

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

May 31 64
in ...

(a ...)

THE ADVISER.

“LIGHT AND LOVE.”

VOL. IV.

TORONTO, AUGUST, 1864.

NO. 2.

CONTENTS.

First Principles.....	17
Overseers.....	18
Are we Drif.ing.....	19
Upside Down.....	20
The Evidence of Feeling.....	25
Paul and the Clergy.....	26
God gave the Increase.....	26
Mere Formality.....	27
Ordinances Divine and Human.....	27
Words from the Work-table.....	28
Camden Town, London.....	30
Evangelists' Advices.....	30
Items.....	32

True they differ. 1. About what is not in the Bible. 2. About (themselves being judges,) what interferes not the slightest with a man's salvation. Looking at it from this angle, is it not expensive folly? There names are not in the Bible and they all say there is "nothing in a name." Now if their party names were all thrown overboard, sinking, never to rise again, it would make a wonderful difference. If the various offices obtaining amongst them, not found in the Bible, were abandoned, (and they say there is nothing essential in church government), it would help to smooth the surface. And if the various organizations ecclesiastical, which are not mentioned in the Bible, were by them rendered null and void, things would wear a more hopeful aspect. And if they would teach for doctrine nothing but what is taught in the Bible and all that is taught in the Bible, lovely union would soon prevail. We say then, if there be no value in non-essentials, why not dispense with them and try to be of one heart and one soul? But 2. They differ about things which are *in* the Bible, but still regarded by them as non-essential. Ah, here is a serious matter; let us look at it. Oh! that the children of men could see that there are *no non-essentials* in the Bible. Who can point out one? Did Moses ever teach one? Did David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, or any other Prophet of God teach *one* non-essential? Which of the Apostles of Jesus taught *one* non-essential? Did they so trifle with man's eternal destiny? No, no. But if we admit that the Prophets or Apostles taught non-essentials, with what are we charging the Holy Spirit of God!! Oh, who shall stand in the day of judgment and charge the Almighty with folly! Well, did Jesus, the adorable Redeemer, the embodiment of all wisdom, teach the people non-essentials? Forbid the impious thought! Ah, kind reader, there are no non-essentials in the Bible. But

FIRST PRINCIPLES.

Professors of christianity have formed themselves into some hundreds of parties. Among them all we find many ranged on each side of two ideas—"essential" and "non-essential." On one side of the fence they say they agree, that is, on "essentials"—on the other side they say they disagree, that is, on "non-essentials." Only think of Protestants, after boldly opposing what they call human traditions, innovations, anti-Bible or anti-christian doctrine—then differing about "non-essentials." Set half a dozen parties in one little town building half a dozen "places of worship"—supporting six clergymen, some of them scarcely knowing how to raise the "one thing needful" for the minister—all this connected with strife, jealousy, contention, and a state things which has a tendency to multiply infidels, and all, all for the sake of, or on account of nothing in the world but *non-essentials*. Who can credit it? Who can suppose that they differ so widely—so zealously—so expensively, about mere "non-essentials!" I am always ready to give them credit for better judgment, more sense, good, common and uncommon, than that all this labor, toil and self-sacrifice is simply the result of a difference about non-essentials.

when you hear the people say *faith* in all that is necessary to the forgiveness of sins, or, that a man is justified by faith alone, or, faith is the essential; is it not implied that repentance and baptism are non-essentials? Not long since a gentleman said to me, "though he very much disliked the clergyman, yet a few evenings before, his infant being dangerously ill and despairing of its life, he sent for him to baptise the child." The next thing you may hear will be a clergyman saying, from the pulpit, "baptism is a non-essential." Now while baptism is a Bible subject, both the views above are outside of its lids. Did not Jesus and the Apostles teach all we need to know about baptism? And where did either say it was a non-essential. O, would the blessed Jesus give a non-essential command? "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved," xvi. Mark. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." How can a clergyman who has ever read such scriptures, and who has any fear of God in his heart, affirm in the presence of the Almighty, that baptism is a non-essential! Here then is a difference about some thing which cannot be regarded as a non-essential. There are some who say that baptism is first in order, then repentance, then faith. Others teach faith first, then repentance, then baptism. Is the difference here non-essential? If the first should become universal we should see no believer baptized at all. Part of the Bible then would become of "none effect." Some teach that we are added to the church before we believe, and some, not till after we believe. Is this idea non-essential? Some teach that Christ died for all and that all *can* be saved. Others, that Christ did not die for all and that part of the world is irrevocably doomed to eternal misery. Is this difference non-essential? Some teach that the Lord's supper should be taken on the first day of the week, others that it may be taken any day of the week, once a month, quarter or year, or that it is "done away" altogether. Is this non-essential? Some say faith is a direct gift of God, some that it is man's own act. Some teach that the Spirit is given before a man believes, and some after. Some teach that people are converted by prayer, some by preaching, some by a miraculous operation of the Spirit without either. Some say their sins are forgiven, and some, they don't know whether they are or not, and a hundred

and one other things might be mentioned in which they differ, and all very important. Now the Bible will cure all these complaints if we will only submit to it as a guide.

SIMON.

OVERSEERS.

There should be overseers and deacons in every church in order to its perfection and growth in grace, knowledge and usefulness. These men should be apt to teach, not only in public, but from house to house. We affirm again there is no higher office in the church than overseer. The idea that a Pastor or Evangelist is to rule over the bishops or elders of a church is foreign to the Bible. Each church with its overseers and deacons manages its own business. Great responsibilities rest upon the overseers. They should be patterns of piety, honesty, self-denial, well acquainted with the will of the Lord, and men who will frown down sin and cause evil doers to shrink away before them. The most of the time they give to the Lord should be spent in feeding the flock. Not with two hour sermons on the first day of the week and no more about it till the next first day; but they should visit the Brethren from time to time, confirming them—strengthening them and encouraging them. It is this way they will get hold of the commencement of difficulties and be able to check them in the bud. The cause suffers much for want of working, devoted overseers. What farmer thinks of allowing a flock of sheep to go where they like through the week, only seeing them once in seven days! How many would he have at the end of the year? And shall the overseer be contented with seeing the Brethren once in seven days! O, how many lambs stray from the fold in consequence of inattention. I do not mean their own carelessness, this is one of the reasons undoubtedly, but the major reason in most of instances is carelessness, coldness, indifference, want of attention on the part of the church. One of the last obligations laid upon Peter by the great Shepherd and Bishop of soul is found in these words:—"Feed my sheep"—"feed my lambs." The Apostles have rested from their labours; but there are sheep—there are lambs still to feed, and while we are so careful in doing part of the work enjoined on the Apostles, viz: preaching the facts, precepts and promises of the gospel, why,

O why should we neglect the other! Jesus said to his Apostles, "Go, teach all nations; baptizing them in (into) the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Did their labors cease here? Was this the end of their commission? Ah, no; read on. "Teaching them to observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you." Now shall we attend to the first and neglect the second? *Can* we do it with impunity? never. How many poor souls are lost in consequence of negligence on the part of the church regarding this second chapter of duties. But the reader may ask, have we not elders? There are no mere honorary titles in the Lord's government. While we gladly admit that there are churches which have overseers who do their duty, we regret to say there are many who have Brethren wearing the title—that's all. If a man cannot or will not perform the duties, let him by all means abandon the title. And there are many who have Brethren who act as elders, but who are so palpably disqualified that the church goes down; then the cry is let us have a pastor—a paid minister, as if this would make all right. There are Brethren who, for certain reasons, think they have an exclusive right to the office of overseer. They seem very impatient, and marvel why the Brethren do not at once appoint *them*. They will manage adroitly to throw obstacles in the way of others being named. 'Tis a pity that such mortals frequently find some unthinking and officious persons to rise up and name Brother so-and-so. Very likely he has not thought five minutes upon the subject, but wishing a little notoriety he names the man. The thing is too important to be trifled with thus. We do not debar that Brother the right to name any body he pleases, but we would simply say he ought, for the sake of propriety, be a little careful and patient. Churches will never thrive nor prosper when they have overseers who are disqualified. Better have none at all. One more thought and we are done. Is that church doing its duty in the sight of heaven, who will ask a Brother who has to labour hard to support his family, to act as overseer; I mean, to do his duty as overseer, and spend one, two or three months in the year of his time and *never offer to remunerate him!* "Do unto others as you would they should do to you" in the same circumstances is a good rule by which to be governed.

