

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

"She hath done what she could."

While the Saviour sojourned in the little village of Bethany, a few days prior to his passion, he enjoyed the hospitality of the home of Simon the leper.

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 perfume anointed the head and feet of Jesus.

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.

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.

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 fields are abundant and white already to the harvest. Do what you can to gather into the garner of God, and leave the result to him, and he will smile upon you; and the blessing of those that are ready to perish will fall upon you.

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 of the Baptist Churches in Nova Scotia," but I

am unwilling to believe he herein represents the 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 views expressed therein are not accepted. It also seems to me that by adopting "the sixth 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 definitions, as framed by human hands."

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 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 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 concealed like "a hidden rock, upon which some have now and then made shipwreck."

It was upon these grounds, together with the length and completeness of the Circular Letter, without the disputed clause, that it was deemed wise by brethren there, as well as us, to omit it, with all its admitted excellencies. And since silence on our part would be regarded as an admission that our position in recommending such a course was groundless and indefensible, I have thus written.

A. N. S. DELEGATE.

For the Christian Messenger.

Chronicle's Finale.

Dear Brother,—

Ten weeks after my last appeared, Rev. C. Duff, in the Witness of July 14th "with a short letter," according to the Editor, "concludes this controversy." And this is his "few words of explanation" promised four months before "as soon as possible," though he had previously pledged himself to "say no more on the matter, except, perhaps, to utter a simple denial, or give the briefest explanation."

But as his "explanation" requires no addition-

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:—"Having been challenged (second defense, par. 22) [my article only contained eleven paragraphs] to put my finger upon a single misstatement and defend my position, I have here put my finger upon four, in addition to the statement of the original paragraph which I have also proved to be false; and, Sir, I can as easily put my finger upon a score as upon four; and let the Rev. Mr. P. not overlook, but properly test the fact as to whether I can maintain my position, and in time he will probably find out. In his last letter, I cite pars. 14, 16, 21, in all of which, there is not one whole sentence (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 misstatement 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."

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.

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 "active-transitive," "scriptural baptism requires the candidate to be poured" upon, or out—(see revised N. T. Phil. ii. 17) "and the water baptised." His proof of that an active-transitive verb is capable of being defined by another and a preposition, is, that Bengel's "abundantly 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 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 illustrations given, or to use his own language 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 baptism is used figuratively and you may with far better reason read, God is a wind, and they 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 figurative," he has again "mistaken his identity," and reversed his argument.

And now, be it observed, that this completely covers the ground "pars. 14 and 21." It is noticeable that 20, the one just considered, is not included among those not containing "one whole sentence of truth." As to "16," I am content to leave it undefended until he attempts to point out its errors.

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 unsparring 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 2d 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 how 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 defensive, 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 he 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 has 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 understand 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 I 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 influence.

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 suasion, 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