conclude. The Master is now absent; he has committed to his servants talents. To meet his approbation when he shall again appear, these talents must have been improved. Some disciples have property; others have the influence of position in society; one has a talent to teach, and another to exhort; one has proper gifts in one thing; another in something else; and some may excel in many things. What then shall be done? The churches should seek the order of the New Testament. Every one should have her bishops and deacons, and as far as they can they should be imitators of the apostles, and primitive overseers and ministers of the churches. And in their individual capacity, and through evangelists, they should send out light and truth to the world. This cannot be done in this country without money. Every one there,

fore, should contribute as the Lord has prospered him, for this purpose. Where a church is unable to sustain an evangelist in the field, several should co-operate for this purpose, as the churches of the Gentiles did to raise funds for the poor in Judea.

I profess not to be an infallible teacher; but I have, on these subjects, read my Bible to but little purpose, if this is not the only view of the subject under consideration, that can be sustained by the general tenor of the apostolic teaching and the example of the primitive christians. Reader, may you and I so improve our talents, that when our Lord shall return, he may say to us, "Well done good and faithful servants, enter ye into the joy of your Lord." W. W. E.

LECTURES TO CHILDREN.

BY JOHN TODD.

LECTURE V.

GOD WILL TAKE CARE OF US.

Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin. And yet I say unto you, that even Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these.—MAT. VI. 28, 29

OUR Saviour used to preach any where, and every where, as he met with those who wanted to hear him. Sometimes he sat down on the ground, and sometimes sat in the boat on the water, and sometimes stood in the great temple and preached. He used to be very plain, and easy to be understood. He would have preached finely to children: and if he were now to speak to all these children before me, I do not believe there is a single one who would not understand all he should say. And yet it is possible, if any one wants to do so, to misunderstand even the Saviour himself. Now see. Suppose a lazy boy should read over my text, and then say, that Christ teaches us that God takes care of the lilies, though they do no work, and, therefore, we need not work, and he will take care of us in our idleness. This would make the Bible favour our sins; but the Bible never does that.

Suppose you should go and visit a man who was so rich that he had his trees covered with silk of the most beautiful colours, and even his most ugly looking creatures covered with gold and silver, and adorned by the most curious art! Would you not think him a rich man? And if he were known to be a good man, and true to his word, and he should tell you that he would be your friend, and always take care of you, would you have any fear but he would do it?

God is richer than all this. He is so rich that he can put more of what is beautiful upon a single lily or tulip, than the great king Solomon could put on all his clothing. The hoarse, homely peacock carries more that is beautiful upon his tail than the richest king could ever show. And even the poor butterfly, which is to live but a few hours, has a more glorious dress than the proudest, richest man that ever lived. God can afford to dress this poor worm up so, because he is rich. If, then, he can afford to take such care of the lilies, the birds, and insects, and to make them more beautiful than man can ever be, will he not take care of us, if we obey him?

Suppose you had a rich father—so rich that he had a hogshhead full of gold, and a great barn full of silver. Do you think that, if you were to be a good child, he would ever refuse to take care of you? But God has more gold and silver laid up in the ground, which men have not yet dug up, than would make a mountain—it may be a hundred mountains. Can he not take care of you?

Suppose your father had more oxen, and horses, and cattle, than you could count over in a day, or in a week. Would he not be able to take care of his child, and give him every thing he needs? Yes. But God has "cattle upon ten thousand hills," and "every beast of the forest" is his, and his are "all the fowls of the air!" Can he not give you food from all these cattle, and clothe you, and give you beds from the feathers of all these fowls? Yes, he is able to do it all.

Suppose your father was so rich that he had ten thousand men at work for him every day, all at work, and all paid to their mind, and all happy in working for him. Would you have any fears but he could take care of you, and do you good? But God has more servants than these. He has all the good people on earth in his employment, and all the angels in heaven. He pays them all. And if you need any thing, he can send one, or a million of these his servants to you, to help you.

A little boy asked his mother to let him lead his little sister out on the green grass. She had just begun to run alone, and could not step over any thing that lay in the way. His mother told him he might lead out the little girl, but *charged* him not to let her fall. I found them at play, very happy, in the field.

I said, "You seem very happy George. Is this your sister?"