PHILEMON.

ARE WE DRIFTING?

'Tis to be feared in some quarters. Time was when, "thus saith the Lord," settled every question—when we studied and loved the Bible, when we were jealous of innovations, when we watched carefully and sedulously over the truth of Jesus. We rejoice to know that this is still the state of things in most of places among the "Disciples." If there is one thing which would cause us to love the venerable Brother Campbell more than another, it is his honest and unflinching adherence to the *word of God*. He fought manfully, courageously and triumphantly for the Bible. In the vigour of his life, when the truth made great men quail before it, that which stood out in boldest relief in Bro. Campbell's character might be couched in the following words:—*no compromise with error*. A noble stand. If there is anything of which a man could be innocently proud, it is such a position. A time-server, a go-between, could not long live amongst us. None but true men could work with the pioneers of what is called the "current reformation." But in some places, I fear the gold is becoming dim. The Egyptian flesh pots are thought of by some who wish to turn back. It is hard to propel the boat up stream, easier to let it go with the current, easier to cut the cable, take the sofa and let her drift. Saul once disagreed with the Lord. He thought he had a better way of managing matters—no use in being so strict in keeping the commandments. The spirit of obedience, a regard for the *essential* was all that human reason deemed necessary. As Samuel said "what meaneth the lowing of the oxen and the bleating of the sheep in mine ears?" So we would say, what mean the appropriation of "Rev." on the brass rapper, the white necktie, the melodeon, the organ, the high spire, the catering to practices of the sects? But more, are we not handling the word of God deceitfully? That man who keeps back any of it for fear of losing caste, who shrinks from declaring all the counsel of God is guilty. He may make friends but he will lose friends hereafter. Are there not some who are ashamed to speak of first principles? I do not say we should be teaching them and nothing else, but the poor sinner will never be right until he understands them, and many professors in consequence of not understanding them easily, stray away. If we become recreant to our high trust, God will

let us go down and bring others on board to fill our places. The idols, respectability and popularity, are to be dreaded. May the Lord deliver us from the snares of the wicked one.

TITUS.

EXTRACTS.

"UPSIDE DOWN."

"These that have turned the world upside down, have come hither also" (Acts vii. 6)

CHAPTER IV.

The gentlemen whose conversation furnished the last chapter, with several others, having again assembled the Curate, according to promise entered upon his defence of infant baptism. He begged them to notice the most ample proof of its very early existence. "IRENEUS," he continued, "wrote about eighty years after the Apostolic age and was then an aged man. He was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of John. Permit me to read his words from *Wall's History of Infant Baptism*—'He (Jesus) came to save all persons by himself; all, I mean, who by him regenerated unto God, infants and little ones, and children and youths, and elder persons.'" Mr. Vapid remarked that "the quotation says nothing about baptism," to which it was replied, "that though baptism is not named it is nevertheless implied, as the early writers used *regeneration* to denote baptism." "Granting that interchange," responded Mr. Clearthought, "are you able to affirm that the one invariably stood for, or implied, the other? If not baptism might not have been at all in the mind of Irenæus when he wrote that sentence." "Do you know of any writer earlier than TERTULLIAN who has actually mentioned infant baptism?" asked Mr. Bell.

"I do not, and I admit that proof of an earlier mention has not been found."

"Did Tertullian, who so far as we can discover, is the earliest writer who names infant baptism, advocate or oppose it?"

"He," continued the Curate, "urged the delaying of baptism and wrote against the baptism of infants."

"Then, Sir, you admit that there is no proof that any one earlier than the third century named infant baptism?"

"Yes so far as actual mention is concerned, but they implied it. Justin Martyr, for instance, who was born near the close of the first century, wrote about the middle of the second century, 'There were many of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years old, who were made disciples in a jancy.' Now the Baptists generally admit that all disciples were baptized, and therefore though baptism is not named, it is without doubt implied."

"No, Sir," resumed Mr. Bell, "nothing of the sort. It is written that 'the Lord made and baptized more disciples than John.' The disci-

ples were first made and then baptized. He baptized disciples and not babes in order to make disciples by baptism. The young persons spoken of by Justin were made disciples by teaching—a disciple is a learner, a scholar, and it is quite clear that in the ancient church catechumens were trained before they were baptized, a fact which cannot be accounted for upon the supposition that infant baptism prevailed."

"But," replied the Curate, "the young persons referred to could not have been of that order. They are expressly called *infants* and therefore if disciples, they have been made so by baptism and not by teaching."

"Here, Sir, you repeat the error into which Dr. Wall and others have fallen. The word *pais*, used by Justin Martyr, is applied to persons of from twelve to thirty years of age. Jesus when twelve years of age is designated by the same term, and it is also applied to him at the time of the combined opposition of Herod and Pilate (Acts iv. 27.) Eutychus, the young man mentioned in Acts xx. is called *pais*. Justin Martyr's *infants*, then, may have been from twelve to twenty years of age. At all events they were old enough to be taught, for only the taught can be disciples. You may rely upon it, gentlemen, that infant baptism has no historical basis. Not one of the five Apostolic Fathers—Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, or Polycarp—either named it or allude to it, but they do say what implies believer's baptism and that only. The like may be said of the oldest of the Greek Fathers. Papius, Dionysius, Tatian, Melito, Irenæus, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria, never mention it. In saying this I do not wish to insinuate a doubt as to its early origin. The Mystery of Iniquity advanced with rapidity, and no doubt infant baptism had commenced by the time of Tertullian, as his protest against it proves. But then those early writers who do name it also indicate that infant communion in the Holy Supper was at the same time common. Let me read two or three passages from my note-book—

"The Lord's Supper was considered as essential to salvation, for which reason it was even thought proper to administer it to infants."—*Mosheim's Church History, century III.*

"St. Augustine, I am sure, held the communicating of infants as much an Apostolic tradition as the baptizing of them."—*Chillingworth.*

"That in the primitive church children received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is obvious from what Cyprian relates concerning a sucking child, who so violently refused to take the sacramental wine, that the deacons were obliged to open her lips and pour it down her throat."—*Dr. Hook, Dean of Chichester.*

"The reason for laying aside infant communion in the Latin church was, lest by *putting* up the holy symbols the sacrament should be dishonored."—*Bishop Jeremy Taylor.*

"The Roman church, about the year 1000, *enter-taining the doctrine of transubstantiation*, fell all the custom of giving the holy elements to infants; and the other Western churches mostly did the like, upon the same account; but the Greeks, not

having the same doctrine, continued, and do still continue, the custom of communicating infants.'—*Dr. Wall—History of Infant Baptism.*

He, then, who will accept infant baptism because it existed in the third century must take infant communion along with it, and very much more that every person present will reject. But, gentlemen, could you prove it to have been practised immediately after the death of the Apostles, you would do nothing. We, as Protestants, demand Bible authority. I refuse to admit the divine origin of an ordinance for which Bible sanction cannot be produced—and now I call upon you who hold infant baptism to give your strong reason from the one unerring book."

Mr. Maitland assured the meeting that he knew nothing of the early writers they had been discussing. He agreed with M. Bell, "that the question must be settled by the Bible and that if infants are baptized on account of what the fathers say they must on the same authority receive the Lord's Supper." He considered that the matter could be soon settled. "Let those who say that the baptism of infants is wrong shew that the Bible forbids it. Let Mr. Bell do this, or let him mind his own preaching and say nothing against a baptism with which men as good as he are satisfied and against which he cannot bring a thus saith the Lord."

"Our friend is not at all logical," responded Mr. Clearthought. "The burden of proof does not rest with Mr. Bell. Those who practice infant baptism either view it as an unauthorized expedient or claim for it Bible authority. If the former then it must stand with penance, holy water, the baptism of bells and other vagaries of the Scarlet Lady—but those who claim Bible authority must produce that authority. To call upon the Baptists to shew that the Bible forbids it is absurd. If a text cannot be found which forbids dancing as a part of Christian worship must we therefore conclude that leg-service of that kind is of divine authority?"

