

The Christian Visitor.

A FAMILY NEWSPAPER: DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

REV. I. E. BILL, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth Peace, good will toward Men." EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

GEO. W. DAY, Printer. SAINT JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1857. VOL. X.—NO. 7

Selected Articles.

Notes of a Journey to Switzerland.

AND
Conference of the South German Baptist Church.
BY MISS ONKEN.

September 4 the Conference was opened with prayer, and my father chosen chairman. The proceedings having for the greater part reference to matters of local interest, it would be superfluous to give them in detail. Of the general character of the meetings, the following extracts from the minutes may suffice to give evidence:—

The CHAIRMAN.—Accept my heartfelt thanks, my brethren, for the confidence shown me in committing the guidance of this meeting to me. To serve the Lord in His disciples is my greatest joy. Yet wisdom from above is needful for every work on our part, and that may be vouchsafed to me on this occasion, I ask your prayers. My brethren, we meet under favourable auspices. The triumphs of grace in our own hearts, the triumphs of the Gospel through our instrumentality, have brought us together. And though some of us dwell where there are no mountain monitors of God ever pointing heavenwards, yet we also know heights that with irresistible power draw us towards their summits. My brethren, we have all inhaled the renewing, re-animating atmosphere of Golgotha and Tabor. Let us now ascend on high, and untidily survey the land of our goodly heritage. I call upon the Secretary of the Southern Baptist Convention to read the report of the past year.

Brother Steinhoff reports that, although nothing of striking interest has transpired during the past twelve months, the object of the Convention—union among the churches—has been promoted. The churches have also contributed with greater liberality towards the funds of the Convention. Brother Steinhoff exhorts to great caution in the disbursement of these funds. He says, "Let us unite to zeal, prudence"; let us be careful in the appropriation of this money in proportion to the sacrifices it has cost many of our brethren.

Several brethren complain of the comparatively small increase of these churches.

Mr. KOENIG.—I concur in deploring that our increase is not more encouraging. If we are faithful, we are justified in looking for great things under the divine blessing. Although the movement in the Wupperthal is not so lively as in preceding years, the church of Barneen and Elberfeld now numbers 100 members. The clouds that threatened to burst in a storm on our heads have been converted into a fruitful rain. The return of Mr. Ribbeck to the National Church has had no evil consequences. He miscalculated its effects. Not one member of the Baptist Church followed him. Peace and harmony prevail among us. The church at Vollmarstein (near Elberfeld) under the pastoral care of brother Ringsdorf is perhaps the most flourishing of our South German churches. It numbers 110 members. Many brethren plead for the appointment of additional labourers for Switzerland. Brother Merkt speaks hopefully of this country as a field for missionary enterprise. He has met with much encouragement here, but finds it impossible alone to meet the wants of the people.

The Convention agrees to support two additional brethren in Switzerland.

Inquiry is made whether persons should be accepted for baptism before they have the assurance of forgiveness. Several brethren speak on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN.—Much depends on our conception of regeneration. Some believe the conscious appropriation of the merits of Christ's work to be regenerated. But I am not of this opinion. We are all by nature spiritually dead; and being dead, it is impossible for us to see our sinfulness, and to long for salvation through Christ with prayerful earnestness. A sincere seeking—such as has the promise of finding—is, therefore, a token of spiritual life, and consequently, of previous regeneration. In many cases it is difficult to distinguish whether the seeking is genuine, and from the Spirit of God; we must then defer our judgment. Sometimes it is long before the consciousness of pardon is enjoyed, because of the secret cherishing of some sin. But often a soul has been long in possession of that which it is still seeking; its peace and joy being too feeble to satisfy it, or to be perceived by it. The appropriation of Christ's merits, therefore, often exists much sooner than the joy which consciousness of it, when it has reached a certain height, produces.

Brother KOENIG.—What, then, is the faith essential to an applicant for baptism?

The CHAIRMAN.—According to the experience or consciousness of many, there appear to exist two kinds of faith or belief. First, the belief that Jesus is the Son of God and the Saviour of the world; second, the belief that Christ has redeemed me. But this is an illusion. In reality there exists but one faith of regenerate souls, which faith, therefore, is the regeneration, and of which we read in 1 John v. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God."

Brother KOENIG.—Where salvation has been imparted, I cannot believe it possible for the possessor to be unconscious of it.

