

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear
within the text. Whenever possible, these have
been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
 - Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
 - Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
 - Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
 - Pages detached/
Pages détachées
 - Showthrough/
Transparence
 - Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
 - Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
 - Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
 - Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
 - Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
					✓						

T H E

CHRISTIAN BANNER.

"If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God."
"This is love, that we walk after his commandments."

VOL. VI.

COBOURG, SEPTEMBER, 1852.

NO. 9.

JERUSALEM MISSION.

Our readers, generally, are aware that the disciples of Jesus Christ in America, have established a missionary family at the ancient and world-renowned city, Jerusalem. We trust they will not, for a single week, forget that the mission continues to increase and prosper. For the information of some of our readers, and to refresh the memories of others, we will take a rapid glance at the history of the effort.

Impressed with the conviction that to enjoy continued prosperity at home, efforts must be made for those "in the regions and shadow of death," the brotherhood were quite unanimous in turning their eyes to the birth-place of Christianity. Some great foreign work was desirable to unite and combine the energies and sympathies of a brotherhood scattered over the entire continent of America. A work good, great, and noble was easily devised, and thus far it has progressed beyond the expectations of the most sanguine. God, our heavenly Father, has graciously smiled upon the effort, from its inception to the present hour. Although, in some minds, doubts may lurk as to the propriety of large associations to carry forward missionary efforts, yet all will, without hesitation, admit that there should be enough combined to carry it on efficiently. The duty of the Lord's congregation, to sound out his Word is so obvious that no disciple of Jesus for a moment entertains a doubt on that score. The gospel must be sent to the world. If one congregation is unable to send it, a sufficient number must unite. The congregations among the Gentiles cooperated to raise money for the disciples in Judea, under the sanction, and by the direction of the Apostles (see 2 Cor. viii & ix). Then the disciples in Judea had the truth—the bread of life, and from them it spread to the Gentiles, and to the ends of the earth. Now we have the bread of life and the waters of salvation. May we not very properly apply the Apostolic declaration (Romans xi 30 31) "For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief; even so have these also not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy." We owe much to the ancient disciples of Judea. Let us show our gratitude, by keeping a light burning on Mount Zion, in the Holy City.

To supply the Judean brotherhood with food and raiment, was a work that not only engaged the Apostle's attention, but one, evidently,

near his heart; if he was now among us, who can doubt that his anxiety would be much greater again to see planted the standard of the cross on her sacred hills. Yes, he would again respond, "My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they may be saved."

Although the brotherhood of old Virginia, (all honor to them) have proposed taking the Jerusalem mission under their especial care and supervision, yet to that we cannot give our ready consent. "Jerusalem, name ever dear to me!" must be the watchword of the entire brotherhood. There is magic in that name. So many glorious reminiscences cluster around it, that this mission must be kept in the van. May it lead on to the establishment of others until the Apostolic Gospel shall again be heard on every hill top, and through every valley, not only of Palestine and Asia Minor, but throughout all Asia and the East.

All the laborers in the begun reformation, have been perfectly agreed in one great fact. Indeed it is a fact of importance so great that its reception is absolutely necessary to a correct understanding of the Gospel dispensation. That the first pentecost after the resurrection is to the Christian institutions what the giving of the law at Sinai was to the Mosaic. That the "law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, that makes free from the law of sin and death"—on that day went forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, are truths and facts so dear to an intelligent Christian's heart, that he can never lose sight of them. Thus the ancient city of Melchisedic was the birth-place of the first congregation of the Lord—that here the Apostles were baptized in the Holy Spirit, and that this congregation should, in all time, be the model church, are facts kept constantly before those who are anxious to proclaim the Gospel, as did the Apostles, with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven.

