Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

"She hath done what she could."

While the Saviour sojourned in the little vil lage of Bethany, a few days prior to his passion, he enjoyed the hospitality of the home of Simon the leper. Simon being desirous of showing still greater love to his Divine Benefactor, honored him and his followers with a supper. Lazarus, and Mary, and Martha, and many others whom Jesus loved, and that loved him in return were found among the guests.

Mary wishing to give an expression of her attachment to Jesus, and do something in return for the great boon she had received from him, in the deliverance of her soul from the power of sin, and the restoration of her brother to life enters the festive-chamber, while the guests were reclining at table, and with rich perfnme anoint ed the head and feet of Jesus. Some were indignant. Judas gave expression of his disapprobation. The Divine Master vindicated the act of Mary, and declared it to be a good work. For " she hath done what she could." We have no reason to believe that Mary would have obtained the defence and commendation of the Saviour if she had attempted to do what was not in her power to perform. Being content with doing what was in her power, she was applauded by her Benefactor and Saviour, which was more to her than all the encomia of the world.

The reason we have so many fruitless ones in the church at the present day, is, they desire to do what is not in their power to perform .-Therefore they fail to do, and become discouraged, drop behind the screen, and are seldom seen or heard. The question is often put to them, " Why stand ye here all the day idle?" They at once reply, "My talent is so small," or, " If I had the ability of such a brother or sister I would willingly work for the cause of Christ." If a man is unfaithful with one talent, what proof does he show that he would be faithful providing he had five? If he possessed the powers of the brother to whose endowment he aspires, with the same mind he now possesses, he would not labor, for he would desire to have something greater. God demands no more of a man than he has given him ability to perform. And when he aims at what he cannot do, he aims at what God purposed he never should do. If each would improve what he now possesses it would prepare him for greater things. In the school of Christ, as in al others, we must advance " step by step." A de sire to do, without an effort to perform will by no means advance a man in the kingdom of Christ.

God has designedly and wisely bestowed upon his church a diversity of endowments, and has so arranged the church on earth. that there is no lack of opportunity to improve all the gifts and graces bestowed upon her, to the glory of his name and the good of souls. In the prayermeeting, do what you can to make it interesting. The Sabbath School is a delightful field for christian labor. Do what you can to advance it. Are there not sorrowing brothers or sisters to whom you can speak a word of comfort, and dissipate their gloom by pointing them to Jesus and his promises? Are there not perishing souls around you? Go to them and whisper in their ears words of salvation and eternal life. Is there not a young man, over whom you may have some influence, who is indifferent about the Sabbath and the sanctuary? Endeavour to persuade him to come to the house of God. By this little effort you may be the means, in the hands of God, ot leading a soul to the fountain of life. The poor, that you have always with you, cannot you do something to ameliorate their condition, and make them to feel that there is, at least, one who cares for their souls?

Is there not one in your circle, that you have reason to fear, has wandered from the path of rectitude? Go and endeavour to bring him back to virtue and to God.

the barvest. Do what you can to gather into the that are ready to perish will fall upon you. P. R. FOSTER

Kempt, Aug. 17, 1868.

For the Christian Messenger.

P. E. I. Baptists and the "Articles,"

Dear Editor,-

Bro. Davis may speak his own sentiments when he says, " Neither are we Baptists in the sense of the Articles of the Faith and Practice a misstatement or two. of the Baptist Churches in Nova Scotia," but I

Island Association. For this language not only implies that they reject the Articles as a definition of their faith, but also that some of the " Having been challenged (second defense, par. views expressed therein are not accepted. It also seems to me that by adopting " the sixth graphs] to put my finger upon a single misstate-Article" of their Constitution, they just as much say to the churches, " If you walk with us you must accept of such and such doctrinal defini- have also proved to be talse; and, Sir, I can as tions, as framed by human bands," exalting "su; b definitions into terms of church fellowship," just as much learn "their fear toward God by the my position, and in time he will probably find commandments of men;" and just as much bow all of which, there is not one whole sentence to human authority," become " bound up by ties," and " say after uninspired men," as do we by saying, " The religious sentiments of this body are those expressed in the Articles." I think this would have been especially true had they adopted the Circular Letter, as a whole; while by describing their "religious sentiments as those held by the so-called Calvinistic Baptists," surely it is manifest that they simply send those in terested to the " Creed" of Calvinistic Baptists. Besides when in "Apostolic times" was such a "confession of faith" made?