"Yes, sir."

"Can she walk alone?"

"Yes, sir, on smooth ground."

"And how did she get over these stones, which lie between us and the house?"

"O, sir, mother *charged* me to be careful that she did not fall, and so I put my hands under her arms, and lifted her up when she came to a stone, so that she need not hit her little foot against it."

"That is right, George. And I want to tell you one thing. You see now how to understand that beautiful text, 'He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.' God charges his angels to lead and lift good people over difficulties, just as you have lifted little Anne over these stones. Do you understand it now?"

"O yes, sir, and I shall never forget it while I live."

Can one child thus take care of another, and cannot God take care of those who put their trust in him? Surely he can; and there is not a child among you here to-day, over whom he is not ready to give his holy angels charge.

Did you never see the lily as it stands in the garden in the summer? God sends it the pure sunshine, and it seems to rejoice in his warm beams. He sends it the cooling dews, and it seems to drink in their sweetness like milk. The clouds gather, the storm rages, the rains pour down, the winds sweep along. See! the lily has shut up its blossom, and

folded its leaves, and meekly bows its head, and bends to the wind, and asks no eye to gaze on it, while the storm lasts. God has taught it to do thus, till the smile shall again follow the tempest. It is not injured. It opens and smiles again. So does God teach the good. The Christian thus rejoices when blessed; and when troubles and sorrows come, he meekly bows and waits till God remembers him and removes the storm.

You have seen the lily, in the fall, when the frosts came, drop its head, and droop, and die. The stalk on which the sweet flower waved all summer, is gone, and the spot where it stood is forgotten. But see the care of God for that lily. The cold winter goes past, the sunshine of spring returns, the young buds swell and open, and the lily, which has only been sleeping in the ground, puts up its meek head, and rises again to beauty and glory. God takes care of the frail, beautiful plant, and will not let it perish for ever. So you have seen the beautiful little child, which stood, like the flower in the garden, struck down by sickness, and cut down by death, and laid in the little grave. But God will take care of it. The long winter will be over; and though that dear child is forgotten by every body on earth, yet it is not forgotten by God. There is a day coming when God will come down from heaven, and send his angel to call this child from the long sleep of the grave, and it will come up from the ground fair and glorious on the morning of the great day. Do you ask how it can be? Let me ask you one question.

Did you ever see a pond covered over with hard ice, thick and cold, all the long winter? Well, the spring comes, and the ice melts away, and the lily seed, which has so long been sleeping in the mud at the bottom of the pond, springs up, and shoots up, and opens its beautiful white flower, on the top of the smooth water, and seems to smile as it looks up towards heaven. How is this done? By the care and power of that God who watches over all his works, and who will take care of the flower seed, and of the immortal spirit of every child.

While too many people, who know about God, seem to live, day after day, for years, without loving, or obeying, or even speaking about God, you can almost hear the lily speak, as if preaching, and say,—

“I acknowledge the presence of God, my Maker. When he passes by me on the soft wings of the breeze, I wave my head as he passes; when he rides on the whirlwind or the storm, I bow and tremble; when he draws over me the curtains of the night, I feel safe, and go to sleep; when he opens upon me the eye of morning, I wake up, and drink in the fresh beams of his sun; and when he sends his chilling frosts, I let my frail body perish, and hide myself in the ground, knowing that he will again raise me up to life and beauty!”

Some years ago, there was a poor child left alone, at the death of his parents, in a distant island of the ocean. His people were all heathen, wicked people. His father and mother were killed in a cruel war. Now, see how God takes care of his creatures. Let us hear his own account of the thing. “At the death of my parents, I was with them; I saw them killed with a bayonet—and with them my little brother, not more than two or three months old—so that I was left alone without father or mother in this wilderness world. Poor boy, thought I within myself, after they were gone, are there any father or mother of mine at home,

that I may go and find them at home No; poor boy am I. And while I was at play with other children, after we had made an end of playing, they return to their parents,—but I was returned into tears,—for I have no home, neither father nor mother. I was now brought away from my home to a stranger place, and I thought of nothing more but want of father or mother, and to cry day and night. While I was with my uncle, for some time I begun to think about leaving that country, to go to some other part of the globe. I thought to myself that if I should go away, and go to some other country, probably I may find some comfort, more than to live there, without father and mother.”