Mr. Maitland expressed his surprise at Mr. Clearthought's speaking against his own practice. "Let," said he, "such persons go over to the other side—we don't want the support of men who practice one thing and speak in favor of another."

"I do not," replied Mr. C. "speak against what I practice, nor am I speaking against infant baptism. I would not however support it by false reasoning. If we have divine authority it is our business to produce it, and if we cannot then it behoves us to give it up or maintain it as a human tradition. Mr. Bell has really nothing to prove—we have to produce Bible authority, he has merely to examine what we present, shew its insufficiency, or admit the reverse."

Mr. Vapid congratulated his "Brother Clearthought" on his straightforward putting of the case. He insisted that thus "to put the matter in its proper light is due to truth and would drive infant baptism out of the field."

"I admit," interposed Mr. Atkins, that I am

bound to find Bible authority for our practice, to give it up, or to abandon Protestant ground. The Congregationalists, with whom I minister, often make too little of the ordinance. I believe it authorized by the Bible and therefore defend it. I look upon it as a serious omission when parents treat it with neglect, and I would not receive to fellowship an unbaptized person."

"Very good," replied Mr. Bell. "Our friend Atkins can serve us by putting that authority forward at once. It may, however, save time if we bear in mind that Bible authority can only exist in the form of

- 1, COMMAND,
- 2, APPROVED EXAMPLE, or
- 3, NECESSARY INFERENCE.

Let me then ask whether any of you can produce a command to baptize infants, given by Jesus or his Apostles?"

After some little conversation all admitted that infant baptism is not directly commanded in the Bible.

"Is there one instance of infant baptism recorded in the New Testament?" asked Mr. Vapid. After a few words, *pro* and *con*, all admitted that the Book does not contain any clear and unmistakable affirmation of the baptism of an infant.

"Then," added Mr. Bell, "You are shut up to inference. Having neither command nor example, your practice has only an inferential foundation."

"You Baptists," retorted Mr. Atkins, "are too much in the habit of decrying inferential proof when this question is in hand, though you take to it readily enough on other matters, and have no other by which to support much that you believe. You observe Sunday as a Sabbath and admit women to the Lord's Table merely upon inference. There is no command to change the Sabbath and it is nowhere said that females partook of the sacrament. Why, then, as inference is a good foundation in these matters do you decry it when infant baptism is in view?"

"You quite mistake," resumed Mr. Bell. "I do not decry inference. Did I not name *necessary inference* as one of the three methods by which Bible authority can be established? I merely said that having admitted that the Bible contains neither command nor example you have now reduced the enquiry to the region of inference. I am prepared to accept any legitimate, that is *necessary*, inference, and if even one text can be found, which leaves no other inference possible, I will at once take to baptizing babies. But you also mistake in regard to the Sabbath and female communion. I do not observe Sunday as the Sabbath, without a command, for I do not observe it as a Sabbath at all. I observe it as the Lord's day—as the First of the week, set apart for commemorating the Lord's death, and for this there is clear and apostolic example. I do not observe the Jewish Sabbath, because it was only enforced upon Jews, and Paul declares 'WE ARE NOT UNDER THE LAW.' I therefore pay no regard for the

Jewish Sabbath, and though I do observe the Lord's day, yet I do it not as a substitute for, or change in, the Sabbath, but as a New Institution ordained by Jesus and made known and established by the plainly recorded examples of the Apostles and Primitive Church. Then, as to female communion. The table is for disciples and converted females are disciples. In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female and all the privileges of the church are consequently open to the sisterhood unless expressly prohibited. Women are also expressly mentioned as numbered with the disciples who 'continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, the Fellowship, the Breaking of the Bread and Prayers.' So manifest is this—so absolutely necessary is the inference, that none deny women access to the Table—no one has a conscience against his believing wife partaking of the feast. But not so with infant baptism—it has been denied from its first mention and hundreds of thousands of the best of men have not been able to see in Scripture a shadow of warrant for its use. Establish it upon the same ground as the observance of the Lord's day and female communion and I will gladly accept it."

"But," resumed Mr Atkins, "household baptisms are recorded and, therefore, it is presumed that in some of the homes there were infants."

"That is not to the point," interposed Mr. Clearthought. "It is admitted that we have to furnish proof. It is our duty to prove that there must have been an infant in one or more of the houses mentioned."

"But," said Mr. Atkins, "I put it to Mr. Bell, whether it is not reasonable to suppose that in some of the households there were infants?"

"Then you mean that our case cannot be proved unless Mr. Bell help us by kindly supposing in our favor. The fact is we cannot prove that the households contained a single infant. If otherwise, do so and settle the dispute."

"Mr. Clearthought," said one of the company, "is a strange man to sprinkle infants and yet talk thus. One would suppose that Mr. Bell has made a convert of him."

"I have before told you," he replied, "that I will not accept such aid as you offer. Mr. Bell has not changed my views, but I advise him not to be led into a maze for your convenience. He has nothing to do but to examine your proof and, as yet, you have not presented any. The household argument stands thus. We must prove—1, That one of the households did certainly contain an infant, and—2, That every member of that household were baptized. Now will you, Mr. Atkins, affirm that for a *certainly* there was an infant in any one of the households?"

"No, Sir—but I say there *may have been*."

"Yes, and there *may not have been*. Your argument then stands thus—There may have been, and there may not have been, an infant in one of the households named in the New Testament, and therefore infant baptism has apostolic

sanction. I presume that Mr. Bell will not reply to the argument."

"But, Sir, as there are several cases of household baptism recorded, the probability that an infant was in one of them is very strong."

"There are three—Lydia, the Jailor, and Stephanus. Of the Jailor it is said that he 'rejoiced, believing in God with all his house'—of Stephanus and his house it is recorded that they addicted themselves to the work of the ministry."

"True," rejoined Mr. Atkins, "but that does not prove that those houses were without infants. Paul and Silas speaking the word to the Jailor's house no more proves that there were not infants therein than my saying I preached last Sunday to my congregation, would imply that there were no infants in the assembly. The Jailor's believing with all his house would only intimate that those of the house who were fit subjects for faith believed. The same holds good with the family ministering to the saints. To minister is to serve. If, then, because the family of Stephanus addicted themselves to ministering to, or serving the saints, they were all adults, then when Joshua said, 'As for me and my house we will serve the Lord,' there must have been no little children in his family—they were all adult believers. The thing is quite preposterous. The children of Israel were commanded to 'take a lamb for a house (a family) according to the number of souls,' and eat it, 'with their loins girt, and their shoes on their and their staff in their hand.' Now is it to be supposed that there were no infants in those families, because infants could not comply with the requirements here specified? Ridiculous and irrational as these conclusions would be, they are quite as conclusive from the premises as is the argument that because the family of Stephanus ministered to the saints all its members were adult believers. We may speak of the hospitality of a family, and of their kindness to us, making our acknowledgments to its members collectively, without intending to convey the idea that the babe in the nursery performed any special service for us. In such cases the thing affirmed is predicated *only* of those members who are *fit subjects* for the work or operation mentioned."

Mr. Clearthought begged to thank Mr. Atkins for having thus completely given up the household branch of the argument. "For," continued he, "it is admitted that we cannot prove the presence of infants in any one of the households, and now Mr. Atkins has clearly shewn that if present there is no proof that they were baptized. Does not Mr. Atkins see that the argument which proves that the language with respect to the faith of the Jailor's house and the ministering of that Stephanus is consistent with the idea that there might have been infants in those houses, equally proves that there might have been infants in them without their being baptized? Thus the households are finished up.

Mr. Mailand thought that Mr. Clearthought said more to oppose his own practice than did Mr. Bell, and he considered that Mr. C. had

better present his own strong reasons for infant baptism or declare himself one of Mr. Bell's converts. In reply Mr. B. intimated that certain inferential considerations inclined him to favor infant baptism and he would submit them to the meeting. If they could be overturned he would not administer the ordinance again. At the next meeting he would do his best to defend a custom which to say the least had come from the ancient church.

CHAPTER V.