But to what extent are N. S. Baptists "bound by human formularies of belief?" Bro. Davis regards them as making the Articles " the rallying point of their faith, and the exponent, if not nothing remains for me but the "withdrawal" the guide of their practice," and believing that some have already exalted them above the New Testament, lest we shall all fall down and worship them, earnestly calls upon us " to dismount lowing as a correct translation :- " I have a them from the lofty position which they now occupy," in our " very front," and dig them up from the depths in which they have been conhave now and then made shipwreck." And yet I have a very distinct recollection, and so probably has Bro. Davis, of churches being received into one of our Associations who preceded their request with the declaration that they had rejected those Articles! A stranger to our practice would infer from his remarks that they are made a test of membership in both our churches and Associations; whereas, so far as I am aware, the question is never asked, as a pre-requisite for admission into either: Do you accept the Articles? Indeed, I know of no other " place' in which we put them, or "binding force" given them, than, as you have well said, to "value them as convenient summaries of Christian doctrine, and generally of what is believed by those with whom we hold fraternal fellowship." It is true that in a certain sense, we hold them up in our 'front," that is instead of leaving our position " as little defined as possible," we are neither is about what we believe, especially as opposed to the views of others, and beginning with the declaration that the "Scriptures," are "our only rule of faith and practice."

length and completeness of the Circular Letter, without the disputed clause, that it was deemed silence on our part would be regarded as an admission that our position in recommending such thus written. Trusting that what I have said that of Micab, the idol-maker,-Ye have taken leave to subscribe myself,

A N. S. DELEGATE.

For the Christian Messenger.

Chronicler's Finale.

Dear Brother,-

Duff, in the Witness of July 14th " with a short frequently, to dip under. It the word must be letter," according to the Editor, " concludes this translated, then with a Baptist writer, I say controversy." And this is his " few words of ex. Baptists must be called Immersionists." Now planation' promised four months before "as soon ask, now can these statements be reconciled as possible," though he had previously pledged with the declaration " it cannot be proved that bimself to " say no more on the matter, except, the act of dipping under or immersing is ever perhaps, to utter a simple denial, or give the described in Scripture by the word baptise?" briefest explanation" As he is considered by 4th. That he "made the discovery" that the same party well " able to support views of " conscientious belief would afford solid founda-The fields are abundant and white already to Baptism evidently scriptural," it seems unfortu- tion for immersion." Now my remark, upon nate that he should have so conducted the con- which he bases this charge was, " on making the garner of God, and leave the result to him, and troversy as to shut himself out of a paper so discovery that his admission would afford solid he will smile upon you; and the blessing of those willing to publish those views. Our readers foundation for immersion, he says only by will observe the appropriateness of his heading, mistake did he concede that baptise means imsince so few of "my misstatements" have been merse." It will therefore be evident to the made by anyone but himself, and will doubtless reader that here he has entirely misapprehended agree with him that he has received an amount the nature of my statement, and especially the of space more than sufficient for what is abso- force of my argument. Probably he himself lutely necessary he should say on that subject.' will perceive this when he comes to look at the It is gratitying that any portion of that space, whole question more dispassionately. he thinks it " necessary" to occupy with a correction of his own errors, though when so many covers the ground " pars. 14 and 21." It is have been pointed out, it is painful to observe noticeable that 20, the one just considered, is how few would admit of even so lame a defense not included among those not containing " one and that he should be satisfied with eaying that whole sentence of truth." As to "16," I am he may have made in the course of his remarks content to leave it undefended until he attempts

am unwilling to believe he herein represents the al comment. I pass to the " proof' of misstatement which his laborious effort has at length enabled him to bring. And some reply seems necessary to that which can thus conclude :-22) [my article only contained eleven parament and defend my position, I have berr put my finger upon four, in addition to the statement of the original paragraph which I easily put my finger upon a score as upon four; and let the Rev. Mr. P. not overlook, but proprly test the fact as to whether I can maintain precepts of men," "teaching for doctrines the out. In his last letter, I cite pare, 14, 16, 21, in