This poor boy, thus left, an orphan, in a heathen country, was under the care of God. He left the island, and came to this country. Here he found kind friends, who took care of him, and taught him to read and write, and who took great pains to teach him about God and about Jesus Christ. He became a true Christian, and a dear youth he was. He wanted to go back to his country, to tell his people about God and Jesus; but just as he had gotten his education, and was ready, he was taken sick, and died. His name was HENRY OBOOKIAH. He died with “a hope full of immortality.” His grave is in Cornwall, Conn. But he lived not in vain. By means of his life and death, good men felt so much for his poor countrymen, that many good missionaries have gone to those islands, and there built churches, and printed school books, opened schools, printed the Bible, and taught many thousands to read and know God. The foolish idols are destroyed, and they are becoming a Christian nation.

I remember when the missionaries first set out for that country. They sailed from New Haven; and before they entered the ship, and as they took leave of their dear friends, amid a great company of Christians, they all united in singing a beautiful hymn. Three verses of this I will now read to you.

“Wake, isles of the South! your redemption is near
No longer repose in the borders of gloom;
The strength of his chosen in love will appear,
And light shall arise on the verge of the tomb.”

The heathen will hasten to welcome the time,
The day-spring, the prophet in vision once saw,
When the beams of Messiah will lumme each clime,
And the isles of the ocean shall wait for his law.

And thou, OBOOKIAH, now sainted above,
Shall rejoice as the heralds their mission disclose;
And thy prayers shall be heard, that the land thou didst love.
May blossom as Sharon, and bud as the rose!”

Oh! what care and goodness in God, thus to guide this lonely child to this country, and, by his means, lead many to go and carry the gospel to that whole nation! The Sabbath is now known there, and many thousands have already learned to read the word of God; and we believe multitudes have become true Christians, and have followed Henry to the presence of God in Heaven. When they were heathen, they used to kill almost all their children when they were small; and many of them were murdered, and given to their idol gods. One day, when the little church there was sitting down at the communion table, a poor woman,

who had been a heathen, but who was now a Christian, was seen to weep most bitterly. One of the ministers asked her why she wept and wrung her hands. "Oh!" said she, "why did I not know of this blessed God before! Why did I not! I once had six sweet children—they are all gone—I murdered them all with my own hands! But oh, if I had known about God as I now do, they would have been alive now!" They have now done with the cruel practice of murdering their children. They know better.

Perhaps some of my little hearers are orphans,—have no father, or no mother. I can feel for such; for I know what it is to stand by the grave of a father when a child. But let me say to you, that God will take care of you. He takes care of the lily. You have heard of the ostrich, that great bird which lives in the wilderness. She lays her eggs in the sand, and then leaves them for ever. The warm sun hatches out the young ostrich, and there is no mother to feed and take care of it. But God takes care of it, and feeds it; and will he not much more take care of the child who has lost father or mother, if that child ask him to be a father? Surely he will.

Children, you have all yet to meet with trials and disappointments. You are meeting with them every day. You will have sickness, and pain, and sorrow, and you want a friend whose love cannot change. You must die, and be buried up in the ground; and you want God to take care of you, whether you live in this world or in the next. Well, God will be such a friend to you on these conditions:—

1. You must ask him to be your father and friend. Ask him every day, and feel that without his blessing upon you every day, your feet may fall, your eyes fill with tears, and your soul meet with death. Ask in the name of Jesus Christ. 2. You must promise him sincerely that you will obey him and do his will. Suppose you had no father or no mother, and a great, and good, and rich man were to offer to take care of you, and make you his own child, and should say he would do it all, on the condition that you obliged him and did his will—would you not at once promise to do it? And so you ought to promise God.

3. You must love God as you would the best father in the world. Love his Son, because he is the express image of the Father. Love his word, his people, his service, his commands, his duties, and thus give him your heart, and he will be your friend for ever and ever. Amen.

OBSERVATIONS IN RELATION TO THE CONVENTION OF ASSOCIATIONAL DELEGATES,

CONVENED AT ST. GEORGE'S, SEPT. 6TH AND 7TH, TO EFFECT A UNION OF
THE REGULAR BAPTISTS OF CANADA.