Brother KOENIG.—Man himself can exist with a very small degree of consciousness, yea, even without it. It is the same with spiritual life. Let me not, however, be misunderstood, as if I undervalued the importance of pos-

sessing assurance of forgiveness. As a healthy material, life is conscious of and rejoices in its vitality, not less in this case with a healthy Christianity. In my opinion, every Christian who has not the assurance of forgiveness, should make it a special object of prayer. Albeit, it is less a guarantee for the existence of faith than a godly life. As to the reception of persons to church membership, experience teaches that a special regard to their life and conversation is necessary. To be concluded.]

The Emperor of Austria's Concordat with the Pope.

FROM AN ORATION BY LOUIS KOSSUTH.
Formerly Governor of Hungary, now an Exile in England.

What danger to Christendom was implied in the fact that Hungary had been chosen as the battle-field for the revival of pontifical supremacy, when that nation had no means to defend herself and the world! (To complete this general survey, M. Kossuth sketched the peculiar characters of the two individuals who were parties to the Concordat, Pope Pius IX., and Francis Joseph of Austria.) It was rather a strange example of the vicissitude in human affairs both that it should have fallen to these two men to commit such an act, and that he should stand before an English assembly to comment on it. Indeed, it looked very much like a mockery of fate, because it so happened that he—to whose broken accents they were thus patiently listening—had to be made a homeless wanderer, an exile, friendless and poor, to make the Concordat possible. If he were not an exile they never would have heard anything of it. In his own time he had had some little to do with the Hapsburgs, which they might know; but perhaps it was not generally known that his name was not entirely unconnected with the other party likewise. Time was when his name was coupled with the name of Pope Pius Nono in thundering cheers along the sunny shores of the Adriatic Sea. Pope Pius the Ninth had once the reputation of being a liberal man. The Emperor had sacrificed his honor, his conscience, morality, the loyal attachment of his subjects, the renown of his house; he had looted his own head with treachery, murder, pillage, every crime by wholesale, down to the infamy of calling upon the brutal force of a foreign nation to aid in murdering the generous Hungarian nation. What for? To what purpose? Only for the purpose of arriving at arbitrary dominion and illimitable despotism. And how could it have come to pass that this unscrupulous despot could, without a shadow of compulsion, have surrendered his illegitimate power to such a weak, feeble, irresolute old man as Pope Pius Nono? And, on the other hand, how came it to pass that that feeble, weak, irresolute old man should have achieved in the line of papal supremacy what none of his gigantic predecessors had achieved—because none of them, not the Gregorys, the Innocents, nor the Bonifaces, had ever succeeded in bringing Hungary within the pale of their supremacy? What was the key to this mystery, so strange that it would be bordering on the ludicrous were it not so tragical in its results? He would give his key to the mystery. One thing is papacy there was that never changed; another thing there was always on the change. The one thing never changing was the eternal aspiration to spiritual despotism, and by it to political supremacy. The ever changing was papal tactics and strategy. Time was when the Pope rivalled with kings for supremacy, when he found it advantageous to throw himself for support on the people. In the times of feudalism it constituted a part of the design of papacy to attack kings and emperors, and to rise to power in spite of them. But time had changed. It would require a long time to relate the progress of the change. The spirit of liberty, the spirit of God, moved o'er the face of the waters, and infused the eternal aspiration of freedom into the heart of the land. Their realisation is the goal towards which the race of nations is bent. Many may stumble, and many may fall. Though misfortune and misery may mow down the ranks of the racers, and others will fall off, the more will rush on towards the goal of liberty. And that liberty is one and indivisible, like God himself. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are one. Again, civil, social, and religious liberty are one liberty. Men are as little inclined to support the despotism of the popes as the despotism of kings. Both are despots, and men will be free. The spirit of freedom stands in the way of spiritual and temporal despotism; the spirit must be crushed to make either of them safe, and to crush it they think no means more permanently sure than to permit the church to rule over the land. What neither hangman nor bayonet could achieve the holy mother church can, if permitted to have the power. Therefore despotism changed its tactics to suit the emergencies.