(from period to period) of truth." " The statement of the original paragraph" at last " proved to be false," it turns out, is found in my expression, "the substitution of pouring for Bible baptism," or, to use his own words, is "the oft-exposed mistatement that our position is pouring when it is pouring upon." And the others being all contained in my last, its suggestion as to what constituted " the real charge" it appears includes too much, and the long-looked for " explanation, proof, and confirmation" goes to establish just nothing. But what is most remarkable is, that his argument-for "proof" it cannot be called-that this is misstatement, only shows that when I have used the expression " pouring," I should have said " pouring upon." And as he contends that I am bound by "the rule laid (own for his guidance," and I have expressed myself " most willing to submi " to it, demanded. I wish then my readers to understand that, instead of what I have before said, Mr. Duff " propagates the substitution of pouring upon for Bible baptism," and advocates the tolpouring upon to be poured upon with. Arise and be poured upon and wash away thy sins .-One Lord, one taith, one pouring upon. Buried with bim by pouring upon. As many of you as cealed like " a hidden rock, upon which some have been poured upon into Christ, have been poured upon into his death," &c.

In the concluding part of his article, he represents my errors as " beginning with the misstatement that we propagate the substitution," &c., but he has never attempted since his first, to make it appear that any thing which followed was worthy of being so designated. Consequently, with my correction as above, he has now yielded all upon which his attack was originally based. Surely be may adopt the language of the prophet, " I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for nought, and in vain."

Let us now briefly examine the " four in addition!" And the first is that " the verb does not include the preposition." The remark however was only parenthetical, or if it had any bearing upon the argument, my "omende" covers all that requires to be said, and his position simply becomes, that, the verb being "activetransitive," " scriptural baptism requires the candidate to be poured" upon, or out-(see revised N. T. Phil, ii. 17) "and the water baptised." His proof 'that an active-transitive verb is capable of being defined by another and a preposition,' is, bat Bengel's "abundantly afraid nor ashamed to say to all the world, This impart, includes the preposition to." Surely his readers cannot fail to see that it just as much includes disciples, or to use his own inquiry, "does not the writer here mean to say that Jesus imparted the Holy Ghost to the disciples ?"

2nd. " That the word which exactly describes It was upon these grounds, together with the pouring" or pouring upon 'is absent in the original.' Of course, in pronouncing this "misstatement, '.he only asserts that pour may correctly be substituted for baptise as in the wise by bretbren there, as well as us, to omit it, illustrations given, or, to use his own language with all its admitted excellencies. And since again, " baptising and pouring upon must mean the same thing." Lexicographers will make a note of this, and revise accordingly. In the same connection, he says, " object that the word a course was groundless and indefensible, I have baptism is used figuratively and you may with far better reason read, God is a wind, and they may not be construed " into an utterance like that worship him must worship him in wind and in truth.' To this I reply by simply reminding him that as wind is literal and not away my gods, and what have I more," I beg "figurative," he has again "mistaken his identity," and reversed his argument.

3rd. That he "admitted that baptise means dip frequently, dip under." His words are " He cannot adduce a single sentence in which I have admitted that these are its classical, much less its Bible meaning." In answer, I will quote two of his sentences, and leave our readers to form their own conclusions. "In the abridged Lexicon already referred to, the first Ten weeks after my last appeared, Rev. C. two meanings of the word baptizo are to dip

And now, be it observed, that this completely to point out its errors.

But as his "explanation" requires no addition- But the most encouraging feature of his

article is, the large proportion of mine which it leaves untouched. The animus of the communication plainly indicates that if mine were open to criticism it would be dealt out with an unsparing hand; whereas the paragraphs he thus enumerates, together with the first two and last, are the only ones at all commented upon, while the body of it from the 2rd to the 14th, in addition to the 15th, 17th, 18th and 19th, are not even alluded to. Probably these are the "lucid intervals" in my "mad career," spoken of. As to my 2nd, only inquiries 3, 4, and 13 has he attempted to answer, while our readers will observe bow very satisfactorily he has done even that much. If then, it would require an equal effort in proportion, for our brother to 'put his finger upon a score" as upon these four, and be attended with no better success, I am scarcely surprised after all that he should stop where he did.

