

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées

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

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

Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque

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

Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/  
Pages détachées

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

Showthrough/  
Transparence

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

Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue

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

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

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

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

Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

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

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

# THE GOSPEL TRIBUNE,

FOR ALLIANCE AND INTERCOMMUNION

THROUGHOUT

## Evangelical Christendom.

VOLUME II.]

NOVEMBER, 1855.

[NUMBER 7.

"ONE IS YOUR MASTER, even CHRIST: AND ALL YE ARE BRETHREN."

*As it is now necessary that all should possess the means of forming a sound and true judgment, as to what the Scriptures teach respecting the use of wine, the reading community are brought under a debt of gratitude to Dr. Mair, by the manner in which he brings the subject under their consideration in this well-timed Essay. Let it be attentively and prayerfully studied: that it was so prepared none can doubt who know the esteemed author. Let none make light of it; the magnitude of intemperance as a monster evil is every day crowding upon the attention—already, it makes the ears of every one to tingle. From whence can deliverance come if abstinence from intoxicating drinks is not a Scriptural requirement? To prove that every inebriating cup should be shunned, in obedience to God, as "The Cup of Devils,"—the poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps," is the object of this Essay.*

### The Topic for the Month.

#### OBSERVATIONS ON THE TEXT

'Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils.'  
1 Cor. x. 21.

The Bible has much to do with distinctions between truth and error, right and wrong, [Lev. x. 9, 10. Ez xlv. 21, 23. Phil. i. 10, see marginal reading,] and notwithstanding the bold and startling paradoxes of a recent writer in the *Westminster Review*, as to the equal harmlessness of alcohol, and the food which we daily use without suspicion or scruple for the sustenance of our bodies,—proves them to belong to opposite categories, and the former to be a moral, intellectual, and physical poison. We must not let men of this stamp, "glorying in their shame, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not," and thrust their absurd and mischievous dogmas upon the voracious maw of "the world, lying in wickedness," without giving to the word of the Lord, "like a hammer," an opportunity to shiver to atoms their base and brittle arguments, and expose to scorn their vile and despicable sophistries. With the view of counteracting such evil influences, we have selected the passage "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils," as the basis of the following remarks.

In this portion of Scripture we opine that only two modes of interpretation can be recognised. Let it be premised that the persons addressed are viewed by the apostle, as in their normal state of health, nothing being said to the contrary.—Then, the truth expressed, "Ye cannot drink," must apply either to the liquid to be drunk, or the manner of its being drunk; either—I. To two cups—the one salutary, which can be lawfully drunk by the persons addressed; and the other noxious, which cannot be lawfully drunk by them: or—II. To only one cup, and that salutary,—which there are

two modes of drinking, one lawful, and the other unlawful, one permitted, and the other prohibited. We shall endeavour in humble dependence upon the teaching of the Holy Spirit, to ascertain which of these alternatives is according to His mind, and therefore to be received as Divine truth:—and may He who is "Light and Love" dispel all darkness from our understandings, and cause us to comprehend this glorious theme in all its simplicity and grandeur.

We are first to take into consideration the doctrine, that there are two cups mentioned in the text, one salutary, which can be lawfully drunk by the persons addressed; and the other noxious, which cannot be lawfully drunk by them.

Two cups are mentioned in this passage, "the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils," and the impossibility of drinking the one and the other. "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils." We purpose treating the subject under the following heads:—

I. What is the meaning of the expression, "the cup of the Lord?"

II. What is the meaning of the expression, "the cup of devils?"

III. What is the meaning of the declaration "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils?"

I. What is the meaning of the expression "the cup of the Lord?"

In the 16th verse of this chapter we find the following words:—"The cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion of the blood of Christ;" and in the 21st verse, the passage before us: "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord." We believe that "the cup of blessing" and "the cup of the Lord" are synonymous or nearly synonymous expressions, or scriptural equivalents. By the word "cup" is to be understood the wine contained in "the cup." What is the meaning of the qualifying term "of blessing"—"the cup of blessing?" To find out this we must refer to Isaiah, lxx. 8, where these words are presented

to our view: "Thus saith the Lord, as the new wine is found in the cluster, and (omitting *one* in italics) saith, Destroy it not; for a blessing (omitting *is* in italics) in it: so will I do for my servants sakes, that I may not destroy them all."

The meaning of this interesting and important portion of Scripture, plainly is,—that 'the new wine' contained in the grape is a good thing, is a blessed thing, and worthy to be compared with 'God's elect,'—as may be seen by referring to the 22nd verse of the same chapter:—"They shall not build, and another inhabit: they shall not plant, and another eat: for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and *mine elect* shall long enjoy the work of their hands." Jehovah there assents to the prayer offered up to Him, that 'the new wine' may not be destroyed. (See also Psalm cxvi. 13, for another scriptural equivalent of this good wine.)

But what is meant by 'the new wine in the cluster,' in its full sense? The meaning of this expression is—wine which has not undergone the vinous fermentation, or wine possessing the same essential qualities which it had when contained in the bottles (grapes with their air-tight tunics), formed by the Divine hand—for preserving it incorrupt—or without the formation of alcohol; for when once alcohol has been generated in or added to the expressed juice of the grape, it can no longer be justly affirmed respecting it that 'a blessing is in it.'

But is there no other passage of Scripture which can be brought to confirm this solitary testimony in favour of this interpretation? Yes,—we point to Deut. xxxii. 14, where we find these words, "and thou didst drink the pure blood of the grape;"—one of the blessings in store for the Israelites, when they should inherit the promised land, in conjunction with other good things enumerated by Moses, viz. "butter of kine, and milk of sheep, with fat of lambs," &c. We also direct attention to Canticles, v. 1., where Christ the bridegroom invites His friends to partake of His choice gifts:—"I am come to my garden, my sister, my spouse, I have gathered my myrrh with my spice; I have eaten my honey-comb with my honey: I have drunk my wine with my milk: eat O friends; drink, yea drink abundantly O beloved;"—and to Proverbs ix. 5. where Jesus under the figure of wisdom says,—“Come eat of my bread and drink of the wine which I have mingled.” And we may add

NOTE.—Various processes have been used for preventing vinous fermentation in the juice of the grape, and other saccharine fruits, such as boiling, filtering, &c.; but this is not the place for enlarging on this subject. It may, however, be noticed, that in ancient times, must, or unfermented wine, could be kept for the space of a year without damage, as may be seen by referring to the writings of Cato, Columella, and others;—and the names given to certain of their wines by the Greeks, such as *adynamic*—or impotent,—and *amethystic*—or incapable of producing drunkenness,—*ethical*,—&c., might be sufficient to show that the use of such wines was not uncommon amongst them: thus Columella—"Inerticula tamen nigra, quam quidem Græci *amethystos* appellant, potest in 2da quasi tribu esse quod et boni vini est et innoxia, unde etiam non traxit, quod iners in tentandis nervis, quam vis in gustu non sit hebes." The following quotation from Thenard the illustrious French chemist, shows that some years since, the preparation of sweet or unfermented wine, formed a considerable branch of commerce in the south of France:—"On préparait il ya quelques années dans le midi de la France, pour le besoin de commerce un assez grande quantité de sirop de raisin. La préparation s'en faisait comme celle du sucre cristallisé et se faisait que, pour prévenir la fermentation du mout, et le bravailler à loisir, il était nécessaire de le muter, et qu'on lieu de l'évaporer jusqu'à bouilliant, il fallait seulement l'évaporer jusqu'à 3/4, &c."—Traité de chimie, par L.I. Thenard, Tome iii. p. 175.

that Milton, the sublime author of Paradise Lost, borrowing his thoughts from the fountain-head of inspiration, favours this view of the subject, for he says of Eve, when by request of Adam preparing a repast for Raphael their heavenly visitant:

—"For drink the grape  
she crushes, inoffensive must, and meath from many a berry,  
and from sweet kernels press'd  
She tempers dulcet creams."—

He would be a bold man indeed, who in the face of such facts would contend for the doctrine that the Holy Spirit never intended that any other wine should be used by holy men of God, but that which Solomon says 'biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder'—and Moses calls 'the poison of dragons and cruel venom of asps';—and who would dare to assert that Jesus invited his beloved friends to drink abundantly of such wine, and chose it to be the symbol of His sin-atonng blood.

We hold it, then, to be established that the wine spoken of 1 Cor: x. 16. was the pure blood or juice of the grape, in which the process of fermentation had not taken place, and in which there was no alcohol.

So much towards the explanation of the term 'the cup of blessing', or 'the cup of the Lord'—its synonyme. But it may be remarked still further upon this part of the subject, that to the term "the cup of blessing", some specific meaning must have been attached, or some intrinsic good quality ascribed by the inspired Apostle of the Gentiles; otherwise God's blessing could not have been invoked upon it, if it had been an evil thing. The phrase is "the cup of blessing which we bless," or literally, the blessed wine, upon which we implore a blessing, as the symbol of Christ's blood. By which we are to understand that it was a good thing by creation, before the special blessing of God was invoked upon it, and when that prayer should be answered by Jehovah, it would be rendered a double blessing by Him. In confirmation of this view we refer on the authority of Dr. Lightfoot, to the thanksgiving of the Jews at the passover-supper: "Blessed be Thou, O Lord, who hast created the fruit of the vine." They thanked God for so good a gift, as "the fruit of the vine," which they used unfermented, and unadulterated. They did not thank Him for fermented, alcoholic wine, which is never spoken of as a blessing in the Bible, but which we often read of in connexion with God's judgments upon the wicked (vide Lev. x. 8, 9, 10, 11. Ps. lxxv. 8. Prov. xx. 1. Prov. xxiii. 20, 21. Jerem. xxv. 15, 17. Jerem. li. 7. Rev. xiv. 10; xvi. 19; xviii. 3). By the cup of the Lord, then, is to be understood simply "the wine of blessing," or "the good wine," which on account of its intrinsic excellence, the Lord Jesus Christ has selected to be the appropriate emblem of His precious blood, similar in its qualities to "the pure blood of the grape," Deut. xxxii. 14, and the new wine in which is a blessing, Isaiah lxv. 8, but not necessarily involving the idea of its being specifically set apart at the "table of the Lord"—to be drunk as the *unique* symbol of His blood.

Let us now pass on to the consideration of the question.

II. What is the meaning of the expression "the cup of devils?" If we have been successful in finding out from Scripture the precise acceptation of the term "the cup of the Lord"—a clue has been provided by means of which, we may be able to thread our way to the exact meaning of the opposite term, "the cup of devils." By referring again to Isaiah, lxxv. 8, we meet the words "Destroy it not; for a bless-

ing in it, *i. e.* Destroy not, or let not be destroyed the new wine found in the cluster." Now—what is the process by which "the new wine found in the cluster" is destroyed,—if not the vinous fermentation; and the result of that fermentation, to which we are conducted, if not alcohol? Thus we arrive at the meaning of the term "the cup of devils," in a very easy manner. It is fermented, or alcoholic—or intoxicating wine. But are there no other parts of Scripture which corroborate this conclusion?—Yes—we can refer to more than one parallel passage, *e. g.*, Deut. xxxii., the same chapter in which the good wine is spoken of with approbation. We find in allusion to the idolaters, at the 33rd verse, these words, "Their wine is the poison of dragons, and the cruel venom of asps,"—and in that most remarkable passage, Prov. xxiii 31, 32, we have the interdict—"Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it moveth itself aright," and the reason assigned for not doing so—"at the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder." These are figures of speech which cannot be mistaken.—They evidently imply physical and moral evil, as resulting from the use of such wine, for they are taken from "the old dragon and old serpent," "the devil," who was 'a murderer and a liar from the beginning.' But our proofs and illustrations need not be confined to the Old Testament. Let us turn to the New, where, Ephes. v. 18, we find the following words:—"Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess, (*αραια*, from *αραιος* not saveable, incorrigible, dissolute, from a priv., and *αρω*, the principle of destruction, the poison alcohol, which, alas! often destroys both soul and body in hell,) "but be filled with the Spirit." Now we venture to express our opinion upon this passage to the following effect,—that it cannot be considered as merely forbidding drunkenness, in the ordinary acceptance of the term, because we have no instance in Scripture where anything less than complete abstinence from intoxicating wine is enjoined as a remedy for intemperance, (*vide* Deut. x. 9, 10, 11; Ezekiel xlv. 21; Prov. xxiii. 31,) and it would be contrary to the 'analogy of faith' if this passage were to be understood to tolerate the use of such wine up to a certain point below the degree necessary to constitute inebriety. Moreover the force of the antithesis would thus be destroyed. Let us invert the passage, and say,—“Be not filled with the Spirit, but be drunk with wine wherein (or in which) is excess, (the principle of destruction,)” words which might very aptly be put into the mouth of the devil, and what would his meaning be, if not that his votaries should take their fill of alcoholic wine, and thus become totally devoid of the Spirit; for to be fully intoxicated (vulgarly dead drunk) necessarily involves the fact of being utterly deprived of all spiritual influence. But can it be conceived that the Spirit of lies would be more zealous in carrying out his wicked devices than the Spirit of truth, who has said, "it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing," (Gal. iv. 18,) in accomplishing his gracious purposes for the advancement of the Messiah's kingdom? We see no alternative, then, but to interpret the passage under consideration, (using the Greek word *μεθυσθητε*, after the example of the Septuagint translation of Ps. xxxvi. 8, and lxx. 4, not in the sense of drunk, but satisfied or filled,) thus, "Be not filled with wine in which is excess, but be filled with the Spirit;" and when we analyse it into its component elements, as authorised by the reasons stated above, we extract the following meaning from these words,—“So far from being filled with wine in which is excess, or the principle of moral and physical ruin, be filled with the Spirit:”

implying entire abstinence from intoxicating wine, the synonyme of "wine wherein is excess;" for if a state of complete drunkenness must entirely destroy all spiritual influence, is it too much to believe that any quantity of such wine, however small, received into the body, (in man's normal state of health,) will proportionally diminish spiritual influence, and so prevent the individual using it, from being filled with the Spirit, which is the command of God? Thus we have ascertained by searching the Scriptures, and comparing "spiritual things with spiritual," that the meaning of the expression, "the cup of devils," is fermented or alcoholic wine; or in the language of the Bible itself, "the poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps;" the red wine which at the last "biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder;" "the wine in which is excess," or the principle of moral and physical ruin—all Scriptural equivalents signifying wine in which the poison "alcohol" is found, and to which it gives its pernicious qualities.

III. What is the meaning of the declaration "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils?" Or, as we have ascertained the signification of these two last clauses—"Ye cannot drink the pure blood of the grape or unfermented wine, and fermented or alcoholic wine." By the words, "Ye cannot drink," we are not to understand that there existed physical impediments to the Corinthians drinking unfermented and fermented, or non-alcoholic, and alcoholic wines, which could not be overcome by them, or that such obstacles now exist to the use of such wines;—but we are to look upon these words, as signifying a moral inability, on the part of the Corinthians and others, to drink alcoholic wine, because of its internal use by man in his normal state of health being forbidden by the Almighty. Let us endeavour to analyse the expression "Ye cannot drink the fermented and unfermented wine." It is plain that the use of unfermented wine by man is not contrary to the Divine Law, for the beloved friends of the Saviour are invited to drink abundantly of it, and it was one of the special blessings promised to the Israelites as already noticed; but the force of the expression turns upon the assumption that if a christian has been taught by the Holy Spirit that the use of alcoholic wine is contrary to the law of God, and will therefore be highly displeasing to Him, he must be in a state of mind which will effectually prevent his making use of that noxious wine which God has stamped with the brand of His execration, while he will thankfully receive from His bountiful hand, and joyfully drink that good wine which He has included amongst His special blessings to His chosen people. The words "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils" might thus be paraphrased.—“Ye cannot drink the cup of devils without sin, and ye will not use the pure blood of the grape with thanksgiving to God for so good a gift—while at the same time you do not hesitate to violate His law in drinking that wine which He has denounced as 'a mocker,' and to which He has assigned the appalling name of 'the poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps,' conveying the most terrific ideas of its vast powers of physical and moral evil to man." In short, the inspired Apostle means that "the pure blood of the grape" will be thankfully received by christians, taught by the Holy Spirit the truth in this matter,—as a blessing from God; and its opposite, the wine in which is the principle of moral and physical degeneracy, will be rejected by them as "an evil thing."

We infer then from the preceding considerations that it was the mind of the Holy Spirit—1st. That the Corinthian christians in their normal state of health

should abstain from the use of alcoholic wine, and other alcoholic drinks, as intrinsically poisonous in a moral and physical point of view: and 2d. That all christians in all ages in their normal state of health, should abstain from the use of alcoholic wine and other alcoholic drinks, as intrinsically poisonous in a moral and physical point of view:—according to the word “all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to every good work,” 2nd Tim. iii. 16, 17.

Having thus endeavoured to bring out the truth of Scripture upon the text, we now proceed to consider:

II The doctrine that there is only one cup and *that* salutary, which, there are two modes of drinking, one lawful, and the other unlawful,—one permitted, and the other prohibited.

In consulting the commentaries immediately accessible to us, we find little to satisfy. It seems as if their authors had shrunk from grappling with the subject, and merely glossed over it in their remarks.—We refer to the writings of Burkitt, Scott, and Barnes. Thus Burkitt—upon the text which we have had under review, and its context—“Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils: Ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and the table of devils,” offers the following comments by way of explanation:—“That is, ye cannot have communion with Christ and with idolaters, too: your communicating with Christ in the Lords’ Supper is utterly inconsistent with communicating with devils in the idol feasts, for this were to do homage to two contrary lords, God and Satan, and to profess service to both.” He then goes on to say that a “sacramental table is here described,” and that “it is impossible that those that hold communion with sin, and particularly idolatry, can be worthy partakers at the Lord’s Table.” Scott does not surpass Burkitt in his exposition of this portion of holy writ, for neither of them distinguishes between the things which differ in sense in these two adjoining but remotely connected passages. Thus Scott in his note on verses 18–22, attempts to explain both in the following words: “Indeed they could not render the ordinances of Christ consistent with these abominable rites (their sacrifices to devils, fallen angels, and malignant demons); and if they attempted it, they would provoke the Lord to jealousy by this familiarity with His detested rivals; as if they were ‘stronger than He,’ and could defend themselves against His judgments; even as a woman though not guilty of gross adultery, must excite the suspicion and indignation of her husband, if she associated familiarly with the man of whom he entertained a peculiar jealousy.”