After some amount of desultory conversation Mr. Vapid asked permission to read a few words bearing upon the stage of the investigation at which the last meeting terminated. He thought that part of an article upon baptism in *Dr. Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature* so well expressed some of the conclusions arrived at when they were last together that it would be well to hear it, more particularly as all the parties concerned in its production were advocates of infant baptism. The article was written by Dr. Jacobi, of the University of Berlin, and approved by Dr. Neander. With this explanation he would read it.—“Infant baptism was established neither by Christ nor his Apostles. In all places where we find the necessity of baptism notified, either in a dogmatic or historical point of view, it is evident that it was only meant for those who were capable of comprehending the word preached, and of being converted to Christ by an act of their own will. A pretty sure testimony of its non-existence in the apostolic age may be inferred from 1st Cor. vii. 14, since Paul would certainly have referred to the baptism of children for their holiness. But even in later times, several teachers of the church, such as Tertullian and others, rejected this custom; indeed his church in general (that of North Africa) adhered longer than others to the primitive regulations. Even when the baptism of children was already theoretically derived from the Apostles, its practice was nevertheless for a long time confined to a maturer age. In support of the contrary opinion, the advocates in former ages (now hardly any) used to appeal to Mat. xix. 14; but their strongest argument in its favor is the regulation of baptizing all the members of a house and family (1 Cor. xvi. 15; Acts xvi. 33, xviii. 8.) In none of these instances has it been proved that there were little children among them; but, even supposing that there were, there was no necessity for excluding them from baptism in plain words, since such exclusion was understood as a matter of course. Many circumstances conspired early to introduce the practice of infant-baptizing. The confusion between the outward and inward conditions of baptism, and the magical effects that were imputed to it; confusion of thought about the visible and invisible church, condemning all those who did not belong to the former; the doctrine of the natural corruption of man, so closely connected with the preceding; and finally the desire of distinguishing Christian children

from the Jewish and Heathen, and of commending them more effectually to the care of the Christian community—all these circumstances and many more have contributed to the introduction of infant baptism at a very early period. But, on the other hand, the baptism of children is not at all at variance with the principle of Christian baptism in general, after what we have observed on the separation of regeneration and baptism. For, since it cannot be determined when the former begins, the real test of its existence lying only in the holiness continued to the end of man's life, the fittest point for baptism is evidently the beginning of life. Nevertheless the profession of faith is still needed to complete it; confirmation, or some equivalent observance, is therefore a very necessary and important consummation. The *fides infantium* is an absurd assumption, of which the Scriptures know nothing. On the other hand the baptized child is strongly recommended to the community and to the Spirit of God dwelling therein, becoming the careful object of the education and holy influence of the church (1 Cor. vii. 14.) Nature and experience teach us, therefore, to retain the baptism of children, now that it is introduced.” Mr. Vapid urged that they had here a very fair surrender on the part of learned and influential advocates of infant baptism.

Mr. Maitland reminded him that the persons alluded to distinctly declare that infant baptism ought to be retained.

Mr. Vapid was quite content to let their unauthorized statement, that it ought to be continued, go for what it is worth, after this distinct intimation that it was neither introduced by Christ nor his Apostles, and that neither in the household nor anywhere else in the New Testament could a shade of proof be found. Then, too, there is the distinct admission that the *fides infantium*—the faith of infants—is an absurd assumption, of which the Scriptures know nothing. But Luther advocated and retained infant baptism on that very ground. He wrote, “We assert that little children should not be baptized at all, if it be true that in baptism they do not believe.” According to these high authorities infant baptism had not the sanction of Christ or his Apostles, nor that of any passage of the Word of God, its only foundation being *nature* and *experience*. Perhaps Mr. Clearthought would not take up the question as intimated at the last meeting.

“I have stated,” said Mr. Clearthought, “that the Bible contains no direct command to baptize infants—that there is no proof that infants were in the households mentioned in the New Testament, and none that they were baptized, even if it be granted that they were therein. I spent the usual time at our college and there I was not taught to search the Scriptures in order to determine the question for myself, but rather instructed in the methods by which the practice is defended. My previous convictions (not the result of investigation but of faith in early teachers, increased by the common practice of nearly every sect) were in favor of it. After leaving college and taking a church in which

no one questioned youthful baptism, and in which I could not remain if I did so, there was really nothing to impel me to investigation. Still I have thought upon the subject and there are considerations which lead me to think it more in accordance with the Holy Writ to admit the children of believers than to restrict the ordinance to converted persons. These considerations will endeavour to put before you. First, then, I conclude that *as the church has existed from the days of Abraham, and as infants were for a long period in it by Divine appointment, that therefore they should be in it now.*"

"Certainly, certainly!" said Mr Maitland. "Perfectly reasonable, unless, indeed, you find a Bible command for turning them out."

"Let us look at it calmly," interposed Mr. Bell. "In the first place, Sir, your major premise is merely assumption. The Bible nowhere teaches that the church was in existence in the days of Abraham. Will you tell us what you understand by the phrase, *the church?*"

"I understand by *the church*," responded Mr. C. "a people separated from the world for the service of God, having divinely-appointed ordinances, including some rite or mark by which its members are known. The Jews were a body of people thus separated and they had such ordinances and distinctive mark of membership."

Mr. Vapid thought that "Mr. Maitland might be supplied with authority for 'turning them out,' as Paul to the Galatians, in allusion to the Old Covenant and those under it, commands that we 'cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.'" Of this casting out of the children of the flesh the exclusion of Agar and her son is an allegory. It is thus clear that if infants, by virtue of their fleshly relation, were in the Jewish church, they were excluded under this dispensation because the flesh profits nothing, a new creature in Christ Jesus being the only subject. And this is further intimated in connection with the two covenants—the Old and the New. During the continuance of the Old Covenant God promised to make a New Covenant with the house of Israel, and those covenants are represented as differing in a most important particular. Under the Old Covenant, which embraced Abraham's seed according to the flesh without regard to age or faith, it was necessary for adults who knew the Lord to teach the young to know him—that is, the children who with themselves were under that covenant. But under the New Covenant it is specially stated that all would know him—that is, not the whole world, but all who are under the covenant. They were not to say, "Know ye the Lord, for all shall know him, from the least unto the greatest." This could not be the case were infants in the church or parties to the covenant, for then, as under the former covenant, we should have to teach, the very thing which the Lord declares there shall be no need to teach. All, then, who are born, not of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God—of "water and the Spirit"—all such and none other, are proper

subjects for the church, and only such are under the New Covenant."

"What, in the name of common sense, are we coming to now?" exclaimed Mr. Maitland. "Infants are not to be taught to know the Lord; Pray at what age will you teach them the way of salvation? When they are twenty-one, or after they are married, or when?"

"Our good friend," continued Mr Vapid, "is quite amusing. I have said nothing against preaching the gospel to the young. Do it by all means as they can understand it. Early hearing of the Gospel and witnessing its blessed fruit, are among the blessings peculiar to the children of Christian parents. Preach the gospel to them—teach them to know the Lord. Do the same to unbelieving adults—but then, neither the one nor the other are under the New Covenant. You preach the gospel to them in order to bring them into that relation and not because they are already in it—to make them Christians and not because they are Christians."

"Let me ask your attention," resumed Mr. Bell, addressing Mr. Clearthought. "Admitting all that Mr Vapid has advanced then the question is considered in the light of the covenants, we come to another matter in dealing with your argument. You really assume that the Jewish nation and the church of Christ are one and the same. If not, your entire assumption falls to the ground. The moment you look at what is called the Jewish church as distinct from the Christian church your proposition dissolves. If the churches are *two*, then it does not follow that the conditions of membership are the same in each. Then, the sense in which you use the word *church* is not admissible. You say 'a body of people separated from the world,' and that 'the Jewish people were such a body.' It is true that the church of Christ is separated from the world, but separated in a sense that will not apply to the Jews. As a nation they were separated from other nations, but they were still of the world—not born again—whereas the church is not of the world. They had divinely appointed ordinances and so has the church, but the ordinances are not the same—those of the one are most unlike those of the other. But this is not all. You start with a mere assumption. The church has not existed from the days of Abraham. There really never was a Jewish church. A church called out from the nations and not of the world, and an entire nation chosen for certain positions and blessings, are ideas so widely different that a careful observer would not for a moment confound them. The Jews had a religion but never were a Jewish church."

