

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear
within the text. Whenever possible, these have
been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

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

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
						/					

THE CHRISTIAN.

Vol. IV. }

SAINT JOHN, N. B., APRIL 1848.

{ No. 4.

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*

CORRESPONDENCE.

I received your pamphlet, "The Christian," with much pleasure as long as I was at ———. Since then I have received none. I am very sorry, for I intended to have them bound. In one or two of your letters you urge upon me the necessity of conformity to the requirements of Christ by an open profession. Now to tell you the truth, I consider these requirements have been so twisted by sects and parties that it is impossible (nearly) for a candid and rational mind to fall in with their views. Now, my dear brother, in all humility, I wish to ask a few questions or make a few propositions, which I believe; and if you object to them, I wish you would send me the number in which you publish them. I believe that there is one Infinite and Eternal Being, the Source of all existence, the Author of all blessings, the Ruler of all worlds; that this God is *One*, without equal, rival, or partner; that this Being, infinitely perfect in his moral attributes, maintains a moral government over his creatures, the end of which is the promotion of the greatest degree of virtue and happiness. That *man* is the subject of his moral government, beneath which he is treated as a free moral agent, capable of choosing between right and wrong, and accountable for his choice; that in this world he is placed in a state of trial and probation, to form and bring out his character, in preparation for a final allotment in conformity *with* his character. That into this state of preparatory discipline he comes not with a character already fixed, but with certain rational faculties and moral capacities, in themselves neither good or evil; that he himself on entering life is neither virtuous nor vicious, neither holy nor sinful, neither an object of praise nor blame; but possesses such powers as when developed will render him one or the other, according to the habits he forms. That these powers are reason and conscience, which approve and lead to goodness; and the passions and appetites, which being connected with sensual objects and present gratification, incline to sensual indulgence and sin. That these opposing principles planted in the breast of man, are intended for man's trial, and its object is to exalt and purify his spiritual nature and deliver it from subjection to the sensual. That in order to aid man in this great struggle—to which from natural infirmities he

was often found unequal—it pleased God to commission his Son Jesus Christ to communicate all the knowledge, encouragement and aid, which might be necessary to his success and happiness; and to set an example of perfect purity of life, and continued resistance of temptation. That in the truths and institutions of the Gospel he has made a provision of means, which it is for man himself to use; and which he is left at liberty to use or refuse. “That these means are his own instructions as recorded in the Scriptures, and as connected with a previous dispensation; the worship and ordinances of his institutions; the spiritual influence granted in answer to prayer; his own life, death, and example, so fitted to affect and influence the heart and character; and the promises and threatenings of future retribution;” that the terms of acceptance to divine favour are faith in Christ, repentance of sin, and an obedient life; that future happiness is suspended on these conditions; those who comply with them shall be abundantly rewarded; those who hold out against them shall deservedly suffer the divine displeasure in future condemnation; “and finally, that as man had no claim to this revelation and aid from God, it is to be accounted the free gift of his grace, and therefore those who are saved, are saved not from their own unassisted righteousness, but by the grace of God.” I have attempted time and again to write you on these subjects as I now have done. I have thought seriously upon them, and tried to read the Bible and other good books in an unprejudiced manner; and the conclusion is irresistible—Baptism is given, in my opinion, as a seal of pardon, not as a saving ordinance. As a figure, representing that the soul is cleansed from sin just as the subject of this ordinance thus cleanses the body. Is obedience of life and purity of heart a necessary result of baptism? If it be, then I consider it a saving ordinance. Purity of heart and consequent obedience of life are the necessary results, and as it were, the offspring of repentance and faith, or the inward change which takes place in the heart. Hence their necessity. Hence without them we cannot be christians. But does the Bible teach that Baptism is necessary to a life of holiness and faith, or that without it no man can see God? It seems to me not. I have thus written a long letter with some haste. If you wish you may use such portions of it as you deem fit. But I have not written with that supposition.

Your Brother,

DANIEL.

REPLY.

MY DEAR BROTHER—I have not time to keep up a private correspondence with a tribe of my dear friends and brethren who favor me with their communications. I should much prefer such a medium of communication with you; but the want of time, and the remote possibility that my remarks may be of interest to some other readers, induce me to give the above extract from your very welcome epistle, and a few general remarks thereon.

You are just the age for theory and speculation. Your position strongly tempts you to philosophise upon God's plan of saving sinners. Most young men of independent, philosophic minds, prefer a splendid theory of religion to a system that appears to be at first sight enshrouded with mystery, and not exactly adapted to what we may deem the real state of

man. That God is one—that Jesus is his messenger, come to teach men virtue, and to set them a good example—that there is something so attractive in virtue and winning in all that is good and praiseworthy, that men disposed to receive this theory will most certainly become pure and godlike here, and shine among the stars hereafter. This, I repeat, is very plausible in theory; but facts, stubborn facts, prove that these theories are the most meagre skeletons of religion—destitute of soul and spirit. The fine theory, my brother, with which you have favored us, without the great facts of the Gospel, never awakened a sinner to a sense of his sins—never penetrated a soul with a conviction of its utter ruin, and God's unbounded love to man. Neither Paul, nor Peter, nor John, ever theorized after your manner, when they called the attention of sinners to what God was, what they were, and what God had done for them. All those fine-spun-philosophic systems are as cold as moonshine: they have light reflected and mild: by them you see things dimly; but they have no genial warmth. The sun of righteousness is not there: without him every thing must droop, and wither, and die.

In your fine theory, my brother, you have found no place for the facts *first* announced, and always kept most prominently before men by the Apostolic Heralds of Salvation. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we can be saved," said the Apostle Peter; and Paul was "determined to know nothing among men but Jesus Christ and him crucified;" and hence he "proclaimed first of all that Christ died for our sins;" "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is that Jesus is the Christ." Only by his death and resurrection could this glorious fact be demonstrated. The Messiah, predicted by the Ancient Prophets, was to be to the people a "root out of dry ground;" "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" "on him the chastisement of our peace was laid," and only "by his stripes were we to be healed." "He was to be led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb so he was not to open his mouth." Thus the sacrificial death and triumphant resurrection of our Lord Messiah, are the great facts of the Gospel. Over the systems that give them not a prominent place, we weep with Mary and exclaim "they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him!" You may reply, that many who hold and propagate something like your theory are among the excellent of the earth. Granted; but they were not made so by such theories. Some Atheists and Deists have been men of most amiable tempers—in all their intercourse with men just and upright; but it was not their unbelief that promoted their virtues.

Of late years we have heard, and in fact known some societies of Unitarians and Universalists, whose preachers have tried to imitate other religious Societies by holding other meetings than those on the Lord's day—called prayer, social, or conference meetings; but who beside the clergyman ever prayed or spoke? Seldom, if ever, any but those who had become religious in other societies. Systems and forms that lose sight of Jesus as the "Lamb of God bearing away the sin of the world" can never infuse life, energy, or power into any soul to make it either alive to God, or ardently devoted to the cause of human redemption.

And in reference to your views of Baptism, I would only remark that God has always made positive institutions just as necessary to the full enjoyment of his favor, as the Sacrifice in order to its procurement · in the testimony of God they stand or fall together. He who rejects baptism as not absolutely necessary in order to the full enjoyment of the benefits of the Saviour's death; for the same reasons may he renounce the death of Christ in order to the procurement of pardon and acceptance with God.

I never taught that "obedience of life and purity of heart were the necessary results of baptism!" But to those whose hearts were pierced by the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, I have repeated the divine precept: "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." The waters of Jordan did not possess any medicinal properties to cleanse a leper, but in them Naaman was made pure from leprosy. He could obtain this purity in no other way. If God has appointed the water of baptism as the place to which we must resort for the healing virtues of Jesus' blood, in vain do we seek it by any other means; unless indeed it can be proved that sincerity is the test of discipleship. In that case, Romanism, Mahommedanism, and various other conflicting systems are at par; for all these systems have their sincere admirers, and most conscientious devotees.

The above are only general hints. I intend giving your letter some further notice when I have more time: at present I am much pressed with many cares and duties. I am happy to inform you that all your relations are in good health. Let me hear from you often; and allow me to ask your re-perusal of my last letter in the previous volume.

Your Brother,

WENTWORTH.

CHRISTIAN TEMPER.—Our Lord, at the very outset of his public instructions, marks, at once, in the strongest and most decided terms the peculiar temper, spirit and character of his religion. He describes the christian temper as humble, meek, lowly, devout, merciful, pure, peaceable, and interesting.

The world calls it mean spirited, tame and abject, yet notwithstanding all this, with the divine author of our religion, this is the favorite character; this is the subject that runs through all the beatitudes. To this he assigns, under all its various forms, peculiar blessings.

To those who possess it, he promises that they shall inherit the earth; that they shall obtain mercy; that they shall see God, and be called the children of God.—*Christian Citizen.*

CHANGES IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—In the days of Edward VI. (1548) "In the administration of Baptism a cross was to be made on the child's forehead and breast, and the Devil was exorcised to go out, and enter no more into him. The child was to be *dip't* three times in the font, on the right and left side, and on the breast, if not weak. A white vestment was to be put upon it in token of innocence; and it was to be anointed on the head, with a short prayer for the unction of the Holy Ghost."—*Neal's History of the Puritans.*

RESTORATION OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF THINGS.

No. IV.

THAT the words of the Apostles shall be the only creed, formula, and directory of faith, worship, and christian practice, when the ancient order of things is restored, we have offered some evidence to show. The constitution and law of the primitive church shall be the constitution and law of the restored church. As the constitution and law then admitted all the faithful disciples of the Lord to an equal participation of all privileges; so when the same is again adopted, the same privileges will be extended to every orderly citizen of the kingdom. Without any of our modern creeds in substance or in form the church was once united, complete, and happy, and will be so again. For the same cause will always produce the same effect. When the disciples shall return to the Lord he will return to them.

