

CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.



PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY A COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS FOR THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH—RUFUS T. HEFLIN, Editor.

VOL. IV—NO. 27.

RALEIGH, THURSDAY, JULY 7, 1859.

\$1.50 a year, in advance.

ORIGINAL.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate.

"Calvinism vs. Arminianism," Reviewed.—No. X.

REV. R. T. HEFLIN:—I proceeded now to P. T. P.'s VII communication, of April 30th, on the "Truth of God." God is, doubtless, a God of Truth. He is true in his nature. Nothing of an evasive character is in his nature, or is consistent with the purity of his essence. His perfections are exact and perfect, so that there is no possibility of erring in the smallest degree. Hence, his revelations must be Truth, without any mixture of error; and can be relied upon as being unqualifiedly correct in all its details. The doctrines set forth are the delineations of principles, whose natures are absolute in the purity of their character, and are the embodiment of infinite perfection. There can, therefore, be no secret reserves, in which are couched sentiments which are adverse to the plain and consistent, out-spoken declarations of His Word.

"The Arminian system," says P. T. P., "charges the God which the Calvinistic system contemplates, with a want of sincerity. And if the charge be true, either there is no God, or the Calvinistic system is false. For we cannot conceive of a perfect Being who is wanting in sincerity." That the "Calvinistic system," on the subject of the "sincerity" of God, is defective, if not "false," there can be no doubt. But this is not the place to review this particular feature of the controversy to any extent, as it will come under consideration, when I shall bring the whole system under review.

It is a mistaken view of the "Arminian system" charging the God which the Calvinistic system contemplates, with a want of sincerity. The "Arminian system" contemplates the God of the Bible, as a Being so essentially true in his nature, and open and sincere in his declarations, that it conceives, in this regard, that it is impossible in the nature of the case, for Him to say or do anything, which would lay Him open to the charge of duplicity, by professing, in his revelation to offer salvation to all men, without respect of persons, and at the same time, know, that by his "secret will" and His "eternal Decree," he has determined that Christ should die only for a certain definite number, who are called the "elect," and that His Holy Spirit should not work in the balance, "effectually," so, as their salvation would be an impossible event; and then, finally punish them forever for rejecting a salvation which he knew was impossible for them to accept, without that "effectual calling," which would "make them willing," and at the same time, withhold from them that degree of "irresistible" working of His Spirit, which alone could accomplish their salvation. Arminians think that such a course of conduct, to be altogether "insincere," and as the "Calvinistic system," (See Chap. iii. and x. of the Confession of the Presbyterian Church,) teaches the doctrine of a partial atonement, and "effectual calling" only to the "elect," to invite all, indiscriminately, to accept salvation, as though it were equally provided for all, while no atonement was made for these "others not elected," and consequently no other calling than "some common operations of the Spirit," which are ineffectual, that there is manifest duplicity and "insincerity" in such transactions. Mr. Wesley's views, as quoted by P. T. P., are fully sustained, and the misrepresentation of the "Arminian system," fully demonstrated.

Arminian definition of God's sincerity, seems to be this: viz., a principle which requires God to do for His creatures, or to enable them to do, what he is willing for them to do, and commands them to do. Nor so. "Arminians" think, and believe, that "God's sincerity" is such, that He "requires" of "His creatures" to do "no more than he knows they are 'able,' by his 'sufficient grace' to do; and that His 'invitations' to accept salvation, are all based upon a sufficient atonement, made for all, through which their salvation is made possible.

But God's sincerity, according to the Arminian system would require Him to give the devil sufficient grace and ability to obey His commands: otherwise, when he requires him to do what he is unable to do, He must be charged with hypocrisy and insincerity. In answer to this, it is only necessary to say: 1. "Devils" and men are not in a like condition, and therefore, what may be required of men, cannot be of "devils." 2. "Prohibitions" can only be "required" to do what is suitable to their state of probation, and their obligations can be commensurate, only with the laws of that state. 3. As "devils" are not on probation, they, therefore cannot be "required" to do a probationary work. 4. From hence it appears Mr. Wesley's charge is, on his principles, fully sustained, and Arminianism is again

indicated from the false allegations here set forth.