Kings and priests, formerly rivals, are to-day confederates against what they consider their common adversary, liberty. Should their combination prevail, then they will return to their ancient rivalry; but, in the meantime, they combine against their common adversary, liberty. That was the key to the mystery. It was a fact, and not mere speculation, that at the congress of Verona, in 1822, a secret treaty was stipulated between Austria, France, Prussia and Russia. England was governed by Canning then; and, to her glory be it remembered, with-

draw from the compact. The third article of that treaty was as follows:—"Convinced that the principles of religion contribute most powerfully to maintain nations in a state of passive obedience which they owe to their princes, the high contracting powers declare that it is their intention to sustain in their respective dominions such measures as the clergy may adopt for strengthening their interests, intimately connected with those of the prince. The high contracting parties offer their common thanks to the Pope for all that he has already done for them, and solicit his continued co-operation with them for the subjugation of nations." Such was the third article of the secret treaty of Verona, concluded in 1822. The present Concordat was but a complement to it. But very likely it was only one of the complements to it. Let Englishmen look around as patriots over the political situation of the moment. Let them consider what was the basis and what the manner in which the pacification with Russia had been brought about, and they must come to the conclusion that the true key of the situation was the re-union of the despotic principle into a new Holy Alliance for an exterminatory campaign against the principle of liberty. Had the English Government a place in this? No, certainly not. God grant that they might not be the dupes! He had told them what the third article of the treaty of Verona was. It was fit that he should tell them what the first and second articles were. The first compelled mutual support for the annihilation of representative government, which the high contracting parties declared to be incompatible with that passive obedience which they had a right from God to expect from their people. The second compelled mutual support for the suppression of the liberty of the press, not only in the dominion of the high contracting parties, but throughout the rest of Europe likewise. Now, what did this mean in other words? It meant a continental collusion of despotic Europe against England—against the great England of representative government and of the free press. That was the next triumph. Therefore the link between the Concordat and the political situation, in his opinion, was evident. Let England pray that the Concordat should not triumph over Hungary, because, if it did, the first and second articles of the treaty of Verona would yet bring sore trials on England. M. Kossuth, in conclusion, proceeded to observe, that after the delivery of his lecture in Liverpool on this subject, a distinguished clergyman in that town told him that he had caused him two sleepless nights—that he had pondered over his words, and was deeply impressed with the conviction that an immense danger was gathering over the Christian world. He was anxious to avoid even the appearance that he, a foreigner, intended to act the part of an agitator in this country. But this much he owed to truth, to the principle of Christian fraternity on which the hopes of humanity rested—he owed it to God himself that he should say to them all, that as they valued their religion, their freedom, and the glorious light of intellect, which was so wide-spread over the country, they ought to bestow the most anxious consideration on this subject. They saw that the Pope was conspiring with a despot for the subjugation of civil and religious liberty, to extinguish the light of intellect, and to enslave the consciences of 36,000,000 of human beings, because thinking men would dream of freedom. Did they think that the effects of such a combination would stop at their pleasure at any geographical frontier, or that protestantism would be a strong barrier to the evil? Protestantism itself was the prey on which the fascinating eye of the rattlesnake was fixed. Let them bring the Catholic world under despotism, and they would have armies to lead against Protestantism, such as Peter the Hermit never dreamed of. He would say, as a Protestant, that it was of great importance that catholicism in Austria and Hungary should not be made a tool in the hands of the Pope. Protestantism was interested in the freedom of Catholic countries. The people of England were Protestant and free, and therefore the object of hatred to every despot. Their enemies were one. The thunderbolt of the Vatican entwined the axe of despotism. The press abroad was fettered, and there were indications of still more being attempted in this direction. If Luther were to arise, where was the prince who would give him protection? Spielberg would be his resting-place. The world wanted a new Luther; the Reformation wanted reform. While the Roman see acted on the principle of unity, Protestantism had till now acted on the principle of division. The Reformation wanted a reform, not for reforming its dogmas or its ritual, but for uniting what is divided. Even the Clergy wanted a Reformer—not for reforming their manners or morals, but to bring their sacred vocation in closer union with practical life. They wanted a Reformer to make their sacred office an instrumentality in the hands of Providence for securing the greatest possible happiness of the greatest possible number. They wanted a Reformer to make them, the teachers of mankind, know how best to glorify our Father in heaven by best contributing to the happiness of his children on earth. Let the light of religion thus identify itself with the practical interests of humanity, and oppose its ranks to the union of spiritual and temporal despotism, Protestantism would be saved, and freedom must stand her ground; should the clouds of obscurantism be allowed to roll onward, the time may come

when, from the excess of volcanic re-action, the words of the poet may yet prove true, that "religions have their turn, and new years see new creeds arise." These might have seemed strong words, but he could only say with Luther—"God help me; I cannot say otherwise."
(To be concluded in our next.)

Correspondence.

Craft and Guile.