Mr. Maitland begged to differ. "The Apostle speaks of the church in the wilderness, and had there been no church at that time he could not have done so."

"Granting," replied Mr. Bell, "that an Apostle applied the term to the people in the wilderness, would that prove that God had then a church, in the sense in which the word is generally used by Jesus and the Apostles? If so, then was that Ephesian mob which worship-

ped Dianna the church of God, for it is designated the *ecclesia*, though in the English Testament this fact is not seen, as the translators have put it, "And when he had thus spoken he dismissed the assembly." In the same chapter that *lawful convocation*, to which the Town clerk intimated there should be committed, is expressed by the same word. A people then called out from others for any purpose is a church in the general sense of the word *ecclesia* but the church of God, of Christ of the First-born, is a very different church, and is never said to have existed till after Jesus, its chief corner stone had been laid in the tomb. He came to lay its foundation, not to build one already laid. His church was future when he came—his words were, "I will build my church." Judaism did not possess, and was never intended to possess, a church in the New Testament acceptance of of the term—a fact which our State-church friends always manage to forget. With the Jews and with Pagan nations the religious and political commonwealths were identical. That a society should exist in an exclusively religious interest was incompatible with every idea of the Jewish theocracy, and would not have been tolerated for a single hour. Their system recognized no distinction between the men of the commonwealth and the true-hearted who worshipped God in a spirit of holiness. As then the church did not exist in the days of Moses and the Prophets, and the Jewish children were not in it, the argument falls to pieces."

"Baptism," said Mr. C., "we were always taught, came into the room of circumcision, and it was argued that, as infants were circumcised they should be baptized. This I felt to be appropriate."

"Felt to be appropriate! Do you settle a question of this sort by feeling?" responded Mr. Bell.

"No, Sir—not when I deal with it as a logician. But I have told you that I have not been previously induced to examine the question. I am now more than ever disposed to do so and therefore I give out what I have held under the influence of early teaching, and in consciousness of fitness and not as the result of logical enquiry. I have said that I did not want to be disturbed, neither do I now desire to get into trouble by discovering that infants are not proper subjects for baptism. I would much rather hold to my present practice but I am here, and I have no intention to run away from the truth, and still less to shuffe it out of the road. You may therefore deal with my remarks upon circumcision."

"Very well! Let us look at it. Infants were circumcised, therefore they should be baptized, as baptism is in the place of circumcision. This we have fairly to carry out. Infants were to be circumcised at eight days old, therefore infants must be baptized eight days after birth! Then, only male infants were circumcised, therefore only male infants are to be baptized. Again, servants bought with money and captives taken in war were to be circumcised, as property and

without regard to faith, and therefore such servants and war-prisoners, without reference to faith in Jesus, should also be baptized. I am afraid our friend Clearthought will get into trouble over this question, for if he has not to give up infant baptism altogether, he must, upon his own ground, set it aside in regard to females, and he must undertake to baptize certain adults without faith or repentance. But further—in this case, as in the last, the major premise is a falsehood. 'Baptism came in the room of circumcision!' Where is the proof? Where is proof that it came in the room of anything that ever existed in heaven, or on earth, or under the earth? Baptism came into its own place, and came not in the room of anything. The opposite position is pure invention to support a practice which has not one inch of solid ground to rest upon."

"Is not baptism called by Paul 'the circumcision made without hands?' asked Mr. Atkins.

"No, Sir. Baptism is mentioned in the next verse. The circumcision made without hands is that of the heart, which comes in the room of that which was outward in the flesh, and on that very account infants are not its subjects, and so, as the baptism is the burial of those whose hearts are circumcised by the truth, infants are certainly ineligible. But who refers to baptism as a circumcision made without hands! I never yet knew a person baptized without hands. Hands are as much necessary in baptism as in circumcision."

"I regret," observed Mr. Clearthought, "that I have to leave early this evening. Pray extend your charity so far as to give me credit for not running away from the investigation and I will reward your liberality by resuming the subject at our next meeting."

THE EVIDENCE OF FEELING.

A man has purchased a farm and feels much delighted with his new home. He has his deed duly executed and *feels* well satisfied with his bargain. A neighbor meets him and conveys the unpleasant intelligence that there is a mortgage upon the property which antedates the deed. "Impossible is the response, "I never *felt* better about anything I did in my life; I am sure, Sir, you are mistaken, for I have no misgivings upon the subject." "Feel right Sir, or feel wrong, I tell you that there is mortgage on your property and you had better see to it. "I *feel* quite satisfied." "Now be persuaded to consult a lawyer on the Records of the Registry Office," urges his friend, and at last, urges successfully. He goes to a lawyer and lays his case before him in this fashion:—

"If a man buys a farm, pays for it, and gets a good deed, how ought he to feel about it?" "Why," says the lawyer, "he ought to feel well satisfied, contented and happy upon the subject." "Just the way I feel Sir; my title is all right, Sir, I'll give myself no more trouble about it."

E. S.

PAUL AND THE CLERGY.

The Apostle was not a clergyman. The chief-est of the apostles was wholly unlike the modern priest or bi-hop. He was simply a good man, touching society on every side, not separating himself either from the "laity" in the church, or the people of the world, by any artificial pretensions or appearances. He was educated for a literary man, but, like all the Jews, had also learned a useful trade—the art of tent making. At Corinth Paul wrought in his occupation with Aquila, because he was anxious to compel the Corinthians to believe in the truth of Christianity, through the disinterestedness of its messengers. If you had entered the workshop you would have seen Paul and Aquila busy at the fashioning of poles and pegs, and Priscilla sitting on the ground stitching at the canvass, with as much skill and sense as other workpeople, and making their calculations for sale so as to "minister a profit for "their necessities." But Paul, although a manufacturer, was an example that he had an object in life beyond his tent-making—a world beyond the world. Tent-making occupied his mind. He made tents in order that he might build temples. Here is the test of a man—what ideas has he beyond his daily industry? There are many of whom you never think except in the character of their earthly functions. You mention their profession or trade—they are lawyers, doctors, grocers, tailors, and that is all. No part of their life is devoted to the advancement of the heavenly plan—to the destruction of evil—to the relief of misery—to the diffusion of truth. They are like salt without savour, and "good for nothing" is the epitaph which God writes upon their foreheads when they are dead. But think of Paul as a tent-maker now? Thus let us also strive to do everlasting work amidst the transient occupations of time.—*Christian Spectator*.

"GOD GAVE THE INCREASE."

"Apollos watered, but God gave the increase."

The Corinthians were divided in attachment to their various teachers, and the Apostle wishes to reconcile and unite them. How he does he proceed? By setting forth the true relation and office of the teacher, and also the superior relation which God sustains to the work of their salvation. The preacher is a mere laborer in the vineyard—God secures the efficiency and prosperity of the whole. He is all in all. We should be grateful to the farmer, who labors for us and provides us with food; but are we to forget Him who stands far above the farmer? Should we not feel much more gratitude toward Him who sends the earlier and the later rains—who blesses the farmer's labors, and gives increase to the seed sown? In like manner, then, are we to look upon apostles, prophets, and teachers as benefactors; but only in a subordinate degree to Him from whom cometh every

good and perfect gift. The scope and design of the passage, then, is to impress upon their minds a sense of obligation to God, so deep and fervent that human leaders could only be recognized in their true relation as laborers in the vineyard of Jesus—as workmen and builders in the temple of God.

As the seed scattered by the farmer falls into the earth, so the truths preached by the Apostles find lodgment in the hearts of men. The field is the world, in the broad sense; but subordinate portions of the field compose subordinate fields. The Corinthians were God's field, *georgion*, verse 9. It is translated *husbandry*, but its primary and common signification is *field*, and it is so translated by many. It was on this field that Paul had labored in sowing the seed. Doubtless this field, like the one spoken of by the Saviour in the parable of the sower, might be composed of several kinds of soil. There were the good, the thorny, the wayside, and the rocky ground. These different kinds of soil would most undoubtedly produce different results, though the preacher and the truth preached were the same in every case.