But "let it be kept distinctly in view, that the inability of the sinner on earth, to love God, is not at all different in kind from the inability of the sinner in hell.—Why then should God be charged with insincerity, in requiring of the sinner obedience to His laws, when he is only prevented from obedience by the same corruption of the understanding, will and affections which prevents the obedience of devils?" &c. 1. The "inability of the sinner on earth," and "in hell," may be the same "in kind," and yet he may be "required" to do "on earth," what he cannot be "required" to do "in hell." The law of the state in which he is, is the rule of the "requirements" binding upon him. "On earth," the law "requires" the "sinner" to repent, believe, "add to his faith virtue," &c. Is there such a law "in hell?" 2. The "inability of the sinner" may be the "same in kind," when "in hell" as when "on earth," but it certainly is not the same in degree. "On earth," he has grace given him and the "operations of the Spirit," restraining him from many vices, and inclining him to some virtues; but "in hell," none of these things exist: nor is there any law there in that state, "requiring" him to do better. The only law known "in hell," is that of justice in its punitive power. 3. As to the "devils," the last paragraph is a sufficient answer. Their probation closed with their expulsion from heaven.

"All of the false arguments of Arminians on this subject are founded upon the presumption that sinners do not deserve eternal perdition, and that it is not by the pure mercy and forbearance of God that they are living upon earth instead of being spirits already damned." All that is here necessary to say, is: 1. Arminians never believe, or taught, that "sinners do not deserve eternal perdition;" that they teach this always. This is an unqualifiedly false issue. 2. They therefore, always teach, that it is the "mercy" of God in Christ Jesus, that keeps them alive, and out of hell. 3. They also believe that God is truly willing that all might be saved, and consequently that he delighteth not in the death of any.—1 Tim. ii. 1-6; 2d Pet. iii. 9; Ezek. xviii. 24-32; John iii. 14-17.

But, "Arminians are constantly confounding God's will or purpose, with His revealed will or command. Both His purpose and His command are called in the Bible, His will, and they are not necessarily the same. . . . God's command is to all men to obey His gospel, but it is not His purpose to work in all a disposition to obey it. He can be brought under obligation to do it. He will have mercy on whom he will have mercy." &c. In answer, I shall not, need not, to say much. 1. Arminians are never guilty of what is here alleged against them. It is true, they have no idea that God has two conflicting wills: one that "all men" should "obey His gospel," the other not to afford them the means "sufficiently saving," by which they can "obey;" and then damn them for not doing an impossibility. 2. They think, and believe, that the entire of God's will and purpose, in regard to man's salvation, the Bible fully reveals to man; and that there is nothing in his nature and purposes contrary to, or subversive of, the revelations which he has made. With "secret things" which "belong to God," they having nothing to do, and leave them to Calvinists with whose system they are essentially "revealed things." Arminians are satisfied with, as they know them "to belong to them and their children." 3. As to the text "Arminians would rage against," if it were not "in the Bible," I need only say that God has clearly shown, "on whom he will have mercy," in John iii. 14-17, and Mark xvi. 15, 16.

As to Mr. Wesley's "mind" being disturbed by Calvinism, respecting man's salvation, I observe that both Wesley and the Methodists, believe that, although God is "sincere" in offering salvation to all men, yet, they believe some men will be saved, because some men "reject the counsel of God," and bring swift destruction upon themselves, because they "deny the Lord that bought them."—2 Pet. ii. 1-3.

"The Arminian system" does not encourage man in his natural opposition of the will of his Maker. Nor is one word of it true, that "encourages man" to believe rather, that God is unable to save him that believe than he is unable to save himself. No one acquainted with the system can truthfully allege these things against it.

With respect to "the experience of Christians," P. T. P. evidently, either does not understand what "Christian experience" is, or that his view of Paul's "vicid description" is a very dull account of man's regenerated state. The "44th Hymn," of the "Methodist Collection," is anything else but Calvinism, either as to doctrine or experience, but is wholly Arminian, according to 1 Pet. i. 3-5.

Yours affectionately,
PETER DOUB.
Lumberton, N. C., June 2, 1859.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate.

BRO. HEFLIN:—An article in the last Advocate, signed "Aminis," brings to mind something I wrote last fall, on the same subject; and as my article contains a little experience of the practical working of what Arminis advocates, I have concluded to submit it to your inspection, and if you think it worthy a place in the Advocate, it is at your disposal. It will be seen, from the date that it was written before our last Conference.

Very truly,
L. W. MARTIN.
June 18, 1859.