In the Constitution adopted, in Article 3d, it is stated "The union shall consist of Churches holding the Word of God, as the Divine and only authoritative guide in matters of religion as revealed therein."

This divine basis is the avowed principle of numerous associations of professing christians: wherefore, as in the present day, such should be tested by bringing the practice of churches to be examined by *the Word*, and practice of the churches set in order as exhibited in the scriptures:

if in accordance in all things, and observing *the all things* whatsoever the Lord Jesus commanded the Apostles, as we have it in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, then, and upon those terms, we are assured Christ will be with all such churches. It is grievous, that notwithstanding such pretensions, we find the Scripture example violated, which violation is effected as much by doing what is not authorized, as by omitting what is authorized (Rev. xx. 18, 19); no change of times or circumstances authorizes any (the slightest) departure from the teaching and practice of the churches, as we have such set forth in the Word of God. I rejoice to see the divinity of the Saviour, and sovereign grace held forth; the fulness of the atonement and intercession of the Lord Jesus Christ; and the obligation of all who believe to shew forth their faith in Christ by being immersed; the majesty of the Spirit's influence in conversion and sanctification; a general resurrection and judgment; the final and eternal happiness of the righteous; while I observe, as to condemnation, the term is set forth *everlasting* instead of *eternal*. The growing sect of Universalists, who build upon the term *everlasting* in contradistinction to *eternal*, that even the damned will be at length admitted to glory—as it is admitted that everlasting refers to time, while eternity is without end. In the margin* I set forth passages translated everlasting in our Bible, while on referring to Dr. Campbell's, (of Marischal College, Aberdeen), translation of the Gospels (to which I find the learned all bow), there the term is set forth *eternal*. May the Lord lead those who have been led into error from the mistranslation, not to look for escape if they reject the free salvation held forth to all who believe and trust in Christ as the only sure foundation.

I take it for granted, that the Word of God referred to in the third Article, is the Bible as we have it in all the churches; and that referring to the Word of God has relation to being guided by precept and example therein; to the exclusion of all measures, orders, terms and acts, however sanctioned by human authority, for which no example is to be found in the Word of God. In the churches of God, Jesus is King; the Apostles are represented as the foundation of the church—as having been sent forth, in the commission (Matt. xxviii): this we find in Rev. xxi. 14, where a view is afforded of the church, to which all that is set forth in that blessed revelation refer, as shall take place on this earth, and refers not to future times; as the angel testifies, in the 1st chapter, 1st verse, "God gave unto him to shew his servants, things which must shortly come to pass." After this digression, I am led to bear my testimony against all terms, measures, or acts, which are not sustained by *precept or example* in the New Testament, being that portion of the Word of God which bears upon the present state of the churches, and no change of time or circumstances authorizes any change or modification of the laws of the Church of God; wherefore I bear my testimony against all orders, arrangements, plans, systems, or terms, not in accordance with the Word of God, as stated. On the present occasion I avail myself of the opportunity of bearing testimony against a powerful agent of Satan in turning professors away from fully following the Lord, namely, that the manners, customs, laws, and state of the world, so materially differ from

* Matt. xix 29; xrv 46 Luke xviii. 30 John iii 16, v. 24; vi. 27. 40; xii 8.

