

RALEIGH CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE

VOL. XXXII.—NO. 22

THE ORGAN OF THE NORTH CAROLINA CONFERENCE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.

ESTABLISHED 1855

REV. FRANK L. BRIDGES,
Editor and Publisher.

RALEIGH, N. C., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1887.

\$2.00 PER ANNUM
Payable in Advance

For the Advocate. Our Georgia Correspondence.

BY REV. G. G. SMITH.

OUR CHURCH PAPERS

are wonderfully rich, about this time, in the matter of correspondence. This is especially true of the Southern Christian, the Nashville, the St. Louis and the Raleigh; I think the Philosophic Editor of the Wesleyan does not care much for this kind of literature, I incline to the opinion that he had rather have an essay on Ruskin, than an account of Epworth any day. I used to hear him preach before the Dons at Oxford, when he was a young preacher, and he always left the beaten track, and chose his own way. Sometimes I differ with him when he does so now as when he drops the time honored "Bro." and calls the preachers "Mr." I don't like for one of our Editors to call me, Mr. Smith. It is not fraternal enough, and while it is very English, you know it is not very Southern, but our paper is mighty apt to be in when the bugle call to duty sounds and when Missions are to be helped, and Colleges are to be lifted and Prohibition is to be defended look out for the Wesleyan. The St. Louis with its 20,000 subscribers shows what can be done by energy and pluck on the part of a publisher. It is useless to sit still and beg the preachers to work for the paper, and talk of loyalty to the organ; make the organ a good one, put it in time, and make it to the interest of the preachers to work for it, and the organ will go, otherwise, no. The best Editor in the world will not make a paper go. It is the publisher, not the Editor, who makes circulations. We have had few papers to succeed as church enterprises, just as soon as they become private property they did succeed. The publishers of the Wesleyan do their work for nothing. This is poor economy. The laborer is worthy of his hire, and at least half the net profits should go to the Publisher, then there would be some encouragement to put forth work—to increase the paper's circulation.

OUR BRIGHT FRIEND OF THE SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN

has been hurt by the murmurings of some of the good brethren of his Conference, because he admitted articles alluding to the modern movement in the holiness line—which some thought were improper, but in last week's paper, Bro. J. Walter Daniel from the side of the Holiness brethren, as they choose to call themselves, writes one of the most judicious, Christly articles, I have seen in a long time. Perhaps it might do good, if we could see with other people eyes and try to see why other people think as they do. It seems to be a foregone conclusion with the "Witness" and "the Standard" that any man who does not follow McDonald, Mrs. Smith, and Mrs. Palmer, is not a Wesleyan, I avow my faith in every clear statement in Wesley's Plain account, and yet I do not believe that the teaching of these brethren and sisters is correct. If one should ask me why I will tell him calmly and kindly and he need not get irritated when I do; but still less do I accept the teachings of those who deny the possibility of Christian Perfection, or who say that every Christian is entirely sanctified all the time from his conversion as Mr. Wesley defines entire sanctification, and if one should ask me why I don't agree to that view, I could tell him, if he will promise not to get angry, and bring his logic to prove that what ought to be always is. I do not see any way out of this trouble, but the one laid down by Paul in the xiv. chapter of Corinthians. Let us agree to disagree. I fully endorse what Archer Butler once said on this subject. "The excellent person who, in the last century principally insisted on this point, really made the theological question of Christian perfection, of far more practical importance, than it ever deserved. To believe, or to deny the possibility of Christian perfection, is to leave the motives of Spiritual life almost wholly unchanged, as long as each man believes that it is his unceasing duty to be as perfect as he can. If you will add to this, and that it is every man's privilege, to have every grace, he really desires, you have my view of the question. I can see no earthly reason why if some preachers want to form a society, to help them selves, and help others, on to a better life, why I should say them, nay. Then many profess high attainments before they have them, but they are few indeed who are going to seek to be perfect, needlessly. This controversy has not been for good among us taken altogether for it has divided many brothers, but the preaching of a higher life and the specializing of it has, I trust, not been for harm. There is an idea however which I trust is not true, and that is that our leaders are more disposed to condone any doctrinal vagary than this. That a pronounced pelagian, has a better chance for promotion, than a second blessing brother. If this is so it ought not to be. Our brethren are good and true and sensible and no more fallible than we are, and are bravely standing up for what they think is true, but ought they to be intolerant, and resent any allusion to their view as an assault on themselves or on old time Methodism? I think not. I think John Wesley was right and John Owen was wrong, that Richard Watson was right and Richard Baxter was wrong, that James