In receiving members or citizens into the kingdom, or in naturalizing foreigners, it appeared, in our last essay, that nothing was required of them but an acknowledgment of the word or testimony of the witnesses concerning the King, Jesus of Nazareth. A hearty declaration, or confession with their lips, that they believed in their hearts, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, the Son of the Living God, the King and Lord of all, qualified them as applicants for naturalization. In the act of immersion into this name, they renounced every other Messiah, Lord, King, or Saviour; they put off their former religion, and renounced every religious obligation to any other system or authority, and put on Jesus as their Lord and King. From a consideration of the ancient order it appeared, that the apostles did not command men to be baptized into their own experience, but to the faith then delivered to the saints. It was affirmed that the ancient order was wiser, safer, and more honorable to the saving truth, than the modern way of receiving members into a baptist society, and some proof was presented.

In the present essay we shall make a few remarks upon another important preliminary to the restoration of the ancient order of things. There must be, and there shall be, an abandonment of the new and corrupt nomenclature, and a restoration of the inspired one. In other words, there must be an abandonment of the Babylonish or corrupt phraseology of the dark ages and of modern discoveries, in the fixed style of the christian vocabulary. This is a matter of greater importance than may, at first sight, appear to all. Words and names long consecrated, and sanctified by long prescription have a very imposing influence upon the human understanding. We think as well as speak by means of words. It is just as impossible for an adult to think as to speak without words. Let him that doubts make the experiment. Now as all correct ideas of God and things invisible are supernatural ideas, no other terms can so suitably express them as the terms adopted by the Holy Spirit, in adapting those supernatural truths to our apprehension. He that taught man to speak, would, doubtless, adopt the most suitable terms in his language to reveal himself to his understanding. To disparage those terms, by adopting others in preference, is presumptuous and insolent on the part of man. Besides, when men adopt terms to express supernatural truths, it is not the truths themselves, but their ideas of them they communicate. They

select such terms as suit their apprehensions of revealed truth, and hence the terms they use are expressive only of their conceptions of divine things, and must just be as imperfect as their conceptions are. It is impossible for any man, unless by accident, to express accurately that which he comprehends imperfectly. From this source spring most of our doctrinal controversies. Men's opinions, expressed in their own terms, are often called bible truths. In order, then, to a full restoration of the ancient order of things, there must be "a pure speech" restored. And I think the Lord once said, in order to a restoration, that he would restore to the people "a pure speech." We know that the ancient order of things, amongst the Jews, could not be restored, after their captivity in Babylon, until the law of the Lord, containing the primitive institutions of the Jews' religion, was read and understood by the people, and the dialect of Babylon abandoned, as far as it corrupted the primitive simplicity of that religion. Hence the scribes read them the law from morning to evening, gave them the sense and made them understand the reading. This became necessary because of the corrupt dialect they had learned in Babylon, on account of which their revelation was unintelligible to them, until the language of Canaan was purged from the phraseology of Ashdod. It will, we apprehend, be found precisely similar in the antitype, or in the return of the people of God from the captivity of Babylon the great, the mother of abominations.

But we shall go on to specify a sample of those Babylonish terms and phrases which must be purified from the christian vocabulary, before the saints can understand the religion they profess, or one another as fellow disciples. I select these from the approved standards of the most popular establishments; for from these they have become current and sacred style. Such are the following: "Trinity. First, second, and third person in the adorable Trinity: God the Son; and God the Holy Ghost. Eternal Son. The Son is eternally begotten by the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son. The divinity of Jesus Christ; the humanity of Jesus Christ; the incarnation of Jesus Christ. This he said as man; and that as God. The common operations, and the special operations of the Spirit of God. Original sin, and original righteousness. Spiritual death; spiritual life. Covenant of works, covenant of grace, and covenant of redemption; a dispensation of the covenant of grace, and administration of the covenant. Effectual calling. Free will. Free grace. Total depravity. Eternal justification. Eternal sleep. Elect world. Elect infants. Light of nature. Natural religion. General and particular atonement. Legal and evangelical repentance. Moral, ceremonial, and judicial law. Under the law as a covenant of works, and as a rule of life. Christian Sabbath. Holy sacrament. Administration of the sacrament. Different kinds of faith and grace. Divine service; the public worship of God," &c. &c.

These are but a mere sample, and all of one species. It will be said that men cannot speak of Bible truths without adopting other terms than those found in the written word. This will be granted, and yet there will be found no excuse for the above species of unauthorized and Babylonish phraseology. It is one thing to speak of divine truths in our own language, and another to adopt a fixed style of expressing revealed

truths to the exclusion of, or in preference to, that fixed by the Spirit, and sometimes, too, at variance with it. For instance, the terms Trinity, first and second person of—Eternal Son, and the eternal procession of the Spirit, are now the fixed style in speaking of God, his Son Jesus Christ, and of the Spirit, in reference to their “personal character.” Now this is not the style of the oracles of God. It is all human, and may be as freely criticised as one of the numbers of the Spectator. Yet because of the sanctified character of these terms, having been baptized or authorized by the orthodox and pious for centuries, it is at the risk of my reputation for orthodoxy, and at the expense of being charged with heresy, that I simply affirm that they are terms that the wisdom of this world teaches, and not the Spirit of God. I would not be startled to hear that I have denied the faith and rejected the revealed character of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, because I have said that the fixed style in speaking of them in the popular establishments is of human origin and of the language of Ashdod, and not of the language of Canaan. This, however, only proves that the terms of human philosophy are held more sacred than the words of the Holy Spirit. * * * *

But besides this species of sophistry there is another more dangerous, because more specious. This is really as foreign and as barbarous a dialect as that we have noticed, though in Bible terms. It consists in selecting Bible terms and sentences and in applying to them ideas totally different from those attached to them, by the Holy Spirit. Of this sort are the following: The natural man, spiritual man; in the flesh, in the spirit; regeneration, washing of regeneration; ministration of the Spirit, demonstration of the Spirit; power of God, faith of the operation of God, the grace of God; the letter, the spirit; the old and new covenant; word of God; the ministry of the word; truth of the Gospel; mystery, election, charity, heretic, heresy, blasphemy, church communion, baptism, faith,” &c. &c. &c. The former dialect rejects the words of the Holy Spirit, and adopts others as more intelligible, less ambiguous, and better adapted to preserve a pure church. The latter dialect takes the terms and sentences of the Spirit, and makes them convey ideas diverse from those communicated by the Spirit. We shall in this, as in the former dialect, specify one instance. Take for this purpose the sentence, “Through faith of the operation of God.” This the populars use to designate a faith wrought in the human heart by the operation of the great power of God. But the Spirit of God intended by this phrase to shew that christians in baptism had represented to them their resurrection with Christ to a new life, through a belief of the great power of God, exhibited in raising Christ from the dead. So the wisest teachers, and so all the learned translators of the last century understood it, amongst whom are, Pierce, Tompson, Macknight, and others. Macknight reads it thus: “Being buried with him in baptism, in which also ye have been raised with him through the belief of the strong working of God who raised him from the dead.” Now in relation to these two dialects there is one easy and safe course. The first is to be totally abandoned as transubstantiation and purgatory are by Protestants, and the other is to be tried by the context or design of the writer.

We cannot at present be more particular; but of these terms and ex-

tences we shall not be forgetful hereafter. It is enough at one time to suggest them to the consideration and examination of our readers.

The adoption and constant use of this barbarous dialect was the cause of making divisions, and is still one existing cause of their continuance. This style furnishes much matter, and many a topic to the gloomy Doctors who delight in metaphysical subtleties, and gains them much credit for their skill in mysteries, which they exhibit in their weekly attempts to unravel the webs which themselves and their worthy predecessors have woven. Let it be remembered that, as these terms were not to be heard in the primitive church, in restoring the ancient order of things they must be sent home to the regions of darkness whence they arose.

A. C.

EXTRACT FROM A CORRESPONDENT'S LETTER.

[The letter from which the following extract is made, was not designed for the public eye. But there are several most excellent suggestions in it, too good to be lost. The manner in which primitive truth was introduced to the inhabitants of Prince Edward Island—the working of that leaven—and the Jesuitical course pursued by some spirits to break up or retard the progress of the ancient order of things, with the varied fortunes of the cause, will, when laid before the community, form an interesting chapter in the history of the Reformation of the nineteenth century. Bro. D. must excuse the liberty taken with his letter. W. W. E.]

“When I first joined the Baptists here they appeared rather pleased, and seemed rather disposed to hearken to what I had to say, until the cry arose against Knox and the Campbellites, when prejudice obtained the complete ascendancy over the minds of the people. I presume you are aware of the discipline at Three Rivers, which terminated in Mr. Shaw's exclusion from the church, and how Brother Knox acted by the voice of the Church in the affair. The rest of the clergy took part with Mr. Shaw, and lost no time in going about, and straining every nerve to enrage the people against Mr. K.; representing him as the sole mover of the whole disturbance between Mr. S. and his church, and laying to his charge a host of the most grievous crimes; such as robbing people of property in meeting houses—urging people against their will to be baptized to secure their salvation—and supplanting Mr. S. for the sake of personal aggrandisement! A Missionary Board was formed, with the professed design of preaching the Gospel to the destitute settlements on the Island; but instead of that the Missionaries who come to these parts do not extend their labours a step beyond such settlements as have Baptist congregations and meetings house. This affords them a first rate opportunity of accomplishing their ends at a dollar per day. All who do not countenance these proceedings are regarded as the filth and offscouring of all things. I was at first inclined to think that brother K. had acted with too much rashness; but when I became better acquainted with the facts of the case, and more especially with the line of conduct pursued by the Missionaries themselves while here, I was compelled to expose some of their conduct, and their fearful expositions of the truth. Their only weapons of defence were, ‘He is a Campbellite!’ which in the popular view is

identical with having a Devil! I do not write these things from any pleasure that it gives me. I cannot think of them without pain! * * *

"I have long been of the opinion that had there been less controversy and more of the life of godliness manifested by those who plead a return to primitive order, the church of Christ would not have had so many grievous stains to wipe off, occasioned by the disorderly conduct of some of its leaders. I am, however, far from approving that mock charity which thinks that any one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven—an opinion, than which nothing is more destructive to the souls of men; and one which I have to combat almost every day: it is absolutely necessary for every one who holds the truth in righteousness to contend earnestly for it. But such is the deceitfulness of the human heart; and so very artful is the enemy of souls, that it requires constant study to fathom his devices. When one is confident he has a 'thus saith the Lord' for what he believes, how ready he is to be elated, to plume himself on his supposed goodness, and rest on his lees. In this case closet duties will become burdensome, or if attended to at all, instead of confessing his sins and imploring forgiveness and strength to resist the world, the flesh, and the devil, it will be to thank God that he is not as other men! But you will probably think me too fond of finding fault, and not out of need of the King of Israel's advice. 'Let not him that putteth on the harness boast as he that putteth it off;' or the Apostle's, 'Let him that standeth take heed lest he fall.' Be it so; we are more ready to mark faults in others than to amend our own." D. C.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY, *displayed as the only antidote against National Establishments, and Ecclesiastical Imposition.* BY JOHN M'CARTNEY. Glasgow. pp. 46.