The nearest approach to an explanation of the passage, “Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils,” by itself, is that of Barnes; but even it is far wide of the mark. He says in his note on verse 21st, “Ye cannot drink,” &c., “This does not mean that they had no physical ability to do this, or that it was a natural impossibility, for they certainly had the power to do it; but it must mean that they could not consistently do it. . . . This is a striking instance in which the word *cannot* is used to denote not natural but moral inability.” He then descants upon the custom of drinking toasts at feasts, as a practice that partakes still of the nature of heathenism, and originated in the heathen custom of pouring out or drinking wine in honour of their gods. “It was one of the abominations of heathenism,” continues he, “to suppose that their gods would be pleased with the intoxicating draught.” All these commentators seem nearly agreed as to the

sense which they attach to this complex passage, making no distinction between the two sentences which, we believe, contain two separate and most important doctrines. Their interpretation of the whole passage, as far as we can discover from their notes, is simply this: that the Corinthians could not consistently with their profession of christianity, and without provoking the Lord to jealousy, be present at, and partake of the Lord’s table, and of the feasts which the heathen celebrated in their temples in honor of their idols, &c.

The objections which we have to urge against this interpretation may be included under the following heads:

1st. The views of Burkitt, Scott and Barnes, if they afforded a just and adequate representation of the doctrine contained in the whole passage—“ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord’s table and the table of devils”—would show that the first division of that passage was superfluous and unnecessary to the establishment of that doctrine.

2nd. The nature of the language used by the Apostle in the passage—“ye cannot drink”—“the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils”—does not admit of its being intelligibly used in conjunction with the terms “the table of the Lord, and the table of devils.”

3rd. The ordinary interpretation affords no solution of the enigma, that liberty was granted by the apostle to the Corinthians to eat whatsoever was sold in the shambles (market), or presented at a feast, “asking no question;” but that no liberty was given by him to drink whatsoever was sold in the market, or presented at a feast for their acceptance.

1st. The views of Burkitt, Scott and Barnes, if they afforded a just and adequate representation of the doctrine contained in the whole passage—“ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord’s table, and the table of devils”—would show that the first division of that passage was superfluous and unnecessary to the establishment of that doctrine.

It has been shown already that the meaning of the expression “the cup of the Lord” is “the wine of blessing” or “the good or unfermented wine;” and of the expression the cup of devils, “fermented wine, or the wine in which is the principle of moral and physical destruction.” If the terms “the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils,” were used by the apostle to signify essentially the same wine, possessing kindred qualities; and the only thing in the drinking of it which he represented as objectionable was the contingency of its being drunk by a Christian communicant at the idol feast of idolaters, and in company with them, after it had been offered in sacrifice to idols (a difference of relation not of kind); no reason can be seen why this passage should have been introduced at all into this didactic discourse, for then the wine spoken of would have belonged to the same category as other articles of drink or food used at the Lord’s table, or at the feasts of idols, to which no exception was taken on their own account, and all addressed by the apostle would have been fully aware of its being one of the things included under the general term “the table of the Lord” as much as bread, and which it was therefore lawful to use equally with bread upon all occasions, except in the circumstances stated above in connexion with idol worship. The same reasons exist then, according to this view, why bread (or any other indifferent article) should have been specified by the apostle as well as wine, in the passage referred to, or both omitted; but no notice whatever having been taken of bread by him in that passage, neither ought any no-

tice of wine to have been taken by him. Thus the inspired apostle is implicated in the charge of having introduced into the record of divine truth his own words, void of right meaning, and having a tendency to lead its readers into error—a charge tantamount to the imputation of the crime of violating the commandment “ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it:” (Deut. iv 2:)—or, blasphemous alternative the Holy Spirit must be made the author of words void of right meaning, and *therefore* having a tendency to lead into error; both of which suppositions, or even the faintest idea of the last must be rejected by every Christian with feelings of righteous indignation and abhorrence.

So far as we have advanced in the examination of the views of our opponents, we are constrained to adhere to the interpretation given above; because as has been briefly—but we trust correctly—shown, their views are inconsistent with the fundamental doctrines upon which our faith in the testimony of Scripture is established, repugnant to the sensibilities of the renewed heart, and do not explain the phenomena of the case. How different it is with the interpretation which has been propounded on the other side of the question. If the apostle intended by inspiration of the Holy Spirit to teach 1st, the Corinthians—and 2dly, all Christians, (as we have endeavoured to prove,) that “the wine of devils” was an intrinsically poisonous thing, (and not objectionable by association merely, as bread was,) and therefore to be eschewed upon all occasions in accordance with the principle laid down in the commencement of the chapter—“These things were our examples to the intent we should not lust after evil things,” &c.; and the saying “Flee from idolatry;” then we can see good and substantial reasons for the special reference made to *that noxious wine* in this passage of holy writ, and to its antidote “the cup of the Lord;” for the one, the wine of devils, is an evil thing, and one of the warmest friends of idol-worship, and very frequently itself idolized, while “the wine of the Lord,” or “the wine in which is a blessing,” is one of the most formidable enemies of idolatry and Satan’s power, and highly propitious to the advancement of the true religion, and the establishment of Immanuel’s kingdom throughout the world.\*

The next objection to the prevailing doctrine which we have to consider is:

2nd. The nature of the language used by the Apostle in the passage “Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils”—does not admit of its being intelligibly used in conjunction with the terms “the table of the Lord and the table of devils.”

Transposition of the very words, without addition or subtraction, fixing the meaning of these affirmations, ought to be capable of being made, without the sense being impaired or altered, if it was the intention of the Apostle, to express one kind of meaning in both paragraphs. Let us try if we can separate the words “Ye cannot drink” from their connexion with “the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils,” and unite them with “the table of the Lord, and the table of devils,” so as to bring out a meaning. We find this to be an impossibility—for “Ye cannot drink the table of the Lord and the table of devils,” would be sheer nonsense—although it can be said intelligibly “Ye cannot be partakers of the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils.” The reason is that the Apostle used different kinds of terms to convey different kinds of truths—a positive verb and noun to signify

a positive or abstract truth, and a relative verb and general term to signify a relative truth, both of great importance to mankind. And here ‘we do rejoice and will rejoice’ that the ‘Spirit of truth has selected’ a word to express His precise meaning which cannot by any hook or crook, be warped so as to bring out a different meaning; for if instead of the term drink, the term drink *of*—had been used in conjunction with the term “the cup of the Lord—and the cup of devils;”—a transposition might have been effected, and the sense perverted thus:—“Ye cannot drink *of* the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils;” Ye cannot be partakers *of* the Lord’s table and the table of devils;”—might be written intelligibly in this manner—“Ye cannot be partakers *of* the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils—Ye cannot drink *of* the table of the Lord, and the table of devils,” (*i. e.* of the drinkable things on the table,) and thus the meaning be brought out which we have been endeavouring to controvert because we believe it to be false.

It is perfectly plain then that the inspired Apostle, if it had been his intention to convey one truth only in the passage referred to, instead of using diversified forms of expression as he has done, would have confined himself to one mode of expression: thus—“Ye cannot be partakers of the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils,—neither can ye be partakers of the Lord’s table and the table of devils;”—or as the general term includes the particular terms belonging to it, under it, and “the table” therefore includes the cup, or wine under it—he would rather have omitted “the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils” altogether, and have expressed himself simply in this manner, “Ye cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord and the table of devils”—including under the generic term “table” everything placed upon it, and expunging altogether the saying “Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils;” as unnecessary and misleading. Here then we are still more confirmed in the truth of the doctrine we have endeavoured to deduce from Scripture in the preceding pages.

3d. The ordinary interpretation affords no solution of the enigma, that liberty was granted by the Apostle to the Corinthians to eat whatsoever was sold in the shambles (market) or presented at a feast “asking no question,” but that no liberty was given by him to drink whatsoever was sold in the market, or presented at a feast for their acceptance. “Whatsoever is sold in the shambles that eat, asking no question for conscience sake.” Upon this text Barnes remarks, “the meat of animals offered in sacrifice would be exposed there (in the market) for sale as well as other meat. The Apostle says that it might be purchased, since the mere fact that it had been offered in sacrifice could not change its quality or render it unfit for use.” They were to abstain from attending on the feasts of the idols in the temple, from partaking of meat that had been offered to them; and from celebrations observed expressly in honor of idols; but lest they should become too scrupulous, the apostle tells them that if the meat was offered indiscriminately in the market with other meat, they were not to hesitate to purchase it or eat it “asking no question for conscience sake,” “not hesitating or doubting as if it might possibly have been offered in sacrifice.” “If any of them that believe not, ask you to a feast, and you be disposed to go, whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for conscience sake.” Upon this text Barnes has the following remarks: “Whatsoever is set before you, and whether it has been offered in sacrifice or not, the connexion requires us to understand it, ‘Eat.’ This should be interpreted strictly. The apostle says ‘eat’ not

NOTE.—In a future essay the truths here assumed may be fully and scripturally proved.

'drink,' and the principle will not authorize us to drink whatsoever is set before us, 'asking no question for conscience sake,' for whilst it was a matter of indifference in regard to eating, whether the meat had been offered in sacrifice to idols or not, it is not a matter of indifference whether a man may drink intoxicating liquor. That is a point on which the conscience should have much to do, and on which its honest decisions and the will of the Lord should be faithfully and honestly regarded." Under the 25th verse of this chapter, Barnes moreover says,—“That which is purchased should be in itself lawful and right. It would not be proper for a man to use ardent spirits or any other intoxicating drinks, more than it would be to commit suicide, because men offered pistols, and bowie-knives, and halters to sell." Here the point seems to be conceded by this eminent commentator, for which we are contending, viz., that intoxicating drinks (or as expressed in the Holy Scriptures, the wine in which is *αγωρια*, or the principle of destruction) cannot be lawfully used by man any more than he can lawfully commit suicide. How strange it is then that he should have slurred over the passage which appears so clearly to bring out the doctrine of the apostle, that fermented, alcoholic or intoxicating liquors, are according to christian law contraband, and to be shunned by man except for medicinal and mechanical (*not sacramental*) purposes.

The reason then why permission was granted to the Corinthians addressed by St. Paul, to purchase meats, but not drinks at the market; and to eat meats, but not to drink liquors at feasts, without scruple or inquiry, was neither more nor less than this, that there was a divine law of universal obligation against the use of "the cup of devils," or fermented wine, while no moral or even ceremonial obstacle, existed to the indiscriminate use of meats since the abrogation of the Jewish polity. Thus the enigma is solved which otherwise must have remained inexplicable.

In conclusion.—It has been seen that Moses, Solomon, Isaiah, and Paul,—those eminent children of light, and of the day, (to whose honored names a long list of sacred writers might be added,) concur in declaring sentiments, and applying epithets expressive of the divine approbation to unfermented wine, and of the divine disapprobation to fermented wine, as a drink for man. The essence of fermented wine, upon which its deleterious qualities depend, is alcohol. It therefore follows that all alcoholic drinks belong to the same category as fermented wine. Concerning it St. Paul, addressing the Corinthians says, "ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils;" but it has been shown above that this saying in a secondary sense applies to all christians: it is therefore the duty of all christians to abstain from alcoholic drinks. But not only can we claim the illustrious names given above in favour of this doctrine. Immanuel himself, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," stands forth pre-eminently conspicuous as the author and patron of total abstinence; for when upon earth, and accused by his bitter enemies, the Pharisees, of being "a wine bibber," He made use of these memorable words in His vindication—"wisdom is justified of all her children," (Luke vii. 35,) evidently referring to the wine which He under the personification of wisdom (Prov. ix. 5), mingled, and of which he invited his beloved friends to drink abundantly, (Solomon's Songs, v. 1,) as the only wine which he sanctioned for a beverage to man, and which he has signally honored by choosing it to be the sole symbol of his sin-cleansing, soul-saving blood!

From the preceding statements the following doctrinal principle and moral precepts may be deduced:

I. Total abstinence from alcoholic drinks by man in his normal state of health, is a clearly revealed doctrine of the Bible, and ought to be received by him as of Divine, and not of human origin and obligation.

II. It is high time for those christians who have imbibed their notions of total abstinence from the traditions of men, and not from the fountain of divine truth, to ask themselves the question as "in the sight of God"—"How can we continue any longer to drink of that wine as the sole symbol of our Saviour's sin-atonement blood at His table,\* which the Holy Spirit has stigmatized as 'a mocker,' and to which He has given the appalling name of 'the cruel venom of asps,' instead of 'the cup of blessing'—'the fruit of the vine' unfermented,—which 'wisdom hath mingled for her children?'"

III. It behoves those christians who have hitherto stood aloof from the temperance movement altogether, because it has seemed to them to introduce a transcendental morality, not warranted by Scripture, to conform not to it as the teetotalism of human expediency—which shall be as the "morning cloud, and as the early dew that passeth away," but to that of the Bible, which is like its divine author, immutable; "being built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."

JOHN MAIR, M. D.

NOTE.—Dr. Adam Clarke in his notes on Deut. xxxii 14, "and thou didst drink the pure blood of the grape," thus writes: "This was the liquid bountifully given to the Israelites by their covenant God, and no ingenious perversion of thought or cunning invention of man can make me believe that the liquid used by our Lord was essentially different from it. What analogy can be traced between the corrupted juice of grapes, with its soul and body destroying poison, and the pure and innocent blood of the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world?"

#### UNEXPECTED FAVORS.

Many encouraging letters are received at the office of the *Gospel Tribune*, which tend greatly to strengthen and cheer the publisher in his work. These sometimes come from parties so situated, as to make the receipt of their favors an agreeable surprise. Of this, the following is a pleasing example, as it indicates a clear appreciation of the *Tribune's* mission.

Dumfries, 1855.

DEAR SIR:—I have never seen you and, perhaps, never will. I hope you are not a stranger to Jesus Christ our Lord. If you are not a stranger to Him, you are not a stranger to my spirit, for the spirit of Christ is *only one spirit*, which animates the whole Mystical Body.

I hope party spirit will soon come to an end, so that instead of glorying in it, and other mean things, all may come to glory in Christ and in him alone, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." But, as I am not a good scholar in the English, I will bid you  
Farewell,

PHILIP GLESS.

This kind correspondent seems to have made good proficiency in the school of Christ, whatever may be his lack in the learning of the English.

## Moral and Religious Miscellany.

From the London Watchman

## A SHETLANDER'S LETTER FROM THE BALTIC FLEET.

Before CRONSTADT, 28th June, H.M.S. *Cæsar*.

"DEAR FATHER AND MOTHER, SISTERS AND BROTHERS,—With the greatest of pleasure do I embrace this opportunity of writing you, to let you know that I am well in health, comfortable in body, and above all, I am happy in mind, and have before my eyes the hope of heaven. I rejoice in Christ my Saviour. Father, father, I have been several years on board a man-of-war, but it appears in this ship the day of Pentecost has returned; may God carry on his work more and more. There were only three, I think, in this ship last year that professed Christ (the other two besides myself are gone away or invalided,) yet now we are increased to between 60 and 100. More than one-half of these can rejoice in the pardoning love of Christ, and have the witness of the Holy Spirit. They know their sins are forgiven, and can go on in the good old way, rejoicing in the hope of heaven.

"Dear father, we have a regular Wesleyan Class-meeting twice a-week, and a leader chosen from ourselves. Our prayer-meetings are held every night, the class twice a-week, as there is neither room nor time to speak to all one night, nor can all attend at once, considering the ship's duty. We commence our prayer-meeting at eight o'clock, and it is very seldom we all break up before twelve at night. We have it between the launches. After our first prayer-meeting, we generally have penitent-meetings. Almost every night some are set at liberty. Time would fail me to tell you all the particulars, and I am not allowed to send more than one sheet of paper by this mail; but I cannot help mentioning a smart young man, a coast-guard, who came in between the boats with us the other night, and sat pretty close to me. All the people had gone out except five or six besides him and me. I did not know his name, nor had I spoken to him before, although he had been all the time in the ship. Seeing him bathed in tears, I said to him, (putting my hand on his shoulder,) I cannot go down to my hammock till you pray. He fell on his knees at once, believing in the power of God; and if ever I did hear a man earnestly pray for pardon, he did. Very soon he got up rejoicing. Then, after, O, how he prayed for God to keep him watchful, and give him grace, strength, faith and love! Dear parents, it is the Lord's doing, and wonderful in our eyes; but nothing is impossible with God. You, if you were on board here, might hear a man blaspheming awfully, and before a fortnight the same man praying to God in earnest, and praising him for what he had done for him in snatching him as a brand from the burning, imploring the mercy of God to stop the current of iniquity, and save his wicked shipmates and messmates from blasphemy. I can assure you this is no strange occurrence on board the *Cæsar*. Glory be to God. O Lord, keep us humble. Another man, one night, who had a good desire once, but left off to watch and pray, and lost his peace, came to the meeting. I said to him, You must pray before you and I go to sleep this night; I want you to commence afresh. He told me he was the greatest sinner in the fleet (thinks I, that's good.) I told him Christ was a great, good, and merciful Saviour, and that he must find peace with God through Christ to-

night, for to-morrow he might be in hell. He had a hard struggle, but stepped into liberty that night.

"I am happy to say that every part of the ship, and in both watches, there are two or three of the little flock, and likewise in each boat. Night afore last, I was away in the second launch, pulled eighteen oars, the boat I belong to; so the side wall of our chapel was broken down. Well, they got between guns on the main deck, were turned out of these, and then got right in the middle of the deck, praying and singing. A glorious meeting they had. This is the news they had to tell three of us belonging to the little flock when we came on board. Our class-leader asked the ship's minister to inquire of the commander if he would allow us to go down into the cockpit on the Sunday afternoon, for we have men who can preach as well as pray. He allowed us to go on the main deck, and a glorious meeting we had. They will soon get tired of that, however, and send us to the cockpit.

"I have the pleasure of telling you that I have had a letter from my brother A—, begging of me to give my heart to the Lord. What a blessing! You have two sons on the road to glory. Pray on, father; the Lord will hear you. I hope brother R— has given his heart to God. I wrote to him inside the last letter I sent to you. I have no more time to write to you.

"We had a blessed Wesleyan meeting yesterday, being Sunday, in the afternoon, on the main deck no one to molest us. I never saw so many praying men in one place in all my life as are here.

"Dear parents, brothers, and sisters, begging an interest in your prayers, [and you have mine,]

I remain, your's till death,

JAMES JOHNSON."

From the Londonderry Standard.