Arminius was right and John Calvin was wrong, that John E. Edwards is right and Jonathan was wrong, that I am right, and every one who differs with me is wrong, but I am not sure of any of these conclusions and not being sure I am going to let harsh judgment alone and cultivate a broad charity.

What delightful letters Dr. Young writes, and Dr. Kelly says he is going to make a book. Well, he can make a good one, and he does not mind losing a little money on it. I have rarely read more entertaining letters than Dr. Young, although I have gone over the same ground a score of times with other travellers. He has done wisely, that he has allowed Cathedrals and picture galleries and great libraries to rest and has given us a view of the people.

They are getting things ready for a grand blow out at Emory this Summer. Dr. Morrison preaches the sermon. Gov. Colquitt, makes an address, but the lion of the day will be Lucius Lamar, Secretary of the Interior, L. Q. C. Lamar, the first of the name, was father of the Secretary. He was a young Judge and a brilliant man. He died early, leaving his excellent wife and three boys and one daughter. They were people in excellent circumstances and all this newspaper gossip about a penniless lawyer and a rich planter is simply fiction. The widow moved to Oxford, and there young Lamar obtained his education under Judge Longstreet and his Associates in the faculty. Our home, and that of Mr. Lamar were separated only by a fence, and when he was a freshman I was in the infant class, and he used to kindly pet me. In after years when his mother married again her home was near that of the bride I won, and in her carriage I rode to the city where we were wedded, after that time I used often to see Mr. Secretary when he visited his mother. One day I found him hard at work on the *Origin of Evil*. He was a better lawyer than I, but I told him to read Pascal and let the Thodocceans alone, that that question could not be and would not be answered while we were here. He was rather skeptical of my scepticism, but long since this I have no doubt he has found that why, evil and God should co-exist may be known, by an archangel, but never has been by a man.

He married a lovely lady in our city last spring and now visits his Alma Mater. I would like to meet him there, but I am afraid I shall have neither time or money to spend on the trip of pleasure. His oration on Calhoun, I suppose you have read. I have not read all of it, but enough to see its drift. Jno. C. Calhoun has never had his peer on this continent. Had Mr. Calhoun's views prevailed, there had never been the strife between capital and labor, neither Secession nor war. Slavery would have gone by the course of events and while we might have moved slowly we should have moved surely. Am I a Bourbon? I was brought up an old Whig, and never was a Democrat till I had no choice, yet I hold to that view, but Mr. Calhoun's views could not, as they did not prevail because men were men. At governing men he revolted, let them govern themselves. This is just what they will not do, and have never done. The constitution of the United States was made for party spirit rises above law, what does it avail? Mr. Lamar has vindicated Mr. Calhoun, but alas facts have shown that they do not vindicate the practicability of his theories. Perhaps Judge Longstreet, Mr. Lamar's father-in-law knew John C. Calhoun better than any man who ever lived except George McDuffie. I once asked him of Mr. Calhoun's views. He said he was a firm believer in Christian doctrine, but he did not know that he had ever a religious experience. Mr. Toombs, said once Mr. Archer of Virginia, said Mr. Calhoun had never tasted wine. Mr. Toombs said, "Mr. Archer he has taken claret at my table, and drank it." "That may be, said Mr. Archer, but I declare he never tasted it." He had not a single, vice said Mr. Toombs.

When I see a Democratic Congress afraid to pay the Southern Methodist Church for the presses broken and the type defaced and the paper used during the war, because it is afraid it will lose the votes of the North, I long for the old Roman and his honest foreman, Daniel Webster, to rise and say, "Thou shalt not steal, even if thou art strong enough to steal, nor hold to stolen goods," and that is just what the United States has done, and just what the Democratic Congress has endorsed by its silence. After years of robbery the poor children of the Coast people in South Carolina receive back their forfeited lands sold for taxes during the war. I blush as an American, when I think of the petty thievery which robbed them, and the slow justice which restores a small part of that which was stolen. How I drift—here's to port.