WEEK-DAY PREACHING—LARGE CIRCUITS!

In the early days of Methodism, week-day preaching and large circuits were a necessity. The harvest was great and the laborers few. The people had to attend preaching in the week, or not attend at all. Circuits then were as large as districts now. But times have changed. Population has increased, laborers are more abundant in other churches as well as our own, and there are but few neighborhoods where there is not preaching on the Sabbath by the ministers of some one of the leading denominations. Hence, the necessity for attending church on the week-days has been done away, and, consequently, the circuit rider goes to his Thursday appointment with the expectation of preaching to empty benches. He may exhort and entreat with all long-suffering and patience, but it is only "wasting sweetness upon the desert air." The fact is, preaching in the week has become obsolete, and under existing circumstances, I can see no remedy that can be applied with any hope of success in restoring the old system. Instead then, of making vain efforts to convince the people that they ought to go to church on Thursday, it appears to me that the better way would be to accommodate our system to the altered circumstances of society. Many circuits are too large, and while they remain so, the onward march of our church must be very materially impeded. Facts are stubborn things, but worth a thousand theories, notwithstanding. I will give one single example to show the propriety of dividing all the large circuits. But before I do so, let me anticipate an objection.

Some one is ready to say, that some large circuits are poor, and can just make out to support a preacher as they are.—Now the fact is, the members of a large circuit will always feel poor, because there are so many to do what might, ought, and would be done by a few. Let us never complain that our economy has a tendency to bring forth and foster that very principle.

But to the example: In 1852, I was in charge of the Smithfield circuit, which then embraced Goldsboro', and several other appointments in Wayne county. As a matter of course, all the claims against the circuit were fully paid. If I remember right, there were only then twelve appointments on this field of labor. At the Conference of 1853, (Raleigh) the circuit was divided, and Goldsboro' circuit set off. I was sent in charge of Goldsboro', and Rev. John Tillett, in charge of Smithfield. What was the result? I took in some new appointments, and so did Bro. Tillett. All my claims were paid, and I presume the same was the case with Bro. Tillett. Goldsboro' has since been made a station, and Everettsville circuit takes its name. Now, if my opinion is worth anything, I would say that the Everettsville and Smithfield circuits are among the most desirable in the N. C. Conference. At all events, I would be willing to spend the remainder of my days on either.

It is preposterous to talk, or write about building up "waste places" when it is impossible for the preacher in charge of a circuit to give one half the congregation in his charge Sunday preaching. The "waste places," generally speaking, have no very favorable opinion of Methodist preachers, and the people will not put themselves to much trouble to go to hear one on Thursday, when they can go and hear somebody, they like just as well, on Sunday.

The probability is, that the transfer of a portion of our territory to the Virginia Conference, will leave us an abundant supply of preachers; and the question arises, what is to be done with them? If the large circuits be made smaller, so that more vacant territory may be taken in and cultivated. The North Carolina Conference ought now to be made the garden spot of Methodism. She has an abundance of laborers and if they can only work to advantage, a glorious harvest will be the result. Not only will the "waste places" stand a better chance by the plan proposed, but it will also have a tendency to develop the resources of the church. Many complain that our people are not liberal. If so, why are they not? (1.) The small salary allowed the preacher, has, no doubt, been a fruitful source of stinginess with our people. (2.) The large number of members on a circuit or station, leads to indifference, inasmuch as there are so many

to do a small thing, that no one feels specially called upon to do much.

It would be an easy matter to enlarge upon this subject, but for the present I forbear.

Yours very truly,
L. W. MARTIN.
Blocker's, N. C., Oct. 1, 1858.

SELECTIONS.

Bishop White on "the Succession."

A pamphlet was written and published in 1782 by the father of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, which is just now exciting some attention, and we advise our friends who think the system of sacramentalism and apostolical succession worth contending against, to procure a copy of it. It is being re-published for cheap circulation in the Protestant Episcopal Church, as an antidote against High-Churchism. We extract some things about this pamphlet and from it, as they are said and quoted by the Episcopal Recorder of Philadelphia, an excellent religious (Low-Church) paper.

"Bishop White is claimed," says the Recorder, "as being a High-Churchman in party sympathy, and, during the latter part of his life, his weight, it is maintained, was thrown with that interest. If such be the case, we have a still stronger proof of the novelty and recentness of the exclusive views of Episcopacy now promulgated by the Altitudinarians in our own communion.—It would thus appear that even High-Churchmanship in those days tolerated, if it did not hold, views which strike at the root of the whole sacramental theory."