## OPEN-AIR PREACHING—OPPOSITION OF ROMANISTS.

The Roman Catholic journals in this country have commenced a furious crusade against "open-air preaching," as if there were a grievous invasion of the civil rights and religious privileges belonging to the denomination which they represent. It would not surprise us to find illiterate partizans, who have no reasoning credit to be endangered, talking in consequent stupidity on this or any other subject of temporary discussion; but we are certainly disappointed at finding the *Dublin Weekly Telegraph* in this catalogue, especially since its conductor is not without a literary reputation worth at least moderate care. In the last number of the journal mentioned, there is an editorial article on "open-air preaching," in which this species of service is described as an intolerable insult to the Roman Catholic community, almost exhausting to their "patience," and such as "no other people in Europe would submit to." A case of outrage, which lately occurred at Kingstown, is to be tried at the next Dublin Commission, and the writer intimates very plainly that, in consequence of the partisan character of the judges, the law will probably be declared to be *against* the riotors; and this, he adds, is a result calculated to endanger the "peace of the country." The Roman Catholic people are exhorted to "feel that they are men,"—that it is "not safe to insult them;" and, at all events, that "it cannot be done with impunity." If these sentences mean any thing, they certainly imply direct encouragement to acts of violence on the part of the Roman Catholic masses; while it is argued, that if Roman Catholic missionaries in England should publicly preach against Protestantism, they would be soundly

drubbed, and the "law in England would be with the Protestant people of England in such a case!" The sum of the matter, according to this writer, is, that "there is *one* law for the Protestant, and *another* for the Catholic;" and he accordingly suggests that, whenever a street-preacher appears, he shall be instantly surrounded by some hundreds of ballad-singers, chanting sarcastic lyrics in ridicule of "Souterism," so as to "rhyme the rats to death."

Taking as our premises the above quoted statements and declarations of the *Weekly Telegraph*, we draw from them the following logical conclusions, viz:—

1. Roman Catholicism must naturally be a very *weak, delicate* system, or it must somehow have fallen into bad health in Ireland, when the voice of an itinerant preacher upon the streets is so terribly dangerous to its life amongst the people. The true Apostolic Church holds a divine guarantee against the "gates of hell," and cares not even though the gatekeeper himself should assail her with open mouth. The Roman Catholic church in Ireland must either be troubled with a misgiving consciousness that she is *not* the true Apostolic church described, or she must *distrust* the *security* that is pledged for her maintenance.

2. "Rhyming the rats to death," in the way suggested,—that is, by raising such an uproar as to prevent preachers from being heard,—is just an evidence of the conscious infirmity alluded to. If men really believed that they had infallibility at their back, and the Redeemer's pledge as their church's shield against the "fiery darts of the wicked," they would never dream of taking a leaf out of that book of the old Pagans, who frequently beat drums, and kept up all sorts of disturbances around burning martyrs, lest a syllable of Christian truth should perchance be caught up by the spectators. An internal monitor told those old Pagans that the divinity of Jupiter would be struck down in the light of the Christian's God, and hence they prudently declined the experiment. It is a bad symptom, when, relatively to its own theology, any Christian denomination is a visible participator in the fears of the old Pagans.

3. Christianity was originally propagated by street preaching. Its first missionaries were street preachers, and were expressly sent out on this identical errand; for thus it is written in the Rhemish Testament, (St. Luke xiv. 21), "Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the feeble, and the blind and the lame." Accordingly, the second public sermon which the apostle Peter preached, after the day of Pentecost, was in an open porch of the temple (Rhemish Testament, Acts iii. 11.) And Paul and Barnabas were content with street preaching in great cities, but they perambulated the country districts in detail. Thus saith the Rhemish Testament, (Acts xiv. 6)—"They understand it, fled to Lystra and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia, and to the *whole country round about*, and were there *preaching* the gospel." It is hardly necessary to inform our readers, that this version of the New Testament is a standard authority in the Roman Catholic church. We therefore quote it in preference to the Protestant translation.

4. The consequences of this street and field preaching were, that Jews and Gentiles became mightily offended at it, and maintained that if the civil law did *not* put it down, a gross *insult* would be perpetrated against all their civil and religious prerogatives. Never had poor martyrs been so badly used as were those associated enemies of apostolic street preaching. Hear their complaints, as recorded in the Rhemish Testament (Acts xvi. 20, 21)—"These men

(the apostles) *disturb* our city, being Jews, and preach a fashion which it is not lawful for us to receive nor observe, being *Romans*."

5. In order to convince the civil authorities that it would not be "*safe*" for them to grant to the apostles the rights of toleration, the Jews and their heathen auxiliaries resolved, not indeed to sing ballads, unless Cæsars laws should leave to them no other alternative, but to try what bludgeon-men and stone-throwers could accomplish. Hear the Rhemish Testament again—"But the Jews, moved with envy, and taking unto them some wicked men of the *vulgar* sort, *made a tumult, set the city in an uproar*, and, besetting Jason's house, sought to bring (the apostles) out to the people."—(Acts xvii. 5.)

6. But although from the inspired narrative it appears that the real authors of this "tumult" and "uproar" had been the "vulgar" and "wicked men" who disturbed the "open-air preaching," yet their employers very dexterously tried to lay the blame upon the apostles; for thus adds our authority, that having failed in their attempt to seize Paul and Barnabas, the 'vulgar' and 'wicked' personages alluded to actually 'drew Jason and certain brethren to the rulers of the city, crying, They that *set* the city in an *uproar* are come hither also!'—(verse 6.) It is an old trick of the adversaries of the gospel, to raise a tumult, and then throw the blame upon others. The Jews and heathens of apostolic antiquity were capital hands at this order of manœuvring.

7. These insulted innocents, moreover, appealed to the *law*: all the matters complained of were, forsooth, 'contrary to the *decrees* of Cæsar.' [chap. xvi. 7.] And when Gallio, though a heathen judge, [chap. xviii. 14—16], refused to convict the apostles for quietly preaching wherever they could find people to listen, the Jews attempted before the judgment-seat to take the law into their own hands, by cudgelling the ruler of their own synagogue! At Ephesus, too, the Rhemish Testament informs us [Acts xix. 23], 'there arose no small *disturbance* about the way of the Lord.' First, because Paul's 'open-air' and other labours had interfered materially with *certain* parties who honestly acknowledged, 'Sirs, you know that our *gain* is by this *trade*.' [Verse 25]. Secondly, Paul had taught heretical and very 'swaddling' doctrine, namely, 'that they are *not* gods which are *made* by *hands*,' [verse 26]; and at that time an 'immaculate virgin named Diana was the heavenly patroness and special protector of the Ephesian city. This twofold ground of the 'disturbance' mentioned is set forth by the 'virgin's shrine-maker in verse 27, as given by the Rhemish translators, in the following words, viz.:—"So that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at nought, but also the temple of great Diana shall be reputed for nothing; yea, and her majesty shall be destroyed whom all Asia and the world worshippeth.' The doctrine 'that they are *not* gods which are *made* with *hands*' was held to involve both these terrible consequences; and hence the origin of the 'no small disturbance,' which arose. The parallel teaching of our own day, that they are neither gods nor goddesses who are 'made' by the hands of popes and bishops, is regarded with equal apprehension; and it is quite natural, as well as in appropriate keeping with the Ephesian precedent, that heretics abetting the aforesaid teaching should be put down by violence, if practicable; and if not practicable, then by ballad-singing to the tune of 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians.'—[Rhemish Testament, Acts xix. 28.]

8. The enemies of 'open-air preaching' by the apostles were quite sure that the law was all on their own side. They felt deeply 'insulted,' showed them-

selves to be 'men,' and they believed, no doubt, that a more hardly-used set of religionists than themselves, did not exist within Caesar's dominions, when they discovered that they could not be permitted to 'make tumults,' to set cities in an 'uproar,' and to have the street-preachers bastinadoed, or banished for the deeds of their mob-assailants

9. This was a hard case truly, and the *Weekly Telegraph* cannot, in consistency, avoid sympathising largely with the victims of so much ill-treatment, inflicted by Paul and Barnabas and their companions. Had the injured parties possessed the power of making Caesar's 'decrees,' they would certainly have passed stringent laws against all preaching in the streets and in the fields, and in every other locality in which 'proselytism' might have been successful. From the complaints of our modern victims in a similar line, we conclude that if they had the making of British law, they would suppress 'open-air preaching' by pains and penalties,—that is, they would repeal the act of toleration to the extent required,—and yet these same men can talk about civil and 'religious liberty'!

10. It is all humbug, or something worse, to pretend there is 'one law for the Protestant and another for the Catholic,' and the authors of this assertion are moreover, perfectly aware of its absurdity. If the law protects Protestant missionaries, the same law, we engage for it will equally protect Roman Catholic missionaries, if their church think proper to send them out as street or open-air preachers. Let the experiment be made, and if the law shall, on trial, be found insufficient for the purpose stated, we hereby engage to join the *Telegraph* in a constitutional agitation for the equal extension of local protection to Roman Catholic in common with Protestant street preachers.

11. In these circumstances, the outcry about aggression, insult, invasion of religious immunities, is therefore sheer ignorance, or artificial hypocrisy. If Protestants preach in the streets, or on the waysides, Roman Catholics can do the same thing if they choose; and if they do not deem it proper or expedient to act upon this right, their declinature is no reason why other people should be disfranchised. Were Protestants privileged in this respect, and Roman Catholics laid under disabilities, there would be just ground for complaint; but when both parties are equally entitled to employ the same theological instrumentalities for the propagation of their doctrines, it does seem to betray a suspicious weakness to find men raising a cry of terror at the very name of free investigation.

12. So far as we in the North are acquainted with 'open-air preaching,' ministers make it a point, on these occasions, to avoid all controversial topics likely to cause popular irritation. This, we believe, is a judicious course, since the plain gospel, intelligently embraced and self-applied, will usually accomplish its 'perfect work' without the aid of any polemic accompaniments. It may be unwise on the part of the street-preachers to follow a different rule,—as a general principle we think it is, but still, we can never admit that they have not a constitutional right in British law to act upon an opposite conviction, unless we are prepared to advocate, in whole or in part, the restoration of the penal code. Admirers of the King of Naples may entertain no objection to this retrograde policy; but having no sympathy with physical force as an instrument of men's conversion, and believing very potently that the terrors of the Inquisition have never yet conducted a single soul to heaven, we reject coercion and all mob-agency as insults to divine truth. Ballad-singing may be deemed an innocent employment, and so it is, except when

made a synonyme for religious burlesque. In this latter acceptance, it stands in the same moral category with that ancient 'form of godliness' which suggested the mockery of 'Hail, King of the Jews,' by way of divertisements to the solemnities of the Cross.

### SCATTERING, YET INCREASING.

BY THE REV. JAMES HAMILTON, D. D., LONDON.

Were it not that the process is so familiar, we would see something very strange in the operations of the husbandman. Here, on the threshing-floor, stands a heap of corn, so daintily sifted, so pure and so precious, like a little mountain of burnished gold or glistening pearls; and there, outside, is a piece of ploughed earth, so black, and bare, and uninviting; and yet into that beautiful heap he plunges his sieve, and from the snug barn carries it abroad, and ruthlessly consigns to the cold and dreary loam the bright relics of last summer, and leaves them in the rain to burst, and macerate, and waste away. You remonstrate, and he replies, "There is no other way to change that black loam into an expanse of waving verdure. And now that this barn is well-nigh empty there is no other way to fill it with sheaves next autumn. Each of these grains, I hope, will grow into an ear, and for this bushel I hope to get back twenty. I scatter to increase."

So with the merchantman. How can you let go those sovereigns, so fresh and true, so radiant with the regal visage, so rich in multifarious promise? How can you bring yourself to part with all this solid joy and concentrated happiness? "I intend that they shall come back to me, and before they return I hope each messenger will find his fellow. By trading, I hope that my ten pounds will grow to ten pounds more. I scatter to increase."

But it is not in husbandry and merchandise only that the principle obtains. You read a new publication, and you close the book, the story or the argument is bright in your remembrance. But having no society, or having that silent humour which even in society makes the man a solitary, you keep your acquisition to yourself; you never speak of it, and six months hereafter a rusty reminiscence, a dim notion, or an ambiguous fact, is the entire remainder: whereas, your affable companion, who shared his intellectual feast with friends and neighbours, retains his treasure unimpaired. Or a young scholar is making his first trial of composition; and he fears that this essay will exhaust the sum-total of his literary property. He thinks he has a few good ideas, and one or two rather striking illustrations. But if he puts the whole into the present speech or poem, what is to become of him? There will be no assets left: he will be reduced to intellectual bankruptcy. But you say, no fear. An earnest mind is not a bucket but a fountain; and as good thoughts flow out, better thoughts flow in. Good thoughts are gregarious; the bright image or sparkling aphorism—fear not to give it wing; for, lured by its decoy, thoughts of sublimer range and sunnier pinion will be sure to descend and gather round it. As you scatter you'll increase. And it is in this way that whilst many a thought which might have enriched the world has lain buried in a sullen or monastic spirit, like a crock of gold in a coffin, the good idea of a frank and forth-spoken man gets currency, and after being improved to the advantage of thousands, has returned to its originator with usury. It has been lent, and so it has not been lost. It has been communicated, and so it has been preserved. It has circulated, and so it has increased.

Again, it is the Christian's duty to scatter kind looks and gracious words, good gifts and friendly deeds; and although not the prompting motive in so doing, God has so arranged the moral husbandry, that he who thus scatters will increase. Not only will he make the world the better, but a recompense will come back into his own bosom.

The gospel is the expression of God's love, and the believer is a man who, filled with heaven's emanating kindness, becomes in his turn a living gospel. There is an ecclesiastical Christianity, and there is a dogmatic Christianity. The former regards it as the main thing to belong to a particular church; the latter lays all the stress on maintaining certain doctrines. The true Christian of the one is a sort of kerb-stone, warning off trespassers; and the true Christian of the other is a denominational flag-staff, displaying a specific testimony, or a theological lantern holding on high a certain light or doctrine. But the Christian of the Bible, if he be all this, is also a great deal more. By believing what God reveals, he becomes what God desires—a holy, devout, beneficent presence in society; a sick world's healer; a sad world's comforter; a sympathizer and a fellow-worker with the Supreme Beneficence. Remembering,

"That throned above all height He condescends  
To call the few that trust in Him His friends;  
That in the heaven of heavens, its place he deems  
Too scanty for the exertion of His beams,  
And shines, as if impatient to bestow  
Life and a kingdom upon worms below;  
Like him the soul, thus knitted from above,  
Spreads wide her arms of universal love,  
And still enlarged, as she receives the grace,  
Includes creation in her close embrace."

In other words, important as are soundness in the faith, and steadfastness of principle, these are but the roots and stem from which spring love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness; and it is hardly uncharitable to doubt if that religion be Divine which does not visit the fatherless and afflicted, as well as keep it itself unspotted from world. Not that we disparage church order or systematic theology, but that we deem vital Christianity a great deal more than either. It is the life of God in the soul; it is a transference into the disciple of the mind of the Master; it is a ray of Divine gladness kindling a human heart, converting it into a living sacrifice, and filling all the circle with such a fragrance, glow and brightness, as can only be created by fire from heaven.

When a man is thus possessed and animated, it becomes his propensity—a necessity of the Divine and diffusive nature within him—to "scatter." To do good and to communicate, are his purest delight, his favourite and familiar employment. To the hungry he draws forth his soul, and from his relaxing grasp his abundance drops in alms-deeds on the indigent, and in alleviation on the surrounding misery. His pleasant words are a healing elixir to the chafed ear of mortified hope or disappointed affection; and even in a case where grief is so great that, like Job's friends, he is constrained to be silent, there is a soothing charm in his presence, and, refracted through his glistening eye, there steals a ray of comfort into the very soul of sorrow. Moved with compassion for the multitude, he performs a good shepherd's part to some of those sheep he finds in the wilderness, and with loving contrivance—through the alluring book, or the affectionate letter, or the fervid outpouring of some solemn interview—he longs and labours to lead souls to the Saviour. And betwixt his radiant smiles and cordial recognitions, his obliging services and friendly offices, his gifts and intercessions, his provident care for his own house, and his far-reaching

care for the heathen, it would be hard to tell how much he does to augment the sum of human happiness, and diminish human misery. Losing none of its stateliness or strength, in such a man the religion of Jesus puts forth its beauty. No mere sectarian kerb-stone; he rather resembles a tree in a linden avenue, whose soft shade and mellifluous murmur at once mark the path and refresh the passenger; whilst a church composed of such members does not suggest lamp-posts all in a row, iron and cololy orthodox, but rather reminds you of an orchard on an autumnal evening fete, where tinted lights gleam forth from every leafy canopy, and mellow apples are handed down by every laden bough—where every trunk is a living pillar, and holy love the banner over all.

The believer in Jesus is the universal benefactor and it is by such free giving of his free receivings, that he not only enriches the world, but he obtains grace for grace, and augments the strength, the beauty and the happiness of his own soul. By such scattering he increases.

#### THE LITTLE SWEEP'S PRAYER.

A certain pastor relates the following fact: "I like to repeat the answer a little sweep gave me, the other day, in a Sunday School. Knowing that all the children of my class were constantly occupied during the week, I feared that the duty of prayer was sometimes neglected. I insisted that day on the importance of prayer. At the close, I asked a little boy of ten years of age, who led a very uncomfortable life in the service of the master sweep, 'And you, my friend, do you ever pray?' 'Oh yes, Monsieur.' 'And when do you do it? You go out very early in the morning, do you not?' 'Yes, Monsieur, and we are only half awake when we leave the house. I think about God, but cannot say that I pray then.' 'When, then?' 'You see, Monsieur, our master orders us to mount the chimney quickly, but does not forbid us to rest a little when we are at the top. Then I sit on the top of the chimney and pray.' 'And what do you say?' 'Ah, Monsieur, very little! I know no grand words with which to speak to God. Most frequently I only repeat two verses that I have learnt at school.' My scholar repeated with fervor, 'God be merciful to me a sinner,' 'Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, Oh, Lord, my strength and my Redeemer.'—*French Sunday School Magazine.*

#### DR. CUMMINGS ON UNION.

"Let me urge union and communion among all true Christians, on the ground of our near and dear relationship. We are fellow soldiers, fellow travellers, fellow voyagers. Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between thy herdsmen and my herdsmen, for we be brethren. It is our solemn duty to cultivate this union. We are only *insupcrable* whilst we are *inseparable*.

"To enforce and illustrate this advice, let me call upon all true Christians to look less at the defects by which their brethren are deformed, and more intensely at the beauties by which they are distinguished. Act the part of the painter who was called upon to sketch Alexander the Great. Alexander had a scar upon his forehead, which he had received in the course of his Macedonian battles, and the painter was perplexed to find a way by which to escape showing this deformity on the portrait. At last he hit upon the happy expedient of representing the monarch sitting in his chair, his head leaning upon his right arm, and the forefinger covering the scar upon his brow."