A SUPERB ANSWER.—Early in the course of the mission in Turkey, a controversy arose between Dr. Schaeffer and the Russian Ambassador, in which the latter said that his "master the Emperor would never consent to the establishment of Protestantism in the Turkish Empire," to which the defiant reply was made that "The kingdom of Christ, my Master, will never ask the Emperor of all the Russias where it may set its foot."—*N. Y. Observer*.

RENEW your subscription.

For the Advocate. Our New York Letter.

BY JOSEPH S. TAYLOR.

It is only a few weeks since the Legislature of this State passed a so-called high-license law by ample majorities. A good many people hinted at the time that the act was passed for political effect only; that it was intended as a net to catch the temperance vote for the Republican party; and that if the majority in the Legislature had dreamed that a high-license bill had the slightest chance of being signed by the Democratic Governor, it would never have been passed.

That this skepticism as to the virtue of our law makers was well grounded is sufficiently proved by the fact that the same majority that passed a high-license bill just passed the so-called "Beer and Music Bill" in the interest of rum-sellers. This bill legalizes beer-selling at the gardens and parks. It is the legal marriage of rum and music. By this law the State means to do all it can to increase the temptation to drink. First the State issues a license to sell the liquor, by which it says to the rum-seller: "If you pay me so much, I give you the privilege of poisoning your fellow-citizens." Then it offers this music license, saying: "If you pay so much more, you may employ the beautiful art of music to lure victims into your poison-shop."

Among the potent elements of the "New South" is a new generation of writers. Of these none is more eagerly listened to in the North than Dr. Felix L. Oswald, of Georgia, who contributes scientific articles to the *Popular Science Monthly* and other Magazines. One of the peculiarities of Dr. Oswald is his marvelous information, and his skill in marshaling the facts so as to make his position impregnable. The *Poison Problem* is a late volume of his just brought out by the Appletons. The trouble with a large number of writers on temperance has been that their work was largely emotional, rather than scientific. They served to convince unscientific and impressionable minds, but not those accustomed to look for facts. Dr. Oswald has supplied an array of facts that bristles on every side like a Grecian phalanx. Here are a few of his positions, which we respectfully recommend to our friends, the young medical students, who are still taught, apparently in every College, and in the name of science, to look upon alcohol as a "food," and upon temperance men as fools:

I. The alcohol habit. Who among the scoffers at total abstinence does not say: "I can drink or let it alone?" Dr. Oswald, quoting Dr. Jennings, says: "[men possessing great intellectual power and firmness of character] become drunkards by law—fixed, immutable law!"

When the temperance orator told you that you called it "sentiment." What will you say to science?

II. "Alcohol lingers in our hospitals," says Dr. Oswald, "as slavery lingers in South America, as torture lingers in the courts of Eastern Europe. Quacks prescribe it because it is the cheapest stimulant; routine doctors prescribe it because its stimulating effect is more infallible than that of other poisons; empirists prescribe it at the special request of their patients; others because they find it in the ready-made formulas of their dispensaries."

Yet, the other day, when you heard this same thing at the temperance meeting, you smiled knowingly, as much as to say, "If these fanatics would only study science!"

III. Once more. "It has been asserted that alcohol protects the system against cold, but the exponents of that theory have failed to show how the constituent elements of alcohol can take the place of the natural heat-producers. They have also failed to explain a fact established by the unanimous testimony of polar travelers, namely, that a low temperature can be longer and more easily endured by total abstainers than by those who indulge in any kind of alcoholic drinks."

IV. Dr. Oswald also discussed alcohol as a "food." Now, the writer is aware that the greatest diversity of opinion prevails among so-called "medical writers" on this alcohol question. Things diametrically opposed are brought forward with equal confidence in the name of science. The fact of the matter is that science is infallible; but "Scientific men" are not. Dr. Oswald represents what in his estimate is the latest verdict of science, when he says: "There is no more evidence of alcohol being in any way utilized in the body, than there is in regard to ether or chloroform. If alcohol is still to be designated as food, we must extend the meaning of that term so as to make it comprehend not only chloroform, but all medicines and poisons—in fact, everything which can be swallowed and absorbed, however foreign it may be to the normal condition of the body, and however injurious to functions."