God gives the increase. This is as true in the spiritual as in the natural world. The Apostle here asserts nothing in regard to the mode in which the increase is given in either case. There is no direct allusion to mode. If we learn anything in regard to it here, it must be by tracing out the analogy between natural and spiritual vegetation indicated in this and other passages. Let us, however, keep to the figure. Many of the fanciful theories on this subject would find no countenance in this passage, if the analogy was not departed from, and something else substituted in its stead. God gives increase, or causes things to grow, in the natural world. "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him and to every seed his own body." Does God cause seeds to grow through the operation of natural laws and secondary causes or does he do it by a direct and supernatural interposition? The Scriptures say that "earth brings forth fruit of herself"—some translate it *spontaneously*. That is, God has endowed the elements with certain inherent properties, which, when acting in conjunction with the vital qualities of seeds, cause germination and growth. It does not concern us now to inquire into the manner in which these powers and properties of nature are upheld by God—whether by an incessant radiation of upholding power from Deity, as our image in the glass is upheld by an incessant radiation of light from ourselves; or whether God has endowed each property of nature with an inherent quality of constancy as a mode of its existence. Into these questions we are not called upon to enter. We are content to know that the earth brings forth fruits of herself, through the operations of natural properties and powers, which become secondary causes. There is no supernatural interposition of divine power in the process in causing the truth to grow, from a passage of Scriptures which compares the growth of truth to that of seeds? Can we sup-

pose a thing to exist in one term of comparison, when it does not exist in the other term which is the basis of the analogy? Then if such a process cannot be proved in natural growth, neither may it be inferred in the spiritual. But it will be inquired, How does God give the increase? We ask, How does he cause seeds to grow? The operations of mind and the formation of moral principles, are as mysterious as the operations of matter and the formation of natural substances. It is certain, however, that the *good ground* and the *good and honest heart* brings forth abundantly—that the thorns choke out the grain, and that worldly lusts erase moral impressions—that the rocky ground brings forth temporary fruit, and that the fickle-minded soon turn again into frequented paths—that the wide ground provides nothing, and that understanding is the first step in the road to reformation. In other words, as different qualities of ground produce different results, so different states of heart produce different results. As God works through secondary causes in the natural, so he works through secondary causes in the spiritual. But, says one, does not God employ a powerful agency, distinct from and above the truth? I ask, Does he employ such an agency in the natural world? Prove it, and I will admit such agency is taught in the passage under consideration. If you cannot prove it, why draw such an unwarrantable inference? But, says another, you make the giving of the increase to come through man, while the Scriptures ascribe it to God. Yes. The Scriptures say that "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him," and also that "the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself." These are no less contradictory than that "God gives the increase," and that it is also dependent upon a "good and honest heart." It is very easy to reconcile such apparently conflicting statements by reflecting that although there is but one great First Cause, there are many secondary causes, and that an eye is properly ascribed to the one as the other. Then while it is the good and honest heart that brings forth fruit, it is God that gives the increase.

C. R.

MERE FORMALITY.

The word of God, and the church of God based upon the word, countenance no mere formality.

Violence must be done to the conscience, or the scriptural ordinances of the church must be wrested from their plain meaning, before membership in it can be professed by careless or thoughtless believers, or office assumed in it by any of its members animated by considerations merely worldly.

Either *God* or the *world* will have our hearts best thoughts and best services. But oh! to serve God—to come daily to His Word and learn something more of his heavenly and gracious character—to submit to his teaching, and by His word to be furnished to all good works:

amidst all our imperfections, short comings and stumblings, still to be led on by His tender and fatherly hand, forgiving, strengthening and enabling us to live not to ourselves, but to Him who died for us and now lives for us, and who will, we know not how soon, appear for us, bringing in his kingdom of glory: is not all this worth *devotion*? Is it not worth the sacrifice of a world which perishes in the using? Is it not worth everything? And is it not worthy a creature formed for communion with his Creator—formed for happiness, for enjoyment, for eternity? Do any inquire how they may secure this happiness? By the study of the word of God, in which He has made himself known. And what must they give for its attainment? All things contrary to that word. Let it never be forgotten that the education of the Word is opposed to the education of the world; but, the one has the promise of life which now is and that which is to come;—the other has also its fruits—disappointment and death.

C. D. H.

ORDINANCES DIVINE AND HUMAN.

If Christ has given directions to His people, they must be the best: otherwise the creature must be wiser than his Creator.

If Christ has given laws to His people, they are guilty of rebellion if they neglect to obey them.

If Christ has given instructions to His people, He will punish their disobedience.

Christ will also commend and reward those who keep His commands.

Every deviation from Scripture insults the Lawgiver by impugning His wisdom, setting aside His authority, and despising His instructions.

In observing the appointments of Christ, or the ways which are in Christ Jesus, which Paul "taught *everywhere, in every church*" (1 Cor. iv. 17) the *SPIRITUALITY* of Christ's kingdom is maintained in *efficiency*, the gifts of His people exercised *profitably*, the power of His presence manifested *evidently*, and His wisdom made *apparent* as the sun shining in his strength.

All these blessings are *obscured*, more or less, by every deviation from the *DIVINE MODEL*.

For these, and other reasons, we cannot bow down to any national idol, whether that of Rome or England, whether that of Scotland or Geneva.

Any system deviating in the least from the *SCRIPTURAL MODEL* we are not concerned to vindicate. We would willingly see it perish before the edifying and all glorious model of the Word of God.

1 Cor. iv. 16, 17: iv. 17: xi. 1, 2, 16; xiv. 33; Eph. v. 1: Phil. iii. 17; iv. 2; 1 Thes. i. 6; ii. 14.

Remember. When brethren departed from the example of the Apostle he would not praise them.

WORDS FROM THE WORK-TABLE.—No. XVIII.

"Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego answered and said to the king, O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O King. But if not, be it known unto thee, O King, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up" (Dan. iii. 16-18.)

In this chapter we find one of the most vivid of Old Testament pictures. At the mouth of the river Chebar we come upon the plain of Dura, in the midst whereof stands a colossal image of gold. In the background is seen a yawning fiery furnace, casting its lurid glare upon the crowd and deepening the golden hue of the monster image. Those who have descended coalpits, visited glass-factories, or passed through the "black country" at night, can readily conceive the power and appearance of this furnace as the flames leap and dance within. In the foreground Nebuchadnezzar, seated in regal pomp, has summoned the princes, the governors, the captains, and the great ones of the land. He commands them to do homage to the image, threatening all who refuse with death. The great men, at the dictation of their imperious master, bend the knee and bow the head before this senseless image. But in the midst of the crowd are three men whose countenances are fairer than the rest and whose appearance is more comely and attractive. These are the men who refuse to defile themselves by partaking of the king's meat, preferring to subsist on pulse and water. There they stand, arrayed before that mighty monarch and his court. For what? Hear the accusation—"These men, oh king, have not regarded thee: they serve not thy gods, nor worship the golden image thou hast set up." "Is it true? Do ye not serve my gods, nor worship the golden image I have set up? . . . Now, if ye be ready to fall down and worship, well—if not, ye shall be cast into the burning fiery furnace, and *who is that god that shall deliver you out of my hands?*" Unmoved by the grandeur around them—fearing not the fury of the king—unappalled by the fiery death, these Jewish captives reply in the forcible language that heads this paper—"Our God whom we serve, is able to deliver, and he will deliver." They knew that their God could save them, but if His purpose would be better served by their passing through the furnace, they were willing to endure rather than violate His laws. "But if not." What majesty in these three words! They embody a faith fearless of consequences. Firm in their obedience to Divine-commands, they leave results with God. Into the furnace they are cast. The infuriated king has caused it to be heated "seven times more than it was wont to be heated." What of that? The omnipotent hand of Him in whom they trust brings them through with hair unsinged, garments unchanged, and with out the smell of fire passing upon them. B,

their undeviating love of right they compel that haughty monarch to acknowledge the God they serve and to respect their own standing and character.