## Movements of Organizations.

From the News of the Churches.

### ALLIANCE CONFERENCE IN PARIS.

PARIS, September 18, 1855.

The great religious event of the month is of course the Conference of Evangelical Christians of all nations, convened by the French branch of the Evangelical Alliance, and which met, as appointed on the 22d of August, and following days. Such a concourse of brethren of so many countries, languages, and denominations, was I believe unprecedented. I had the honor and privilege to be present at a similar gathering in London in 1851, but it was nothing like this one in point of numbers. We, Parisians did certainly expect great things, but we were fairly overrun by the multitudes which were asking for respectable hotels, for tickets of admission [about 1500 were distributed] to the Conference, and for instructions without number on all sorts of subjects. Hence a certain amount of confusion was unavoidable during the first days. An office had been organized, it is true, but where we had one man, five or six at least would have been needed; the mere labour, for instance, of distributing every day the letters, newspapers, and parcels which were directed to the office for different persons, might have employed a postman for a great portion of the day. This confusion however did not last; the brethren helped one another as best they could; and they were all ready, I believe, to say long before the close of the meeting, "All right," since "all's well that ends well."

Another consequence of the great influx of foreign brethren was at first a certain amount of stiffness or constraint. We were overjoyed at seeing so many new faces, and yet we did not feel altogether at home. But this also very soon wore off. We were not long in finding out that we were brethren, saved by the same Saviour, and heirs to the same kingdom; and then our meetings became more expansive and of a thrilling interest. Hence the rejoicing fact that the last sittings of the Conference were as well attended as the first, and even better in some cases.

We are therefore happy to say that upon the whole the twenty sittings of the Conference have been good, very good. The excellence of the reports [the only defect of which was their length,] the amount of information that was brought forward, the unity of feeling of the brethren, notwithstanding the great differences in their language and habits,—all these made us thank God that we had been enabled to be present.

After these introductory remarks, we may enter into some details on the meetings themselves. They were generally held in the morning at ten o'clock, and in the evening at seven, and invariably ended, as well as begun by singing and prayer. The natural language of the Conference was French, but when the circumstances required it, abstracts of the reports and speeches were given in English and in German. The foreign brethren were not all presented to the Conference at the time, as was the case in London in 1851, but when the subject of their respective countries was taken up, they were welcomed to Paris and addressed in their own language by a member of the committee, whilst the audience testified their approbation and sympathy in various manners.

On Wednesday the 22d, the Conference initiated its proceedings by a solemn meeting for reading the Scriptures and prayer, in the Lutheran Church of the Redemption. Pastor Vallée, formerly the chaplain of the Duchess of Orleans, presided. Prayer was

offered in English by the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, in French by Pastor Fisch, of Lyons, in German by Dr. Krummacher, of Berlin. Luther's celebrated German hymn, "Ein, feste Burg ist unser Gott," was also sung before the close.

### EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

The first day of the Conference, Thursday the 23d, was very appropriately devoted to the Evangelical Alliance, and the Young Men's Christian Associations, which are nothing but the Evangelical Alliance practically carried out. In the morning Dr. Grandpierre presided, and gave an admirably suitable speech, drawing a most striking contrast between that day and the event of which it was nearly the 300th Anniversary, the massacre of the St. Bartholomew. What a change! a Protestant Queen is now welcomed and honored by the whole nation, invited by the Catholic Emperor himself; and at the same moment the descendants of the persecuted Huguenots invite and welcome Christians from all parts of the world! What a spectacle to present to Rome boasting of our extinction! We are millions, and we are progressing in life, love, and union.

Pastor Fisch read the report of the Evangelical Alliance. The last four years have been years of rapid progress and blessing. In conclusion, as all agree in the desirableness of union, they are, he said, but three alternatives. Union by the spirit of sectarianism,—that is the unity of Rome, casting out all who do not belong to a narrow party, and striving to extend that party alone; union by all agreeing to remain *in statu quo*,—that is death; or union in the Spirit, liberty, Christian union in the broad principles of Christ,—the latter is the unity of the Alliance.

Dr. Kunkze, of Berlin, then spoke of the Evangelical Alliance in Germany. Attempts at union have been made for three hundred years, especially in Brandenburg. The late King Frederick William III. tried to unite the Lutherans and Reformed, but these efforts to unite churches by force led to no result. Now the difficulty is that the Lutherans and Reformed and other evangelical communions join, but will not give the hand of fellowship to the Baptists, who remind them of Munster and the Anabaptist of the Reformation, while the Baptists, on the other hand, are often very harsh against Established Churches.

Dr. Cappadose, of Amsterdam, said that the Alliance had met with much opposition in Holland, from the erroneous idea that it was opposed to Established churches.

R. A. Macfie, Esq., of Liverpool, brought before the meeting a resolution of the committee of the Alliance of that town, requesting that the attention of the Alliance should be turned to the state of isolated Christians and converts in the midst of Romish, heathen, or infidel populations, and to the means of encouraging them.

Pastor Gauthey, of the Courbevoir Normal School, also spoke of the necessity of manifesting the union which really exists amongst Christians; and Pastor Hoffman, of Frankfort, called the attention of the meeting to the gathering of the Jews at Jerusalem, and to the means of promoting that movement.

### YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS.

In the evening Pastor F. Monod presided; and Mr. Max Perrot, president of the Geneva Young Men's Christian Association, read a deeply interesting, but too long, report, on the origin, the aim, the means of action, and the basis of Young Men's Christian Associations in different parts of the world. We heard with pleasure, that although these Associations are of

a very recent date, their statistics are of an encouraging character. Thus, in Westphalia there are already 130 *vereine*, as they are called, with 6000 members: in England there are forty-three Associations, with about 7000 members, who exercise a religious influence over at least 40,000 young men, most of whom are in business. In America forty-four Associations were organised some months ago, with 8000 members; but the spread of the Associations is so rapid, that that number is perhaps now actually doubled. Sweden and Denmark are the only Protestant countries where they do not yet exist. France and Switzerland have about 100 unions or special meetings frequented by 1500 young men.

Mr. J. P. Cook then read the following resolution and declaration of the principles which had been adopted the day before at the convention of delegates of Young Men's Christian Associations:

"The representatives of various Young Men's Christian Associations of Europe and America, assembled at Paris, on 22d of August, 1855,—feeling that they are one in principle and in operation, recommend to their respective Societies to recognise with them the unity existing among their associations; and whilst preserving a complete independence as to their particular organization and modes of action, to form a confederation on the following fundamental principle, such principle to be regarded as the basis of admission of other societies in future:—

"The Young Men's Christian Associations seek to unite those young men who, regarding Jesus Christ as their God and Saviour, according to the Holy Scriptures, desire to be his disciples in their doctrine and in their life, and to associate their efforts for the extension of his kingdom amongst young men."

The meeting was afterwards addressed by Pastor Durselen, president of the Rhenish Westphalischen Jungling-bund, or alliance of the associations of Westphalia; and by Mr. Smart, president of the Philadelphia Young Men's Christian Association.

#### GREAT BRITAIN.

On Friday morning, August 24, the religious state of Great Britain came under consideration.—Sir Culling E. Eardley in the chair. From the report written by the Rev. T. R. Birks, and read by Pastor J. P. Cook, it appeared that in Great Britain, five-eighths of the population may be regarded as under the Christian influence of the churches, and three-eighths not.

Denominations professing the same principles as the Church of England in her articles, are about twelve in number, and are aspiring to unity in their diversity. No great modification appears to have taken place during the last four years, neither revival nor decline. Three elements have modified the character of English Christians:—1. The papal aggression has roused Protestant feeling. 2. The Great Exhibition has drawn countries nearer together, and enlarged the intellectual horizon. 3. The discovery of gold, by drawing multitudes to Australia and California, has enlarged missionary effort; it has awakened care for emigrants, created ragged schools, and directed attention to the good of criminal transports. Then the death of Wellington, and the revival of the French empire, seem to have commenced a new era; the war has had, with all its evils, some good results, such as sympathy with France and French Protestants, an increase of missionary effort, a diminution of selfishness, and attention to prophecy. A part of the population has been injured by the infidel or pantheistic writers of America and Germany, but the good derived from Christian authors of Germany has preponderated. The literature,—

quarterlies, monthlies, weeklies, and dailies,—as regards standard or religious publications, has improved. The books of the present day are short; the telegraphic despatch takes the place of the folio volume. Of the three divisions of the Church of England, the Evangelical is increasing the most numerous in numbers and clergy; the High Church is losing ground; and the Broad Church has comparatively few representatives, but those few intellectual. The Unitarians were but one in two hundred in the last census, and tend to diminish. As to the various Christian Dissenting denominations, the papal aggression served to press them closer together with Evangelical Churchmen. The aberrations of religious opinion may be seen in the adherents to American Mormonism, accounted for by ignorance of true religion and the spirit of emigration; and still worse, in the careless latitudinarianism, which would reduce religion to mere poetic feeling, refusing it sap and life. Present duty seems to point to the field of missions,—to be active in the Lord's service,—and to the second advent of the Lord, which is now an active principle among the majority of religious men. Let us live so as to say, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus!"

The British brethren present at the Conference, seventy-three in number, were then introduced, and welcomed by Pastor Fisch in a few heartfelt words.

The meeting was also addressed by the Rev. A. Dallas, on the progress of Protestantism in Ireland; Rev. J. Jones of Ireland, on open-air preaching; Rev. Dr. Craig, and Rev. Norman McLeod, of the Established Church of Scotland; Rev. Robert Ashton, Secretary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales; Rev. Dr. Henderson, Moderator of the Free Church of Scotland; Rev. J. Benar, L. Irving, C. J. Glyn, Dr. Urwick of Dublin, and Edward Baines, Esq., of Leeds.

#### INFIDELITY.

The evening meeting was devoted to Infidelity. Dr. Krummacher, who presided, announced that he had been commissioned by the king of Prussia to attend the Conference, in order to bring back to him a correct account of all the proceedings. In a speech of two hours' duration, he mentioned seven different forms of infidelity, which obtain in Germany,—viz., 1. *Indifference*; 2. *Rationalism*, making man's reason the highest and only religion; 3. *Pelagianism*, which is rife among pastors and schoolmen; 4. *Gnostic Pantheistical doctrines*, which dethrone a personal God, annihilate all idea of futurity, all sin; 5. *Materialism*; 6. *Criticism*, which pretends artlessly to sift history, but in reality operates with *a priori* principles, such as, "The gospels are myths," &c.; 7. *A Moral Spiritualism*. Opposite this camp of infidelity is the well-armed camp of faith, the Universities being generally at the head of Evangelical movements.

The report was presented by Pastor de Presense, who successively characterised the *Deism* of England, the *Pantheism* of Germany, the *Unitarianism* of the United States, and the two new schools which have in France succeeded *St. Simonism* and *Fourierism*, namely, *Spiritualism* and *Positivism*.

The lateness of the hour only admitted of an eloquent speech from Pastor Rognon of Montpellier.

#### UNITED STATES.

The meeting of Saturday morning was one of the most interesting, and certainly the liveliest of all. G. H. Stuart, Esq., of Philadelphia, took the chair.

Dr. Baird gave a concise abstract of the report he had prepared at the request of the Conference. He successively made known,—1. The position, extent [three millions of square miles], and resources of the

United States. 2. The manner they were colonised by the English, Swedes, Dutch, Germans, French and Spaniards. 3. Their progress in every branch of material interest. 4. Their progress in moral and intellectual interests. In 1850, there were 80,958 public schools in the different States, with 91,966 teachers, and 2,890,507 scholars; 6089 ladies' boarding schools, with 12,230 teachers, and 263,096 pupils; 119 colleges, with 11,903 students; 44 schools of theology; 36 schools of medicine; and 16 schools of law; 35,000 Sunday schools, with 250,000 teachers, and 2,500,000 scholars. Fifty millions of dollars were annually spent for education. The proportion of scholars to the entire population was 1 to 5. There were 1200 public libraries, containing 1,800,000 volumes. The number of newspapers was then 2302, it now is doubtless 2500. 5. Their progress in religion. From 1800 to 1850, the members of the Evangelical Churches multiplied by eight or nine, while the general population had only increased fourfold. The census of 1850 revealed very important facts; the number of edifices consecrated to divine worship was 38,183 containing 14,270,139 hearers—that is, much more than half the population; besides which the gospel is preached in many schools, private houses, court-houses, and even forests and fields. The Episcopal church is the oldest; it has 33 dioceses and 38 bishops, two being superannuated, one in Africa, and another in China; 1714 ministers; 105,350 communicants. The Congregationalists have 2449 congregations, 1848 ministers, and 207,609 members. The Baptists form a group of eight branches, the total number of churches being 18,181; ministers, 8525; communicants, 1,058,654. The Presbyterian Church has eight branches also; its congregations amount 7752, its ministers to 5807, students and licentiates, 1544, and members, 680,021. The Methodist Church has nine branches, 8389 active ministers, 1,672,519 members; it is the most numerous of all the American churches. The Lutheran Church and others have 2591 congregations; 1418 ministers; and 242,500 communicants. The number of ministers of different denominations may be stated at 27,729, and if we add the thousands of Methodist local preachers, together with many licentiates and supernumeraries, this number will be raised to 40,000, making about one orthodox preacher for 927 inhabitants. The non-Evangelical Churches,—Romanists, Unitarians, Swedenborgians, Mormons, &c.,—have about 2946 ministers, 3607 congregations, and some 700,000 members; but they are diminishing. The Bible Society has distributed 11,000,000 copies of the Scriptures; the Society for Religious Publications has 1300 colporteurs, and effected sales last year to the amount of 526,009 dollars. There are societies for the observance of the Lord's day, for temperance, anti-slavery objects, home missions, foreign missions, &c. The last general receipts of all these societies were 3,053,535 dollars.

The American brethren, seventeen in number, were introduced and welcomed by Dr. Grandpierre, who congratulated them on having travelled thousands of miles in order to attend the Conference.

The Rev. Dr. Macleod, President of the Board of New York Missions, put the question, where is Christianity in the United States? and answered: 1st, In the hearts and lives of their Christian inhabitants; 2d, In their ecclesiastical organization, and in the various churches, all one in the confession of that truth by which we are sanctified and saved; 3d, In their voluntary benevolent associations. The palaces of the United States are the hospitals and asylums for the poor: 4th, In their state and federal government. The Congress has two chaplains, who open

and close the proceedings of both houses with prayer, and preach before them on Sundays; it also pays about 40 chaplains for the army and navy.

Mr. Danblay, an ex-member of Congress, the Rev. Dr. Patton of New York, the Rev. Mr. Wyllie of Philadelphia, and others, expressed the interest felt in their country for France, to which they owed much.

#### HOLLAND AND BELGIUM.

The sedate and proverbially phlegmatic character of the Dutch gave to this meeting, held in the evening a very different aspect to that of the morning. Mr. Elton van Soeterwande, member of the second chamber of the States-General of Holland, presided, and the Rev. Chantessia de la Saussaye, of Leyden, read a learned report on the different theological and ecclesiastical tendencies of the Dutch Reformed Churches. His conclusions were: "Protestantism has been the glory of Holland. Holland is one of the glories of Protestantism." The report on Belgium was presented by Pastor Panchaud of Brussels. The increasing power of the priests, in consequence of the death of the queen, the confirmation of the young prince, and the Duke of Brabant's marriage, excite serious apprehensions with regard to Religious Liberty. At the court and the government, all are Ultramontanes. Education is generally Papistic. Jesuitism has the upper hand. Protestantism is a very small majority, composed of a few state churches, and fifteen free churches, with a general synod. There are only twenty-five Evangelical schools in Belgium. Three religious papers are published monthly, and 30,000 tracts distributed annually, together with about 6000 copies of the Scriptures.

The meeting was addressed by Dr. Vuleton, of Groningen, and Mr. Cornet, delegate of the Synodical churches of Belgium.

The brethren of these countries were welcomed by Pastor F. Monod.

#### GERMANY.

The meetings on Popery and on Religious Liberty having been suppressed, on account of the absence of Dr. Merle D'Aubigne's report, \* and from prudential motives, it was resolved by the Committee of arrangements, that the excellent reports which had been sent from Germany on these subjects should not be put aside, and in order that they might be brought forward, the whole of Monday, August 27, was devoted to Germany.

In the morning, Pastor Fisch, and in the evening, Pastor Mayer, of Lyons, took the chair. Reports were presented by Pastor Faube, of Barmen, on the state of Germany during the last five years; by Prelate von Kappf, of Stuttgart, on the same subject; by Professor Dörner, of Göttingen, on the German Universities. † Amongst the speakers were Dr. Tholuck, of Halle, who showed the progressive development of Evangelical truth during the last twenty-six years amongst the students in the universities. Formerly there was but one university professing Christian faith, that of Tubingen; now there is perhaps only one where Rationalism is dominant, that of Giessen. In colleges where indifference or enmity against living Christianity were rife, the students now excite better hopes. Pastors de Pressense and E. Bonifas, who had studied in Germany, also gave their testimony in confirmation of the words of the illustrious professor.

\* Family and personal afflictions prevented him from preparing it, and even from attending the Conference.

† The last two were respectively read by Dr. Grandpierre, and Mr. de Pressense.

## FRANCE.

Tuesday morning was devoted to France. Pastor Fuillerat, the venerable President of the Consistory of the Reformed Church in Paris, was called to the chair. In his introductory remarks, he feelingly compared the present time, when Protestantism holds its meetings openly, with the times when it was said: "There are no more Huguenots in France." There were some, however, even then, and Louis XIV. might have known it for our prisons were filled with them.

The report was read by Pastor Farjat, a Wesleyan minister and military chaplain in Corsica, who had been requested at a very late hour to prepare it, instead of Pastor Adolphe Monod, actually laid up on a bed of suffering by a painful and dangerous illness. This trial, which is a severe affliction for the whole of French Protestantism, was twice alluded to by the subsequent speakers, and Pastor Cuvier, president of the Consistory of the Lutheran Church of Paris, proposed that a deputation should be sent to him, to express the affectionate sympathy of the assembly, and endeavour to strengthen him in the Lord. This was done on the following day, the beloved invalid being well enough to receive the deputation.