We are told in a letter from Bishop H. U. Onderdonk, published lately by Dr. Sprague:

"He was, to the last strongly opposed to the theory comprised in the words *priest, sacerdotium*; this being one of the very few points on which he was highly sensitive."

The subject of this pamphlet is, "The case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States considered." After describing the peculiar situation of the Episcopal Church in this country at the time, and the urgent necessity of its establishment upon an independent basis, Bishop White offers a "sketch of a frame of government," with only one part of which we have to do at present.

In reference to the subject of Episcopacy, we have the following statement of the difficulty, together with the proposed remedy:

"But it is generally understood that the succession cannot at present be obtained. From the parent Church, most unquestionably it cannot; whether from any other, is presumed to be more than we can at present be informed. But the proposal to constitute a frame of government, the execution of which shall depend upon the pleasure of persons unknown, differing from us in language, habits, and perhaps in religious principles, has too ludicrous an appearance to deserve consideration; the peculiar circumstances of the war in which our country is engaged, preclude us from procuring the succession in those quarters to which alone application could consistently be made; the danger of offending the British government constraining (perhaps) a refusal of what it would, of course, be indelicate for us to ask. Now, on the one hand, to depart from Episcopacy would be giving up a leading characteristic of the communion, which, however indifferently considered as to Divine appointment, might be productive of all the evils generally attending changes of this sort. On the other hand, by delaying to adopt measures for the continuance of the ministry, the very existence of the churches is hazarded, the duties of positive and indispensable obligation are neglected."

The conduct meant to be recommended, as founded on the preceding sentiments, is to include in the proposed frame of government a general approbation of Episcopacy, and a declaration of an intention to procure the succession as soon as conveniently may be; but, in the meantime, to carry the plan into effect without waiting for the succession.

"The first part of this proposal is conceived to be founded on the plain dictates of propriety, prudence, and moderation; for if the undertaking proceed on acknowledged principles, there will be far less shock to ancient habits, and less cause of intestine divisions, than if new principles are to be sought for and established."

"The other part of the proposal was an immediate execution of the plan, without waiting for the Episcopal succession. This is founded on the presumption that the worship of God and the instruction and reformation of the people are the principal objects of ecclesiastical discipline; if so, to relinquish them from a scrupulous adherence to Episcopacy is sacrificing the substance to the ceremony. It will be said, we ought to continue as we are, with the hope of obtaining it hereafter. But are the acknowledged ordi-

dinances of Christ's holy religion to be suspended for years, perhaps as long as the present generation shall continue, out of delicacy to a disputed point, and that relating only to externals? It is submitted how far such ideas encourage the suspicion of want of attachment to any particular Church, except so far as is subservient to some civil system. All the obligations of conformity to the Divine ordinances, all the arguments which prove the connection between public worship and the morals of a people, combine to urge the adopting some speedy measures to provide for the public ministry in these churches; if such as have been above recommended should be adopted, and the Episcopal succession afterward obtained, any supposed imperfections of the intermediate ordinations might, if it were judged proper, be supplied without acknowledging their nullity by a conditional ordination, resembling that of conditional baptism in the Liturgy."

He was in the fix that John Wesley found himself in once—the people dying for bread, and the Bishops of England refusing to ordain preachers. Wesley proceeded, as Bishop White was minded to do, "without waiting for the succession." We are glad he did. Thousands in earth and heaven are glad. And "the father of American Episcopacy," as the Protestant Episcopalians love to call Bishop White, was ready to do the same thing, for the same reason.

But hear the ground on which he held Episcopacy:

"That the apostles were thus succeeded by an order of ministers superior to pastors in general, the Episcopians think they prove by the testimonies of the ancient fathers, and from the improbability that so great an innovation (as some conceive it) could have found general and peaceable possession in the second or third century, when Episcopacy is acknowledged on both sides to have been prevalent."

