

# The Christian Visitor.

"HOLD FAST THE FORM OF SOUND WORDS"—2d Timothy, i.

DL. XXXII.

SAINT JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1879.

NO. 16.

## THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR,

Largest Religious Weekly in the Maritime Provinces,

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY

AT

No. 85 GERMAIN STREET,  
SAINT JOHN, N. B.

\$3.00 per annum in advance, or 50 cts. extra if not paid within the year.

REV. J. E. HOPPER, A. M.,  
Editor and Proprietor.

Correspondence for the paper must be addressed to the CHRISTIAN VISITOR OFFICE, No. 85 Germain St., St. John, N. B.

Payments or remittances for the CHRISTIAN VISITOR, from May 1st, 78, are to be made to REV. J. HOPPER, No. 85 Germain Street, St. John.

## THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR,

A representative paper of a large and growing denomination, is a most

VALUABLE MEDIUM FOR ADVERTISING.

Relates, more or less, in all the Provinces of the Dominion and United States.

TERMS:

Per square—first insertion, \$1.00  
Per square—subsequent insertions, .50  
Per line—first insertion, .10  
Per line—subsequent insertion, .05  
Business Card per year, .60

Special terms and yearly contracts apply at the

CHRISTIAN VISITOR OFFICE,  
No. 85 Germain Street,  
ST. JOHN, N. B.

## Poetry.

Friday Afternoon.

### My Cup Runneth Over.

BY LUCY LARCOM.

Before drink with me friends! It is no draught of intoxication; at its brim the wreathed head of Bacchus ever laughed the pilgrim-cup of mine, now worn and dim from time's rough usage: no bright bubbles swim, foam-heads sparkle over.—Have ye quaffed waters clear that through green pastures glide, where they who love the Shepherd follow Him, armed with His peace, my soul is satisfied; and are my feverish fancies, calmed the stir of dreams whose end was only bitterness. Led at this fount our inmost all would be, we but health about disease prefer. My cup is filled at wells whose blessedness the world's thirst cannot drain. Friends, drink with me!

[For the Visitor.]

### "Sinai" and "Feeling."

I was much interested in two prominent articles on your first page, March 19th,—rested, not because I was in sympathy with the sentiments advanced, but because how perfectly they voiced views by means confined to the writers, but which regard subversive of the gospel. I have been hoping that some one else would refer to this, but am not willing that it should be unchallenged.

Dr. Cuyler, an authority with many, says, "Oh that the people of our times should be made to hear more distinctly the solemn voices of Sinai, uttering forth the sacred authority of law, the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and the sure retribution of a path to come! Never was there a time when that sharp sword which Mr. Finney wielded was oftener required." He goes on to say that those pulpits where the law is not preached are occupied "with cologne and rose-water ministers," who preach "a one-sided God—all mercy and no justice," and sinners are not warned to flee from the wrath to come. They are to be coaxed into holiness by a magical process which makes nothing of repentance, and simply requires a 'faith' which costs more labor than a snap of the finger. This shallow system," he says, "may produce long rolls of 'converts,' but it does not produce solid, sub-soiled Christians. It is one very vital sense no Christian is free from the law." It would not be a happy condition for him if it were so, any more than it would be a happy condition for New York or Chicago to disband their police," etc.

Again, he represents what he is attacking—as illustrated for instance in Mr. Moody's preaching—as "a lumber-backed theology which has no stiffening of the word 'ought' in its fibre. We need more law-preaching in our pulpits, and more law-work in the conversion of souls. The Apostles preached law as Gospel." Mr. Moody "does not make enough of repentance before a sinner trusts in Christ, nor enough of holy living as a proof that he is trusted in Christ. The law is vital as

an element in healthy, vigorous, well developed piety. Christ crucified is not the whole of the Bible. Let us direct men's eyes toward Sinai as well as towards Calvary."