V. On the "cost of intemperance," the following statistics are quoted:

1. "Waste of remedial expenditure in the United States"—\$100,000,000 for prisons; \$5,000,000 for hospitals.
2. "Loss of wealth." During the last ten years the people of this country spent \$624,000,000 a year for alcohol. "We can therefore be quite sure of understating the truth, if we estimate the aggregate cost of poison-vice at \$1,055,000 a year—a yearly sum equivalent to the cost of all our public libraries, our church property, school property, steamboats, bridges, and telegraphs.

But enough. We only ask our friends, "the enemy" to remember that Dr. Oswald is accepted as a scientific authority on every subject he touches. He is not to be set aside with a sneer.

When the Legislature of Pennsylvania passed the Prohibitory Submission Law, one member of that body wrote to his constituents and warned them that there was treachery in the camp; that the law had been passed to "kill" high-license. But the high-license bill is passed and signed by the Governor. This looks like business, brethren. We do not know the secret motives of the Pennsylvania legislature, but their public acts conform pretty well to their public professions. That is more than we can say in New York!

I was very much surprised to find so able and genial a writer as the Hon. W. M. Robbins condescend to notice the crude lay efforts of the New York Scribe. He writes in the spirit of a true disciple. His fairness and courtesy are matched only by the grace and power of his eloquence. I deeply regret to have made the impression that I undervalue the different Christian denominations, their dignity and importance; for I do value them as means, but not as authority. "Truth for authority, and not authority for truth," said Lucretia Mott.

Evangelical Christianity, I suppose, is that which is represented by the Evangelical Alliance, and embraces Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, Reformers, Moravians, and others. This Alliance put forth in 1846, when it was organized, the following articles of faith, not as "binding," but as deemed "essential" by those represented in the Alliance:

1. "The divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures."

Mr. Beecher: "Now, the Bible is inspired of God, I have said." It is the record of the results of Divine inspiration on mankind.—Sermon on "Inspiration of the Bible."

2. "The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures."

I suppose neither Mr. Robbins nor Mr. Smith will contend that Mr. Beecher failed to keep this part of the faith! Yet, I beg them to remember that the interpretation of Scripture is claimed as a "right" and a "duty" by Evangelical Christianity. Mr. Beecher never repudiated the Bible. All he asked was the right to interpret it for himself. If Beecher sifted the divine utterances of Holy Writ through the sieve of human judgment, he did no more than exercise his "right and his duty" as an Evangelical Christian.

3. The unity of Godhead and the Trinity of the persons therein."

On this point Beecher's orthodoxy is, I believe, unquestioned.

4. "The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall."

Beecher did not believe in the imputation of Adam's guilt because he did not think the Bible taught it. He did not deny the Scriptures; but certain interpretations of the same by men. He did believe that all men are sinners; and that they are punished for the sins they commit.—Sermon on "Adam and the Race."

5. "The Incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for the sins of mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign."

Beecher: "I believe all the world is involved in sin; I believe Jesus Christ came to redeem men from their sins." "But this—the need of every man, and the provision for that need in Jesus Christ, the help of the Holy Ghost,—this is my practical theology; that I always have preached and always shall."—Sermon on "The New Birth."

6. "The justification of the sinner by faith alone."

I suppose there is not more divergence on this point between Beecher and his critics than between Paul and St. James.

7. "The work of the Holy Spirit in conversion and sanctification."

See remarks under "5."

8. "The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked."

The only point in this article on which Beecher's orthodoxy is questioned is that about "eternal punishment." He refused to believe in a literal hell of fire and brimstone. But here is what he did say: "The thought of the future punishment for the wicked, which the Bible reveals, is enough to make an earthquake of terror in every man's soul. I do not accept the doctrine of eternal punishment because I delight in it. I would cast in doubts, if I could, till I had filled hell up to the brim. I would destroy all faith in it; but that would do me no good; I could not destroy the thing. I can not alter the stern fact." *Life Thoughts*, p. 196.