"Can any reasonable rule of construction make this amount to more than ancient and apostolic practice? That the apostles adopted any particular form, affords a presumption of its being the best, all circumstances at that time considered; but to make it unalterably binding, it must be shown enjoined in positive precept. Bishop Hoadly clearly points out this distinction in his answer to Dr. Calamy. The latter having considered it as the sense of the Church, in the preface to the ordinal, that the three orders were of Divine appointment, and urged it as a reason for nonconformity; the Bishop, with evident propriety, remarks that the service pronounces no such thing; and that, therefore, Dr. Calamy created a difficulty where the Church had made none; there being some difference (says he) between these two sentences—bishops, priests, and deacons are three distinct orders in the Church by Divine appointment—and from the apostles, time there have been in Christ's Church bishops, priests, and deacons."

"Now, if the form of church government rest on no other foundation than ancient and apostolic practice, it is humbly submitted to a consideration whether Episcopals will not be thought scarcely deserving the name of Christians, should they, rather than consent to a temporary deviation, abandon every ordinance of positive and Divine appointment."

Lastly, Bishop White defends his view as to the "lawfulness of deviation (from Episcopacy)" in cases of necessity," by quotations from such "writers in defence of Episcopal government" as "rank among the most respectable for their authority."

He first quotes from the "venerable Hooker":

"This accomplished writer, after asserting with great zeal the authority of Episcopal government" makes the following exception: "When the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep; when the Church must needs, have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have a Bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity the law of God hath oftentimes and may give place; and, therefore, we are not, simply and without exception, to urge a literal descent of power from the apostles by continued succession in every effectual ordination."

From Archbishop Usher:

"Answer—It is not against God's law; but contrariwise they ought indeed so to do; and there be historians that witness that some Christian princes and other laymen have done the same."

"Question.—Whether it be defended by God's law, that if it so fortune that all the Bishops and priests of a region were dead, and that the word of God should remain unpreached, and the sacraments of baptism and others unministered, that the king of that region should make bishops and priests to supply the same or no?"

"Answer.—It is not forbidden by God's law."

"The above may be offered as the opinions not only of Cramer, but also of most of the eminent bishops, and other clergy of that period."

The Bishop concludes the quotations with the following pertinent remark:

"On the credit of the preceding names, the author rests the last part of his subject; and if his sentiments should meet with an unfavorable reception, he will find no small consolation from being in a company so respectable."

"Waiting for the succession!" Think of it, while sinners are perishing for the gospel, and churches vacant. Bishop White and his brethren may have got the fabulous thing called "the succession" since, but they might have waited till dooms-day for the reality."

The apostolic practice is well. Methodist Episcopalians have that too. But the idea of "succession" tends to corrupt, and mystify, and destroy the benefit of the practice—ever running into sacramentalism. We are happily rid of it. "The succession" was not worth our waiting for; and, what is more, we devoutly pray that it may never take us. It has done incalculable mischief to those who have had any thing to do with it. To the Protestant Episcopal Church it has been a plague. The fact of succession cannot be sustained, with any approach to historic certainty; and, therefore, many sound minds are driven away from the Church that lays stress on it. The idea runs off with many weak minds, making ecclesiastical excoombs of them, and carrying them to High-Churchism, Romanism, and worse bringing-up places. "Tactical communion"—what a taking fiction to sentimental souls! How it draws away from the inward to the outward, from heart circumcision to fleshly! May their idle and pernicious dogma of "succession" never get in among us. If there was danger of the infection, we would sooner have our ministry vaccinated against it than against the small-pox.—*Nashville Christian Advocate.*

Farmer's Daughters.

Miss L. Virginia Smith that was, Mrs. French that is, the crinoline editress of the *Southern Homestead*, gives the following excellent advice to farmer's daughters.—Although intended for rural districts, it is applicable to young ladies whose fathers are not farmers.

"Now, if the form of church government rest on no other foundation than ancient and apostolic practice, it is humbly submitted to a consideration whether Episcopals will not be thought scarcely deserving the name of Christians, should they, rather than consent to a temporary deviation, abandon every ordinance of positive and Divine appointment."

ery day to short for the accomplishment of all your duties. You know how much you can assist mamma in all her varied departments of domestic economy, the dairy, the poultry-yard, the store room, the sewing basket, the garden, the shrubbery, and twenty other things over which her watchful eye presides, but while doing all you can for her, please don't neglect papa.—Now I see you smile incredulously, saying to your nice little self, "Why, what in the world could I do for papa?" O! a great deal, if you will assume the responsibility. Besides preparing some refreshing delicacy when he comes in, as he expresses it, "hungry as a hawk," or singing him a sweet song when his mind is over-taxed, you can talk with him, and learn of him about his fields, his stock, or his business; you can read to him his agricultural books and papers, (for there is a good deal of head work in farming,) and thus improve your own mind while adding also to his knowledge. Suppose, then, that some day he is called off on important business, though it is in the hurry of harvesting, he quietly takes his seat in the car, and goes on his way rejoicing. Ah! squire, glad to see you, but how in the world did you get up to town? This is your business season is it not? The old man smiles, a deep light flashes in his blue-grey eyes—is it pride, or love?—as he quietly replies: Yes, sir, it is, but my Mary will attend to that. O! wouldn't you glory in that? I would.