the days of the Apostles, that the laws of Christ and practices of the first churches are inapplicable; and becoming "all things to all men," that we may save some—justifies omitting some of the rules and practices of the first churches. All I can say is, where has authority been given for any alteration or substitution of what the Holy Spirit enjoined and taught? Paul writing to the Corinthians (11th chap.) says, "follow me as I follow Christ;" oh that these assuming the term Holy or Reverend would hold forth this blessed sentiment: the terms which now prevail are—follow me as I follow the conference, the presbytery, the general assembly, the pope, the council of elders, the statutes enacted for regulating the church, with the conventions, delegates, and authorities appointed by the clergy. We find the first church, which was converted at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii), consisted of three thousand—converted in one day; no delay (as now); they were baptized, and they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayers. I ask has change of times produced any ground to prevent obedience to all we see attended to in the days of the apostles. In the 20th of Acts, we see that the church came together on the first day of the week to break bread (not to partake of the *sacrament*, or *swearing*, as that simple and blessed ordinance is now blasphemously called). The Jewish church was typical of the Christian dispensation; and there the lamb, three times a day, was offered up on the altar; and through that sacrifice, the Jews in all parts of the earth turned to the temple, and offered their prayers through the offered burning lamb. To the Christian, the Lord Jesus is the Lamb of God, who was once offered, and unless our prayers are offered up through Christ, as the Lamb slain for us, there is no other way of approach to God; so that any act of worship in private, or in the church, unless offered up through Christ will find no acceptance with Jehovah; but now, instead of stedfastly shewing forth the Lord's death, many (regarded as *pious*) attend to it once a month, or once in three or twelve months, and place it in the back ground, as it is, after the people have gone away, while the other exercises are placed in the fore ground as more attractive: oh! oh! When will Christ be honored by being kept in view as the only way to the Father, and acceptance for every act of worship attended to, having the Cross in view as the means of being heard. I now come to examine the order established at St. George's, which supercedes looking to the Word of God, as the order there sanctioned has no place in the Word of God. In no unkind feeling, but from an earnest desire to draw my professing Brethren in Christ to review their proceedings, upon their own avowed principle; for had they not appealed to the Word of God, I should not take any notice of their awful departure from the *Word*. Their terms are—

The union of "regular Baptists of Canada," are to be conducted and governed by officers and regulations as herein; extracted from the proceedings at their late meeting at St. George's, in order that they may prove wherein such regulations and rules correspond with, or are sustained by example in, the Word of God, while in many terms used they are as far from the Bible, as the order of the church of Rome.

Example for the following is demanded upon their own terms, namely, according to the *Word of God*

1st. "Agreeable to *Resolution* of the Western, Grand River, Eastern, Haldimar, and Johnstown *Association* of regular Baptist Churches, appointing *Committees* from each."

2d. The term *Delegates* of Association.

3d. *Plans of the Union*.—Where are they?

4th. Regular Baptists of Canada.—Any example of such a term?

5th. Appoint Sub Committees.— ditto.

6th. Joint Committees —Quere. Where in the Word of God?

7th. Report of annexed *Constitution*.—Quere. By whom authorized?

8th. Executive Committee.—Authority for such in the Word of God.

9th. Committee to appoint officers of the Board.

10. Convention of Delegates of the Churches may have an opportunity of joining the Union, may be represented by *two Delegates*, and one *additional for every six pounds* contributed annually. Each *beneficent Society formed within any such Church*, may be represented by one delegate for every *ten pounds* contributed annually. Any member of a regular Baptist Church, may become an annual member of the Convention by *paying ten shillings*.—Oh, money! money! how powerful thou art!

11. Committee of Management.

12. Committee of Associations to effect union of Regular Baptists.

13. Nominating Committee.

14. *Provincial Board*.

15. *Executive Board*.

16. *Executive Committee*, to procure co-operation by *subscription*.

17. *Moderator*, and various other terms. Majorities to prove effectual.

It is stated the Churches are to regulate their own affairs.—Quere. Are not the Churches connected with and subject to the measures of the Associational Delegate, and authorised by them to act?

At present I add no more, as there are associated with this anti-scriptural Association many whom I hope to meet in glory; but to such I say cease from man, come out of all associations who do not hold that a single human rule or order vitiates the order of a Church of God, if acted on.

May the Head of the Church in mercy turn the hearts of all his people to regard the Holy Scriptures as "able to make men," as well as children "wise unto salvation," and to shew by their proceedings, that they are deemed "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

In love to the souls of all who profess to be Christians—in the spirit of the publican—from

JAMES BUCHANAN.

QUERIES ON MARRIAGE.

Will you have any objections to give your views in reference to *marriage*? Is it lawful for christians to marry those who are not? If it is, where will we find the law? If not, how is the church to deal with them? Are they to be expelled? If they are, where is the authority?

If brother Eaton will give his views on the above, he will confer a

great favour on his friends in this place ; and, I doubt not, on his readers in Canada generally. Your's, with christian respect,
Esquesing, June 4th, 1848.

JAMES MENZIES.

REPLY.