9. "The divine institution of the Christian ministry and the obligation, and perpetuity of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper."

Beecher observed both these ordinances in his own church, and therefore must have believed in them. Now, if I have given a correct representation of Evangelical Christianity; and if the words of Beecher which I have quoted prove what they are intended to prove; I still believe the charge that Beecher has done more harm to Evangelical Christianity than Ingersoll to be a gross exaggeration of the truth.

For the Advocate. Broadus on Matthew.

BY BISHOP J. C. GRANBERY, D. D.

The American Baptist Publication Society has recently brought out an elaborate Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew by Rev. John A. Broadus, D. D., LL. D. My regard for the man enhances my interest in the book. I have known Dr. Broadus many years, and all that I have seen and heard of him has added to my admiration of his heart and head. But personal friendship is not necessary to a high appreciation of this able work, the ripe fruit of careful research, patient thought, and reverent love of the Great Teacher. The author is equally eminent for Greek scholarship and the elegant use of the English language. His style suits the learned, but not less the great reading public. By inheritance and conviction, he is a thorough-going Baptist, devoted to much water and opposed to giving to infants the seal of the righteousness of faith; and his Commentary is not undenominational (who wants such a thing?), but Baptist. Moreover, he is a Calvinist, of the moderate type. But he has no bitterness of spirit, no lack of respect for Christians of other creeds; and all evangelical believers can agree with him in ten cases to one in which they may differ. While waiting for leisure to read the book thoroughly, I have tasted it here and there with great relish and an appetite for more.

Compare Broadus and Whedon on Matt. xi. 12: "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." Whedon: "Our Lord here shows that John is not alone in his mistake. It is the error of the day. From the time of John's first appearing to the moment of our Lord's speaking, men have been disposed violently to hurry the kingdom into a premature existence. They will have it now. They will take it by storm. The kingdom of heaven, as all admit, is here the kingdom of God on earth, the Christian dispensation. It is compared to a city under siege, or rather under assault by storm. These who, like John, are impatient for its arrival, wondering why it does not come, and demanding of Christ whether he is really going to come out and be its king, are its captors, or rather *vandals*. The kingdom suffers violence from them; and these violent captors are taking it, forsooth, with an onset."

Broadus: "Before the time of John many were expecting the establishment of the Messianic kingdom, but in general were quietly waiting without any earnest efforts to prepare for it, and share its blessings. John's ministry awakened an eager expectation of its immediate appearance, and men were aroused to press into it, like invaders pressing into a country and taking possession. . . . It is appropriate and eminently desirable that both individuals and communities should become greatly aroused on the subject of religion, and be deeply in earnest about it, so as to resemble in their pursuit of salvation, the resolution and irresistible force with which an invading army presses into a country. How it forces its way along every obstacle is overcome, every stronghold is seized, every opposing host is broken and scattered, nothing can withstand its conquering advance. Of course the application of this is to spiritual energy, and it gives no warrant for violent bodily exercises, except in so far as these may sometimes naturally result from uncontrollable feelings of the soul; but it does show the propriety of impassioned earnestness and indomitable resolution in the entrance upon, and pursuit of a Christian life. The period in question was the first of those seasons of widespread religious excitement which have repeatedly marked the progress of Christian history. Christianity was born in a great revival." I side with Broadus, Watson, and the majority of commentators in the interpretation of this text.

I can not concur with Whedon and Broadus in the interpretation of the field in the parable of the Wheat and Tares, Matt. xiii. Whedon: "The sower is the Redeemer, the field is not the church, but the world; the good seed are the Christians; the tares are the wicked, their sower is Satan." Broadus: "Now the point of the parable is not that obviously wicked men are to live on as recognized subjects of Christ's kingdom, regarded as a definite organization, i. e., as members of his church, but that he suffers them, under or during his reign, to live on in the world, instead of being at once destroyed, as the Jews expected."