(Continued from page 75)

These remarks may serve to prepare the mind of the reader for the due examination of the next proposition; and may enable him more clearly to perceive the reasonableness of the appointment of Infinite Wisdom, which renders it

IV. THE DUTY OF PASTORS TO SUPPORT THEMSELVES.

If scripture required that pastors should spend the flower of their age, in the acquisition of learning, to qualify them for their office; if the whole edification of a church devolved upon a single pastor; if the scriptures required that pastors should be wholly employed in the duties of their office, then we might reasonably expect, that a provision would have been made for them by the Chief Shepherd in his word. But if, as we have seen, classical learning is not necessary to qualify for this office; if, as we have seen, the duties of the pastoral office in a church are divided amongst a plurality; if, as we have seen, the ordinary members of a church are to contribute to its public teaching; then it follows, that pastoral duties being quite compatible with a due attention to secular affairs, their performance cannot give any just or reasonable claim to maintenance. But, as this claim must be determined by what the scriptures enjoin, to them we shall appeal for a decision on the subject.

Before adducing the scripture proofs, it may be proper to clear the subject of much of that misrepresentation which has been heaped upon it; and with which it is generally associated in the public mind. The most common way of mystifying this subject, and giving an appearance of scripture authority to the popular practice, is by CONFOUNDING THE DISTINCT OFFICES OF PASTORS AND APOSTLES. Indeed, so far as our reading extends, we never perused a defence of the right of pastors to support, (excepting those who found their claim upon the example of the priests and Levites under the law,) but what was founded upon this fallacious and deceptive principle of reasoning. The abettors of this deception have been frequently driven from it on the arena of public controversy, and their reasoning exposed in all its unscriptural deformity. Such, however, is the anxiety to perpetuate the popular practice; such is the indifference of professors to examine this subject for themselves, that many still practice this deception, and thereby blind the minds of superficial enquirers. To enable the enquiring reader to discover the fallacy of this principle of reasoning, and the unscriptural practices resulting therefrom, we shall briefly illustrate the *qualifications, duties and rewards* of Apostles, and compare them with those of pastors.

1st, Regarding the QUALIFICATIONS of Apostles, it was necessary. First, That they should be called and chosen by Christ himself. Luke vi. 13. Acts xvii. 14—xxvi. 16. Second, that they should have companied with the Saviour during the time of his personal ministrations. Acts i. 21, 22. 1 Cor. xv. 3. Luke i. 3. Third, That they should have seen Christ personally after his resurrection from the dead. Acts i. 3—i. 22—xxvi. 16. 1 Cor. ix. 2—xv. 8. Fourth, That they should have received their commission from Christ's own mouth. Matt. x. 5—xxviii. 19. Acts xxii. 14—xxvi. 16. Fifth, That they should have such a portion of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, as to guide them INFALIBLY into all truth. Luke xxiv. 49. Acts xx. 27. 1 Cor. ii. 16. Sixth, That they should have power to work miracles, in confirmation of the truths which they taught. Mark xvi. 15, 20. Heb. ii. 2, 4. 2 Cor. xii. 12. Reader, examine these qualifications, and the scriptures by which they are supported, and then estimate the arrogance, presumption, and daring impiety of those men, who, although destitute of *every one* of these qualifications, nevertheless conspire to make us believe that *they* are the SUCCESSORS of the Apostles and the AMBASSADORS of Christ.

2d, The DUTIES of the apostolic office may be summed up as consisting in preaching the gospel to all nations; illustrating the evidence of the truth of the divine testimony; teaching Christians to observe the "all things" which Christ had commanded; planting and watering churches; and promulgating, generally, the principles of Messiah's kingdom—the faith and obedience of the gospel. As the *sent* of Christ to introduce a new dispensation of his covenant, it was their *duty* to lay the foundation of the new testament church. As *ambassadors* intrusted with a message from heaven—with the ministry of reconciliation, it was their duty to beseech men in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God. Matt. xxviii. 19—xxviii. 18. John xx. 31. 1 Cor. iii. 10. 2 Cor. v. 20.

3d, The REWARDS of the apostolic office were chiefly of a spiritual

nature, those of a temporal nature, extending, not to gold and silver, merely to food and raiment. When Christ sent forth his Apostles on their first mission through the cities of Israel, he commanded them to make no provision for their journey, but to depend solely upon the bounty of those who received their testimony for their maintenance by the way: and he gave them a right to accept thereof, to the supply of their necessary wants. Matt. x. 9, 16. This was their *right* to live by preaching the gospel, a right given them by their Lord, and ordained by him. That this provision was adequate to the end for which it was ordained, is obvious; for, on their being questioned by the Saviour on their return if "they lacked anything," they said "nothing." Luke xxii. 35. Let it be carefully observed here, what the work was for which this right to food and raiment was granted; because, if this right is still to be appealed to, it must only be for the same, or similar labour as that, for the performance of which it was originally granted.

We shall now briefly advert to the *qualifications, duties and rewards* of pastors.

1st, The *QUALIFICATIONS* of pastors are minutely detailed in the Epistles of Timothy and Titus, as follows:—"A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach: not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover, he must have a good report of them that are without, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." 1 Tim. iii. 2, 8. Again, respecting the elders whom Paul left Titus in Crete to ordain, he writes—"If any* be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly. For a bishop must be blameless, as the Steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate, holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convince the gainsayers." Titus, i. 5, 9.

These qualifications are essentially different from the extraordinary qualifications of Apostles, being obviously all of an ordinary nature, and such as the ordinary operations of the Spirit and influence of the truth are calculated to produce in the subjects of divine grace. These qualifications, although they ought to be possessed by pastors in an eminent degree, are such as ought to be apparent in every Christian, so far as his situation and circumstances require their display.

2d, The *DUTIES* of pastors, as set forth in the 20th of Acts and the 5th of 1st Peter, may be summed up as consisting in holding fast the faithful word; exemplifying the christian virtues in their own deportment; guiding the flock into the rich pastures of divine ordinances; feeding the church with the words of eternal life; ruling the church by the doc-

* "If any" These words show that there is no limitation to the number that may be chosen to the eldership; the Head of the church intimating, by their possession of these qualifications, that they have been designed for that office.

administration of all the laws of the king of Zion; and keeping themselves from being burdensome to the church, when they possess the means of ministering to their own wants.

In comparing these duties with those of Apostles, it is obvious they differ essentially in their limits, those of Apostles extending to "ALL NATIONS," those of pastors merely to the individual "flock over which" they are ordained. Apostles were commanded to leave all for their work, but no such command is given to pastors.

3d, The REWARDS of the pastoral, like those of the apostolic office, are chiefly of a spiritual nature. While pastors are enjoined to take the oversight of the flock, not by constraint, but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind, they are cheered with the promise of a crown of glory that fadeth not away, at the appearance of the Chief Shepherd, 1 Peter v. 4. This is the primary reward attached to the faithful discharge of pastoral duties. 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 when they stand in need. These are all the rewards which the scriptures have attached to this office: 1st, A crown of glory that fadeth not away, when the Chief Shepherd himself appears; and 2d, A double portion of the esteem and honour of the church, which gives pastors a double claim to have their wants supplied, when through age, infirmity, or any other cause incident to humanity, they are deprived of the means of ministering to their own necessities.

Having made these remarks, to fix in the reader's mind the essential difference between the apostolic and pastoral offices, and show the necessity of preserving this clear distinction in the examination of pastoral claims, we shall now proceed to adduce the proofs in support of the proposition, that it is the duty of pastors to support themselves. And

1. *It is the duty of pastors to support themselves, because the scriptures have nowhere ordained that they should live by their office.* Of the potency of this argument, the advocates of the popular practice appear to be sufficiently sensible, from the care which they manifest in their defences, to substitute in the place of the ORDAINED RIGHTS OF PASTORS, the ORDAINED RIGHTS OF APOSTLES. If the scriptures have ordained pastors to live by their office, then why do not the advocates of this right found their claims upon this legitimate foundation? If the scriptures have not so ordained, then why build the claims of pastors upon the illegitimate foundation of apostolic right? This lack of scripture to institute and sanction pastoral claims is still more unaccountable, when contrasted with the Divine procedure in every other instance where support was intended. When priests and Levites were appointed to minister about holy things, they had a divinely-ordained right to live of the things of the temple and altar. When Apostles were sent forth to "teach all nations," they had such a provision ordained them, that they "lacked nothing." When the poor in the Christian church stood in need of maintenance, a specific ordinance was appointed to be observed weekly for their relief. How unaccountable then, that when the pastoral office was instituted, not one word was said respecting its giving a title to maintenance? But

II. We have not only a total want of a divine institution of pastoral maintenance on the one hand, but, on the other, we have, in the *very first* recorded instructions given to pastors, *the most pointed injunctions for them to maintain themselves by their own industry.* Paul, in that affecting farewell charge to the pastors of the church of Ephesus, after forewarning them of the introduction of the popular practice, takes them to record how he had been with them at all seasons, saying, "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 showed 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." Acts xx. 33, 36. Could language more explicitly establish our proposition, that it is the duty of pastors to support themselves? The most powerful reasons, even those of a coming apostacy, are here adduced to enforce this duty. The highest authority, even that of Christ, is here quoted to give weight to this obligation. The most disinterested example, even that of Paul, is here exhibited to enforce this practice. Paul, in common with the other Apostles, had an ordained right to food and raiment, and although he laid aside his exercise, yet he uniformly asserted this right as belonging to the Apostles of Christ. For what purpose then, we ask, did Paul lay aside his apostolic right to food and raiment, and subject himself to so many hardships and privations, in consequence? The answer which the Apostle himself has furnished to this question, ought to silence for ever the most audacious advocate of pastoral claims. He informs us that he did so for an **EXAMPLE** to the pastors of the Ephesian church, and not only to them, but to all who should follow after. The Apostle had a clear prophetic view of the injury which christianity would sustain from teachers counting gain godliness—men through covetousness making merchandise of God's people. He foresaw that his example would be laid hold of, to give a colouring of scripture example to the unhallowed traffic; and he was careful, as himself informs us, to "cut off occasion from them that desired occasion," and has caused his example to be recorded, as illustrative of the duty of pastors to support themselves. (2 Cor. xi. 12.)