I HAVE no "objection" to giving my "views" in reference to any thing connected with the present and future happiness of the human family. But when I can express *only my views* or opinions in religious matters, I would, especially in a work such as I wish *The Christian* to be, much prefer silence. Opinions on religious subjects often do much harm where they generate speculation ; they seldom result in good. Whether the discussion of the above question has been wholly confined within the record is rather doubtful. I have not yet satisfied myself relative to it, and I cannot, therefore, promise to settle the question even in the mind of a brother so confiding and moderate as my brother Menzies.

There is one difficulty confronts us at the very threshold. Are christians to treat every man, not a member of the congregation of the Lord, as the Israelites were required to treat idolatrous nations ? Dare we say that every man who has not obeyed the form of doctrine delivered to the Apostles, is a heathen man and a publican ? I dare not ! I cannot look upon the thousands around me, who certainly believe that Jesus is the Messiah the Son of the living God, as infidels, though they may be so influenced by early training and education, that they may refuse to evince in the Lord's own appointed way the faith of the gospel. Just then as we decide the previous question, shall we answer all the others. If all out of the congregation of the Lord are infidels, then does the word of God forbid a christian to marry any of them. Certain it is, that the Israelite was forbidden to marry one of another nation. Paul says "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers." Dr. Macknight understands this as referring to marriage ; but Dr. Clarke is of opinion that, primarily, it has no reference to marriage. For my own part I am inclined to the conclusion that it is a great unchangeable rule, that the disciples of Christ keep themselves as distinct from the infidel world, in every thing, as possible. The marriage of a professor of christianity and a mere worldlying, more frequently results in the apostacy of the former than in the conversion of the latter. How a devout, God-fearing disciple of Christ can *love* one of his enemies, so as to make a bosom companion of them, is most astonishing ! What ! shall I give my heart and my hand to one who withholds her's from the Lord Messiah. How could I so dishonor him as to enter into alliance with his enemies ! In this manner, we would imagine, every lover of God would reason.

But then, on the other hand, there are difficulties. If it be known that certain christians will not marry those that are not disciples—will not this fact be an inducement to hypocritical professions ?

An excellent sister once came to me for advice. An exemplary, conscientious pædobaptist, confident he was right, had secured her affections. Ought she to marry him ? He was willing that she should continue in the church, he would throw no obstacle in the way of "her religion ;" but he would not go with her. I dared not call him an infidel, and therefore durst not object to the union

I need not take up the question in detail. From these hints the reader can readily perceive that while I would decide that a disciple who would marry, an infidel would be worthy the censure of all God's people; while one who married the nominal believer—moral in his deportment and manifesting regard for the Christian religion—could be aided by the prayers, teaching, and exhortations of the church to induce her companion to be obedient to the faith. But on these points I will not debate with those who differ from me. I shall be happy to insert a plain, well written essay on the subject, from any one who can give us any additional light.

It is a melancholy truth, however, that nearly all who marry unbelievers, either entirely backside, or in a great measure lose their first love for the Saviour. And, indeed, when disciples choose the company of the careless, if only for a brief period, or enter into business with them, they usually turn away from the Lord and his cause; and to their sorrow often learn not only that "the backslider in heart shall be filled with his own ways," but that "those who wander out of the ways of understanding remain in the congregation of the dead."

W. W. E.

REFORM ALWAYS AGGRESSIVE.—You must not expect that reform is a matter of peace. It never was and it never will be. The greatest, the only perfect reformer that ever appeared on earth, said he came not to send peace, but a sword. Reform is always aggressive. It cannot be otherwise. The moment it sinks and lulls itself into quiet, it ceases to be reform. And yet, whenever there arises a call for a great and national reform, there always starts up a variety of characters, and the natural inevitable consequence is collision, and it cannot be otherwise. You will find that in all history, you will find that in every society, the moment there is a call for reformation, there will appear men of great charity, men who are like the Hindoo fanatic. Their religion consists in putting out their eyes, their charity thinks to cover a multitude of sins by sealing up their eyelids instead of getting rid of the obstruction to a clear and searching vision. These are the moderate men; these are the men to whom Luther alluded when he described Erasmus, his contemporary. "Men who strive to walk on eggs, without breaking them." They are the men who think that moderation is the secret of success, when on the contrary there never was a reform carried by moderate measures, and especially when the evil sought to be eradicated had spread its roots through the whole structure of society.—*Extract.*

"I WAS WRONG."—The best confession of wrong doing in the past is right doing now. When a man brings forth fruit meet for repentance, we take it for granted that he is repentant, whether he says so or not. And yet we like confession, where error has been committed or wrong done. A man tenacious of opinion, and proud of his consistency, must possess rare moral courage to say, "I was wrong."