The picture is finished. Has it any lessons for us? Some say that this *Old Testament* is effete, that it has served its purpose, and now only contains "heaps of Hebrew old clothes—Jew stars long since gone out." But there is life-power in it, quickening us into activity by the noble example of ancient worthies and by its types and histories, which carry us Christward and strengthen our faith by bearing witness to the facts of the New Testament.

Can the Christian learn anything—can he derive comfort or instruction from this old story? Truly, yes; and much need have we in this day of expediencies to study its teaching.

1. The complete confidence and reliance of those Hebrews in the protecting power of God. In the present time we meet people who have full confidence in Christ as a Saviour—who can unhesitatingly commit their souls to his keeping, knowing that his death brought life and immortality to light—who by their anxiety, their yielding to worldly schemes, and conforming to worldly customs, seem to have little faith in God as a provider and preserver. They can trust Him for their spiritual food, but ignore his power to guide them in temporal matters. Such should ponder this example, till under any exigency they can say—My God can deliver; but if not—well, even then I will trust! Ponder it till they can exclaim—"Although the fig-tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines; the labor of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls; yet will I rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation."

2. They allowed no unnecessary arguing of of the matter—they knew that God had said—"Thou shalt have none other gods but me"—"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them, for I the Lord, thy God, am a jealous God," and therefore their reply was prompt. They held no parley with the tempter—they knew God could save—not only *could*, but would guard them either *from* or *through* the furnace. "They trusted in the Lord: He was their strength in the time of their trouble." This lesson is supported by the example of our Lord himself. In the temptation in the wilderness he promptly repelled the tempter—the Word of God was his ready weapon: and again in his to Peter there was no delay—no lingering about the matter as though it might be entertained. Nay, there is an abruptness in our Lord's address that is very rarely apparent, as though in haste to cast from him anything that might draw him from his great work. Sin is often encircled with so much seeming beauty, so insinuating, that we need promptness. If we parley the

chances are that the chains will be cast about us. Let us be prompt with our "Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou savorest not the things that be of God;" or else, with the Jewish children, firm in our "But if not" we will not thus sin.

3. We are constrained to admire their close adherence to the Law. There were many surrounding circumstances which might have been pleaded in excuse for swerving from duty. Captives in a strange land—slaves to an absolute monarch—their language but little known—threatened with a fearful death—surely they may yield to the compulsion, bow before the image, and pass on. What care the Babylonians? It is but a form. In their hearts and in their homes they can still serve God, who is merciful, long suffering, and slow to anger. Not so did they reason. They understood that with God "obedience is better than sacrifice," and accordingly they ate not the king's meat, neither would they worship the king's image. But in the present day many seem to think and act otherwise. With the full blaze of gospel light around them, with the word of God in their hands, they cut, trim, hesitate, and keep hold on the world, adding just as much Christian practice as they imagine may ensure an entrance into heaven. We have our laws, and we should act upon them as strictly as did those captives. Can we conscientiously say we do? If we examine ourselves on one or two points only, we find ourselves wanting. Our law commands us not to neglect the assembling of ourselves together—to commemorate the Lord's death on the first day of the week. How frequently are trifles allowed to deter! A little rain, a little headache, a little fatigue, a little distance and we neglect the Lord's ordinances, bow down to the *idol ease*, and lose sight of the cross. Then we often think more of self than of Christ. They thought of God, not of themselves. We sometimes have little or no influence—we move in such restricted circles, what can we do? We cannot change the order of things—we have neither time, nor talent, nor money. These captive children might have pleaded their isolated position, but they desired to honor God—they were obedient to His commands and thus brought glory to Him and honor to themselves. Let those who complain of lack of power and opportunity read again and again this Jewish record, till in their turn they can do likewise, and earn for themselves respect as consistent doers of that which they profess, instead of bringing reproach upon the cause of Christ by their lukewarmness.

In manufactories furnaces are required for various purposes. We may also, in Scripture, find traces of several which God employs. There is the Refining furnace in which God's children are purified by affliction. There is the Testing furnace, in which they learn the quality of their faith and by which it is manifested to others. And there is the Destroying furnace into which the rejected are cast. Happy are those who endure the trials first named, for they

shall receive the crown of life which the Lord has promised to them that love him.

Preaching brethren! Is popularity courting you? Is he whispering that if you will just keep back that unpalatable truth and speak in more general terms you will gain a large congregation and effect much good? Do you perceive that if you speak all the truth a furnace awaits you? Well, the Lord can and will bring you through it, but if you go not forward in faithfulness you are likely to finish your course in one of severer fire, from which he will not deliver. Stand ye forth and speak all the words of the law of love—the gospel and commands of Christ.

Man of business! Do you see the furnace? Is it hard work to make both ends meet, and would a little deviation from the Lord's own ways bring you safely over? Are you reminded that "Everbody does so," and that your means of doing good would be increased? Well, never mind what Satan says, but say you. "The Lord will deliver, and if not, then for his glory I'll go through the fire, if need be!" Be like the poor old Irish woman, in the recent revival, who, having given her heart to Christ, was confronted in her lonely cottage by the whiskey jar which was her only means of livelihood. Sin or destitution seemed to be the only alternatives. But little consideration was required, love to Christ prevailed, and the jar was, with its contents, dashed into the road with the exclamation, "Christ and thee cannot dwell together." Thus she went into the furnace, and no doubt the Lord was watching to deliver in the right time and manner. Be then ready to say—

"My God, whether I rise,
Or still lie down in dust,
Both I submit to Thy blest will;
In both, on Thee I trust."

Trembling, loving one, bending at the Throne of Grace, asking that your absent treasures may be safely kept and brought back to your arms, can you say, "But if not?"

"Whate'er my God ordains is right:

Here will I take my stand,
Though sorrow, need, or death make earth
For me a desert land,
My father's care
Is round me there;
He holds that I shall not fall,
And so to him I leave it all."

Stricken, suffering one when earthly things seem passing away—when pain racks the frame, and all that loving hands can do, or skill devise, seem powerless to relieve, can you say—"But if not?" Can you look beyond and trustingly exclaim—

"Whate'er my God ordains is right;
He taketh thought for me;
The cup that my Physician gives
No poisoned draught can be,
But medicine due;
For God is true,
And on that changeless truth I build,
And all my heart with hope is fill'd."

"Whate'er my God ordains is right ;
 My Light, my Life is He,
 Who cannot will me aught but good :
 I trust him utterly ;
 For well I know,
 In joy or woe,
 We soon shall see as sunlight clear,
 How faithful was our Guardian here."

If this entire trust be ours we shall most assuredly be enabled to carry out the Apostle's injunction, *his voice always*.

"The child leans on its parent's breast,
 Leaves there its cares and sinks to rest ;
 The bird sits singing by its nest,
 And tells aloud
 His trust in God, and so is blest
 'Neath every cloud.

"He has no store, he sows no seed,
 Yet sows aloud and doth not heed :
 By flowing stream and grassy mead
 He sings, to shame
 Men who forget, in fear need,
 A Father's name.

"The heart that trusts for ever sings,
 And feels as light as it had wings ;
 A well of peace within it springs :
 Come good or ill,
 Whate'er to-day, to-morrow brings.
 It is His will !"

Birmingham.

LOUISE.

CAMDEN TOWN, LONDON.

I have now come to that page in my life's history on which to chronicle the closing events of my Evangelistic labors on these shores. On next Lord's day evening I shall (n.v.) preach my last discourse in England, and on Tuesday, May 24th, embark on the "Great Britain" for Melbourne, Australia.

My brief sojourn in this country has been happy and blessed, and will ever be a green and cherished spot in memory's vale, upon which my soul will delight and ponder, when traversing the arid desert or the toilsome steep of life's journey.

On April 27th my labors at Nottingham and vicinity closed with 15 additions—13 by faith and baptism, 1 from the Baptists, and one reclaimed. Of the above number 6 united with the church at Bulwell. On the same day the brethren presented me with a chest of medicines and a set of Barnes' Notes on the N. T. handsomely bound. The following day I took the parting hand of the brethren and bade them a last farewell. I arrived in London in the afternoon, and preached in Milton-hall in the evening to a large and attentive congregation, and have continued my labours up to this time. The present results of these labours are 12 additions—8 by faith and baptism, 1 reclaimed, 1 from the Baptists, and 2 by commendation. Betides these 4 others have decided for Christ and will shortly be "buried with him in baptism."