But to return. Mr. Farjat took a general survey of the fine arts, the literature, and the philosophy of France, and showed that with a few exceptions, they are far from being imbued with the regenerative spirit of Christianity. As to Popery, it has fulminated its maledictions against all that is opposed to its symbols, proscribed all study of the Word of God, undermined religious liberty, served up three ages of calumnies and invectives against those who proclaim the Word of Jesus, ridiculed and slandered Bible Societies and Protestant nations, directed the public mind towards superstitious and image worship, and worm-eaten *reliques*, and money-bought medals, and scapularies miraculous and preservative; it has increased the pomp of its theatrical ceremonies, and proclaimed the impious dogma of the Immaculate conception of Mary. Protestantism only has really done something through its churches and societies, and is daily improving, though we yet have too many heterodox, or indifferent, or spiritually-lifeless pastors, and too large a majority of unconverted and careless hearers. We want more love and more faith; we want the influence of the Holy Spirit, and then France will be ours.

Pastor William Monod, of Rouen, said, that however paradoxical it might appear, France is the natural and the best auxiliary of Protestantism in Europe; first, by her *history*, which makes conspicuous the faith of our persecuted ancestors, and prefers against the faith of the persecutors an indictment which can never be refuted; for whilst Popery triumphed over Protestantism, it was itself wounded to death. Second, by her *political constitution*. France was the first country to proclaim liberty of conscience and of worship. For the last sixty years, every successive government—the National Assembly, Napoleon I., the Bourbons, Louis Philippe, and Napoleon III., have all proclaimed it. Let France dare to practice what she has proclaimed, and the holy cause of this liberty will triumph, for in order to triumph Protestantism only wants a hearing. Third, By her *literature*. Her language is universally known, and that, in a great measure, is owing to the Reformation; the works of the Reformers are admired by Europe; then the persecution which dispersed them spread abroad the French tongue, until a door for the gospel was thus opened in every country. Her literature is constantly becoming more European; true it is not always Christian; but it strikes more violent blows at Rome than ever Protestantism did, for in such controversy

Christians would not indulge. It might be said that Catholicism also had its influential writers; true, but Bossuet's works are not so Roman Catholic after all; and where would you find the Pope's supremacy, or the worship of saints and images, in Fenelon, Massillon, and Pascal, who were not without some taste of Rome's persecutions themselves? Is there any popular writer of the present day who does not do his best to subvert Popery? Not that he joins cause with them, but he states facts. The most accredited and the most popular journals are against Rome; the *Debats*, the *Siecle*, the *Presse*, and we have no better servant to our cause than the *Univers*. Fourth, By her *moral and religious state*. France is not without some religious worship; true, but it is without religion. Now, there are two ways of being without religion, either because the religion of truth has been put aside, or because the religion of error has been trampled on; in other words, either from hatred for the gospel, or from disgust for superstition. Now France is without religion, not because she will have none, but because she is too much enlightened to keep that which had been given her. As a proof of this, see the veneration with which the people speak of Jesus Christ; see the crowds which flock to hear the truth in some towns and villages. God has therefore prepared France by its very irreligion to receive the religion of Jesus Christ. When the Gospel was preached to her in the sixteenth century, it spread as in the times of the apostles, and nothing could put a stop to it except a war of extermination. France has now recalled it, and will finally receive it.

After this speech, which was one of the best we heard in the conference, the Rev. Baptist Noel spoke on the responsibility of Protestantism in France; Pastor Dhombres, of Alais, mentioned a threefold revival which was taking place in the south of France,—in the pastors, the congregations, and the Missionary spirit; Pastor Bois, of Montmeran presented to the Conference the brotherly salutations of the villagers who constitute his flock; Pastor Puaux, of Rochefort, alluded to the interesting work begun by means of Sunday-schools amongst 60,000 Protestants of the Poitou, and insisted on the importance of beginning by the young, if we wish to renovate France; Pastor Gallienne, of Ganges, told of the awakening spirit brought about by means of prayer-meetings in the Cevenner, where he labours as a Methodist; Pastor Cadier, of Blois, gave a cheering account of the churches on the Banks of the Loire, so ravaged formerly by the revocation of the edict of Nantes; Pastor F. Monod gave a few details on the union of Independent churches, which he represents, as president of their synod; Pastor Larcher, of Achicourt, spoke of the work of the Central Society for Evangelization in the North of France; Mr. Lucien Desmenard, editor of the *Temoin de la Verité*, et Saintes, told of the fraternal conferences of the Charentes, and of their weekly, monthly, and quarterly Bible classes; and Pastor Deribeaucourt of Lons-le-Saulnier, referred to the very isolated position of Christians in Franché Comté, where there is only one pastor for seven churches.

At the conclusion of these addresses, and others from Pastors Bost and Lambert, the meeting solemnly engaged in prayer on behalf of Mr. G— of Orleans, who is threatened with the removal of his two little daughters from his guardianship, because he has become a Protestant.

(Continued on page 201.)

The remainder of this deeply-interesting sketch is necessarily withheld till the next issue for want of room.

## Views and Doings of Individuals.

For the Gospel Tribune.  
WHAT IS LIFE?  
BY THE FOREST BARD.

The golden orb that illumines the day,  
Had travelled far on his western way,  
And softly and mild did the west breezes rove  
Through the lofty aisles of the taken grove;  
But a pow'r more strong than the breeze was there,—  
The DOOMER ALL POTENT, that rides on the air,—  
And his voice, more deep than the wild wind's strife,  
Whispered me thus, say What is Life?

And a maiden play'd, through the oak-grove there,  
With a dimpled cheek, and with jetty hair;  
And the winds that blew o'er this wild retreat,  
Bore a small, small seed to her tiny feet;  
And she planted it there 'en without a design,  
And it grew to a tall and a graceful pine,  
And the breeze in its bough was hush'd from strife;  
Yet how strangely it whispered—What is Life?

The maiden then wondered what life could be,—  
The sun's bright shade, or the green-leaf'd tree,  
Or the thunder's roar, or the lightning's flash,  
Or the close-falling rain-drop's babbling splash.  
But ah, no, she thought, for it may not be these,  
The thunder's hoarse roar, or the howling breeze:  
And the maiden grew sad with her thoughts' deep strife,  
And she wondered *which*, of all these, is life.

Now she homeward turn'd with the fast-fading day,  
But thought's dark gloom she could not chase away,  
For the voice was still there with a voice how clear,  
That whisper'd, still seeming afar and now near,  
With gloom undispell'd, for the maiden was young,  
And love's flame in her youthful heart had sprung:  
But aye that one thought in her breast was life;  
It ask'd, but she, yet, had to seek—What IS Life.

Now years fled away with a magical speed,  
And the woman 's from childhood's thralldom freed,  
And Time swept along in his unceasing course,  
And childhood to womanhood ripened with force,  
And she loved with a deep and a lasting love,  
And felt it bliss in this circle to move.  
For another had loved and pledged her his wife:  
And then, she queried if *this* could be life.

On, onward sped Time with his pitiless pace,—  
Ceasless his tread, and undying his race,—  
And wisdom of years with her youth's bloom did twine:  
Again she approached her own favorite pine,  
And knelt by its roots, where her youth-tide had fled;  
Love's scroll was unfolded—the missive was read;  
Anew in her heart burnt love's passionate strife,  
And she asked of solitude—*Can this be life?*

The murmuring voice of the breeze seemed to coax:  
She paused, for she'd learned to converse with the oaks:  
She listened to catch the first sound of their voice:  
Their language she'd learned and made it her choice:  
'Twas the wisdom of age, not the fancy of youth:  
She knew that they spoke but of wisdom and truth.  
And louder than ever they spoke in their strife,  
Asserting *Endurance* the science of life.

And the swift gale passing along in its flight,  
The axiom bore on to the bosom of night,  
Till echo rebounding, returned with the trope,  
From some far-off goal whence she bade us to hope.  
Then the heart's strings burst forth as a fountain that playeth,  
And they murmur'd in joy the sweet talisman Faith.  
But hark! the ALL-POTENT, for husband or wife,  
Tells Love is the vital conducive to life.

Still her spirit was sad, and she knew not why,  
Her bosom unconsciously heaved a deep sigh.  
She said, when ten years are again grown mine,  
I'll back to thy shade, sweet whispering Pine.—  
She came, but alas! how altered! how changed!  
The eye's flash was fled, the smile was deranged;  
She mourned her belov'd,—he had made her his wife,  
A child, an adored: oh, this was not life!

Her soul now was bow'd, and her spirit was crush'd;  
She knelt by her pine, while the pearly tears gush'd;  
Thus said her sweet lips that in prayer seemed to move.  
I've tasted *Endurance*, and Faith, Hope, and Love:  
The labyrinth of life I have threaded again,  
And found them confusion, and sorrow, and pain:  
I have found in the world but a merciless strife;  
But oh, sure our Lord hath not said this is life.

Again then I met, on the world's crowded stage,  
The maiden once fair, but now wrinkled by age:  
She stood by the vortex where Folly's waves tossed,  
Extending her hand to the sinking ere lost.  
She stood there to save the poor wretch fit to sink,  
A beacon of mercy, on misery's brink,—  
An angel of pity, to point the world's strife,  
Warned by a whisper, she told them of life.

What is life? ever seemed her whole thoughts to engage:  
She found it when youth had full ripened to age.  
Yes, she found it at last, which so long was disguised,  
A voice oft by mortals neglected—despised.  
How clear burst the truth, and how dear to her soul;  
Thus angels thy music in cadence would roll;  
Believe on the Lamb who hath freed man from strife:  
Dear, bless'd invitation, 'tis unending life.

AURORA, NOV. 1855.

For the Gospel Tribune.  
REST NOT ON EARTH.  
WRITTEN FOR A FRIEND.

Whoe'er thou art, that deigns to scan this page;  
Whate'er the projects which thy thoughts engage;  
In age or youth's decline, or gay, or spirit-pressed;  
Oh! still remember, this is not thy rest.

In Pleasure's bowers thou seekest rest in vain;  
And Mammon gives not rest, but toil and pain:  
Vice gives her votaries a thorned pillow,  
And Folly bids hers rest upon the billow.

Nor for the Christian *here* can rest be found;  
Mid these rude scenes where sin has cursed the ground.  
Then let him seek it not, but onward go,  
To Heaven's own rest where endless pleasures flow.

Rest not till the fight is done;  
Rest not till the victory 's won:  
In armour rest not; 'tis not meet:  
Girded traveller, haste to greet  
Those who scorned on earth to rest,  
Who now repose on Glory's breast:  
Rest on earth is never given;  
On then, look for rest in Heaven.

M.

## CHRISTIAN UNION.

To the Editor of the Gospel Tribune.

DEAR SIR:—I rejoice to see that the excellent letters of your correspondent, W. B., have brought you into the very heart of the subject of "Christian Union," into a discussion of the nature of the union among Christians, which is desirable and to be aimed at, the basis on which it is to be founded, and the means by which it is to be sought. The question is

one which has not hitherto been discussed in its practical aspect, to an extent at all proportioned to its intrinsic importance. A union of all true Christians in one organization, is a thing so utterly diverse from aught that meets our view in casting our eyes over the present state of Christendom, that it has been assumed to be unattainable, and the mode of bringing it about, has scarcely found a place among questions for the practical consideration of Christian men. That this feeling is not universal, and that the contrary feeling is a growing one, the establishment and success of the *Gospel Tribune*, is a pleasing indication. Still, the subject is comparatively new to thinkers of the present generation, and much friendly interchange of sentiment will be necessary, ere the faithful in Christ Jesus, now scattered abroad through almost innumerable denominations, should be enabled fully to understand each other, and to see how they may unite and harmoniously co-operate in advancing God's cause in the earth, without compromising one iota of what each holds to be the truth. I would respectfully suggest that you should invite correspondence on this topic, that, from a comparison of the views of individuals in different circumstances, and subject to different influences, it may be seen what are the difficulties in the way of union, and what grounds for hope there are that these difficulties shall be eventually overcome. And, with your permission, I would anticipate this invitation, by stating freely a few of the thoughts which have long had a place in my own mind, while thinking of the approaching realization of our Lord's prayer, for the unity of His followers, and the consequent conversion of the world; "that they all may be one; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me."

In the first place, allow me to express the conviction that the union of a number of denominations into one large incorporation, might be accomplished without in any considerable degree promoting the objects for which Christian union is desirable; and that the amalgamation of two, three or four sects, into one more comprehensive sect, might be productive of evils more than counterbalancing any good results that might flow from it. In the words of one whose praise is in all the Churches, the Rev. Baptist Noel of London, the union we seek must be "a union of believers—followers of Christ, else it will be fraught with danger and disappointment. If it be a union of the living and the dead—of believers and unbelievers—of those who love Christ and those who love Him not; there will be seeds of disunion sown, which will constantly spring up. Now, if it is a union of believers, then it must be a union founded on a common faith; and on this point, I agree that it cannot be a union of Churches, inasmuch as we do not sympathize with each other's systems; but still more, because Churches, as they are now constituted, do not, even in the judgment of charity, consist purely of *living* believers. We do not want to unite the cold and the warm—the enlightened and the

bigotted—those who love Christ, and those who love Him not." The language here quoted was used with special reference to the formation of the Evangelical Alliance, but it is applicable with still more force to a union of believers in Church fellowship, and in labours of love in Christ's cause. Before union can be effective, there must be a previous separation. Were all the various Protestant denominations, constituted as they now are, united together to-morrow into one vast Church, we might find that we were further away from what we are seeking, than we now are. There would be set up, as in Roman Catholic countries, an *imperium in imperio*, a government of ecclesiastical rulers, as well as a government of civil rulers, which again would naturally tend to the re-establishment in the Protestant world of a spiritual despotism, in comparison with which our present divisions into sects would be tolerable.

"My Kingdom is not of this world," said our Lord, and yet we see our various Church organizations used as worldly engines to advance the selfish interests of scheming politicians. Instead of being simply instrumentalities for the conversion of the ungodly and the edification of Saints, the influence of this and the other Church, is made an important element in the struggle of one political party to gain ascendancy over the others. Worldly men seeking worldly advancement, cajole and flatter and bribe the representatives of ecclesiastical bodies with a view to securing the votes of the several denominations of which they are either the recognised or virtual leaders; and when they succeed in this, which is not unfrequently the case, the effect is doubly disastrous. Greater acerbity is introduced into our political dissensions, when there are super-added to them ecclesiastical anticipations, and the weapons of the Church lose their keen edge and celestial temper, when they are made use of in the conflict of earthly politics. Men in becoming Christians, do not cease to be citizens, and it is their duty, as far as their individual influence extends, to co-operate with others in measures which they conceive calculated to promote the welfare and happiness of their country. This they do in the capacity of citizens, but in their capacity of Church members, the objects they combine to promote, should be purely of a spiritual character. A Church should not assume the badge of any political party, and if she does so in order to secure for herself peculiar favours of any sort, she sells her birthright for a mess of pottage, and betrays the cause of her Lord and Master. And more than this, if the Church is enticed into meddling with matters out of her own province, the natural result will be the growth of a spirit of ecclesiastical domination. When the early Church forgot that Christ's Kingdom is not of this world, ecclesiastical tyranny and ecclesiastical corruption grew up together side by side, until they attained such gigantic proportions that throughout Christendom little was left of Christianity but the name. But human

nature in the same circumstances is the same in all ages, and if all our Protestant denominations could be incorporated into one, which should contain all the worldly elements now existing in the several denominations combined together, the ecclesiastical rulers of such an incorporation would constitute the most important powers in the State, and would be in a position to set up or cast down civil rulers at their pleasure. The people would find they had got a new master, whose tyranny would be all the more crushing and irresistible, that it had attached to it the sanctions of a supposed sacredness exceeding aught that any merely civil power can claim. It was such a tyranny as this that our forefathers threw off at the Reformation, and we would act unwisely if by anything we should do we should contribute to bring about its re-establishment.

The reason why more evil than good, is expected from the mere union of several Churches into one, arises simply from the circumstances so strongly urged by the Rev. Baptist Noel, in the paragraph quoted above—the circumstance that the Churches, as they are now, are not as they ought to be, consisting as they do of the cold and the warm, the living and the dead, those who love Christ, and those who love Him not. Did they consist purely of living believers, seeking above all things else, the glory of God and the spiritual welfare of their fellow men, the evils we have referred to would not arise from their union. On the contrary, the further that union was carried, the more powerful would it be for good and not for evil.

If then there be any force in the sentiments I have thus ventured to express in opposition to the idea that all we want, is to be attained by the incorporation of existing sects, we must consider what other modes of action are open to those who desire to promote the cause of Christian union. It seems to me, at least at the present moment, and until a clearer light is cast upon the subject by ample discussion, that there are but two. The first of these is for Christian men to unite together into a Christian Church, of which the sole term of membership shall be union with Christ, the Head of the Church.—Failing this, the other mode of action which may be pursued with advantage, is for Christians in the various denominations to promote within their respective communities, greater purity and separation from the world than now exist, so as to hasten the time when the Churches thus purified, and assimilated to the likeness of Christ, shall be impelled as strongly to a thorough incorporation, as are the streams of earth to mingle their waters in the mighty ocean.

You seem to fear that any attempt to realize the object we have in view by the first of those modes, would merely result in the formation of a new sect, which would soon become as sectarian as any already in the field. Undoubtedly this danger is to be ap-

prehended from any attempts at union, if they do not proceed on the right basis. But I do not see that the idea set forth by your correspondent, W. B., if fairly carried out, would imply anything like the formation of a new sect. Let a Church be formed, which, however excellent and liberal in other respects, yet necessarily excludes any one class of believers in Jesus, it is still a sect. But let it be formed on such a basis that it shall not knowingly shut out any whom Christ hath received, or admit any whom He hath not received, and it would be an abuse of language to call such a body a sect. A sect properly means something cut off, separated, ideas altogether incompatible with the constitution of a body which should open its arms wide to receive all the true followers of the Lord. You speak of the "Brethren," "Disciples," and "Christians," having degenerated into sects. But were they ever anything else? A merely Catholic name does not necessarily imply a Catholic spirit or a Catholic constitution; and, if I am not mistaken, the denominations to which you allude, have been from their very origin, the most sectarian of all sects. Other denominations make a belief in a certain set of doctrines their term of communion; these, the submission to an outward ceremony, performed in a particular manner. A Catholic basis is the all important consideration, the name a merely secondary matter, all that is proposed, is a return to the position occupied by the Church in the first three centuries of her history, during which period, greater inroads were made on the Kingdom of Satan, than in all the fifteen centuries that have since elapsed. In these our days, when the powers of evil are more than ever rampant, we want revived the old divinely appointed instrumentality wherewith to oppose them, and to carry forward the peaceful triumphs of the gospel of salvation.