MR. EDITOR.—My attention has just been called to a short article in the "Colonial Presbyterianian," of January 31st, signed David Palmer, on the disputed passage in 2 Cor. 12: 16. As the controversy on that subject first originated in a dispute, between myself and the respected Editor of the *Presbyterianian*, I hope I shall not be considered intruding by making a few observations on the subject.

The very candid observations, and the kind Christian spirit evinced by the writer, entitle him and his opinions to the greatest respect, which I shall cheerfully award him.

Mr. P. in alluding to the views of Brother Spurden, says, "If such liberties are taken with the apostle's words, when there is not the shadow of a reference to another person, we may make the scriptures say anything or nothing, just to suit our predilections." Here we think our worthy Brother wrong. This twelfth chapter is but the continuation of his defence of his character and ministry, against some who had been laboring to disparage both, as is obvious by a reference to the two former chapters. Some charged him with "walking according to the flesh." They had said, "His letters were weighty and powerful, but his bodily presence was weak, and his speech contemptible." He warned the Corinthians against those who would corrupt the minds from the simplicity that is in Christ; chapter 10, verses 2, 10, 12; and chapter 11, 3. In the verses 12 to 15, he speaks of some who sought occasion; and he calls them "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ." He speaks of these as bringing the Christians at Corinth into bondage; as *despousing* them; and as *exalting* themselves. This twelfth chapter is a defence against these, and an argument to prove his own authority as an inspired apostle, by a reference to the wonderful revelations which had been made to him, by Jesus Christ, when *caught up into the third heavens*; and also by reminding the Corinthians that, the signs of his apostleship had been wrought amongst them, in "signs, and wonders and mighty deeds," verse 12. The next verse reminds them of his disinterested spirit, in not being burdensome to them.

Now under the circumstances in which the Apostle was placed, in connection with his enemies, who were seeking an occasion against him, I cannot think it possible that the Apostle would so commit himself, and put a wean into the hands of his inveterate enemies, by acknowledging that he had acted craftily, and caught them, like the insidious fowler, with a bait and snare, or with guile! To me, this appears the more improbable, because he had just before charged the devil, or the serpent, with the same thing, (chapter 11, 3.) when he beguiled Eve. "I fear lest as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." In this text the word *craft* in the Greek, in the text under consideration.

Brother Palmer is right in saying that "Mr. Spurden has learned expositors to back him." Lexicographers and Commentators are, "that the words *craft* and *guile*, are always used in a bad sense in the New Testament." The word *craft* is certainly used in a bad sense in Mark 14: 1., where the Scribes and Chief Priests, sought how they might take him, (Jesus) by *craft*. Also, in Luke 20: 23, "He perceived their *craftiness*;" and in Eph. 4: 14, "Cunning *craftiness*, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Also in 1 Cor. 3: 19, "He taketh the wise in their own *craftiness*."

But, the word *guile*, is equally as inconsistent as the word *craft*, with the spirit and simplicity of the Gospel. The word, as used in the New Testament, has, so far as I know, an evil odour. In 2 Peter 2: 14, we have a description of false teachers, where they are described as the vilest of men; and many other practices, as *beguiling* unstable souls; and in the 18th verse, the words "allure through the lusts of the flesh," is of the same import.

But, there is yet clearer and stronger evidence in the Apostle's writings that he did not mean that this was his own language, for he and others of the Apostles have so strongly condemned it in others, that to indorse it by their own example, would be to condemn themselves. For instance, Paul, in the spirit of holy indignation, denounced Elymas the sorcerer, as full of all *subtilty*, (dolou) and perverting the right ways of the Lord. Everywhere in the New Testament, *craftiness* and *guile*, are deprecated as connected with the works of Satan and his agents.

But, our Brother has referred us to Matt. 25: 2; and Rom. 11: 25. But, what have those passages to do with the subject under consideration? Did the Saviour or the Apostle refer to *craft* or *guile*? Does the word *prudence*, which Christ introduced, in referring to the "wise virgins" and Paul's admonition to the Romans, not to be wise in their own counsels, anything to do with *craft* and

guile? The Greek Lexicons give us the meaning of the word *prudence*, wise, prudent, provident; and, I believe, never *craft* or *guile*. Nor on the other hand, have I ever seen an instance of the word *prudence* explained by these or similar terms; but, by craft, cunning, subtle, &c. The same may be said of the word *dolos*, guile. It is translated guile, fraud, deceit. And Parkhurst says of the word under consideration, "In the New Testament it is used only in a bad sense." And referring to the text we have in debate, says, "It seems plainly an *objection* or *insinuation* put by the Apostle into the mouths of his opposers."