The only direct charge to pastors, in scripture, is that given by the Apostle Peter, and therein the same duty is enforced, and, the same disinterested conduct enjoined. "The elders which are among you, I exhort, * * * 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; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." Peter v. 1, 4. We have here the same self-denied conduct enjoined, the same restriction imposed, against making a gain of this office. If language has any meaning, these words, "*not by constraint, but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind,*" can never be reconciled with the assumption that the pastoral office entitles to maintenance. If pastoral claims are scriptural, the Apostle has given a very unnecessary caution indeed, for pastors not to accept of this office *by constraint.* Constraint!

why, let the whole history of hireling teaching testify, if ever such an advice was found *even once* necessary. Constraint! why, take things as they really occur; a young man devoted to the ministry by his parents, perhaps from his birth, trained for the pastoral office, and put into it for a piece of bread, when the object of his longing desires is about to be realized, he must be gravely cautioned NOT TO ACCEPT OF THIS BY CONSTRAINT!! Upon no principle of interpretation can these words of the Apostle be understood, except that the duties of this office were to be performed gratuitously, without fee or reward. Upon this principle they are not only intelligible, but highly appropriate. For example, if a rich man were found qualified, and were chosen by the church to this office, he might be averse to accept of it, from a consideration of the duties which it would devolve upon him, and the difficulties which may frequently attend their discharge. While a poor man, similarly qualified and chosen, might be influenced to accept office, from a consideration of the expression of the esteem and honor of the church which it would secure him. The Apostle thus guards both classes against the temptations of their respective situations; the rich were not to accept office by constraint, but willingly; and the poor, not from any consideration of the christian law in his favour, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind.

III. A further proof, that it is the duty of pastors to support themselves, may be drawn from *the reproofs administered by the Apostles to those first churches, who either recognised or submitted to the imposition of their claims to maintenance.* Paul reproofs the Corinthians, saying, "ye suffer if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take of you, if a man exalt himself," &c. 2 Cor. xi. 20. This description is as applicable to the professors of the present day, as the example which Paul adduced to counteract this conduct, is neglected. "Did I make a gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you? I desired Titus, and with him I sent a brother; did Titus make a gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you? Walked we not in the same spirit? Walked we not in the same steps?" 2 Cor. xii. 17, 18. And again, to the Thessalonian church, he writes, "now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us. For yourselves know how ye ought to follow us: for we behaved not ourselves disorderly among you; neither did we eat any man's bread for nought; but wrought with labor and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you; not because we have not power," (as Apostles of Christ we have seen that they had power to forbear working, and accept food and raiment,) "not because we have not power, BUT TO MAKE OURSELVES AN ENSAMPLE FOR YOU TO FOLLOW US. For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if ANY would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some who walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. Now, them that are such, we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread. And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." 2 Thess. iii. 6, 15. The supreme authority by which this command is

given—"the Lord Jesus Christ;" its universal obligation on "every brother," "any man;" the exalted example by which it is enforced—"Paul, Sylvanius, and Timotheus;" the reasonableness of the thing commanded—"with quietness to work and eat their own bread;" the necessity for the church withdrawing from the fellowship of such as would not obey this precept, are all so exceedingly plain, that, although there was not another direction given in scripture on the subject, no Christian could be at a loss to discover the path of duty.

But this passage not only establishes the duty of pastors, as well as other Christians, to maintain themselves by their own industry, but it also prohibits churches from relieving their pastors from secular duties, under a pretence of devoting them wholly to the duties of their office. It is a prevailing opinion, even with many who admit that the scriptures have appointed no maintenance to this office, that nevertheless, if a church feel disposed to employ one or more of its pastors wholly in the church's service, and support them for that purpose, that they are at perfect liberty to do so. If churches have this liberty, then the example of Paul, Sylvanius, and Timotheus is not binding! Then all the labour and travail which they endured, is of no use as an example to pastors, if churches are at liberty to set aside the obligation of such example at pleasure! Then the command, "if any man would not work, neither should he eat," may be violated and disobeyed merely because a church feels disposed to do so! When will professors cease to make void the law of God through their traditions?

(To be Continued)

WHAT THE WORLD WANTS.—We want *self governing men*, for they only can do that work, without which the earth must continue to groan in bondage. Political institutions and literary institutions are of no avail. Standing armies are straw, when arrayed against the excited passions of a free people. The Republics of South America have been fields of blood, scenes of anarchy and despotism—a burlesque on the name of Republics; and the reason is, they have no religion there. The brute force of arms cannot now hold men, they must govern themselves. But they can never govern themselves till they fear God and keep his commandments. We cannot save civil liberty even—to say nothing of giving the gospel to every creature under heaven without men—men who were nurtured amid prayer, devoted to God and to the salvation of men from their infancy. We need whole generations of missionaries who shall rise up, clothed with salvation, and pour the streams of mercy, which shall flow from the throne of God, over all the earth.—*Todd.*

ROMAN CATHOLIC MIRACLES!

Some Fifteen years since there stood a Convent under the shade of Bunker Hill. So recreant had the sons of New England become to the zeal, devotion and faithfulness of their Puritan fathers, that Romanism was making rapid strides over their granite hills. Prelacy and priestcraft were seeking an asylum among those who by their tyranny were driven from the old world. Monuments of Romanism became conspi-

chous in many towns and cities of the Pilgrim fathers; and on Mount Benedict in sight of Boston were the walls of a Nunnery. The report, in progress of time, by some means got abroad that a female was kept within its gloomy recesses against her inclinations. Instead of calling to their aid the law or the gospel, the fiery sons of Charlestown, in opposition to both law and gospel destroyed the (to them) obnoxious Bastile. "Six months in a Convent," has been read, we suppose by a large proportion of our readers. The author of it to her dying day attested its truth. We do not purpose, however, at present to write an essay either on Romanism or Mount Benedict Convent; but merely introduce an extract to show how much confidence there is to be placed in traditions said to be handed down from the fathers. If in this day of steam printing presses, and when intelligence is sent with lightning speed, dignitaries in the Romish church will attempt to palm upon the world such a wholesale fabrication, what might not have been done in the "dark ages!" Indeed it is fearful to contemplate what was done! And more melancholy the reflection that so many are yet under the influence of ignorance and superstition so gross. But we deprecate physical force either in advancing truth or retarding the progress of error. Let truth have a fair field and she asks no favors from her enemies. To demolish any system of error, we need only men of God entirely devoted to the faith and practice of primitive christianity. We need primitive christianity walking about among us as it did when the disciples were of one heart and one soul; and then we should see all false systems melting away like the mists before the morning sun! But to the miracle. Read and be astonished that any *man* professing to believe in a God, to say nothing of a professed teacher of truth, would dare to publish such a wholesale fabrication:—

W. W. E

THE MIRACLE OF THE CHARLESTOWN CONVENT.—The way in which Papists deal with truth and miracle, has an exemplification in a letter written from Boston to Europe, and published in the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith." The letter is signed by the Very Rev. Dr. Brasseur de Bourbourg, Vicar General of Boston, and it must have been published by mistake. For surely the writer cannot have been so stultified, as to suppose that he could meet it before the Boston public without a clash. The letter is long, and we can afford room only for one extract, and that respecting the burning of the convent; which he says, was done by the "Puritan populace led on by some fanatical ministers."

"In the middle of the tumult one of the fanatics had ascended on the altar. I mention it in horror—with sacrilegious hand, he seized the holy Ciborium, [the vessel containing the consecrated wafers, supposed by the Papists to be the real body of Christ] emptied the precious particles into his pocket, and swelled with the satanic pride of Calvin, he went to an inn of Charlestown. Surrounded by a throng who were eagerly listening to his sacrilegious exploits, narrated in the presence of an Irish Catholic who listened with profound awe—the fanatic recognised the Irishman. Suddenly he drew from his pocket several hosts, and in a sneering tone, 'Here,' said he, exhibiting them, 'behold your God, what need you go any more to seek him in the church?' The Irish man was mute with horror. The sacrilegious man then felt himself

seized with a call of nature; he went out. But a quarter of an hour—a half hour elapsed—he returned not. A vague fear seized on the bystanders; by a presentiment which they could not account for, they go out and open the privy. The sacrilegious man lay there dead—dead by the death of Arius.

“I cannot state to you, Reverend Gentlemen, the unutterable sentiment of terror which then seized upon this troop of Protestants. The Irishman soon rushed forward in his turn, and, admiring in his heart the works of Divine Justice which so promptly smote the guilty, he cut the pocket containing the sacred particles, and, leaving the other spectators weighed down by the panic, which had, as it were, chained them round the tainted corpse, he ran to the cathedral, where he tremblingly consigned to the Bishop the august deposit which he had just secured possession of.

“This extraordinary fact, which forms so striking an episode in the history of the burnt convent, has been related to me by several ocular witnesses; some of whom were Protestants at this epoch, and have since become Catholics. Besides, it is known to the whole then existing population of Charlestown and Boston, as well as several other no less interesting facts of that epoch, so little known in Europe.”