LETTERS RECEIVED.—David Oliphant, Francis Layton, D. Crawford, and H. Greenlaw.

We commend to the attention of our Baptist readers the following extract from the "Montreal (Baptist) Register," published under the auspices of the "Canada Baptist Union;" and edited, we presume, by the Rev. Dr. Camp, President of the Baptist College, Montreal. Although the Editor publishes the unscriptural order in which Baptist ordinations are performed, he does not appear to be disposed to defend them. Indeed, to us, he appears to give them up as indefensible. We are indebted to Mr. Buchanan for the copy of the *Register*, from which we make the extract.

W. W. E.

ORDINATION.

NIAGARA FALLS, Sept. 4, 1848.

Unscriptural terms and proceedings as to the appointing of preachers or elders, extracted from the *Register* of the 2d September, 1848.

Whitby, ordination of J. S. Crellin, 25th August.

A Moderator.

A Clerk.

1. A sermon from Phil. i 21.

The *candidate* gave his christian experience.

2 His call to the ministry. Quere, what was it, from whom, and how?

3. His views of Christian doctrine. Quere, what were they?

4. His views of the constitution of a Christian church. Quere. what were they?

All to the satisfaction of the *council*, unanimously. Quere, who were they, and by whom constituted a council?

Resolved.—"That brother Crellin be ordained to the work of the Christian ministry."

Hymn; reading the scriptures; prayer; ordination sermon; ordaining prayer; imposition of hands by the presbytery; right hand of fellowship; hymn and benediction.

To the Editor of the Montreal Register

Sir—As the denomination above referred to take the name of the Baptist church of Canada, and avow they are in all things governed "by the Bible, and nothing but the Bible," I respectfully call upon those who engaged in the above procedure, to favor me, through the *Register*, with the passages in the Scripture which they obeyed, and that *the call* to the ministry may be set forth as stated, such being satisfactory to the "*council*." Quere, what were the the gifts conferred by the laying on of hands? Were they spiritual gifts which the presbytery had the power of conferring? If so, the authority for the continuance of spiritual gifts resting within the power of any order of men in this day—we see I Cor. xiii. 13—while spiritual gifts were to pass away, "faith, hope, and love" were to continue. No man, or body of men, have power now to confer spiritual gifts on any, but such as are peculiar to the humblest believer in Christ Jesus our Lord.

J. BUCHANAN.

[Our correspondent is probably aware that many of the observances practised in certain parts of Canada have been imported from the United States. Our brethren in the States, singularly enough, who are Republicans in things civil, favour Aristocracy in things ecclesiastical. Hence their peculiar practices in regard to Ordination, Councils, licensing for

the ministry, &c. These things would not be tolerated in England. They are regarded by English Baptists as incompatible with Christian liberty.

When Baptists affirm that in things sacred they are "governed by the Bible, and nothing but the Bible," they evidently refer to those matters in which the Scriptures have given us plain precept or precedent. The Saviour has not thought fit to burden us with minute directions. We are furnished with general principles, partially illustrated by example, and we are to apply them, as cases arise, in harmony with the spirit of the gospel and the design of the Christian constitution. But we must avoid all tendency to infringement on freedom, assumption of power, or requisition of uniformity — *Ed. Register.*]

WATER AS A BEVERAGE.

WATER is the natural and proper drink of man. Indeed it is the grand beverage of organized nature. It enters largely into the composition of the blood and juices of animals and plants; it forms an important ingredient in their organized structures, and bears a fixed and unalterable relation to their whole vital economy. It was the only beverage of the human family in their primitive state.