But, again, Mr. Palmer objects to these Commentators, because he thinks their "minds are so constituted that they can find nothing but rank Arminianism in the Word of God." And are all Commentators tainted with rank Arminianism? But, what has this to do with a criticism or exposition of a Greek word? Sure I am, that I have no love for rank Arminianism. But, I am at a loss to know how to apply this remark to the subject in hand.

Again I object to our Brother's application of this passage, because the inspired writers have warned the churches against the very spirit of the thing, and the course he supposes the Apostle to pursue and in the very words he uses. In Eph. 4: 14, Paul warns the brethren against being "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men's *craftiness* (panourgia) whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Here the word *craft* is interpreted by the Apostle himself, to *deceive*. So Peter exhorts his brethren to "lay aside all malice, (dolon) guile." And in a passage referred to already, Paul expressed his deep anxiety lest the Corinthians, "As the serpent (dolon) beguiled Eve, their mind, should be corrupted, &c."

If these things do not convince our Brother that Paul never could have used the words *craft* and *guile*, in the sense he understands them, I think the apostle can, and will satisfy him, that he is laboring under a mistake, by referring to the same epistle, chapter 4: 2. Describing the manner in which he had labored and preached the gospel, and won souls to Christ, he does not intimate that he had done it and succeeded by *craft* of any kind, but, "Having renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in (panourgia) *craftiness*, nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God;" 2 Cor. 4: 2.

Whatever may be the meaning of the words in review, whether cleverness, prudence, or deceit, cunning, &c.; one thing is certain, he did not apply them to himself, for in the above passages, he, using the same words, declares before God and this Christian church, and in the same epistle, that he never did use *craftiness* or anything of the kind!—Paul then, being "permitted to speak for himself," clears himself from the suspicion, far more effectually than our good Brother can, by supposing that he might have used the words *craft* and *guile* in a modified sense; i. e. *As our Saviour did* when he said, "Be ye wise as serpents, &c."

May I not close then by saying, "I hope that for the future," Brother Palmer "will be careful not to lend his influence to sanction such a vague interpretation of the scripture."
D. NUTTER.

For the Christian Visitor. Christian Meekness.

There is no feature of the Christian character more frequently insisted on in the word of God, than that of exhibiting the spirit of meekness and forbearance towards those who may have injured, or spoken evil of us, or of any course with which we may be closely identified; and yet, such is the frailty of our nature, that it becomes exceedingly difficult to manifest this spirit, when attacked by foes, or opposed by those whose sentiments and opinions are antagonistic to our own; and so great is the difficulty to overcome the natural propensity which lingers within the bosom even of the regenerate, to a greater or less extent, that men of eminent abilities and lofty standing in the Christian church, who are exercising a wide spread influence for good upon society, are sometimes betrayed into forgetfulness of their relationships and obligations, and indulge too much in the spirit of the world, when brought into close discussion, upon matters which relate to the advancement of the kingdom of Him "who when He was reviled, reviled not again, when He suffered He threatened not." There are, undoubtedly, some points connected with the religion of Christ, which are subjects for investigation, and were they to be taken up in the spirit of Christian meekness, and with a sincere desire to ascertain what is truth, might result in the enlightenment of the understanding of individuals, and elevation of the entire Christian church, to a position more exalted than she has hitherto attained; and a likeness more nearly assimilated to that of our Divine Master. But, alas! how frequently is it the case that discussions are brought forward, not so much to ascertain the truth, as to propagate a sect or party; and then it is that Christians, un mindful of the spirit of their Lord, allow their carnal propensity to burst forth from its lurking place, and they are tempted to retaliate an accusation or report of injury, and thus give occasion to the enemy to blaspheme; and such as are eager to find flaws in the religion of the Bible, have stumbling blocks placed in their way, by those whose very of-