I am aware, however, that before any such union can be realized, many, very, many prejudices, and these too the prejudices of good men, will have to be overcome, and unless the spirit of God work more powerfully than our feeble faith anticipates, we cannot expect to see it speedily brought about. But to the other mode of action suggested, no possible objection can be raised. We cannot avoid seeing that the standard of communion is very low in perhaps all denominations. It would be hard to find a Church, by simply connecting himself with which, a new convert would find that Christian communion and fellowship which his renewed spirit longs for. In a fellow member of the Church he has scarcely any greater grounds for hoping to find a brother in the Lord, than in a fellow clerk or a fellow merchant. In seeking for disciples with whom to hold spiritual fellowship, he will find them just as readily in the circle with which his daily avocations surround him, as in the Church itself. This surely ought not so to be, and while we uphold the principles of freedom

of communion against secretarians, we must struggle for purity of communion against those who, looking only to the swelling out of the list of Church membership, make no distinction between the precious and the vile, but incorporate wood, hay, stubble, with the gold, silver, and precious stones, which should alone be accepted in building up the temple of the Lord. If efforts to this end were earnestly put forth in the several denominations, we might hope ere long to see them in a condition fit for being united into one glorious and irresistible phalanx, which should go forth strong in the Lord and in the power of His might, to bring all nations into a willing subjection to the Prince of Peace.

With your permission I may take up some other aspects of this deeply important subject, on a future occasion.

E.

## REMARKS.

It is particularly gratifying to find so much in the preceding article worthy of being denominated strictly practical; and that more may be expected of equal value in E's. treatment of the remaining aspects of his subject. Let him continue his observations, by all means; and let them be seriously weighed by the memberships of all denominations; and let any who may be competent improve upon his suggestions; and let all Christians be anxious to understand each other correctly, and a doubt need not be entertained, that a candid and free interchange of sentiment, will lead to such a generous interchange of affection, as will secure the union and ultimate incorporation of all the sincere followers of the Lamb. E. is progressing admirably—his enquiries are leading himself and many others to sound, common sense, practical conclusions of great value. It is hoped that he will have his next article ready in season for the December *Tribune*.

Believing that the Communion question has received ample attention in the columns of the *Tribune*, and even more than a common share, it is the intention to admit, *hereafter*, simply enough to maintain the ground which has been taken; and hence correspondents must expect that all inferior articles and paragraphs will be rejected. The following is a correspondence in an abridged form, which is too valuable to be withheld.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

\_\_\_\_\_ , Oct. 4th, 1855.

To F. Malcolm.

DEAR BROTHER:—I am fully of opinion that the New Testament gives no ground for open or general communion. If we admit the example of the primitive churches to be really and positively binding on us now as the followers of Christ; the question simply is, were the converts to the gospel-faith baptized

in order to be admitted into, and have the privilege of communion with the apostolic churches? If this is admitted, then we have a divine example which must be binding and obligatory in every age, unless we take up the unscriptural dogma that a change of circumstances may demand and justify a change in the order and ordinances of the church of Christ. You well know that this glaring error is at the root of all the heresies and anti-christian practices which have corrupted the professing churches of God ever since the days of the Apostles. It is the principle of human expediency grounded on human authority, changing by the changes of human caprice; and has led to evils of the most awful kind. . . . If we set aside one ordinance of the gospel, and make the dispensing with it a matter of forbearance, why not set aside the whole of Christ's laws together? On your principle there is, I think, great danger of verging to the error of the Quakers, who both set aside baptism and the Lord's supper. \* \* \*

## REPLY.

EAST ZORRA, Nov. 7th, 1855.

DEAR BROTHER:— \* \* \* I now offer a few observations on your declaration that "you are fully of opinion that the New Testament gives no ground for open communion."

I should have been very much surprised at this declaration, were it not plain from what follows that you view open communion to be *disregard of the example of the New-Testament churches*, or the doctrine that we may act as we think proper in regard to the ordinances of Christ; *lay them aside,—dispense with them*, or otherwise, just to suit our convenience. This being the light in which you view open communion, no wonder you declare "the New Testament gives no ground for it." But, Brother, there is another light in which open communion may be viewed: and I must say "I am fully of opinion" it is really unfair,—absolutely unjust to view it in the light in which you view it; for in reality there is no such thing as *disregard of the example of the New-Testament churches*,—no such thing as *setting aside*, or *dispensing with an ordinance of Christ* contended for or countenanced by open communion. It is mere misconception. What! no doubt you will say, did you not admit to your church that Pedobaptist without immersion? And is not that *setting aside* the ordinance of baptism? We did admit that Pedobaptist brother; but we did not lay aside the ordinance of baptism when we did so. Both we and our brother held at the time, and still hold with unflinching tenacity, the permanency of baptism. He was admitted with the full understanding that he regarded baptism as an ordinance of Christ, and was resolved to act in reference to it conscientiously, according to the best of his knowledge and belief. Neither we nor he then had the least idea of *setting it aside*. You will say, why then was not the ordinance observed before admission, as was the case in New-Testament times?

Simply, Brother, because of the apostolic injunction, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." The sole reason why our Pedobaptist brother was not immersed before admission was, that he was not persuaded in his own mind that it was his duty; nay, he was persuaded it was not his duty. In such circumstances, would you, Brother, have baptized him? No, I am sure you would not. In this respect, then, we did just as you would have done. We did not baptize him; neither would you have done it. For us to have baptized him, or for him to submit to it while convinced it was not his duty, would have been equally culpable as it would be for you to sprinkle the infants of a Baptist, or for him while a Baptist to observe that rite. But perhaps you will say you would neither have baptized nor admitted him. Why not admit him? he is a disciple of Christ, and as such it is both his privilege and his duty to celebrate the Lord's Supper. Why should we hinder him from doing that which both he and we believe to be his duty; because he has not done that which he does not believe to be his duty? or which indeed would have been wrong for him to do; for it is certain it would be wrong for him to be immersed while persuaded it was not his duty. Our close brethren may consider themselves warranted to assume the responsibility of hindering acknowledged disciples of Christ from attending to that which is confessedly the privilege and the duty of every disciple without exception, on the pretext that they ought first to attend to baptism, or any thing else: we will not,—we dare not assume it. *Regard being paid* to such passages of Scripture as Acts xi. 17; xv. 10; Rom. xiv., throughout, especially verses 1, 4, 10; with many others, the solemn interrogations contained in these Scriptures would stare us in the face, awake and asleep, should we dare to hinder our brethren from attending to their privilege and duty. Allow me to say, Dear Brother, we cannot but feel wronged when we find our brethren broadly insinuating that our open communion is the result of *disregard* to the ordinances or commandments of the Lord, when we feel conscious it springs from *pure regard* to the plain language of the whole tenor of the word of God, and the express injunctions of many particular passages, which we regret they seem to *disregard* or overlook.

I am aware you will say we cannot be wrong in following the example of the New-Testament Churches, which was to admit to fellowship and the supper the baptized only. Dear Brother, allow me to say that the tenacity with which you cling to this, while you resolutely refuse to listen to any other consideration, astonishes me more than I can express. Suppose it granted, that the primitive churches communed with the baptized only; and that in this one respect you imitate them: to make you right, all the unbaptized *now* must be classed with the unbaptized *then*! But I know, Brother, you would spurn at the idea of classing pious Pedobaptists with the unbap-

tized of apostolic times: the latter were "strangers and foreigners"; but the former are "fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God"; and we contend that they have an indisputable right to the immunities of citizens and children.

Supposing it proved that in respect of receiving the baptized only, you imitate the apostolic churches; do you imitate them in every respect? They received all the accepted of God, even the weak in the faith; do you imitate them in this? Peter, by divine warrant, taught his audience that to refuse to receive those "whom God had cleansed", and on whom he had bestowed the gift of his Spirit, and granted repentance unto life, would be to withstand and tempt God. To this teaching the people gave heed, and joyfully assented to receive the Gentiles, though not the subjects of an ordinance which, as Jews, they believed was divine. In this example followed by the ministers and members of close-Baptist churches? Close Baptists exclude, reject, or refuse to receive those whom they admit are as good Christians as themselves, and consequently as high in the favour of their Lord. In this do they follow the example of the apostolic churches? They generally commune with unimmersed Christians in every religious and devotional exercise, except church fellowship: for instance, they recognize many unimmersed ministers as faithful ministers of Christ, and join with them in the most solemn devotional exercises: for this will they say that they have the example of the apostolic churches? Unless these questions can be answered in the affirmative, Close Baptists do not follow a divine example in all they do.

I have said, and I repeat it with all deference, and in the utmost sincerity, it does appear to me as evident as any thing else in the New Testament, that we are bound by the express terms of the law of Christ to receive into the communion and to the privileges of the church, every one who has obtained grace to repent and believe the gospel, and to walk so as to constrain us to believe that he loves Jesus Christ in sincerity. We are bound, I say, to receive such, when circumstances induce him to request to be so received, either to occasional or to permanent communion. I repeat, Brother, this position appears to me sustained by such ample evidence, that I wonder that any attentive reader of the New Testament should for a moment set himself to gainsay it: and when I see you and other good men conscientiously repudiating the principles, I cease to wonder at that blindness which Baptists are so ready to charge upon their fellow Christians.

In your estimation we *disregard* the example of the New Testament churches. I assure you, Brother, in our estimation you *disregard* not only the example of these churches, but the express injunctions of the Apostles of the Lord, in refusing to receive those whom he has received.

It is not, as you insinuate, the principle of human expediency that we plead: you know that our con-

stant appeal is "to the law and to the testimony;" and it is because close communion amounts, in our estimation, to disregard of both apostolic precept and example, in regard to what is of far greater importance than baptism, that we feel impelled to repudiate it.

F. MALCOLM.

*To the Editor of the Gospel Tribune.*

DEAR SIR:—The following incident in the life of Lord Byron not recorded in his memoirs, not likely to meet the notice of many of your readers, appears to me to be so interesting as to warrant an insertion in your excellent paper. The testimony of such a man to the wretchedness of scepticism, and the excellence of true religion is well worthy of consideration. Truly "their rock is not as our Rock, our enemies themselves being judges." John Sheppard, Esq., of Frome, author of several very excellent treatises, found among the papers of his pious and talented wife after her death, a prayer written evidently with reference to the distinguished nobleman above mentioned. He immediately conceived the design of acquainting Lord Byron with the circumstance. His reasons for doing so and the manner in which he performed the task, will be gathered from the following letter:

To the Right Honorable Lord Byron, Pisa.

From Somerset, November, 21st, 1821.

*My Lord,*—More than two years ago, a lovely and beloved wife,—was taken from me by lingering disease after a very short union. She possessed unvarying gentleness and fortitude, and a piety so retiring as rarely to disclose itself in words, but so influential as to produce uniform benevolence of conduct. In the last hour of life, after a farewell look on a lately born and only infant for whom she had evinced inexpressible affection—her last whispers were "Gods happiness! . . . Gods happiness." Since the second Anniversary of her decease, I have read some papers which no one had seen during her life, and which contain her most secret thoughts. I am induced to communicate to your Lordship, a passage from these papers, which there is no doubt refers to yourself; as I more than once heard the writer mention your agility on the rocks at Hastings:

THE PRAYER.

"O my God I take encouragement from the assurance of thy word, to pray to thee in behalf of one for whom I have lately been much interested. May the person to whom I allude (and who is now, we fear, as much distinguished for his neglect of Thee, as for the transcendent talents Thou hast bestowed upon him), be awakened to a sense of his own danger, and led to seek that peace of mind in a proper sense of religion, which he has found this world's enjoyments so unable to procure. Do thou grant that his future example may be productive of far more extensive benefit than his past conduct and

writings have been of evil; and may the sun of Righteousness, which, we trust, will at some future period, arise on him, be bright in proportion to the darkness of those clouds which guilt has raised around him, and the balm which it bestows, healing and soothing in proportion to that agony which the punishment of his vice has inflicted on him! May the hope that the sincerity of my own efforts for the attainment of holiness and the approval of my own love to the great Author of religion, will render this prayer and every other for the welfare of mankind more efficacious—cheer me in the path of duty; but let me not forget, that, while we are permitted to animate ourselves to exertion by every innocent motive, these are but the lesser streams which may serve to increase the current, but which, deprived of the grand fountain of good (a deep conviction of inborn sin, and firm belief in the efficacy of Christ's death for the salvation of all who trust in him, and really seek to serve him), would soon dry up, and leave us as barren of every virtue as before."

July 31, 1814, Hastings.

There is nothing my Lord, in this extract, which in a literary sense can at all interest you; but it may, perhaps, appear to you worthy of reflection, how deep and expansive a concern for the happiness of others the christian faith can awaken in the midst of youth and prosperity. Here is nothing poetical and splendid, as in the expostulatory homage of M. De-lamartine; but here is the sublime, my Lord; for this intercession was offered on your account to the Supreme Source of happiness. It sprang from a faith more confirmed than that of the French poet; and from a charity, which, in combination with faith, showed its power unimpaired amidst the languors and pains of approaching dissolution. I will hope that a prayer, which I am sure was deeply sincere, may not be always unavailing. It would add nothing, my Lord, to the fame with which your genius has already surrounded you, for an unknown and obscure individual, to express his admiration of it, I had rather be remembered with those who wish and pray that wisdom from above, and peace and joy may enter such a mind.

THE ANSWER.

Pisa, December 8th, 1821.

SIR—I have received your letter. I need not say that the extract which it contains, has affected me, because it would imply a want of feeling, to have read it with indifference. Though I am not quite sure that it was intended by the writer for me, yet the date, the place where it was written and some other circumstances which you mention, render the allusion probable. But, for whom ever it was meant, I have read it with all the pleasure which can arise from so melancholy a topic. I say *pleasure*, because your brief and simple picture of the life and demeanour of the excellent person whom, I trust that you will again meet, cannot be contemplated without the admiration due to her virtues and her pure and un-

pretending piety. Her last moments were particularly striking; and I do not know that in the course of my reading the story of mankind, and still less in my observations upon the existing portion, I ever met with anything so unostentatively beautiful. Indisputably, the firm believers in the gospel have a great advantage over all others, for this simple reason, that if true, they will have their reward hereafter, and if there be no hereafter, they can be but with the infidel in his eternal sleep, having had the assistance of an exalted hope through life, without subsequent disappointment. Since (at the worst for them) "out of nothing nothing can arise," not even sorrow. But a man's creed does not depend upon himself; who can say, I will believe this—that—the other? and least of all, that which he can least comprehend. I have, however, observed that those who have began life with extreme faith, have in the end greatly narrowed it as Chillingworth, Clarke, (who ended as an Arian), Bayle and Gibbon (once a catholic,) and some others; while on the other hand, nothing is more common than for the early sceptre to end in a firm belief, like Manpertuis and Kirk White. But my business is to acknowledge your letter and not to make a dissertation. I am obliged to you for your good wishes, and more than obliged by the extract from the papers of the beloved object whose qualities you have so well described in few words. I can assure you that all the fame which ever cheated humanity into higher notions of its own importance, would never weigh in my mind, against the pure and pious interest which a virtuous being may be pleased to take in my welfare. In this point of view, I would not exchange the prayer of the deceased in my behalf, for the united glory of Homer, Cæsar, and Napoleon, could such be accumulated upon a living head. Do me, at least, the justice to suppose that *Video meliora proboque*; (I saw and approved better things,) however the *Deteriora Segnor*, (I followed worse things,) may have been applied to my conduct.

I have the honor to be,  
Your obliged and obedient serv't.  
BYRON.

Were it not for encroaching on your space, I would add a few comments on this interesting disclosure of Byrons feelings, but forbear to do so, resting assured that the letter itself, will be abundantly suggestive to the mind of every reader.

Yours very truly. M.

For the Gospel Tribune.

YOUNG MEN BEWARE.

Last Sabbath I attended the funeral of a man who was murdered by his own son. The awful tragedy occurred at Clark's Mills, N. Y. The circumstances were these:—The father and son, who were employed in the Factory, occupied the same bed. Upon going to his room one evening, about nine, to retire for the night, the father found the door fastened inside. He

called to his son within, but got no answer. There was a moveable window over the door, through which he succeeded in getting into the room, and opened the door. He then asked his son what he meant by such conduct, but received no reply. Repeating the question he slapped him upon the face, as he lay in his day clothes upon the bed. The son turning over with a pistol in his hand, replied that he meant a good deal, and at the same time, shot his father through the abdomen. It is not my purpose to give a detailed account of this bloody scene; but I wish particularly to bring it before the notice of young men, together with its probable cause, in order that from its thunder tones they may learn a lesson of wisdom. It is the testimony of those who know, that the leisure hours of that young man [of seventeen], were wholly occupied in reading—but in reading *what?* works of blood, murder, histories of pirates, and the like—works which have destroyed thousands besides him. That the horrid deed is to be referred to the influence of such reading, there appear to be little doubt. The young man has a very pious mother; and his father was frank, amiable and kind. He now lies in Utica Jail, with stoical indifference, awaiting the sentence of the law. What heart-rending sorrow must that mother endure, who dared not trust her life in the hands of her patricide son, when he requested a private interview! Bad reading has nearly as much influence for evil as bad company; while it is more dangerous, inasmuch as it is more easily concealed. If a man cannot take hot coals into his bosom and not be burned, no more can the mind, however self-sufficient, receive the contents of an impure and bloodstained volume and not be contaminated thereby. Then we say, *shun such books more than death.*

A. D.

Toronto, Nov. 2d, 1855.

#### "THE CHRISTIAN UNION."

This is the name of a projected new Monthly, the Prospectus of which has recently made its appearance. It is to be edited by J. S. Lamar and A. G. Thomas, assisted by D. Hook and P. F. Lamar, and published in Augusta, Ga., for one dollar per annum. According to the printed announcement,

"This Work will be devoted to the Union of all Christians upon Christian principles. It will be the object of the Editors to give prominence to the excellencies of the various denominations, leaving others, whose qualifications or tastes may fit them for the work, to spy out and expose their defects. At the same time they will feel authorised to animadvert, in the spirit of kindness and love, upon such practices and principles, as being manifestly unscriptural, are incompatible with the formation of that union for which they plead.

"They believe that the time has come, when all who love the Lord should rise superior to party spirit and sectarian feeling, and cordially unite in their opposition to Sin, in the advocacy of Truth, and in the practice of Virtue. They will devote much space

to the development of the great principles of Faith and Hope and Love, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures, assured that no union can be permanent or desirable which is not based upon the immutable truths of the Bible.

"They confidently anticipate the countenance and support of the good of all parties, in this their humble attempt at healing the unfortunate divisions which have so long estranged the members of the family of God. And to bring the work within the reach of all, they have resolved to issue it at a cost barely covering the expenses of publication.

"*The Christian Union* will be published in the City of Augusta, in monthly numbers of 32 pages each, neatly covered and trimmed. The first number will be issued by the 1st of January, 1856."