Having so often stood in imagination, with the first heralds of the cross, on Mount Zion in Jerusalem, it is not a matter of surprise that the brotherhood should feel much more than ordinary interest in the re-proclamation of the same glorious gospel from the rock on which rested the "beautiful gate" of the ancient temple. Being all greatly enamoured with the great facts first demonstrated in that city, by the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, it seemed perfectly natural that a charm would again seize all our hearts at the thought of again being assured that the same gospel was being again proclaimed through our humble instrumentality. Realising, in some measure, our indebtedness to the Sons of Jacob, as the instruments of our present joy and anticipation of life immortal, we would, in this humble manner express to the long-scattered Sons of Israel who now cluster around the tombs of their fathers, our gratitude to them and to God for the distinguished favors of which we have been made the partakers. And above all; gazing, by the eye of faith, on the Jerusalem church, as the *model* church, who would not feel extremely desirous that on the same spot there might another congregation be built up "continuing steadfast in the Apostle's doctrine, in fellowship, in breaking of bread and in prayers!"

Those, therefore, who, whenever they announced the glad tidings of salvation to lost sinners, led them by faith first to Jerusalem, and then assured them, on the authority of our Lord Messiah, that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name, to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem," were just the men to stand as heralds of the same faith, of the same transcendent facts. And the audiences who hung with so much delight on the lips of such proclaimers were just the brotherhood to contribute intelligently to carry forward energetically a work so praiseworthy, grand, and glorious. Appeals have been made to them in vain. We would have them, therefore, not only kept informed on the subject, but constantly reminded of the necessity of greater exertions to keep the mission in a healthy and vigorous condition.

But if the *condition* of the brotherhood; the *unity* of sentiment, on a great radical principle; the constant practice of every herald of truth, in fixing attention on the doctrine first announced at Jerusalem; the church in that city the *model* one; and the disciples generally finding in their hearts a chord that always felt the *charm* of these considerations—if, we repeat, all these circumstances were favorable for a missionary effort from that long consecrated spot, how much more fortunate—nay, how much more providential—that such a brother as Dr. Barclay—with a companion and family, all devoted to the service of the Lord, and anxious to engage in the same work—should just at that time be found ready and willing to forego all the comforts, ease, and undue luxuries of a delightful home, and consequently to meet our enterprise! Certainly in all these things we can trace the hand of wisdom infinite. This, then, must be, to all the brotherhood, a favorite mission—one in which every disciple must not only feel an interest, but take a part.

We must again call attention, to another favorite omen of good in this sacred effort. For years before anything was said or done in view of foreign missionary effort, it was, with many of us, a favorite thought, if not a cherished idea, that in order to missionary success, instead of sending an isolated man among pagans and false religionists, a christian family or community should take up their abode with them, that thus the believers in all the relative conditions of life might exemplify the excellencies of christianity. It was, by those who cherished this view of the subject, thought that could the most benighted see christians conducting in the relation of husbands and wives, parents and children, brothers and sisters, and as members of the congregation of the Lord, constantly showing forth the sacrificial death of God's own Son, and walking constantly in the fear of Jehovah, that the most stupid would see the practical nature of Christianity, would understand its design, and behold it strongly contrasting with all *their* ideas of religion, and thus lead to the truth, to Jesus, and to Heaven.

In brother Barclay's family we see all this. Parents between the ages of *forty and fifty*; beyond the age of mere courage and energy without judgment and discrimination, and below that time when too great cautiousness and fear too often places the good old man only in

the path which has before him a thousand times been trodden.— Children between the ages of *fifteen and twenty*, intelligently devoted to the service of the Lord Jesus—well educated, and their hearts deeply interested in the cause of missions—under the eye, the instruction, the guidance of christian parents, greatly devoted to the cause of God and humanity—are just in the spring time of life, just at the proper age to receive a missionary education. Such were the ages of our young brother and sister Barclay.

From the time of their departure from New York, till their arrival at Jerusalem, whenever the winds and waves permitted, they met as a congregation of the Lord. [In expectation of a separate publication of that voyage and the incidents of an overland journey from Beyrout to the city of their hopes and labors, we defer any detail or comments.] Having been, then, from the beginning of their christian career, in the practice of meeting upon every first day of the week, for the commemoration of the justice, truth, and mercy of the Lord, on the first Lord's Day in February, 1851, they were therefore duly prepared to assemble for the same purpose in the city of Jerusalem. Nearly eighteen hundred years had passed since heaven had looked down upon such a sight on that memorable spot. The people saw and heard. Their residence in that city had been counted only by weeks when an entire household heard, believed and were immersed, in the presence of numbers from the four quarters of the earth. A public pool, large and convenient, even within the walls of Jerusalem, was found, in which a resident missionary, of but a few weeks, found no difficulty to gain access in order to bury in immersion those who had received Christ Jesus by *fai h*.