Rev. L. C. Stevens of New Hampshire commends "feeling as an important element in religion, and that too not less in him who is seeking to enter in (at the strait gate?) than in him who has already entered it." "Now," he says, "people are taught, and that too by Baptists, that feeling is of no account, that it is nowhere required, that faith and coming to Christ and taking up the cross are the things requisite to being saved. Glad indeed should I be to believe that many souls are not deceived by this pernicious teaching. It is plain that inspired men did not overlook feeling in determining the moral condition of the soul." He then in the way of strongly affirming, asks "Do these terms (contained in Rogets' One Hundred and Sixteen Synonyms) denote feeling that is of any account in the soul's salvation?"

It seems then that we have in this half of the nineteenth century and among "Evangelical Christians" to fight over again the old battle of "justification by faith only." If that be so, the sooner we are about it the better, and may God defend the right.

Now I affirm that the statements here made would be news to Paul. The Apostles preached law as Gospel, did they? I could fill pages with proofs from their own writings that this was just what they did not do, and what they with one accord denounced and condemned—except when they had to be "withstood to the face because" they were "to be blamed." I unhesitatingly challenge Dr. Cuyler, Mr. Stevens, or any one else to produce one single instance where the Apostles preached to sinners or saints, law, or Sinai or feeling as Gospel, or as of any account either in the salvation of the soul, or in producing solid Christians. Theirs was the "shallow system" that produced long rolls of converts, many of whom ere long had to be addressed as "carnal," "soon removed from Him that called them into the grace of Christ into another Gospel which is not another," "neither cold nor hot," or having only "a name that thou livest." Roman Catholics and Arminians generally tell us that we should preach more law and penance and "repentance." So did the Judaizing teachers of New Testament times, and even Peter, "inasmuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation." So says the human heart everywhere and always. Nothing is more natural or common than for men—even Christians—to interpose something between—a naked sinner and a naked Saviour." This has been the history of mankind, and of an apostate church, and herein, if at all, Peter became the head of the church of Rome. Instead of Dr. Cuyler telling us something new, it is as old as Cain.

If the law be so necessary and efficacious, why did it effect so little when it was "received by the disposition of angels?" Sinai certainly was not "extinct" when it "was altogether on a smoke." And yet, instead of "toning up the popular conscience," and producing a healthy, vigorous and well developed piety. Israel corrupted themselves even in the very midst of its "thunders and lightnings and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud." The power of "law for righteousness" was thoroughly tested under the Jewish economy, but Dr. Cuyler is not satisfied, and proposes to send us again through the wilderness. For my part, I object, I wandered there a quarter of a century after professing religion, and nearly a score of years in the ministry I have traversed, and retraversed every foot of it. Dr. Cuyler's system drove me to the borders of infidelity, despair, insanity and suicide, and I am satisfied, nor do I intend to have "suffered so many things in vain." Messrs. Cuyler and Stevens and other good men may yet comfort these, but sinners like me and Saul of Tarsus, the publican, the prodigal, and the woman that was a sinner can find peace nowhere but in such assurances as "to him that worketh not, but believeth in Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Law was faithfully tried on the Green-

landers, but the "theology of love" was found a great deal more efficacious. "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did."

But even Dr. Cuyler gets things a little mixed. With one breath he talks of "the complete sufficiency of Christ's life as our model, and Christ's death as the atoning sacrifice for sin," of "Christ's commandments and laws," and with the next, of directing men's "eyes towards Sinai." Are Christ's commands and the thunderings of Sinai in his mind identical? Is the yoke which is easy, and the burden which is light the same as the "yoke which neither our Father's nor we were able to bear"? Is the law written on tables of stone "a perfect counterpart of that which is engraved on the fleshy tablet of the heart"? Is the new covenant "not according to the Covenant that I made with your fathers," after all, the same as it, and Mr. Cuyler and the Holy Spirit of equal authority? Or is it true that "Ye are not come unto the mount that burneth with fire, but unto Mount Zion," even though Mr. C. can afford to sneer at "certain pulpits pitched so far away from the sublime mountain."

Mr. Finney seems to be Dr. Cuyler's mould. Those who have read his lectures on Revivals and accept his view, that God and man are the two agents in salvation, will be able to appreciate this reference. But some time ago I learned that "Cursed is the man that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm and whose heart (correspondingly) departeth from the Lord, for he shall be like the heath in the desert and shall not see when good cometh." Dr. Cuyler is not alone in failing to see the value of the work Mr. Moody is accomplishing. I may add in contrast with that of other leading Evangelists of the day, as well as Mr. Finney, "I also will show mine opinion."