Here we know not which to wonder at the most, the spirit of falsehood which could fabricate such a story, or the cool impudence which could assert that it was known to all the people, who will now hear of it for the first time. This is a specimen of ‘the signs and lying wonders,’ which are characteristic of that ‘mystery of iniquity.’—*Puritan.*

[FOR THE CHRISTIAN.]

THE PREACHER'S ADDRESS,

Altered from the celebrated War Ode of Burns.

Saints, who are by Jesus led,
Saints, for whom the Saviour bled,
Come, behold, his gory bed,
And his victory.

Now's the black and fearful hour,
See the clouds of darkness low'r,
See approach fell Satan's pow'r,
Stripes and agony

From destruction's woes and pains,
And from everlasting chains,
Jesus drain'd his dearest veins
That we might be free.

Since he died our souls to save,
Yes, his life an oil 'ring gave,
Who would fill a sinner's grave?
Dark with infamy

Who for Heaven's King and Law
Faith's bright sword will strongly draw?
Onward, to the glorious war!
Brothren come with me!

Lay the dread usurper low,
Satan is our deadly foe,
But as Christ will guide the blow,
We shall conquerors be.

Some object to entwining the popular airs of Ashdod, around the songs of Zion: as they call them the Devil's tunes; but properly speaking there are no Devil's tunes; for the evil is not in the tune but in the use that is made of them. And I would here suggest a consideration, to those who are lovers of music, but not lovers of God. That it is necessary to change, if they would have their taste gratified in the next world, for although, there is music in *Earth and Heaven*, there is none in *Hell!*

But in reference to those, who object to appropriating the best tunes we can find, in which to sound the praises of God. their opposition

arises from the influence of habit and education ; but more enlarged and correct views are fast gaining ground, although the use of such tunes at first appeared to jar upon both the ear and conscience of some who no doubt were both honest and well-meaning. To illustrate the power of habit, and the force of association, I relate the following occurrence.

A friend of mine was once in a Presbyterian congregation, in Ireland, and when the Precentor commenced singing, he observed an old woman to rise up hastily, and leave the meeting house ; he immediately followed her, to ask the reason of her sudden departure. She replied, "They are not singing an *evangelical* tune : there are only twelve evangelical tunes, and I believe the Apostles had a hand in making them."

Your Brother,

W. A. STEPHENS.

REMARKS

ON AN EFFORT OF "THE REV. WM. SOMERVILLE, A. M." TO PROVE INFANT BAPTISM.

THIS gentleman, of Cornwallis, N. S., is on a visit to our city. His courage and zeal in defence of infant baptism, in this pusillanimous age, are worthy of notice. His talent and skill in the management of an argument, employed in the cause of truth and righteousness, would place him among the useful men of the present day. But, alas, his apparent determination to sustain infant church membership at all hazards, or his entire confidence in the cause which he has so zealously espoused, makes him exceedingly reckless in his assertions. He is the only pædo baptist which we have heard for some time, who has the requisite confidence in himself and his system to court investigation ; but the high opinion which he appears to have of his own standing as a clergyman and as a disputant, has hitherto, so far as we are informed, forbidden his engaging in controversy with any one lower than a Doctor of Divinity, a Principal, or Professor, in some Baptist college. He refused to debate either the *action* or *subject* of baptism with Elder Howard ; but expressed his entire willingness to meet Doctors Crawley or Pryor ! It is a source of regret that some of the Baptist dignitaries do not gratify him with an opportunity of displaying his skill as a logician in defence of this relic of the Apostacy ! We feel no disposition however to chide the leading men among the Baptists for refusing to engage in a controversy with Mr. S., for of all the savage, bitter, sarcastic productions that have fallen in our way for years, the letters addressed by him to Mr. Pryor cap the climax. If he possess the ability to pour out as much more gall and wormwood in a protracted discussion as he has in that little pamphlet, we blame no one for avoiding a discussion with him ! For ourself we have much more confidence in the believer's immersion as the one only baptism, than we have in our ability to defend any question in a public oral disputation, and hence we should be very willing to avoid a debate with a man that can be so very severe in invective, until the cause of truth imperatively demand our services. We do really hope, however, that Mr. S. may yet succeed in calling out some of the learned men among the Baptists, that he may have a fitting opportunity to deliver himself, not only of what he has to say on the *probability* of infant

rantism, but also of his many cogitations of the awful tendency of baptist principles, which seem to be struggling within his soul for utterance.

Why such belligerent feelings should be possessed by Mr. S. towards the Baptists of N. S., is hard to divine. In this city there are Baptists and Presbyterians of almost every kind. The regular Baptists and the regular Presbyterians appear to be on very friendly terms—hold union meetings, and in many other ways co-operate in the spread of what they call evangelical christianity. Indeed there appears to be a much better feeling among the Baptists towards the Presbyterians than toward us, or, even the Free Christian Baptists. An individual who heard one of Mr. S's. addresses in the city, informed us that he had remarked that though there were several divisions among the Presbyterians, yet they all agreed on the subject of infant baptism. But were it not for the annual visit made by Mr. S. to Saint John, we would not learn from one year to another that a set effort was made by any one of the Pædo churches to defend its peculiarities in contrast with the Baptists. Some one has presumed to suggest as a cause of Mr. S's. hostility, that the Baptists on his circuit, in N. S., are more zealous and successful in making practical converts to immersion than he can find even of infants to sprinkle! But we presume not to assert that this report has any good foundation; we are only informed that in Cornwallis and Horton, the Baptists have had a great ingathering of their sons and daughters, on their *own* profession of attachment to Jesus Christ. This state of things surrounding a man of the conscious ability and self-esteem of Mr. Somerville, is sufficient to call into full play all his intellectual powers, to undermine those whom he seems to esteem his enemies, and far below him in moral and mental capabilities, and to make him more zealous to build up the cause of infant church membership.

But he ought before this time to have learned that so long as the Baptists can hold their own, and make occasional inroads upon those who were saints when they came into existence, but have apostatized from the church of their fathers—into which they were born without their knowledge or consent—they will risk nothing in a public discussion with a preacher whose denomination has little to lose, but every thing to win!

The Baptists, nevertheless, in our opinion, ought to discuss the "subject" and "mode" of baptism with Mr. S., for a large proportion of the Presbyterians think the Baptists either want confidence in themselves or their cause to meet Mr. S. Under these circumstances duty calls for courage.

It ought, perhaps, to have been stated, in the first of this article, for the information of some of our readers, that Mr. S. is denominated a *Reformed Presbyterian*. They will, however, understand him, denominationally, better by the cognomen of *Covenanter*. The latter name we highly venerate for the interesting reflections which it calls up of the devotion, firmness, and valor that cluster around its original devotees. Although we recoil at the thought of defending the Christian Religion by the sword; yet when we read of the sacrifices made by the ancient Covenanters of Scotland—their persevering efforts for conscience sake—their zealous opposition to the *Laingy* book of the church of England

we cannot but touch lightly on their resort to arms after suffering the loss of all things. Indeed we would honor their memories, and charge rather on the ruthless myrmidions of Charles, this too strong temptation to the violation of the Saviour's precept—"resist not the injurious," rather than upon these suffering non-conformists. But then to see and hear one of the favored sons of these old Covenanters zealously defending infant baptism, the practice of which has done more towards weakening Protestantism, and keeping in existence Romanism, than any one practice now prevailing among the evangelical sects, makes one feel sick at heart, and ready to despair of ever seeing the "man of sin" receive his mortal blow.

Having a meeting Lord's day evening, we had not an opportunity of hearing Mr. S's. first set effort to prove, from the Oracles of God, infant baptism. We have heard something of his discourse, and of the manner in which he endeavored to make out his cause. From two very attentive hearers, well-read in the whole controversy, we heard that on citing the case of the Jailor's household as a proof of infant baptism, and that the family was baptized on the faith of its head; he neither *read* nor *commented* on the fact, stated most explicitly by the sacred historian, that the Jailor "rejoiced believing in God *with all his household!*" We presume not however to review a discourse which we neither hear nor read.

On Tuesday evening, we heard the gentleman for ourselves; and we did anticipate an opportunity of requesting the privilege of making a few remarks, as we heard that he had thrown out a hint that he would endeavor to answer any questions that persons of "piety and discretion" might propound to him. But he got so earnestly engaged in the defence of his favorite views, that he kept us in a full half hour after the usual time of dismissing meetings before he concluded his discourse! Our position in the house was unfavorable for a hearing, several around were asleep, and he had granted only the privilege of asking questions, when we desired to show the manner in which he covered up and perverted the truth, that we let the opportunity pass without asking the privilege of speaking.

For a text, he took Malachi ii. 15. "And did he not make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth." This of course was coupled with 1 Cor. vii. 14. "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." On this last text he remarked, for the benefit of the mere English scholar, that the word rendered "holy" is from the same original word from which we have "saint." Hence to give a uniform rendering of the word, and one warranted by the original, the latter part of the passage would read "else were children unclean, but now are they *saints!*!" As though startled by the grossness of the conclusions to which it was evident the mass of his hearers would come, he passed on to another point with scarcely an additional remark; although from his text and this introduction, we anticipated an effort to prove that *saints* were made not by

a reception of the "will of God," or by the regenerating influence of his spirit, but by *natural generation*, provided only that one of the parents was a believer. And, indeed, through a labored effort of nearly two hours, he dropped not a hint to relieve the mind of this impression! Can it be possible that he ever read John i. 12, 13. "To as many as received him, believing on his name, to them gave he power [right or privilege] to become the sons of God; who was born *not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God?*" Did he ever lose sight of his doctrine, of the *total depraved infant, born a saint*, long enough to read the words of Jesus, (John iii. 6) "That which is born of flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit, is spirit?" And is it possible he can use his fine discriminating powers and prostitute all his acquisitions to teach that believers propagate *saints* contrary to the express words of the Divine Redeemer, and the whole tenor of God's holy oracles!! A man as well read as Mr. S., must have known that one of the best Presbyterian biblical critics [Dr. George Campbell] that Scotland has ever produced, has shown clearly and unanswerably that the word here rendered *holy*—which Mr. S. would translate *saint*—has no such meaning (necessarily) attached to it! His words are, "In regard to the word *hagios*, I acknowledge that it does not seem to me to have had originally any *relation to character and morals.*" Among other passages quoted by Dr. C. to illustrate his views of the meaning of this word, is this very passage under consideration.