fice it is to remove them, and point the world, not only in theory to the Lamb of God, but practically to manifest the excellencies and show forth the superiority of revealed religion by their holy lives, and meek and forgiving spirits. It is not meant here to find fault with those who stand up boldly for the truth, but to remind those who engage in controversies that if they do not possess much of the "grace of our Lord Jesus Christ" ere the controversy shall cease, something of the "old Adam" will certainly manifest itself, and the ungodly and profane, the weak and feeble minded, find in this an excuse for dispensing with religion altogether, and are led into entire carelessness concerning eternal realities, and live "without God, without Christ, without hope in the world," and die unreconciled and unsaved; and all because Christians fail to exercise that lovely disposition, so prominent in our Saviour's life, viz: the spirit of love, meekness, longsuffering and forbearance. If there must be controversies let it be seen that love is not absent. Let Christian men be careful lest by their words or example they become the medium of publishing to the world, language and sentiments which savor more of the spirit of envy than of love, and lost they thus become stumbling blocks to those who are enquiring after truth, and these lead to conclude that if Christianity does not produce a nobler spirit than the worldling exhibits, it is of no value and one would better without it. Let Christians be more actively engaged in doing their duty, and seeking God's glory, and then speedily would controversies cease, and all would love each other as brethren children of the same Father, seeking the same object, loving the same Saviour and journeying towards the same heaven. S. M.

From the Colonial Presbyterianian.

There were two lawyers, Lawyer A., and Lawyer B. Lawyer A. was engaged to defend the cause of certain minors whom certain uncles were determined to dispossess of properties of which said minors had held possession by trustees for some time—alleging want of title. Lawyer B. was engaged for the plaintiffs. When the cause came on for hearing lawyer B. made a strange proposition across the table to lawyer A. to the effect that he would give him £100 if he would establish the minor's title by one evidence distinctly proving it. Lawyer A. demurred to this course when lawyer B. affirmed that if he did not accept the proposition it was certain that he had no just grounds of defence—and that he should throw up his brief and allow judgment to be given in favour of the plaintiff. Lawyer A. said that this was the strangest proposition and affirmation he had ever heard made, that he had never heard any respectable lawyer make such a proposition, or found such an affirmation upon it, and he was quite surprised that his learned friend should be guilty of such an attempt to prejudice the minds of the jury. Lawyer B. called this small talk. Lawyer A. said that it was the more easily answered, and insisted that if this principle were to be admitted as the law of evidence in many cases it would be utterly impossible to establish what was yet perfectly just and fair, and proceeded to reason out its absurdity to the full satisfaction of every member of the jury who had any capacity. Lawyer B. then tried to throw dust in the eyes of the jury by representing that what was not the fact, that he had merely asked for evidence, and that his learned friend had said he had no evidence. Now this was not true. He had asked lawyer A. to establish his case "by one single evidence," and then by that peculiar chicanery for which certain lawyers are remarkable, lawyer B. desired the jury to mark how lawyer A. had no case, for he had refused to bring forward his evidence. Now all honest people indicated their disapprobation of such transparent trickery. We do not know whether lawyer A. was ashamed or not, but we think he ought to have blushed for appearance sake.

The above case is so excessively like that of the *Visitor* with us that it may stand as the image of the mode of controversy adopted by its worthy Editor. He offers his £100 for a single passage from Scripture distinctly proving Infant Baptism. We do not choose to rest our case on the production of one single passage—the affirmations and therefore that we have no evidence and should give up our cause at once. We would rest it on "one evidence," and because we would rest it on one evidence he affirms we have no evidence, professes he is very anxious for evidence, but wont let us produce it unless we first confess we have no evidence, and as proof that we have no evidence he appeals to our refusal to rest our case on one evidence. What an admirable lawyer our friend the *Visitor* would make. His readers should be proud of the inimitable adroitness with which he throws dust into their eyes.

The *Visitor* professes to have been very anxious about evidence for Infant Baptism, and to have searched the four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles and epistles to the churches, and can't find Infant Baptism in all, and then he says he has appealed to the Presbyterian for guidance and he wants "the law" on the subject. Candid Enquirer!—Now if he had not come out in the bragadocio style of the reward, and if he had not indicated the sort of tender mercies we would meet with, if we had chosen to try conclusions on one ill-chosen text and if he had come out with the placid, lamb-like disposition which he displays in the article we have laid before our readers, we might have been induced to give him that instruction which with all semblance of teachableness he now entreats. As it is we demur. We have "the law" a law which was in operation from apostolic times notwithstanding Neander and the *Visitor*, but we will just say nothing about it at present till we have settled our accounts with the *Visitor*, and until we have paid him in his own coin.

To show what are the tender mercies we have to expect from the *Visitor*, let the readers of the *Presbyterianian* and *Visitor* consider the disingenuous misrepresentation of our reasoning in applying the *Visitor's* principle of argument to the salvation of infants. We reasoned that if it required "a *Thou saidst the Lord*" in so many words to gain admission into the church below, it could not require a less explicit statement to enable us to hope that they would be admitted into his church above. We said nothing about Baptism