Dr. C. also has an idea that the sinfulness of sin and the retribution of a wrath to come are to be learned only at Sinai. I have long supposed that Calvary reveals to men God's justice and anger against sin as neither Sinai or even hell itself could. The best way to convince men of guilt and danger, is on the line of the Spirit's work. There we may expect his aid. Says Jesus, "When he is come he will reprove the world of sin," not because they violated the law, but "because they believed not on me."

I wonder if Mr. Cuyler would call Jesus a "rose-water minister," because when he came to the words, "and the day of vengeance of our God," he closed the book, or because he declared without ifs or ands that "whosoever believeth on him should have eternal life." Is there no danger of including him among those whom he charges with coaxing men into religion by a magical process which simply requires a faith which cost nothing? I have a vague recollection that the Unitarians and Free-thinkers of Boston made a similar charge against Mr. Moody, though the stalwart and logical Joseph Cook, thoroughly endorsed him. But what Paul represented as "the gift of God," Mr. Cuyler thinks these "cologne ministers" make too easy! For my part I am quite willing to be classed with such, since Paul and his fellow-workers were "a sweet savor of Christ." Mr. Cuyler unfortunately has placed himself among those who savor of "that which decayeth."

As for Mr. Moody not making enough of repentance before coming to Christ, I read that Jesus is established "Prince and a Saviour to give repentance," and therefore conclude that the most effectual way of getting it is to come to him for it. Does Mr. Cuyler know of anyone whom Sinai has frightened or coaxed into "repentance unto life"? Is it clear that he knows exactly what he means when he uses the word repentance, or if he does, that he means what the Apostle meant by it? And the same inquiry may be made respecting Mr. Stevens and all who are hoping to profit "in the Jews' religion."

These brethren evidently are in full sympathy with those who sneeringly talk of "the Evangelist with his lump Bible singing, 'Oh to be nothing, nothing.'" "But of these who seemed to be somewhat whatsoever they were it maketh no matter

to me, God accepteth no man's person for they who seemed to be somewhat added nothing to me." For my part I prefer the sentiment of the song to its opposite, "Oh to be something, something," which lies at the foundation of all this legalism. But it is certainly something new that in a very vital sense or in any sense, the law of Sinai is the Christian's police. If it would be cruelly to any man or community to place them beyond the reach and the just penalty of divine law, may not the blessedness of heaven be questioned? The Apostle says "Ye are not under the law." From my heart I pity the Christian minister who cannot appreciate and does not enjoy the sentiment of that precious hymn, "Free from the law, O happy condition, Christ hath redeemed us once for all."

Concerning holy living as a proof that a sinner has trusted in Christ, I would ask how much holy living is necessary to prove that I am a Christian? The soul consciously trusting in Jesus for the first time, immediately rejoices in the assurance that he is saved. Has an old Christian any less reason to be happy, even though conscious of failures on every hand? The dying thief had little opportunity of testing the genuineness of his faith by his works. And I am free to confess that if I had no better evidence that I am saved, than my life or my experience or feelings give me I would be in despair. The word of my Saviour is sufficient to satisfy me. And has not "God that cannot lie," assured me that "by one offering he hath perfected forever" the believer, and that "as far as the east is from the west so far hath he removed our transgressions from us"? It is true we are told to examine ourselves, but is it not simply "whether ye be in the Faith"? "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness within himself." We show to others our faith by our works, but it would be the last of all methods of proving it to ourselves. The Comforter "shall not speak of himself."

As to "the stiffening of the word ought," it is upon the assurance of what faith has done for them that the Apostle bases the practical part of his Epistles. "Therefore we, receiving a kingdom that cannot be moved, let us have grace to serve God acceptably." "I beseech you therefore brethren by the mercies of God," etc.