From that time the mission has gone on, gradually prospering, not, however, without opposition from "the world, the flesh and the devil." Even from those who would be "Lords" in Protestant Christendom, calling themselves also missionaries of the cross, unexpected opposition was experienced; but the Lord has stood by them and now a congregation of some *twenty* members meet weekly to celebrate the triumphs of Immanuel and to sound forth the Word of the Lord.

The circumstances by which many residents in Jerusalem are surrounded are such that for them to leave "their religion," and to join the Christian Church is to deprive themselves entirely of subsistence. These facts have called for much thought, wisdom and deliberation. Priestly and prominent individuals in various communities have expressed a desire to obey the Gospel, and to cast in their lot with the disciples of Christ Jesus, but hesitated when they could not see by what means they should subsist, cut off from their former brotherhood. To promise them anything temporal, as the reward of their obedience, was so manifestly in opposition to the genius of Christianity, that it could not be made; and many have turned away sorrowful.

To give our readers some idea of this phase of the work in Jerusalem, I will make one extract from Brother Barclay's letter of June 30th, 1852:—

"Twelve or thirteen families or heads of families, belonging to the Latin and Greek churches, formally proposed a few days ago to unite with us, if I would only allow them the house-rent which all denominations [ourselves alone excepted] grant to their members. And the Romanist has become enlightened and wishes very much to be baptized, and unite with us—declaring that he wants no house, nor anything else but pure religion; and yet the fear of starvation makes him unwilling to abandon a lucrative, but unlawful trade, and resort to something else for a livelihood. He is now driving a thrifty business by painting images of the Virgin Mary and other Saints for the purpose of being worshipped; and declares that he knows no other avocation by which he can eke out the most scanty support. But although he has "confessed and showed his deeds," he cannot yet bring himself to imitate the example of the Ephesian converts, who 'burnt their books' when the iniquity of their curious arts was exposed. Were our place of refuge in operation, it would probably be a suitable trial of his faith. Poor fellow! if he is saved, it will cost a mighty struggle; for both the flesh and the Devil are strongly urging his continuance in this shrine making business, by which he and a few other craftsmen of like occupation 'have their wealth'."

The "place of refuge" referred to by Dr. Barclay, is to be a kind of manual labor school, which the Board has decided to get in operation as soon as possible, in order to have a home and the means of subsistence for those who give good evidence of their sincere attachment to the Lord and his cause, and who may need such an asylum in consequence of their obedience to the faith.

The expenses, therefore, of the mission, this year, will be double that of last. Our subscriptions must be proportionably increased.—
"God loves a cheerful giver."

In conclusion, we may add that brother Barclay now proclaims the gospel every other Lord's Day at Artos (Bethlehem) to a company, at the head of which is the distinguished Mussulman, who is endeavoring to teach the Jews who return, or are residents of the Holy Land, to gain a subsistence by the cultivation of the soil. Thus far, they have been quite successful. Let us pray that his labors and theirs may prove a blessing to the sons of Ishmael and Israel, as they have already to many of the sons of Japheth.

W. W. E.

PREACHERS—PEOPLE.

NUMBER ONE.

Upon no topic have the people who glory in being called Disciples given greater emphasis, than that relating to the undue power, omissions, and commissions of preachers. The swelling pretensions, erroneous influence, and proud bearing of the ministers of our times have been pointed out, commented on, and severely rebuked by almost all our pensmen and spokesmen. A faithful and impartial witness, one who could look at us without prejudice, either in our favor or

against, would doubtless testify that we are as much distinguished by the fault we find with that class of prominent people called clergymen, as for anything else besides; and no doubt the witness would exhibit a fair degree of candor and verity; for in all honesty, we have, as a people, spoken out in full tone against the vices, besetting sins, and imperfect attainments of professed ministers of Jesus Christ in this very defective and evil generation.