Thus the evidence continues to accumulate that the church on earth is ripening for the Union of the "latter days," through which "the world" will be led to believe, in answer to the prayer of the Great Head of the Church. Let the advocates of this Union multiply and increase—let "*The Christian Union*" unfurl its banner,—let every heart and voice be lifted up in promotion of "Glory to God in the Highest, peace on earth, and good will to man"—that every yoke may be broken and the oppressed set free.

For the Gospel Tribune.

#### ON CHRISTIAN COMMUNION.

BY THE REV. JOHN GILMOUR.

We beg attention to the two questions, to which the few farther remarks of this paper will particularly apply. They seem to us to embrace the whole subject, and deserve the attention of all denominations of Christians in the present day. Honest, earnest men will attach themselves to the denominations which they consider most in accordance with the directions of the New Testament. Having done so, are they authorised by positive injunction or just inference to refuse all other Christians access to the table of the Lord? To elicit a reply we now state the two questions.

1st, Should the spiritual family of God enjoy free access to all the privileges of that family as far as they understand and appreciate them? Or,

2ndly, Are there instances in which any portion of that spiritual family should deny those privileges to any *acknowledged* member of the family? Though these questions equally concern other denominations, the remarks which we make in reference to them apply especially to the Baptist denomination, as in this section of the church the question of communion has been agitated more than in any other. We think Christian communion is enjoined in the New Testament, and no other. And by Christian communion we mean, the communion of all the people of God, notwithstanding the differences of opinion and practice which obtain among them; and even should that difference extend to a positive institute, such as Baptism.

I. Because there is no *declared* connection between Baptism and the Lord's supper. Between the rite of circumcision and the Passover under the former dispensation there is a *declared* connection. It is written, Ex. 12. 48, 49. "For no uncircumcised person shall eat the Passover. One law shall be to him that is home-born and unto the stranger that is born among you." Now between these two institutes we perceive

a *declared* connection, and therefore the Passover could not be properly celebrated unless circumcision had been previously practised. No such dependence is declared between the two ordinances of the New Testament; and we cannot see how by any just inference such a connection can be established—because we find that the ordinance of the Supper was celebrated both before the administration of Christian Baptism and also after it. Now had Christian Baptism been necessary to the proper celebration of the Lord's Supper we do not suppose that our Lord would have celebrated it before he ever instituted Christian Baptism. The Lord's Supper was celebrated before our Lord's death by himself and his disciples, but the ordinance of Christian Baptism was neither instituted nor practised till after the resurrection of Christ from the dead. It could neither exist nor be practised *before* the commission. It was not the duty of the apostles under the injunction, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of Samaria enter ye not," to "go and preach the Gospel to every creature."—This was not their duty until the commission was given, nor was it the duty of any to be baptized with Christian Baptism until that commission was given. True, John's Baptism was binding on all under that dispensation, but not Christian Baptism. It may however be stated in reply, that John's Baptism obtained before the celebration of the Supper, and the two Baptisms are identical. We deny this,

1. Because they differ in formula and in spirit. The formula of John's was, "That they should believe on him who was to come"—that of Christ, "In the name of the Lord." "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." They differed also in spiritual signification. "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." As a symbol it referred to the future. Christian Baptism is a symbol of that which is past. "Into Christ's death, and resurrection" See Rom. 6. 4. Col. 2. 12. They were not therefore identical. Farther, were not so,

2. Because Paul ignores John's Baptism, as Christian Baptism, seeing that he baptized those *again*, who had been baptized with John's baptism: see Acts, 19. 5.—Now had that of John's been identical, or valid, he would not have administered Christian Baptism to the disciples at Ephesus. It is then a fact that the Lord's Supper was celebrated before *Christian* Baptism was instituted, and hence we conclude, as there is no *declared* connection, neither is there any necessary connection of priority deducible from fair inference. The institutes stand on distinct grounds: and a mistake concerning the one does not disqualify for a proper attention to the other. John's Baptism was temporary, and passed away with the intermediate dispensation which he came to proclaim. The Christian ordinance is as permanent as the commission itself. Circumcision was incorporated with the Mosaic economy, and endured at least as long as that economy. John's Baptism was not incorporated, but a new institute was established, and is contained in the commission. But if as permanent as the commission, is it not binding on all that believe? We think it is. How are we then to act towards those whom we deem in error on this point? Just as you would act towards Brethren in error on any other point; since there is no *declared* connection between the institutes. Does the New Testament suppose that

error may obtain among brethren, and diversity of opinion prevail? and does it make any provision to meet such an emergency? It does: and therefore we think no one section of the spiritual family of God has authority to exclude any other section of the family of God from the Lord's Supper, though a mistake in the other institute may obtain.

II. Because he has enjoined them to forbear one another in love. The Bible never contradicts itself. A full attention to one precept, will never be at variance with a full attention to another. If therefore my view of any precept of the Word of God infringes on the legitimate range of another, it is my *interpretation* that is at fault, not the precept. The precept is God's, the interpretation is mine. The precept is the dictate of unerring truth, the interpretation is the conclusion of an erring man.

Did my views of forbearance oblige me to ignore the ordinance of Baptism, or did my view of Baptism interfere with the fair range of Christian forbearance I might suspect the correctness of my view in either case, as I find both are urged upon me in the sacred volume. My view of the ordinance itself might be correct; but my view of its relation to all Christian practice might be wrong.

The question returns here,—How far am I to carry my forbearance? has it no declared stint? We think it has, even to those who are in the church; and exclusion or non-association must ensue; to such as are heretical in doctrine, Gal. 5, 12; vicious in practice, 1 Cor. 5 11, 13; schismatical in temper, Rom. 16, 17; injurious to brethren, Math. 18, 17; or are wilfully and openly disobedient to the commands of Christ, 2 Thes. 3, 14.

Now does a person involuntarily mistaking an ordinance of Christ, come under any of these heads? then in that case you are not called to exercise forbearance, but to enforce exclusion. Do Pedobaptists, as such, come under any of these particulars, and do you consider them all reprobate concerning the faith, then they are to you as heathen men and publicans. You reject them because you have no confidence in them as Christians. But if, notwithstanding their error, you still consider them Christians, and as such associate with them in many exclusively Christian acts, such as social prayer, brotherly intercourse, Christian conversation, preaching the word, &c. &c.;—nay, you frankly admit that many of them excel you and others (with whom you associate in full church fellowship) in Christian knowledge, moral excellency, and holy zeal; then I think on the principles of Christian forbearance you are bound to admit them to the fellowship of saints at the table of the Lord.

Does the Apostle Paul or any of the Apostles contract forbearance in love within narrower limits than Brotherhood in Christ? or do they show in any place, or can it be deduced from fair inference that any of the *acknowledged* Brotherhood has forfeited his right to such forbearance, or that any of that Brotherhood is in error by exercising such forbearance to all the Brotherhood? We speak with confidence when we say that the range of Christian mutual forbearance in love is Christian Brotherhood. It should not pass *beyond*, nor should it fall *short*. There is no more authority for falling short than there is for going beyond.

It is true A. may require more evidence than B., or evidence of a different kind, to satisfy him that C. is a

Christian; in this case their forbearance will differ in range, still it operates in both cases towards the *acknowledged* Brotherhood. Should A. consider no man a Christian who in his esteem mistakes an ordinance of the Lord, or a plain precept of his word, and B. think it possible that a man through prejudice, education, &c., may mistake a plain precept or divine ordinance, and yet be a most decided Christian, we can see that the range of B.'s forbearance will be wider than that of A.'s, but simply on the ground, that the Brotherhood is more extended: yet A. we conceive is under obligation to exercise forbearance to the full extent of acknowledged Brotherhood.

A. is a Baptist, and considers no man a child of God who mistakes the ordinance of Baptism, and therefore refuses to have communion with him at the Lord's table, and if consistent, refuses to engage in any religious acts which require christian character to their proper performance, such as a soiree, prayer, preaching, christian conversation, &c. He views him as an unbeliever, and treats him accordingly. In acting thus, one cannot say that A. lacks in christian forbearance, for it can never legitimately operate beyond the acknowledged brotherhood. But we do consider him at fault in his *estimate* of christian character. Facts, and the actual graces of the spirit prove him at fault.

1. Because many Pedobaptists possess the moral excellencies which the N. T. declares are evidence of christian character, such as Faith in Christ, repentance towards God—brotherly love—see John 1. 12: and 13, 35; 1, John, chap. 4: 1, also manifest the fruits of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, &c. see Eph. 5: 9; Gal. 5: 22, 23; though all are, in my view, mistaken about baptism. What a host of worthies crowd on the mind: Luther and Calvin—Leighton and Howe—Owen and Baxter—Doddridge and Wait—Edwards and Brainard—Newton and Cecil—Wardlaw and Pye Smith—Chalmers and Bogue.

2. Because we think A. must admit, that men of unquestionable piety—high christian attainment; and of teachable disposition, have mistaken a very plain precept, and persisted for years in disobedience not wilful but ignorant. What precept more plain or important than, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." Surely this part of the commission is as obvious as that which follows, baptizing them, &c. And who in this day, more pious, more fully replenished with the spirit of God, more ready to yield an obedient ear to the instructions of truth than the Apostles of our Lord, and yet for eight or ten years they mistook this very plain precept, and lived in disobedience; nor did anything less than the remarkable vision of the sheet let down from heaven, &c. remove Peter's mistake, and that of others in that day. Acts, 10 and 11th chaps. Now we ask our baptist brother A. Is the ordinance of baptism more lucidly taught in the N. T. than is the duty, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature?" or does the mistake in regard to the ordinance of baptism, involve consequences more injurious and lasting? But men of no common attainment fell into this mistake, yet were truly christians; and why should A. hesitate to admit the piety of men who in our day fall into a mistake on the ordinance of baptism.

I am aware that Baptists do not question the piety of

Pedobaptists, while judging them to be in a mistake; but cheerfully recognize them as brothers in Christ: then we ask where does the head of the Church teach that spiritual members of his body shall be denied a place in his visible church on earth; or where teach to stint our forbearance within narrower limits than the brotherhood. We ask emphatically, *Where?* and if forbearance is not to fall short of the brotherhood, why practically ignore the injunction of forbearance. In doing so you show how possible it is for a good man to misunderstand a plain precept. But in extending your forbearance to the brotherhood, you show your honest conviction of the truth of what you hold, yet afford no sanction to any error in which you consider your brother involved. To forbear is not to sanction: it is your standing practical protest against the thing involved. A perfect state requires no forbearance: it supposes defect, there has always been room for its operation, there is now and probably will be, while man is heir to flesh. We conclude that, whenever evidence of brotherhood is given we are bound on the principle of christian forbearance to admit to all the privileges of the family, the Table of the Lord not excepted.

III. Because this is positively enjoined notwithstanding the differences which may obtain. Rom. 14: 13; "Receive him, for God hath received him;" "Receive ye one another as Christ also received us to the glory of God." If these exhortations were given to believers in the days of the Apostles, why suppose that they do not apply to believers now? The things about which they differed were Jewish rites which had become obsolete, or were done away in Christ. Some understood this, and therefore relinquished them; others were still in error, and therefore insisted on their obligation. It does not appear that they questioned each other's personal religion, but doubted whether it was proper with such discordances of opinion to receive one another to christian fellowship. Paul scales the question, not by asserting that the one was right and the other wrong, but urges them to mutual confidence and communion, from the fact that God had received them. Indeed this seems to be an Apostolic maxim, as upon the same principle Peter justified his conduct before his brethren, when he received Cornelius and his family into the church, Acts, 11: 17, "Forasmuch therefore as God gave them the like gift, as he did unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I that I could withstand God! To have proof that God has accepted a man, and yet refuse him the fellowship of saints, is branded here with, *to withstand God*. It perfectly satisfied the church, and "They glorified God, because he had also granted to the Gentiles repentance unto life." You see the stress of the statement which removed their difficulty, was that "God had received them,"—had granted them repentance unto life.

It may be objected that, the differences of opinion which now obtain, are not those which then prevailed, and therefore the precept does not apply: there was no difference of opinion then on the subject of baptism; now there is, consequently the injunction does not reach the case. But it will surely be admitted that the reason by which it is urged overtakes the difficulty. "For God hath received him." By whatever means we reach the conclusion that a person is accepted of God, when we have so concluded, the precept appears with all its urgency—"Receive him." In a subsequent verse of

this chap. 14, 17, 19, the evidences of divine acceptance are specified, "Righteousness, peace, joy in the Holy Ghost;" "for he that in *these things* serveth Christ is acceptable to God, and approved of men. When any person possesses these great moral excellencies or manifests such graces of the spirit, we are assured he is accepted of God, and the mind must be at fault that does not approve, for it is added 'Approved of men.'"

Is it not a maxim in ethics That a precept applies to all that comes within the limits of the general principle on which it rests; though it does not extend beyond it? The particular case to which it first applied does not exhaust its force, nor stint its range; it may be required in other instances, and still enforced by the same reason. When I say, "treat him with respect, for he is a man," the person in question happens to be a Frenchman; but does not the reason given, extend the injunction also to an Englishman, and to a man of any nation.—When I say to a man afflicted with the guilt of taking his maker's name in vain—believe in the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be pardoned, because his blood cleanseth from all sin; does not the command believe extend to the guilt of any other sin, as the principle on which it rests extends to all. Thus it is obvious that the range of a precept is only limited by the extent of the general principle with which it is urged. Now what is the general principle by which believers are urged to receive one another? it is "For God hath received him." We hence conclude that while in the first instance the precept applied to the Jewish differences, yet it extends to all differences which lie within the general principle by which it is urged. The question which settles whether or not a person should be received into christian fellowship is, *has God as far as we can judge received him?* Should we with that conviction reject him, we withstand God, Acts 11: 17.

IV. Every member of the family of God should enjoy the common privileges of that family, because they are commanded to walk by the rule of present attainment, Phil. 3: 15, 16, "Nevertheless whereto we have already attained let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing." All have not the same knowledge, all have not made equal progress, all have not embraced the truth to the same extent. In things in which we differ we cannot have fellowship, yet this does not prevent us from fellowship in things in which we are agreed. We may differ about the ordinance of baptism, yet be agreed in the doctrine of Christ crucified: we may differ as to the extent of the atonement, yet be agreed about the efficacy of its application: we may differ about the personal reign of Christ, yet be agreed as to his coming to judgment: we may differ about the freedom of the will, yet be agreed in the moral responsibility of every man: we may differ about the kiss of charity, yet be fully agreed in the communion of the body and blood of Christ in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. Let our differences come under the rule of "christian forbearance," our agreement, the rule of "mind the same things." Thus minded, the things in which we differ, we may expect to pass away, under fresh light from heaven; for if in anything you are otherwise minded, "God shall reveal even this unto you." We then enforce the communion of saints at the Lord's table. 1st. Because it stands upon its own basis, and is independent of baptism. 2d. Because christians are

commanded to forbear one another in love: 3. Are enjoined to receive one another, for God has received them; and 4th. To walk together in things in which they are agreed.

Is it objected, to act thus, is to dispense with the proper administration of an ordinance of Christ: we reply, no. We practise it according to conviction, we administer to all to whom the strictest Baptist can legitimately administer it, and meekly protest against the opposite practice, by forbearing—for surely to tolerate is not to sanction, to forbear is not to approve.

Is it objected we depart from primitive order—we reply, no; we overtake it into: primitive order is apostolic order: he halts in his step who proceeds half way in that order. Is to baptize on a profession of faith primitive order, this we do. Is to commune with all believers primitive order, this we do. Is to receive them, but not to doubtful disputations, whom God has received, primitive order? This we do: from this order you depart.

Is it objected, we render void the evidence of faith. We reply, No! Baptism is never mentioned as an evidence of faith, nor spoken of as a badge of discipleship. The Saviour says, *Love* is the badge, and Barnabas proved the discipleship of Paul by no such precarious evidence, Acts, 9: 27, and Simon Magus in spite of it, proves himself no disciple at all. Love of the brethren is the evidence of having passed from death to life. But by making it a necessary term of communion, 1st. You place submission to a title higher than moral excellency. 2nd. You exclude an *acknowledged* brother from the fellowship of saints, and reduce him to the level of a heathen man and a publican. Is not this unscriptural in practice? Does it not render church discipline odious and inefficient? and make the duty of independent judgment impracticable, Rom. 14: 5, You rebel them from communion, who have the faith and devotedness which the rite expresses; and instead of taking the lowly place of a fellow servant, you assume the place of a judge, to become which, "Christ had to die, and rise and revive that he might be Lord:" and who art thou that judgest another man's servant? and inflictest on him the heaviest penalty of the law—viz: exclusion. But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou *set at naught* thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ:" 3rd. You make Baptism the basis of ecclesiastical union, whereas the New Testament makes Christ crucified the bond—"one in Christ Jesus," Gal. 3: 28, and 6: 14-16. One in the rite of baptism overrides the oneness in the spiritual signification of the rite, as also oneness in Christ, in your church fellowship; such is the practical aspect of your procedure; personal godliness is ignored in your brother, because he mistakes a rite, and he is left in the world though he seeks a place among the saints.