In relation to Mr. Somerville's evident design in quoting I Cor. vii. 14, we have a passing remark. He left the impression on our mind, and we presume on that of all his attentive hearers, that he considered this text so obviously in favor of the sanctification of infants for the ordinance of baptism in consequence of the parents' faith, that he did not deem farther detailed comments necessary! But, so far, is this celebrated text from being a proof of this tradition, we shall "show that it is decidedly *against* infant baptism!" Indeed we do not now remember one argument, or a single passage of scripture, on which Pædo Baptists rely for proof of this dogma, if clearly understood, or carried to its legitimate issue which would not go against it. But to the true meaning of I Cor. vii. 14. "We think that it may be made evident to all intelligent and candid persons, from this passage, that infant membership was never thought of during the apostolic age. It is a wonder that Baptists have not understood it more generally, and made more use of it in all their discussions of this question. Most commentators and learned men, have, in their dissertations on this passage, wholly mistaken the most prominent point in it, which would have decided the whole matter. They have supposed that Paul here, to illustrate his meaning of *holy* and *clean*, and their contraries, *unsanctified* and *unclean*, referred to the children of persons intermarried with unbelievers. and not to the children of the whole church. In one word, they make Paul say, 'else were *their* children unclean,' instead of 'else were *your* children unclean,' but now are *they* *holy*. This mistake most evidently led them astray.

"The case is this—a question arose, in Corinth, whether person intermarried, one party a christian, the other a pagan, ought to continue as husband and wife, and still live together. It was referred to Paul.

He takes up the matter, and using the words *clean, sanctified* and *unclean* in the current ecclesiastic and Jewish sense, affirms that "The unbelieving wife is sanctified to the believing husband, and the unbelieving husband to the believing wife: otherwise *your children* were unclean, but now are they holy." As our food is said by Paul, to be "*sanctified* by the word of God and prayer," so he uses the word here, not to denote *real* holiness, but that kind of lawfulness or holiness in the use of present things, authorizing such use of them, and an intimate civil connexion with them. It is not, then, *legitimacy* of wives, husbands, and *their children*; but whether believing and unbelieving parties might, according to the law of Christ, continue together. Paul's response is briefly this. They may live together, they are sanctified or clean persons, as to one another in this relation. If you may not do so, you must put away your children also, for all your children stand to you, as do those unbelieving, unholy persons. If you must reject your unchristian, unprofessing husbands and wives, you must, for the same reason, reject all your unprofessing, unbelieving children. Does not this passage, thus, conclusively prove that infant membership and infant baptism had never occurred to any in Corinth? for in that case Paul's proof would have been taken from him by one remark, such as—No, Paul, we may retain our children, for they have been baptized, and are not at all like our unbaptized, and un sanctified wives and husbands. We, therefore, contend that in 1 Cor. vii. 14, we have, at length, found a clear and invincible evidence that infant sanctification, or dedication, or affusion, or immersion, or baptism, had never entered the mind of Jew or Gentile, that all the children of the members of the church at Corinth, stood in the same *ecclesiastic* relation to the church, as did the unbelieving, un sanctified, unbaptized fathers and mothers. Paul does, most undisputably, place all the infant children in the church in a state of such cleanness as unbelieving parents occupy towards believers. This passage, when correctly understood, will go farther than a thousand lectures to displace this superstitious usage from the church.

"The usual argument from this passage is, indeed, a good one: That if the relative holiness of the child gives it a right to baptism, then the relative holiness of the unbelieving father and mother, would also give them a right to this ordinance. But this is an argument designed not for the question, but for the party.

"To recapitulate this argument, let it be observed that the main question turns upon *your children*, and *their*, the parties' children. That the children of all the members of the church in Corinth, stood in the same relation to the church as did their unbelieving parents, and that if it would be lawful to baptize the children on the faith of one of the parents, because of being sanctified to their parents; then it would be equally right to baptize the unbelieving party on the faith of the other, or because sanctified in, to, or by the other."

If Mr. S. should ever deign to notice these remarks upon his discourse, we hope he will do his best to set aside this exposition of his favorite text; for we regard it as a demonstration, that infant membership was unheard of in the apostolic age.

There is only one other point in Mr. S.'s second discourse that we

shall have time or room to notice at present, and that is a remark of his in reference to the celebrated John Bunyan, the author of "Pilgrim's Progress," the "Holy War," etc. He spoke highly of the talent and piety of Bunyan. This was rather surprising, for, if we understood Mr. S's views of the "mode" of baptism (it is now, near two years since we read his pamphlet), he contends that immersion is not a scriptural mode; and also that the baptism, for which he contends, is necessary in order to regeneration. How he can reconcile these views with the piety and inspiration of the celebrated Bedford tinker, is not a little surprising.

But to the use he made of Bunyan. He said he had often been surprised at one incident in the "Pilgrim's Progress." After Bunyan had given an account of Christian's journey from the city of destruction to the celestial hill, he gives a history of the pilgrimage of Christiana, and her children (Christian's family), and a young woman, a neighbor of Christiana, named Mercy. But we will give the account in Bunyan's own words: "Wherefore, methought, I saw Christiana, and Mercy, and the boys, go all of them up to the gate; to which when they were come, they betook themselves to a short debate about *how* they must manage their calling at the gate, and what should be said unto him that did open to them. So it was concluded, since Christiana was the eldest, that she should knock; and as her poor husband did, she knocked and knocked again." [After all had been much terrified by the barking of a dog.] "The keeper of the gate said, Who is there? and what is it that you would have? Christiana answered, we are come from whence Christian did come, and upon the same errand as he, to-wit, to be, if it shall please you, graciously admitted by this gate, into the way that leads to the celestial city. I am Christiana, once the wife of Christian, that now is gotten above. With that the keeper of the gate did marvel, saying, What! is she now become a pilgrim, that, but awhile ago, abhorred that life? Then she bowed her head, and said yes; and so are these my sweet babes also. Then he took her by the hand and led her in, and said also, '*Suffer little children to come unto me;*' and with that he shut the gate. Now, all this while, poor Mercy did stand without trembling and crying, for fear she was rejected. But when Christiana had got admittance for herself and her boys, then she began to make intercession for Mercy. Now Mercy began to be very impatient, and each minute was as long to her as an hour; wherefore she prevented Christiana from a fuller interceding for her, by knocking at the gate herself, &c." At last Mercy gained admission in a manner similar to Christiana.

The point in the narrative that surprised Mr. S. was that a Baptist, as Bunyan was, could represent Christiana's children as admitted on her faith and intercession. This appears evident to him from the fact that Mercy not being of her family, had to intercede for herself! [Whether Bunyan considered the entering through the "wicket gate," becoming a member of the church, we know not; for he represents Christian as passing in with a great burden upon his back! Indeed Christian ran quite a long race on the "straight and narrow road," and received much instruction at the "interpreter's house" before he found the cross and the sepulchre for his sins!] But then we are not apologists for

either Bunyan or those who differ from him, and we must therefore leave these difficulties for those who are better skilled in resolving enigmas, and visions, and dark sayings!] To return. The only way that Mr. S. could account for such a peculiarity in the production of a Baptist, was that the above account was not given as a Baptist, but that he must at that time have been writing under the direction of the spirit of God, "*who put words in his mouth and thoughts in his heart!*" We wrote this last sentence as he uttered it.

This is certainly a summary way of settling the controversy. If "Anabaptists" are occasionally inspired when writing Religious Novels, then certainly may those who are born saints, and receive the true baptism, be constantly inspired when writing in defence of a doctrine of as much moment to every Pædo Baptist as that of infant church membership. That a Protestant, more especially a Covenanter, should represent any man since the Apostles, as under the inspiration of the Spirit, when writing on any subject is marvellous; but that God should specially guide any man in the production of a Novel like the "*Pilgrim's Progress,*" is too much for any one to receive who glories in saying "*the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants!*" We have a few questions for Mr. S., or for any other advocate of infant baptism. It has been reported to us, that he has so high an opinion of his powers as a logician that he can argue either side of any great moral and religious question. He certainly knows what is expected of the man who takes the affirmative of a question; and yet he very frankly confessed that he *could not refer to one instance of the baptism of an infant!*

1. Will Mr. S. inform us, and the public, as a logician, how many probabilities and inferences it takes to prove the affirmative of a proposition?

2. As a Presbyterian will he let us know, how he reconciles his obligation to teach according to the confession of faith, which says "*Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament,*" with the assertion that baptism "*is a divinely instituted rite of the former dispensation?*"

3. To be consistent with the advocacy of infant baptism, and the church membership of unconscious babes, how can he object to their receiving the Lord's supper with him? By excluding them from this ordinance, does he not shut the kingdom of heaven against them equally with the Baptists, who refuse them baptism?

W. W. E.

POSITION IN PRAYER—A QUERY.

BROTHER EATON.—Will you be so kind as to inform a constant reader of your interesting monthly periodical, what the customs of the *ancient disciples* were, in regard to the particular position of their body, at the time of offering up prayer, when assembled for the worship of God? That is, was it a custom for them during the time of prayer, to sit, kneel or stand? I am particularly anxious for you to give me all the information you possibly can upon this subject. In the Acts of the Apostles, *xx. 36*, I read that Paul kneeled down and prayed with them all. It is my opinion that it is the preacher's duty to kneel when offering up prayer to God for the congregation. I have recently been informed that it is the practice of some congregations professing to adhere to the "an-

“ ancient order of things ” for the preacher to stand while he is praying, and the congregation to sit !

This custom of standing and sitting in the time of prayer in the house of God, and that too in the time of worship, and on the Lord’s day, appears to me, to be a strange mode of worship, and more especially so among congregations of the followers of Jesus Christ, professing a determination to return to the “ ancient order of things.”

CONDONO.

RELPLY.