I can see no necessity in the world for your troubling yourself about marriage, but if Harry Thornton, that intelligent, handsome, and successful young man will keep on coming to consult your papa about this or that, always contriving, by the way, to terminate his consultation with a ride, or a *tea-a-tete* with papa's "Mary," why then you needn't be surprised, on some fine evening, to hear yourself "respectfully solicited" to become Mrs. Harry Thornton. Then I wish you to remember that marriage is only a question of will with you, not a necessity; your good parents are not at all anxious to get rid of such a sweet, sensible, brave, and beautiful child; and you, if you don't think you have a "well called" to become a wife, have been too well educated to fear the name of "old maid." But if you love Harry, and your will is won, (which for his sake, poor fellow, I trust is the case,) then like an honest, dear little girl as you are, having far too much love for your lover, and too much respect for yourself to "flirt," say "Yes" immediately, and heaven bless you both.

Eating-Meetings.

Those who knew that great man, Ezekiah G. Leigh, of the North Carolina Conference, need not be told that he uttered strong sayings. He was "a good liver," as the phrase goes, and owned it. Once, drawing his friends around a grinning and hospitable board, he began, "Eat with thankfulness, and eat enough. David thanked God because he filled his mouth with 'good things,' and so do I. I don't believe the Lord made all the good things just for fools and knaves."

But who, in the day when our venerable friend preached great sermons, ate strawberries and cream thankfully, and felt kindly to all mankind—who preached that by the year 1850 eating would be introduced into the social liturgy of respectable and learned sects in this practical America? The English have long had their religious tea-drinkings and their breakfast prayer meetings. Once we asked our foreign correspondent to describe to us readers how they were carried on, but he has never done it—perhaps has not been invited to one of these occasions.

The New York eating-meetings were very popular last month, and well attended. Few excused themselves. The best speeches were made; dry toasts abounded, convivial nature was gratified, there were songs and wit helped digestion. Different denominations met in representative members, and over bread, and cheese, and nuts, and cold meats, and confectionary, drew the bonds of human fellowship closer; that the books and eyes of other fellowship might be joined. Even our Baptist brethren were almost persuaded into open communion. Those who were admitted professed to have their charities warmed and their souls enlarged.

When the Rev. Mr. Scott, an Irish Wesleyan, was in this country, his brethren of the North got up one of these eating-meetings in his honor. The quaint John Hersey, who used to walk to his preaching-places because pride rode, who wore no buttons on his coat or band on his hat because they were needless luxuries, has reproved the feasters, like another Nathan. He has written a letter about it, and wants to know if the poor, lame and blind, were invited. Dr. Bond, of Baltimore, who was there, thus acquits himself: "God gave us a social propensity, and a tolerable appetite, and filled the earth and sea with good things, and converted sinners and made them good company, and it would be very ungrateful not to enjoy what our Heavenly Father has so beneficently given. When the brethren in New York shall give another dinner of the kind we hope they will invite us again, and if Bro. Hersey will go and see the truth, instead of imagining evil, we are inclined to think he would not be so much afraid of 'the sword.' What a notion that is, that the good Father would fall with a sword upon his children, assembled in all innocence, around his own table, and rejoicing in him as the giver of all good! Brother Hersey has never taken a look at God through a kitchen, garden, or a fruit tree, or a poultry-yard, or a flower-bed."

"With regard to the facts, Brother Hersey is mistaken in an essential particular. No toasts were drunk. There was nothing but 'dry toast.' No drink stronger than coffee was furnished. To our knowledge, (though we are not sure,) we did not 'ouch any unclean thing,' and as to being 'separate from sinners,' we sat between Dr. Murray (Kirwan) and Dr. Bangs."—*Nash. Chr. Advocate.*