"Some argue that the parable must refer to the church, because the person who sowed the good seed is the Messiah, and the enemy sowed afterwards; while in the world there had been sons of the evil one long before the Savior's appearing. But no illustration can throw light in all directions. This parable must of course describe tares as sown after wheat, for otherwise the story would have been unnatural. Therefore this illustration could depict only the present and future relations of good and evil in the world, and could not bring within its horizon the past history of the human race." He states forcibly the objection to understanding by the field the church, but he misses the great difficulty in the way of understanding our Lord to warn his servants against killing the wicked, "lest haply while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them." Is that the reason why we should not exterminate the ungodly?

Christ gave a different reason to James and John, when they would have commanded fire from heaven to consume the Samaritans: "But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." The Lord is longsuffering, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. The good were wicked before conversion. There could be no church, if all sinners were put out of the world. The church and the whole Christian scheme are designed for the salvation of sinners. Think of Paul as busy in slaying unbelievers instead of pleading with them to receive God's grace, Paul who had been a blasphemer and persecutor before he laid hold on the great truth that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners! That true Christians should be fired with zeal to seek a clean church by measures which, owing to human fallibility, would endanger genuine disciples, is natural, and has occurred again and again.

Christ said, it is true, "The field is the world." But he also said in the interpretation, "So shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity." The church shall cover the whole earth. The real difficulty is in avoiding the inference against all church discipline. If we allow wicked men to stay undisturbed in the church, wherein will the church differ from the world? Paul was filled with holy grief and indignation, and rebuked the Corinthian saints severely, because they retained among them a man who was guilty of flagrant sin. I construe the parable as I do the precept, "Judge not, that ye be not judged," the saying, "Charity believeth all things, hopeth all things," and the exhortation, "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." When a tramp begged for hospitality on this plea, the good woman silenced him by replying, "Angels do not carry ticklers in their pockets." "Charity is no fool," commented the divine. There is no danger of rooting up the good by mistake when we turn out of church drunkards, libertines, thieves, liars, and other vicious and criminal classes. Yet it is easy to confound the tares and the wheat, difficult often to determine what is due to wilful sin, and what to ignorance and infirmity in sincere, though imperfect disciples, even babes in Christ. We may be sure, as we look over the field, that many are there who have no right to a place in the church; we may feel distressed and mortified at the injury and reproach to the cause of Christ which result from their presence; we may burn with desire to drive off all inconsistent members, and get a blameless church; then the caution applies, "Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them." If it be said that I have no right to limit the tares to the evidently evil, then I ask, When did the servants of the Lord ever think that they ought to put to death every unconverted person? How is such a thought possible in a world where all are conceived and born in sin?

I would discuss other expositions, if time permitted. The judicious commentary of Dr. Sumners is not at hand, or I would quote his views on the points mentioned above. Let us be diligent in the study of God's word, and use the labors of good and wise men as helps in understanding it.

For the Advocate. Those Two Articles.

MR. EDITOR: The first two leading articles in the last No. of the *Advocate* are worth a full year's subscription to the paper. Dr. Edwards, the venerable evangelist, so well known and beloved everywhere, especially in Virginia and North Carolina, a man who has the right kind of convictions, and the courage of them, throws hot shot in the ranks of Pseudo-Evangelists and plainly and boldly comes to the rescue of practical religion, by giving a side thrust to those who like Mr. Brown, are so wonderfully misleading the thoughtless, by giving them an anomalous and short cut to salvation—without repentance or conversion—all honor to this venerable man of warm heart and level head. The article by Mr. Robbins is a trenchant, dispassionate forcible, beautifully expressed, and truthful exposition of the matter before him, and if any man can draw a better pen portrait of Mr. Beecher I would like to see him—yet every unprejudiced man will freely confess, that his remarks show not the least taint of rancor, or prejudice—his idea simply is to disabuse your readers (if you have any such) minds, of drinking in the intellectual and semi-orthodox creed to the damage of pure, undefiled, undiluted, Christianity—in sum his cloak of broad catholicity is sufficient to cover Mr. B's errors; but gives him due credit where credit is due. No man in our Conference could have expressed it more truthfully or forcibly. Right Gentlemen—keep errors out of the church if you have to offend the multitude of "time servers."

J. D. THORNE.
Panacea Springs, N. C.

We should more seldom take offense at each other, if we looked oftener at the why than at the what.