BROTHER C.—What means have we of information that you do not possess ? Why ask us what position you should occupy while engaged in prayer ? I presume that this query is rather to call attention to what the Bible says, rather than to get our judgment in the case. This being the motive, it is all right. Let us avoid making conductors of Periodicals, or our Elders and Bishops oracles. Should we do so, we will build again what we have been trying to destroy. We ought to obey those who have the rule over us, while they rule in the fear of the Lord, and according to his word ; but we must remember that there is neither a law *making* nor a law *explaining* power in the church. Jesus Christ is the one lawgiver, and the teaching and practice of the Apostles and the first congregations are the law interpreting power. We must compare spiritual things with spiritual, to understand his word. There can then be but one other power in any rational government, and that is an executive—a power to see the laws are obeyed. For this purpose every congregation ought to have a competent body of overseers possessing the qualifications ordained by the Apostle Paul. (1 Tim. iii. and Titus i.) Conductors of religious papers are useful to exchange thoughts and reflections, and to aid each other in obtaining religious knowledge. If in this way we can be useful, it will give us pleasure to hear and attend to the queries and suggestions of the brotherhood, and of all our readers.

Now for the question ; should we sit, stand, kneel, or prostrate ourselves when we speak to God ? We do not now call to mind an express *precept* prescribing any particular posture in prayer. The example of the Saviour and the primitive saints should be carefully noticed, and as far as possible, imitated by us. We should rise superior to even established usages, when they do not exhibit proper reverence for God and his institutions. The practice of sitting while the Lord Almighty is being addressed, is most shocking to our own veneration. The Psalmist says, “ O let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord, our Maker.” Patriarchs and Prophets, and men distinguished for holiness, not only kneeled but prostrated themselves with their faces towards the earth, when they called upon God ! Witness the records we have of Moses and Aaron, Elijah, Elisha, Jeremiah, Daniel, and others. Even the great King Solomon in the presence of all Israel—standing—kneeled before God when he offered his supplications to the Lord at the dedication of the temple. And in the Garden of Gethsemane, a greater than Solomon, prostrated himself when pleading with his Father. Paul says, I bow my knee to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. And, as you have well observed, we have several accounts of Paul’s kneeling down, even in the open air, on the sea shore, and in the suburbs

of a city, and calling upon the Lord. A careful examination of these cases must call up many others, that would suggest the necessity of bowing the knee when we presume to supplicate favors from our Heavenly Father. Indeed, the instance does not now occur to us, when any patriarch, prophet, or apostle, ever offered a set prayer to God, either standing or sitting! Too many of us are in the daily habit of taking our seats at table previous to giving thanks, and some disciples sit even at the Lord's table while thanks are being given for a Saviour's love, and the monumental loaf and cup; but it is to be hoped that such *apparent* indifference is owing more to thoughtlessness, than to a real want of reverence for the great author of our being.

When the Lord fed the thousands on a few loaves and fishes, he commanded them to sit. The impression made on the mind by these accounts, is, that he stood and gave thanks, and then broke and passed the broken food to the multitude. From this, it is presumed, that the practice of sitting at table before giving thanks has become so common. As to the position at the Lord's table, much, we presume, depends on customs which prevail at ordinary meals. The probability is that the Saviour and the Apostles reclined; but Israel, in primitive times, ate the pass-over standing. Why this custom should have given place to that of reclining at full length, we are not informed. On the whole, from an attentive perusal of the word of the Lord, and from that which is comely and best calculated to express the emotions of a soul under the influence of the gospel of God's grace, we conclude that during the offering of public and social prayer, not only the brother who calls audibly on God, but all who unite with him mentally should, if possible, bow their knees before God. At the Lord's table, and at our ordinary repasts, standing reverently before God, with the eye closed, that nothing may turn off the attention from the object of worship, appears to us the most fitting to express adoration, gratitude, and thanksgiving. And we would also, in this place suggest the propriety of having the mind so occupied, while thanksgiving and supplication are being presented to the Lord, that every one may from the heart and understanding respond AMEN.

These general, and desultory remarks are made more for the purpose of inducing a careful and thorough investigation of the subject—that all may act from a conviction of God's will—than for the purpose of settling the question. Let us all remember that we are not our own, we are bought with a price, and we should glorify God with our *bodies* and our spirits which are his.

Fraternally yours,

W. W. E.

Milton, Indiana, April 4th, 1848.

BELOVED BROTHER EATON:—Your kind letter of March 24th, came to hand last night, and I am now seated, though pressed with business, to try to comply with your kind invitation, in preparing a few thoughts for your valuable pamphlet, styled "The Christian." And, in the first place, allow me to express my hearty concurrence with you, in the propriety and utility of such a friendly correspondence as that suggested by yourself. Of all men in this world of sin, the brethren engaged in the publishing department, in defence of the Holy Bible, ought to exhu-

bit to the world the most complete harmony of spirit, and uniformity of action. We ought to shew forth a pure system of co-operation, and thus prove by our conduct, that the great object with us all is, the enlightenment, cultivation, and elevation of our race, that we may thus be instrumental in delivering man from the manacles of sin and death, and thus qualify him for the glorious liberty of the children of God. What a God-like calling! How high and heavenly should be the minds of men engaged in such a holy co-operation with the grace of God.

One selfish, jealous, partizan spirit, who has worked his way into public notice, and obtained an extensive circle of admirers, in a few months can sow the seeds of death so plentifully, in the publishing department, that many good men, in many years, may not be able to subdue the noxious weeds which will spring up from such seed. And, you know, that weeds, briars and thorns will frequently grow more rapidly without any cultivation, than the precious grain which will support life, will, when cultivated. I believe the same is true of almost every evil. In this arrangement, it appears to be in the power of one enemy to God to do more evil than many good men can do good. One bad boy, who will turn from the weeds and grass, and commence cutting down the corn, can do more harm than fifty good boys can balance in doing good. In the same way, an editor who will do any thing to nurture and cultivate a selfish, envious and partizan spirit, can do more harm than several good men can do good.

How many of our publications will be an honor to us in the day of judgment is a question that will not be decided till that most wonderful of all days; but one thing, it appears to me, ought to be obvious to all, and that is, that editors of religious papers, should shew as much courtesy and brotherly love for each other, and as much of a desire for the success of each other as ministers of the gospel should shew towards each other. And it is manifest to all that no minister of the word is possessed of the spirit of our Master, who exults over the downfall of his brother proclaimer. Nor can any editor be possessed of the spirit of Christ, who would exult in the fall of a brother editor; but on the other hand, we should certainly do every thing in our power to encourage each other onward. And I can see no better way to do this, than that suggested in your letter, viz., to write for each other's publications.

Not to protract remarks of this kind, I will proceed to notice some of the retarding influences with which the gospel has to contend. The Apostle Peter says, to the "elect according to the foreknowledge of God." "Seeing that ye have purified yourselves in obeying the truth through the spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." 1 Peter i. 22, 23. According to this passage, the word of God is the incorruptible seed, which *liveth and abideth forever*. This is the same word or seed which our Saviour says, "*IS SPIRIT and life*." Seed of any kind, cannot be better than *unadulterated, living, spirit and life*.

Now, in all kindness, I should like to hear some man shew the consistency, in any one who claims to be called and sent of God to preach

or to sow the good seed, but who in the place of sowing it, tries to persuade the people that *it is dead and powerless!* What fruit can such instrumentality produce? Suppose a farmer should go into a good field with a quantity of good seed, and in the place of sowing it bountifully, he contends that it is *dead*. What kind of a crop could he expect? Now, I am willing to admit; that if the sower would sow the seed, it would grow, if he should contend that it was dead; but those spiritual sowers who believe the divine seed is dead, do not sow it at all; but spend their time in trying to make every body else believe as they do. All such preaching as this is calculated to diminish the importance of reading the scripture, and preaching of the gospel—the sowing of the unadulterated seed—the word of God. Who will take any interest in reading the scripture, or promulgating it to the world, believing all the time that it is a dead letter? But what is worst of all, is that such preaching contradicts the scripture. While the Lord says his word “is *spirit* and *life*,” such teaching says it is *dead!* While the Apostle says, “it *lives* and abides forever,” they say, it does not *live*.

Those who become imbued with the spirit of this kind of teaching, almost imperceptibly are led into a class of expressions directly calculated to neutralize the influence of the word of God. They call it the “*mere word*,” the “*bare word*,” a “*dead letter*,” &c. &c., in the place of calling it the “*power of God* unto every one that believes,” and saying that “it is able to make thee wise unto salvation,” as Paul did. But if you will approach such a teacher, and tell him that his word is his *mere word*, his *bare word*, &c., he will feel himself insulted; yet he thinks it no insult thus to speak of the word of the Almighty Jehovah!

Those who profess to be authorized to sow this good seed are not contented with finding fault with the word of God, in asserting that it is a dead letter, but they have demonstrated that they believe what they say, by that which speaks louder than words—their *actions*. It would be inconsistent to say the word of God is a dead letter, and then use it for an all-sufficient rule of faith and practice for the church. Hence they have set it aside as a creed, and have made other creeds for the government of their churches which are *not dead letters*, but mighty through the clergy even to the opposing of the word of God.

There is one thing however, in this, that I never could see through. They always tell us that they can prove these other creeds by scripture. If this is so, I cannot see wherein that which can be proved by a dead letter can be any better than the dead letter itself! If the proof of creeds is dead, powerless, and wanting in force, whence do they derive their power?

These to whom I have referred, allow that the mere evidence of the *mere word* of God that a man has the forgiveness of sins, is quite insufficient; but when we call in question the lawfulness of their creeds, they exclaim with great confidence, we can prove them by the word of God. Thus, with them, the word of God is no evidence in one case, and the best of evidence in another!

It is not only the case that some teachers of religion find fault with the seed God has commanded to be sown in all the world, but they find fault with the soil in which God has commanded it to be sown. The

Lord however, admits that there are six qualities of soil. Three of these qualities produce nothing. The ground by the way side, the stony ground, and the thorny ground, proved entirely fruitless. The fault was not in the seed, but in the soil. But the Lord did not make all the soil, way side, stony and thorny, else there would be some propriety in saying the human race are totally depraved. He spoke of some good ground, and of this he has three classes, some of which yields thirty fold, some sixty and some an hundred.