Lastly, it devolves upon me to consider his confirmation," which is almost exclusively a comment upon the following sentence of my last :- " Though I did not impose it upon myself, I am most willing to submit to the rule laid down for his guidance-explanation if possible, if not, withdrawal or proof, and I cannot understand why he should deem it rigorous." Now himself, in part at least, ' laid down this rule,' when he said he would, "as soon as possible, add a few words of explanation, proof, and confirmation:" Therefore, I did not contradict myself and misstate my own rule' by affixing to what I had formerly said, "explanation if possible," but simply expressed satisfaction with his proposal. And my position being the detensive, and the rule not applying in any way to me, wherein did, or could I "disregard" it? Beside, I never " rejected explanation," it being "a simple denial or the briefest explanation" that I said "will not do" and which he styles boasting myself.' And though be was under every obligation to conform, I appeal to our readers whether he understood his own language in saying I " worse than berated" him for not doing so, when the strongest expression I made use of was "regret." And yet, my friend declares that in that sentence, as given above, I distinctly intimated that I was not bound to do to him as I would that he should do to me,' and that I gave a 'plain and distinct intimation of my non-allegiance to moral principle,' and suggested my inability to stand well the test of swearing to my own hurt and changing not.' He then adds, "Let him remember that he whom he professes to serve has said, With what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged, &c. Surely he does not imagine that by going down into the water he bas fulfilled all righteousness, in the sense that there are no other righteous acts for him to perform." After the remark,-"When, in the remaining portion of the sentence, he says, 'I cannot understood why he should call it rigorous' he certainly pays as great a compliment to his understanding, as he does in the previous portion to his heart,"-he concludes with the 'assurance that at such a sight his feelings of indignation are no sooner inspired than they yield most readily to those of the profoundest pity,' that he is" not so much amused as appalled." that my "example warns rather than instructs," and that 'MYSELF and my position require a defense which would be best secured by a radical moral change in both.

To all this the only additional reply 1 shall attempt, is to kindly inquire whether in permitting himself to be driven to such an extremity, as is herein indicated, he has not, with all his admitted willingness to resort to "dishonorable, immoral, and unchristian means," adopted a course unworthy of himself, and calculated to retard rather than promote the cause so dear to his heart, and whether it would not have been better to have exercised enough Christianity, or at least manliness to admit "that in occupying two columns in correcting some of my misstatements, he, to say the least, exaggerated them!"

Absence from home has rendered it impossible for me to forward this before. All interested may congratulate themselves upon "the conclusion of the whole matter," so far as discussion is concerned, having been at last reached. Yours very truly,

T. H. PORTER, JUN. North Sydney, C. B., Aug. 15th, 1868.

For the Christian Messenger.

United States Correspondence.

For the past few years the Temperance cause in our land has enjoyed a continued revival. This has been confined for the most part to the young. These have readily yielded to its influence, and have signed their names to a sacred pledge. The rest look on, for the most part, with an apparent indifference, keep themselves entirely aloof from the movement, withhold from it the voice of encouragement, and cast against it a most powerful

It cannot be denied that the friends of Temperance were too sanguine in their hopes, had not fully measured the strength of their foes, expected that they would be more easily overcome, and having suffered a failure in not having secured the success they anticipated, have now yielded their hearts to discouragement. But few of them entertain much faith in the power of moral sussion, see any use in open organizations, and believe that any thing except a prohibitory law can really advance the Temperance cause. They are waiting for a moral sentiment to be formed that will demand, secure, and enforce Prohibition, and are allowing, almost unrebuked, intemperance to advance. But very few open Temperance societies exist .-The opinion prevails that their interest and influence cannot be sustained. And while the feeling prevails, in and out of the church, among the true

her and all eure r. We

how d by Lastcause born must rents. led to

a lite,

ove,-

_ The stroke seem ng acgiven ed an meter, ot as n to a one of taggernever as just

een left ansition hat exbefore e called ess with sleep. ny horn nay say, esembles nen who n, after hat exace pre-

egational cords are sh voices how ine of har-, and the n the reharmony. t. " Let I the peo-

al thought m an inn, ere is no Radway's on in the ce a day. , in nine

ts of malund them Druggists. n the mass favor of RRY, as 8 in curing se. Many

wn for fleshstiff joints, stands upmily medi-

r, soak the me bot herb to sweat Purgative