For the information of the brethren I will ere give the apparent result of my evangelistic work during my visit to this country. I have been preaching in these isles nearly two years and nine months, during which time 331 *additions* have been made to the fold of Christ through my instrumentality and the blessings of God.

And now, dear brethren, to you and to all the faithful brethren in Christ I affectionately bid my last farewell. Yes, farewell ! till we meet in you bright world above, where the parting tear will not bedim our sight, nor the farewell hand be given. Here we meet and part again, but there we "meet to part no more." Blessed thought ! Thrice happy and blessed ! Farewell ! Farewell ! God bless you !—Yours affectionately in Christ.

HENRY'S. EARL.

EVANGELISTS' ADVICES.

On the 5th of May I took the cars to Clinton, on the Buffalo and Lake Huron Railway, for the Township of Wawanosh. Next day I walked 17 miles, carrying a heavy carpet bag, to the house of Bro. J. Densmore where I felt at home, and spent a day resting and making appointments before I could preach. I continued preaching on both sides of the river Maitland, in this Township, over three Lord's days, and considering all the circumstances, I had no reason to be discouraged. One Brother was baptized, and several other persons told me that they knew we had the truth, and I trust that some other Brethren will soon make them a visit and find them ready to obey. If Bros. Anderson and Lister could visit them for a couple of weeks this fall, I believe a church could be organized. There are 13 members there already.

Bro. James Hunter accompanied me on the 23rd as far as Clinton on my return, and walked nearly all the way so that I might ride. I found Bro. D. Butchart, from Eramosa, in Clinton, and stayed with him over night on my way going and returning from Wawanosh. He and his sister wife made me quite welcome, and I enjoyed their company very much.

On Queen's birth-day I left the cars at Mitchell Station in the forenoon and got to

Bro. McDougal's, in Fullarton, early in the afternoon. I continued preaching and visiting about Fullarton Corners for nearly a week. One Sister was baptised, and there are several others not far from the Kingdom of God. There are four different organized bodies of professors here, 2 classes of Methodists, Presbyterians and Free Baptists. The Brothers McDougal and Sister McDougal once connected themselves with the last body, but by some means they are now separated. I found these Baptists very friendly, some were glad to hear me preach baptism; some thought me unsound on foreordination, others approved our views on that and other subjects connected with it, and others are still in doubt but considering. I hope that Brethren going to Wawanosh will call and reap a harvest, and be classed with Bro. Kilgour and myself, whom they called *honest Baptists* preaching what they believe.

Mr. Alexander McDougal conveyed his brother and myself 30 miles to Listowell on our way to Minto, he intending to preach in Gaelic and I in English in the Townships of Minto and Arthur. We found the Brethren in Minto upon the whole doing well. Bros. John Darroch and Donald Ferguson are the only speakers among them, but I understand that they are both intelligent and reliable men. I made Bro. Darroch's house my home while in Minto, and would be glad to see Elders in every church copying his example in training his family. In Minto the hearing for the time and place was good, but none volunteered to follow the Saviour. This little church deserves to be helped. Bro. McDougal only remained a few days in Minto, when he had to go home.

The next place visited was the Township of Arthur, about five miles from Mount Forrest. In this Township there are quite a number of Disciples who have united with the Baptists about the time the Baptists organized as a church, and when they would receive them without compromising their principles.

At present Baptist Calvinism (Fullarism) is more prominently set forth. The Disciples do not feel satisfied. From several experiments which have been made in that direction, I am satisfied that no intelligent Disciple of Christ can feel at home in a *Baptist Church*. In conversation with a prominent Baptist minister, we drifted from one point to another of our differences until we stuck fast on the *effectual calling*, he maintaining that man cannot believe the Gospel until he is first made alive by the Spirit, and that it is just to condemn the unbeliever for losing his power to believe God! On this tour of six weeks there were three baptisms, one in Wawanosh, one in Fullarton, and one in Arthur.

After the June meeting, I visited Bro. Cyrus Bower, near Berlin, intending to preach a few days in that locality, but in consequence of a German camp meeting then in progress in the neighbourhood, it was thought best to postpone it. Bro. Bower is a firm Disciple and well qualified to plead the truth, and from the consideration that he is well known and esteemed as a reliable man by the German and English population, and well acquainted with both languages, he should be urged to become a proclaimer of the Gospel. Bro. Lister is expected there soon. From Berlin I went to the neighbourhood of Fulton, where a small church of choice members was organized about twenty years ago, but shortly after that a majority of them became Adventists, and the remaining few, (Bro. Stewart and his family), though still as firm in the truth as ever, do not meet as a church.

I would recommend to Bros. Anderson and Lister, when they go to the opening of the meeting house at Carlisle, to spend some time between Fulton and Strathbane, and I think the prospect is good for organizing a christian church comprising more members than formerly. One was baptized near Fulton on this visit.

JAMES BLACK.

Eramosa, July 8th, 1864.

Visited Uxbridge. Bro. Anderson could not leave Esquesing to come at the appointed time. He joined us at the third meeting. We continued more than a week. Good attendance, good order, &c., but no additions. Spoke two or three times in Stouffville. One meeting was occasioned by the death of a fine promising boy, son of Bro. Wm. Kester. Little Willis has gone, but Jesus said, "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Brother and Sister Kester will look to Jesus, who will bring us all to enjoy a happy meeting hereafter. We left for Bowmanville, where we had two good meetings. Brother Anderson had a warm invitation to visit all those places. He had a good deal to do in those parts. The little old-fashioned, flint lock blunderbuss is not much in requisition when we have on hand good one hundred pound rifle guns. This is as it should be. How thankful we ought to be for good, substantial and able preachers.

Took leave of the friends in Bowmanville for Mure. Held meetings there nearly one week. Spoke in four different places. Had a good turn out just above Brighton. Glad to know that Brother Wm. Ainsworth is there and doing a good work. The church in Mure is doing very well. Thence to Hillier. We have here a full house, but there are certain influences at work here, I mean in the County, of which it does not become me to speak particularly, which will in all probability prevent us doing much good to perishing sinners.

29th July, 1864.

L.

DEAR BROTHER LISTER,--

The Lord's Supper was instituted before his death. It is said to be an institution in the church. As I read the Bible, the church was not set up until the day of Pentecost after the death, burial, resurrection and ascension of the Lord. Please reconcile or explain, and oblige yours in the one faith,

ANDREW.

MY DEAR BRO.,--

True, the supper was instituted before the church commenced. The "all things whatsoever he commanded" were given before that period. These were intended by the great Teacher to be practiced by those who

should become members of the church which was subsequently established. See Matthew xxviii. 20.

L.

ITEMS.

Synopsis of news from the B. M. Harbinger, May and June:

During May,	Three additions in Birmingham.
"	Two " Liverpool.
"	Five " Walsal.
"	Six " Dundee
During June,	Four " Birmingham.
"	Ten " Chelsea, London
"	Three " Bath.
"	Three " Loughboro.
"	Four " Shrewsbury.
"	Four " Newick, Sussex.

See also a letter from Brother Earl.

For the Evangelist Fund,

From the church in Pickering..	\$17 00
From the church in Gainsboro'....	6 50
From Bro. Allen Way.....	2 00

Received for the co-operation from

Brethren in Wawanosh.....	\$3 50
A. and J. McDougal.....	7 00
C. Bower.....	5 00
Brethren in Flamborough.....	3 00

J. B.

During the last month I have been assisting Bro. Sheppard in holding meetings in Lobo and Mosa. The attendance was large; six or seven were baptized. The prospects in the west are encouraging.

Aug. 8, 1864.

S. KILGOUR.

Communications from J. Ash and Wm. Thomson, were received. Too late for this No.

N. B.

ADVISER.

Published monthly. Only 50 cents if paid in advance. All money, new names changes of address, &c., should be sent to Elder Jas. Kilgour, Rockwood. All matter designed for its pages will be received by Elders Jas. Black and Jas. Kilgour, Rockwood; Lazarus Parkinson, Eramosa, and C. J. Lister, Bowmanville. The last responsible for any deficiency.