Sectarian gospel or seed then, is dead, and the soil, the hearts of the people, totally corrupt, all wayside, stony or thorny ground, that will not produce any thing. If dead seed and such soil as this should ever produce any good fruit, it will be by some process not yet discovered in the kingdom of nature or of grace.

But by sowing the living seed—the word of God, unadulterated, in good ground, a good and honest heart, that understands and obeys it thus purifying the soul in obeying the truth, it will produce fruit abundantly to the honor and glory of God.

Your fellow-laborer, in Christ,

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

FRATERNAL CO-OPERATION OF EDITORS.

DURING the three or four years, in which we have had the controul of a publication, the semblance of a rupture, or even of ill-feeling between us and those engaged in the same cause has existed neither in form nor in fact. To perpetuate this state of things, we most heartily respond to a proposal made by brother Hall of the "Gospel Proclamation," which is, that conductors of all publications devoted to the restoration of the ancient order of things, in the course of the year, write for each other's periodicals. We will take the liberty to add to the resolution, that the subjects on which each one shall write, will be that which, he thinks, most needed by the readers of the work for which he writes; and, also that the article shall be written expressly for the paper to which it is addressed. Whether any agree to this amendment or not, is a matter of no great consequence to us. If all the brethren will go for the original resolution in some form or other, we shall be satisfied. Without arguing the great benefits that would result to the brotherhood and to the cause, generally, from such a co-operation, we purpose, the Lord willing, manifesting our good will by tendering to each of our brother editors a short article, in manuscript, and shall confidently anticipate an early response. They, no doubt, who find time to glance at our pages, often see the necessity of other themes being spread before our readers, which through ignorance or inattention we neglect. They will please fill the vacancy. Having occasion, recently, to write to brother Benjamin Franklin, of the "Western Reformer," we called up brother Hall's proposal, and, as our readers will see, he has at once complied with our request by furnishing our readers an interesting article.

A brother greatly beloved by all who know him, either personally, or by reputation, E. A. Smith, of Kentucky, calls for a convention of editors to meet at Bethany, or some other central point, "to consult freely as to what course, we all can agree in pursuing," in order we presume, to present

a more efficient front against error, and in defence of the Apostolic Gospel, and the whole truth as it is in Jesus. We now have the "Genius of Christianity," the "Millennial Harbinger," "Christian Intelligencer," "Gospel Proclamation," "Protestant Unionist," "Western Reformer," and "Christian Record," which we receive; and then we hear of the "Messenger and Advocate," "Christian Magazine," "Ecclesiastical Reformer," "Christian Mirror," "Christian Teacher," "Christian Journal and Union," "Investigator," one or two called "The Christian," and others in the United States. "The Witness of Truth," in Canada; several in Great Britain, and "The Christian" for these Eastern regions. America furnishes near *twenty* publications, each one with apparent zeal, and in good faith, advocating a return, and a steadfast adherence to the teachings the Oracles of God.

Brother Campbell is the senior editor. He thinks there are too many publications. He seems favorable to convention of editors and brethren sometime in September. Persons unacquainted with him, might suppose that his objections were dictated by a desire to have the field to himself, or from selfish considerations. We think otherwise. Some time in 1842, he assured me personally, that notwithstanding his numerous books and publications, he was in doubt whether the balance was for or against them. That is, after printing and publishing *twenty years* he thought the receipts had barely met the actual expenses. Who of all our Editors can tell a better tale of pecuniary results? Why then do we publish? *We hope to do good*—to be *more* useful than we could be *viva voce* alone. This I believe to be the grand motive of the entire brotherhood editorial. Every publication has a local interest, and every new effort is put forth with fresh vigor, and consequently we circulate more intelligence, and have *seven* times more readers than we should have with two or three publications, *unless all the present writers could take the same interest in the two or three papers, that they now take in their own.*

We, once, thought differently. Sometime before we thought of conducting a publication, we had a correspondence with brother Cribfield, then editor of the "Heretic Detector," on the propriety of fusing all the papers into one, and devoting the entire profits to the support of Evangelists, to enable them to sound out the word of the Lord, where the truth in its purity had not yet been heard. We agreed in our opinion, but no effort was ever made to carry the plan into effect. Our opinion now is, that each editor is better acquainted with the state of things in the vicinity of his own locality, and is, consequently, more capable of adapting his communications to their wants than the most gifted can be at any central point. What, therefore, we lack in talent, as writers, we make up in adapting our efforts to the situation, capacity, and known wants of our readers.

And then we have in the sacramental hosts of God's elect, many zealous spirits that must have a publication called "*my own*," in which we intend to print and publish what we please! As well might we attempt to roll the Mississippi back to its source, as to stop the onward progress of such spirits. They must have their day. If they sometimes write and publish that which is puerile and uncalled for (and who does not),

refrain from them, and let them alone; they will soon find their level. It is impossible to kill one of our "Reformation Editors!" Detract one iota from their real or supposed merits, and you will raise up for them hundreds of friends. Such are some of our reflections. But be it known to all, we are willing to merge *The Christian* into any kind of a publication, and do our utmost to circulate it, if it can be adapted to our own wants. But we can assure our brother editors, that we can get ninety-nine readers for ourself to one for any other publication, and we suppose this to be the case with all the rest.

In our next we will suggest a publishing plan for the consideration of any who may please to give it a reading. In the mean time, we pray Heaven to bless the efforts of the entire brotherhood, be they writers, speakers, or hearers.

W. W. E.

FRANKLIN'S APOLOGUE ON WAR.—In what light we are viewed by superior beings may be gathered from a piece of late West Indian news, which possibly has not reached you. A young angel of distinction being sent down to this world on some business, for the first time, had an old courier spirit assigned him as a guide. They arrived over the seas of Martinico, in the middle of the long day of obstinate fight between the fleets of Rodney and De Grasse. When through the clouds of smoke he saw the fire of the guns, the decks covered with mangled limbs, and bodies dead and dying; the ships, sinking, burning, or blown into the air; and the quantity of pain, misery and destruction, the crews yet alive were thus with so much eagerness dealing round, to one another: he turned angrily to his guide. "You blundering blockhead, you are ignorant of your business; you undertook to conduct me to earth, and you have brought me to hell!" "No, sir," says the guide, "I have made no mistake; this is really the earth, and these are men. Devils never treat one another in this cruel manner; they have more sense and more of what men (vainly) call humanity."—*Letters to Priestley.*

SUCCESS OF THE ANCIENT GOSPEL.

The *Millennial Harbinger* for March, reports the addition to the army of the Lord *one thousand one hundred and eighteen.*

Brother Morten, writes from Liverpool, N. S., that brother John McDonald's visit to the congregation in Milton, had resulted in the confession and immersion of three: others confidently expected; the brethren are also being revived.

Brother W. M'Donald writes, on the 11th instant, that up to that time Brother Dealtry had immersed one hundred and one, in Halifax, since last fall. May the Lord bless the efforts of all his faithful laborers.

LETTERS RECEIVED.—D. Fullerton, George E. Barnaby, H. Banta, D. O. Gaskill (5), Alexander Hall (3), J. Burgin, A. Upjohn, R. Beaty, S. Morton (2), N. Minard, William M'Donald (2), J. Slade, E. Barnes, J. B. Barnaby (2), George Garraty, F. Caleff, W. A. Stephens, David L. Layton, D. Oliphant, A. M. Stephens, C. M'Millan, D. Crawford, J. A. Rouse, J. J. Uhlman.

UNIVERSALISM against itself, by Alexander Hall. We have just received one hundred copies of this ably written and deeply interesting work. Every passage of scripture and every argument ever urged by any Universalist of note in defence of the ultimate salvation of all men, without obedience to the Lord Messiah, are fully and impartially weighed in the balances of truth and reason. It is clearly shown that so far is the system from receiving countenance or support from the oracles of God, that they are always diametrically opposed to the doctrine of the enjoyment of future bliss by any not conformed to the word of truth. Brother Hall's book differs from many other treatises on the same side of the question in that he carries the war into Carthage, and turns every argument of the enemy against his own citadel.

The book is printed on fine clear paper, well bound in leather, and lettered, and contains four hundred and eighty pages and the author's likeness, at from *three quarters to a dollar*, according to the binding. Send on your orders brethren. Every candid, honest Universalist neighbor whom you can induce to give it a careful reading, will advocate ultra Universalism no longer.

BAPTISMAL CHART.—This is a splendidly engraven chart. The plate alone cost three hundred dollars. It was designed by a "Regular" Baptist Minister. It gives a most excellent miniature view of the christian church. Two beautiful columns, on which are inscribed every passage in the New Testament where the word baptism occurs—supports a fine arch, beneath which stands the Saviour delivering the commission to the Apostles! Under them, the Spirit, dove-like, is hovering over a neat gothic structure situate on an island. The banks slope prettily towards a placid stream, from which the obedient believer is calmly walking into the Chapel. The lowest and nearest view presents a multitude of well dressed men, women and children, shaded by a verdant grove, intently gazing on the baptist standing in the water, midway between them and the church in the act of immersing a believer preparatory to his admission into the company that has past the stream before him.

The costume of the Saviour and the apostles is Oriental, that of the multitude modern. All finely colored, and the entire plate requiring a frame eighteen inches by twenty-four.

We have fifty copies which we are authorized to sell at the low price of *one shilling and three pence*. Copies of both works may be seen at the stores of Messrs. Heney & Bannison, South Market Wharf, and at J. N. C. Black's, North Market Wharf.

Daily expected the entire works of Alexander Campbell. All of which will be sold at New York prices.

☞ From several friends and brethren, whose co-operation we desire, and greatly need, we have not yet heard a word since the commencement of this volume. Let us hear from you, brethren, and how many subscribers you have obtained. Whether you can make a remittance or not, write and let us know what we may anticipate by and by. We have not yet been able to determine how large an edition to issue. A word to the wise is sufficient.