In that garden where grew "every tree pleasant to the sight and good for food," producing all the richness and variety of "fruit and flower" which an omnipotent and all bountiful Creator could adapt to the relish of his senses, and the exigencies of his entire organization; it cannot for a moment be doubted that man was in a condition, the best suited to secure him an uninterrupted, as well as the highest and best exercise and enjoyment, of his physical, mental, and moral powers. His drink was water. A river flowed from Paradise. From the moment that river began to "water the garden" till the present time, no human invention has equalled this simple beverage; and all the attempts to improve it by the admixture of other substances, whether alcoholic, narcotic, or aromatic, have wholly failed, but have served to deteriorate or poison it, and render it less healthful and safe.

Water is as well adapted to man's natural appetite as to the physical wants of his organs. A natural thirst, and the pleasures derived from its gratification were given us to secure to the vital machinery the supply of liquid necessary to its healthy movements. When this natural thirst occurs, no drink tastes so good, and in truth none is so good as water; none possesses adaptations so exact to the vital necessities of the organs. So long as a fresh supply of liquid is not needed, so long as there is not the least relish for water, it offers no temptation, while its addition to the circulating fluids would be useless, or hurtful.—*Extract.*

ASSOCIATE BAPTISTS OF NEW BRUNSWICK.—From the minutes of the associations just published, we learn that there are in the Province 67 churches, 46 ordained and 17 unordained Ministers, and 4823 members. There have been, during the associate year, in all the churches 264 immersions and many added by letter; but death, exclusions, and dismissions, have reduced the net increase, of the entire body, to 97.

Minutes of the Montreal Baptist Association:—11 Churches; 545 members; increase during the year 18; decrease 48.

SUBSCRIBERS to The Christian, who have not paid for the present Volume.—Many of you probably anticipated a visit from me during Autumn, when you purposed handing in the dollar due. I am sorry it was not in my power to call on you in person. Although I have spent half my time superintending the issue of *The Christian*, I have not yet received near enough to pay the printer. I shall not complain, though you compel me to work for nothing and find myself; but to pay the printer also is more than I can do. A word to the wise is sufficient—a *hint* to the honest will be all that is necessary to insure prompt payment. Whether the work continue or not will depend upon the punctuality of delinquents previous to the middle of December.

W. W. EATON.

THE CHRISTIAN PSALMIST—Again.—The four copies from brother Leonard, by way of brother Comings, have come safely to hand. To both would we acknowledge our obligations. To the brethren we would again say: The Psalmist is a neat volume, containing near 400 pages, of hymns and tunes of every variety. They can be furnished at from six to twelve dollars per dozen, according to the binding. If any of the congregations purpose changing their Hymn Book, we would recommend the Psalmist to their particular notice; and to lovers of the science of music we would recommend the work as furnishing the improved system of numeral music, which so completely simplifies the science as to bring it down to every capacity. Cash orders will be promptly attended to, and no commission charged.

W. W. E.

BRITISH MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.—We were delighted to get a sight again of our brother Wallis' efforts on the other side of the Atlantic.—The Harbinger is beautifully printed on very fine paper, and stitched in a printed cover, containing 48 pages, a few lines larger than *The Christian*, at Sixpence per number. We have sent the current volume of our periodical to brother Wallis' address; but the numbers for September, October, and November, are the only copies of the H. we have seen. Will brother W. continue to send his work, and let us know how cheap he can furnish his work, through the mail, to provincial readers, should any desire to order it.

W. W. E.

SPEAK GENTLY.

- Speak gently!—it is better far
To rule by love than fear—
Speak gently!—let not harsh words mar
The good we might do here!
- Speak gently—love doth whisper low
The vows that true hearts bind;
And gently friendship's accents flow,—
Affection's voice is kind.
- Speak gently to the little child!
Its love be sure to gain;
Teach it in accents soft and mild;
It may not long remain.
- Speak gently to the young, for they
Will have enough to bear;
- Pass thro' this life as best they may,
'Tis full of anxious care.
- Speak gently to the aged one
Grieve not the care worn heart;
The sands of life are nearly run,
Let such in peace depart.
- Speak gently, kindly to the poor—
Let no harsh tone be heard;
They have enough they must endure,
Without an unkind word.
- Speak gently to the erring—know,
They must have toiled in vain;
Perchance unkindness made them so;
Oh win them back again!