As respects "feeling" is it not a result rather than a cause of anything, and does not this cover the whole ground? I know of no one that objects to feeling but only to placing confidence in it. I am glad that I am not told in Scripture to feel anything in order to be saved or to be assured of salvation, for I never could satisfy myself that I have felt enough or felt exactly right. I think we could well afford to drop that word from our religious vocabulary and substitute for it and "duty," the Scriptural "know," and privilege.

And now, concerning preaching, "Peter pricked the heart of three thousand sinners" not by proclaiming the terrors of the law—he never thought of such a thing—but by charging home upon them their guilt in rejecting and crucifying Christ, and at the same time proclaiming him as a risen and exalted Saviour. "Paul, as his manner was," reasoned with Felix on the line of the work of the Comforter in reproving the world. What he preached he plainly tells the Corinthians in 1st Cor. xv. 1-4. Not a word of law from beginning to end, and his testimony concerning the matter is that he "kept back nothing that was profitable," "saying none other thing than that Christ should suffer and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people and to the Gentiles." His preaching of terror was "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ. Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord we persuade men." Any one who will take the pains to carefully examine the sermons recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, and what is said of them there can easily satisfy himself as to how the commission "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," was understood and carried out by those to whom it was directly given. And the teaching of all the Epistles including those to Timothy and Titus, only confirm us in the conviction that as good authority as we can find that the Apostles

preached or authorized others to preach Law as Gospel is Theodore L. Cuyler. For my part I prefer and must have a "Thus saith the Lord."

And now Mr. Cuyler's main dependence seems to be the law of Moses. It is the sole remedy he has to recommend for all ills. He has no idea of power apart from it. It is only the gospel that he deems inefficient. The manifestations in connection with the tragedy of Calvary and with the words of Jesus during his ministry must be a great mystery to Mr. C. But how differently the Apostle saw things. It was "what the law could not do in that it was weak," that he dwelt upon, and the gospel only that was "the power of God unto salvation." The law he represents, as "weak and beggarly." It could not give "life," and therefore "righteousness" must be in some other way. It was a "carnal commandment" only, "that which decayeth and waxeth old," and therefore was "ready to vanish away." Dr. C. assumes that it was for all time. But Paul speaks of it as merely "added because of transgression till the Lord should come." It "entered," he says, "that the offence"—not the righteousness—"might abound." "The law was our school-master unto Christ. But after that faith is come we are no longer under a school-master." "There is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof." Dr. C. to the contrary notwithstanding. "Therefore my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law," also, "now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held." Mr. Cuyler appears to think the law is on our side, Paul represents it as "the enmity" "against us," contrary to us, and in the way. It "worketh wrath," the best it has for us being "a curse." Therefore it had to be taken "out of the way" and even "blotted out" and "abolished." Why will Mr. C. persist in bringing it back? "They zealously affect you but not well." This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you." The "foolish Galatians" allowed themselves to be "bewitched," but let us give "place by subjection, no not for an hour." "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." "Cast out the bondwoman and her son."

Finally, though Christ crucified be not the whole of the Bible, would not Dr. Cuyler and one or two others of his Brooklyn friends as well, be considerably the gainers were they henceforth to act upon the Apostle's resolution, "For I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, him crucified?" "To the law and the testimony, if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them."

Yours very truly,  
T. H. POSTER.  
Yarmouth, N. S., April 10, 1879.

## Items of Interest.

Gen. Grant was expected at Siam on the 1st. The King sent him an autograph letter inviting him to be his guest. A grand reception was awaiting him. The King has just issued a proclamation, granting the utmost liberty of conscience in his domains. Besides this, he has recently endowed a college for the children of his court and of the princess, and appointed a Presbyterian missionary to manage it. The institution is to be strictly Christian in its character.

Vanderbilt has awarded the contract to tunnel the Detroit river, from Stony Island to Anderson, Ont., a distance of 3,700 feet, for \$1,500,000, and will begin work early next month. The double arches for a double track will be 18 feet high, and 15 feet high.

The late Governor, General of India, Lord Lawrence, says that "missionaries have done more to benefit India than all other agencies combined," which Sir Bartle Frere supplements by saying that "they have worked changes more extraordinary for India than anything witnessed in modern Europe."