**PROTESTANTISM IN UPPER AUSTRIA.**—From the accession of the Emperor Ferdinand II., the Protestants lived for two hundred years under the most rigid repression, their worship being wholly interdicted. And yet when the Edict of Toleration was published by Joseph II., in 1784, many Protestant communities arose, who reared chapels and called pastors. The political convulsions of 1848 procured them some ameliorations, and they are now permitted to have steeples and bells to their places of worship. A

Württemberg minister, who has lately visited the Archduchy, gives some details of interest. He found that the Protestant pastors received salaries of 1400 florins, and that the schools and chapels were neat and in good repair. Their new churches at Wallern and Wels are among the most beautiful in the country; and the Romanist, who at first laughed at these undertakings, now say with surprise, "That Protestants know how to sustain themselves!" These are erecting and enlarging other chapels. At Linz, there are numbers who go four leagues, let the weather be as it may, to attend worship; and even the poorest contribute toward its support. The Austrian Protestants receive no allowance from the State; and besides maintaining their own ministers, are obliged to pay tithes to the Romish clergy. At Gosan, the inhabitants have remained silently, but faithfully attached to Protestantism. In 1785, after the Edict of Toleration the agent employed in its promulgation at that place did not suppose that any one would claim the benefit of it. To his astonishment, a man came forward and avowed himself a Protestant, and nearly all the community joined him in the declaration. Of thirteen hundred people in the village, not more than one hundred are Romanists. In Upper Austria there are ten thousand Reformed Christians forming twelve congregations. In Styria there are five thousand, forming three communities. In Carinthia, there are eighteen thousand Protestants; and in the city of Vienna and Lower Austria, there are twelve thousand. In Bohemia are fifty-four congregations exceedingly poor. Austrian Silesia contains seventy-six thousand Protestants.—*American and Foreign Christian Union.*

#### L O R D B A C O N .

Francis Bacon, the "father of experimental philosophy," was born in London, in 1561, and educated at Cambridge, where he made great progress in all the sciences. He subsequently travelled in France, and gave to the world the results of his observations, in a work entitled, "Of the State of Europe." The sudden death of his father in 1579, obliged him to return to England, and pursue the study of the law. In 1590 he obtained the post of Counsel Extraordinary to Queen Elizabeth, and a seat in Parliament. Shortly afterwards the Earl of Essex presented him with an estate at Twickenham, worth £2000—a favor which Bacon returned with the basest ingratitude. On the accession of James he was knighted, and obtained successively the offices of King's Counsel, Solicitor General, Judge of the Marches Court and Attorney General. In 1619 he was created Lord High Chancellor of England and Baron Verulam: in the following year the latter title gave place to that of Viscount of St. Albans. He had now reached the summit of his ambition, but his arbitrary and unprincipled conduct exposed him to degradation and disgrace. He received bribes from suitors before the Court of Chancery, and allowed Villiers to interfere with his decisions as a judge. A parliamentary committee, appointed to inquire into his conduct, pronounced him guilty of the crimes and corruptions with which he was charged, and inflicted upon him a fine of £40,000, together with imprisonment in the Tower during the King's pleasure. They also declared him forever incapable of holding any office or emolument. Thus fell Bacon—"the brightest, meanest of mankind," but the nature and importance of his works have done much to redeem his name and memory from merited infamy. At the period of his death his debts amounted to £22,000, although he possessed an annual income of £2500.

## Political and General Miscellany.

From the St. Louis *Intelligencer*.

### THE BITTER FRUITS—THE SUICIDE OF SLAVERY.

Our news from Western Missouri is of ominous and most discouraging character. That region is suffering from mildew and blight. Its glory is dimmed, its spirits abated, and its hope fading.

The emigration to Kansas has been almost entirely checked. Emigrants from the Northern or free States have ceased to go to Kansas, because they can find as good lands elsewhere, not cursed by mob law, nor ruled by non-resident bullies. Emigrants from the Southern States do not go to Kansas, because they will not put their slave property in peril, by taking it into a territory where there is a strong Free-soil element, threatening the security of slaves.

Any man of sense might have foreseen this result. Alabama and Georgia may hold public meetings, and resolve to sustain the slaveholders in Missouri in making Kansas a slave State. But their resolutions comprise all their aid—which is not 'material' enough for the crisis. When slaveholders of Alabama and Georgia emigrate, they go to Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas. They do not come, with their slaves, to Missouri or to Kansas. Call they that backing their friends?

Thus the matter stands. The Northern emigrants shun Missouri and Kansas as plague spots of the nation. The Southern emigrants shun Missouri and Kansas, because here is the battle ground between Slavery and Free-soil.

The result is, Kansas, the fairest land under the sun, is neglected and idle; occupied by a few honest and earnest, but disheartened pioneers, and lorded over by a dozen or two feudal tyrants of Missouri, who curse by their presence the land they have desolated.

Such is Kansas,—poor, neglected and despised—and Western Missouri stands infected by the horrible contagion of outlawry, and dwindles away under the moral leprosy of its mobocratic leaders. We are assured by two gentlemen of high position in Western Missouri, but totally differing in political sentiment—one upholding the oligarchy that controls the affairs and tramples upon the people's sovereignty in Kansas, the other deploring the accursed madness of the day—that matters are gloomy enough in Western Missouri. Business is dull. Commerce is stagnant. Money is exceeding scarce, and a panic pervades the people. The fifty thousand emigrants that ought, this season, to have poured over into Kansas are not there. The prairie sod remains unbroken. The sound of the axe, and the whoop of the husbandman is not heard. Western Missouri towns are not thronged with settlers buying their outfits and their equipments of husbandry. The farmers find no market for their horses, mules, oxen and cows. There is no new and large trade springing up in Kansas. The much vaunted Kansas towns lie neglected—a mockery to their owners and a laughing stock for all men. "Dead—dead—dead"—may be written on all the country—so deep and disastrous has been the fall from the high and fond hopes of the past year.

In May last, the editor of the *Intelligencer* was in Kentucky, and he met numerous of the most respectable and wealthy farmers of that State, such as form so large a portion of the population of Missouri, who inquired earnestly about the condition of things in Kansas and in Western Missouri. They spoke of the intention they had of removing to Kansas or Western

Missouri; but said they had abandoned it utterly, for the reason that they would never think of taking their families to a region where law was set aside, presses mobbed, and men driven from the country by irresponsible and unknown bands of Regulators. They preferred the rule of law to anarchy. In a recent trip through several Northwestern States, we found that the same circumstances were most industriously and fatally used to divert emigration to those States; and to prejudice Missouri and Kansas with every class of people. The most aggravating stories of insults and outrages committed by Missourians on the persons of emigrants from the Old World or from the Free States, who are found ascending the Missouri River, are circulated in the newspapers all through the Free States; and it is impossible to conceive of the deep hatred thus generated towards our whole State in the Northern half of the Union.

Between these fires, Missouri is leading on her languid existence. St. Louis is retarded in a most woeful way. Our railroads creep at snail's pace.—We build ten miles while other Western States build one hundred. In every department of life we feel paralysis. Instead of bounding forward, buoyant, strong and rejoicing, we sit with dull eyes and heavy spirits, and listen to the tick of a death-watch.

These are the bitter fruits of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise—a wicked and wrongful deed—that will yet bring hell of bitter self reproaches to its authors. Missouri did not demand that repeal. The South never asked it. Atchison solicited it—and in a moment of political insanity, the South consented to the wrong and made the wrong her own. *This was the suicide of slavery.*

Every step since taken has deepened the wrong and enhanced the danger. The Free States organized Aid Societies, and sent their men to make Kansas free. It had been free soil by solemn compact, for thirty-five years and they naturally were incensed to see its character changed. The South would have been far more indignant if a slave territory had been thus, by unexpected Act of Congress, converted into Free Soil.

The Free States had a right to be indignant that a life-long Compromise had been repealed—and they had a right to try and keep Kansas free as it had been, by peaceable colonization. They attempted nothing else. But a portion of the citizens of Missouri, headed by Atchison and Stringfellow, denounced the northern emigrants as "paupers and hirelings," because they were sent west by the money of a society; and so they held county meetings in Missouri, and raised money and sent Missourians to Kansas to make Kansas a slave territory! Were these Missourians hirelings too? and did these two wrongs make one right?

Atchison and Stringfellow, with their Missouri followers, overwhelmed the settlers in Kansas, browbeat and bullied them, and took the government from their hands. Missouri votes elected the present body of men, who insult public intelligence and popular rights by styling themselves the "Legislature of Kansas." This body of men are helping themselves to fat speculations by locating "the seat of Government" and getting town lots for their votes. They are passing laws disfranchising all the citizens of Kansas who do not believe negro slavery to be a Christian institution and a national blessing. They are proposing to punish with imprisonment the utterance of views inconsistent with their own. And they are trying to perpetuate their preposterous and infernal tyranny, by appointing for a term of years creatures of their own, Commissioners in every county, to lay and collect taxes and see that the laws they are passing are faithfully executed. Has this age anything to compare with these acts of audacity.

The Free State men of Kansas have resolved not to submit to this daring usurpation of a non-resident oligarchy. They have called a convention of the people of Kansas, to meet in September next, and frame a Constitution for their government. This movement will be supported by thousands in Kansas; and it will rally and bring to their aid the Northern States that have been for the time staggered and confused by the untoward events in Kansas.

The next Congress will find then this issue before them—a Free State Constitution presented by one portion of the people of Kansas, and the pro-slavery territorial laws of the present fraudulent Legislature. The House of Representatives of the next Congress will be largely Free-soil or Anti-Nebraska. The pro-slavery law of the *bogus* Legislature will be rejected, and without Congressional sanction they are not valid—and the contest will then be on accepting the Constitution presented by the Free State people. The Free State Constitution may pass the House, but not the Senate. But the effects will be as disastrous to Missouri and the South. Kansas will be left to anarchy. The slavery that is there will flee from it—perhaps even the slave property of Western Missouri will give way under the panic, and seek safety in the cotton fields and sugar plantations of Texas.

It has been the common opinion with thoughtless persons and thick-headed bullies of the west, that the northern and eastern men will not fight. Never was a greater mistake. The sons of New England and the Middle States do not *like* to fight. They would rather work—plough—build towns, railroads—make money, and raise families, than fight. But fight they will, if need be. Remember the sons of New England shed the first blood in the American Revolution; and they were the last to furl their flag in that terrible struggle. They have never disgraced their country by cowardice, and they will not. They are Americans, with spirit, courage, endurance, and a deep love of liberty to animate them. The Free State men in Kansas will fight before they will be disfranchised and trampled on. Mark the word.

Here comes, then, the suicide of Slavery. The outrages committed by Atchison and his fellows in the repeal of the Missouri compromise and by Stringfellow and his followers in subjugating Kansas to non-resident rule, will bring on a collision first in Congress and then in Kansas—and who shall tell the end?

Slavery will never sustain itself in a border State by the sword. It may conquer in some respects; but it can never "conquer a peace." Never! never!—Once light the fires of internecine war in defence of slavery, and it will perish while you defend it.—Slaveholders will not stay to meet the fight. Property is timid, and the slaves will be sent to Texas to be in a 'safe place' while the fight lasts; and as soon as the slaves are gone it will be found that Missouri has nothing to fight about, and the fight will end "before it begins."

Thus the Slavery propagandists, who repealed the Missouri Compromise to make Kansas a Slave State, will make Missouri free; and in endeavoring to expel abolition from Kansas and Missouri with an entire free white population—worth more to the two States than all the negroes in America.

Is not the Kansas outrage the suicide of slavery? Have not the people of Missouri, interested in the preservation of Slavery in the State, brought themselves into a desperate predicament by following the insano counsels of Atchison and Stringfellow?

From the Church Review.

#### ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOVERY.

A relic of antiquity has lately been brought to light which promises to be of some importance. It is described as follows in the *Journal of Commerce*.—We may add that an exact copy of the inscription has been sent to New Haven, and is now in the hands of our best Oriental scholars, who are at work in deciphering it.

"On the 19th January last, some men were digging for hid treasure in an ancient cemetery on the plain of Sidon, called *Mughorat Tubloon*, when at the depth of about 12 feet below the surface, and near the walls of an ancient edifice, they uncovered a *sarcophagus*, upon the lid of which there is a long Phœnician inscription. The lid is of a blue, black marble, intensely hard, and taking a very fine polish. The lid is about eight feet long, by four feet wide. The upper end is wrought into the figure of a female head and shoulders, of almost a giant size. The features are Egyptian, with large, full, almond-shaped eyes, the nose flattened, and lips remarkably thick, and somewhat after the negro mould. The whole countenance is smiling, agreeable and expressive, beyond any thing I have ever seen in the disinterred monuments of Egypt or Nineveh. The head-dress resembles that which appears in Egyptian figures, while on each shoulder there is the head of some bird, a dove or pigeon, and the bosom is covered by what appears to be a sort of cape, with a deep fringe, as of lace.

"On the lid, below the figure-head, is the inscription, consisting of twenty-two long lines, closely written. The letters are in perfect preservation, and can be read with the utmost ease and accuracy, and the whole forms by far the longest and most perfect inscription yet discovered in this most ancient language and character. It is mainly a genealogical history of the person buried in the sarcophagus, who, as it appears, was a king of Sidon. The names of *Baal* and *Ashtoreth*, the well-known gods of the Sidonians, occur repeatedly in these inscriptions. Some of the words are Hebrew, as *melek*, king; while the forms of some of the letters are so much like those of the ancient Greek, as at once to indicate the relationship. Letters were *invented* by the Phœnicians. Here we seem to see them dropping from their hands in the first casting."

Sufficient progress has been made in the translation as to render it certain that from this inscription we learn the names of three kings of Sidon, of one line of descent from father to son succeeding each other, also the names of public edifices built and founded by this dynasty. The particular deities who were the objects of worship are also named, Baal and Ashtarothe, the deities of Sidon and Tyre, in the most ancient time of which we have any record, and Esmuna recognised divinity of the Phœnicians. There are reasons for believing the inscriptions much more ancient than B. C. 111; it is most probable that it is as old as the time of Alexander the Great, and future research may prove it to be much older still. The substance of the inscription is a dreadful imprecation against any one who should disturb the repose of the deceased king.

From the London Times.

#### THE SLAVE TRADE.

A collection of papers and correspondence relating to the slave trade in various parts of the world, and to the means adopted under the direction of the British Government for its suppression, has just been issued from the Foreign-office. These papers bring up our information as to the progress made in the

work of humanity to which the British nation and Government have applied themselves for so long a period, and at the cost of such considerable sacrifices, to the year ending on the thirty-first of March last. We see that an amount of good has been effected much greater than could have been anticipated. This is especially the case with regard to the slave trade from the African coast to the Brazils, which seems to have been all but extinguished, thanks to the good faith with which the Government of that empire have fulfilled their engagements. It is true that some increased activity had been noticed by the British agents in shipments of slaves from the neighborhood of Lomda, and some other part of the coast, within the last few months, to which the reports refer. This is, however, accounted for by the very reduced naval force which we as well as the French, have latterly employed in the preventive service, and as the shipments appear to have been made principally for the Havana, where the Spanish authorities have recently shown every disposition to put a stop to the trade, and enforce the penalties of the laws against those engaged in it, there is every reason to hope that, ere long, the exportation of African slaves will be entirely suppressed, the Havana being now almost the sole market remaining open to the traders.

From the Morning Star.

#### SPIRITUALISM CONDEMNING ITSELF.

President Mahan, in his excellent and able work, in which "*Modern Mysteries*" are most effectually "*explained and exposed*," uses the following language:—"Another fact, equally decisive of the question of the origin of these manifestations, is this. The opinions and sentiments revealed in them uniformly take form from, and correspond with, those peculiar to the particular circles in which they originate. In China, "the spirits," for they have spirit circles there—are all worshippers of Confucius. In Siam, they are equally devoted Buddhists. In Hindoostan, they are worshippers of Juggernaut. In Christendom, they are Catholic or Protestant, Christian or Infidel, churchmen or dissenters, orthodox or heterodox, of all opinions, and no opinions, just according to the peculiar complexion of the circles in which they appear. Take any spirit that can be named and introduce him into each circle on earth in succession, and he will affirm, as only true, the peculiarities of opinion existing in each circle, and as positively deny every opposite opinion, though he has for thousands of times asserted its truth before. Thus he will do, with the most unblushing effrontery, boldly denying in every circle, that he has ever since he entered the spirit-land, changed his opinions, or at any time, or in any place, contradicted his present teachings. There is not a solitary form or shade of human belief, the denial of the existence of spirits excepted—a form of belief held by Christian, Turk or Infidel,—which has not been absolutely affirmed and denied by the same authority."

The general fact involved in the above quotation, is this, viz., It is the spirit of the circle acting through the medium, and no spirit outside the circle that dictates the responses. This our able author abundantly proves, resolving and relieving all the mystery of spiritualism, by reference to the *Odylic Force*. Where spiritualism has abounded, his book should much more abound.

The reader will note the italicized exception above. The italics are ours. The President, however, might have spared himself the trouble of making that exception, as the following will show:

A Christian brother of our acquaintance and con-

fidence, was put into communication with a medium.—After asking a number of questions mentally, and receiving correct replies, he said, "well, there is one more question I wish to ask, and then the matter shall rest." He asked it, and received the reply, "Yes." The question was this: "*Is this Spiritualism all a humbug?*" The spirits replied "yes," it is all a humbug. Now this was in perfect accordance with Mahan's notion of the origin of the responses. The person in rapport with the medium really, though unconsciously, answers his own questions. Is this all a humbug? asked our friend. He thought it was, and that thought he *odilycally* expressed through the medium. Spirits will deny the existence of spirits when *Sadducees* are in rapport with them, just as they will pronounce for orthodoxy, when an orthodox circle is studying theology at their feet! O tempora! O mores! We have seen strange things to day.—M. J. S.

From the Wachman.

#### A SPANISH HISTORY OF PROTESTANTISM.

Don Bertran Tomas y Soler, a gentleman of Barcelona in Spain, spent several years in England as a refugee, became a Protestant, returned to his country after the last revolution, and lately sent to press a history of Protestantism. A prospectus of the work fell into the hands of the Bishop, who had already failed in attempts to injure the author, and the following official notice, a Spanish copy of which lies before us, appeared in the papers:

"In fulfilment of our duty, we have to inform the faithful Catholics of this diocese, that we have received the prospectus of a work, that, under the title of '*History of Protestantism*,' contains heretical, erroneous, and wicked doctrines,—doctrines destructive of society, and condemned by the canons of the church and the laws of the kingdom. It places Jesus Christ beside Belial, or the church beside the most terrible heresy that the world has ever seen. It contains an open apology for this sect of perdition, to the scandal of true believers, whom it stir up to fraternize with the children of error, without making any account of the anathemas which the church has launched against it, or of the strict obligation which is laid on every believer.

"No! The Catholic religion will never be sister of a parody on religion. Christian virtues will never own sisterhood with the prostitution of sects. Eternal glory will never be the reward of those who are outside the Catholic Apostolic Roman Church. Therefore we exhort in the Lord, and, if necessary, we command all the subjects of this diocese to deliver up to us the prospectuses and numbers of this venomous production that may fall into their hands. DR RAMON DE EZENARRO. "Barcelona, April 26, 1855."

Startled by this thunder, the printer refused to proceed with his work, but the press is now free, and another printer was soon found willing to brave the malediction of Dr. Ezenarro. The work is in the press, and if the above notice of it be at all correct, it must be worthy the attention of Spaniards. As for the irreconcilable opposition which the bishop declares between his religion and that of Protestants, it would be foolish to dispute. Reconciliation is impossible. Bossuet, Archbishop Wake, and a few others on both sides, have now and then dreamt otherwise; but we agree with the Bishop of Barcelona that reconciliation is impossible, and must also maintain that neutrality is but another name for defection. Spain, however, is awakening; and this "*History of Protestantism*," we rejoice to know, although written and printed without concert of the author with other Protestants in Spain or England, is but one of several works that are now on their way to the press in Spain, or have issued from it, for the promotion of historical truth and scriptural religion.