“Let those who are without sin throw the first stone,” was the counsel of the Lord when numerous accusers of a sinful woman clamored against her. It is fair—it is reasonable—it is consistent that those who rebuke and correct should at least be a little more exemplary than those to whom they administer correction. Satan's legions would make poor preachers of righteousness. Those who do not first learn themselves, will make slow work in learning others.—It is right that it should be so; for the power of sympathy and the influence of example must always be as strong and as great as the power of words either spoken or written.

Talk as we may, and plead as we please, the influence of preachers either on the right side or the wrong side must always be great. To think otherwise, is to think against reason, experience and the Bible. It was ordained of heaven that preachers shall have immense influence—not the power of pride or of lordship, nor of intellectual prowess, nor of splendid genius; but very great and widely extending moral and religious influence. Their creation as preachers, indeed, may indicate the grandeur of their power; for they are created by God, their brethren, and themselves conjointly and co-operatively. We have no real and true preachers unless made by the God of heaven, the people of heaven, and themselves concurring and qualifying accordingly. Self-made, self-sent, self-operating preachers are always counterfeit. By the score or by the hundred, they are not worth the ink or the breath necessary to write or speak their names. Let us not be misunderstood. Hundreds are now at the plough, the work-bench, or the merchant's counter, who should be pleading for their Redeemer; and almost as many hundreds are trying to “hold fortu” who ought either to go to Jericho or somewhere else, and work at some calling for an honest living. But those to whom God has granted the requisite mental and moral faculties—who have by their faithfulness and zeal improved their gifts—and whom the people of God have tested, entrusted, and authorized according to the divine pattern, are the workmen to whom belong undoubted influence of the genuine description.

A good, a pure, a well-qualified ministry is the life of a people; while a bad, a corrupt, an ill-qualified class of ministers are as death in the midst of life. Influence and the ministry go hand in hand, side by side, step with step—separate they cannot and will not be—and hence there must be influence greatly good or greatly evil, connected with every ministry on earth.

What manner of persons therefore should preachers be, if they are thus to be viewed and recognised! What nobleness of purpose—what worthiness of principle—what magnanimity of soul—what carefulness of manner—what excellency of heart—what humility of mind—what purity of speech—what spotlessness of character—what spiritual examples held up by them to the saint and the sinner—what zeal, love, patience, prudence, forbearance, truthfulness, meekness, holiness, religious greatness and christian grace should they show! “Who is sufficient for these things?” Let us ask again, who?

But we must become more orderly. We have something to say about preachers: 1st. As it respects their conduct one toward another, 2nd. As concerning their walk among the saints and christian brethren, 3rd. Their conduct in the presence of the Lord in the station they occupy, 4th. Their character and exemplariness before the world generally. The first will be sufficient for this present article. How the people of God are to act toward their preachers we shall enquire into before the subject gets cold.

That no one may be left to guess at our meaning when speaking of preachers, let us first ask and answer the question formally, Who or what is a preacher? A preacher, in our vocabulary, is one who announces the glad tidings of salvation and teaches christianity generally. We use the term in place of evangelist. Scripturally speaking, a preacher is not an elder; neither is an elder a preacher. They are as distinct as elders and deacons, though the deacon can act the elder and the elder the deacon, as occasion demands. Perhaps our shortest definition of a preacher is, one who proclaims the gospel and teaches Christ's religion. He has authority from the supreme Master to hold forth the Gospel to sinners, establish congregations, and build up the Lord's people at all times and places as opportunity serves.

Then how should such workmen view and treat each other? If like should love like, and brethren should love brethren, are we not justified in thinking that preachers should be cemented together in the holiest and best bonds? Their work the same, their model the same, their authority the same—ought we not to expect the fullest and happiest harmony? And when we look back and find Paul with a Tim-

othy, a Silas, a Titus, a Tychicus, an Aristarchus, an Epaphroditus, a beloved physician Luke, an orator Apollos, and a host of laborers both of Jewish and Grecian nationality, and find him always ready to commend them upon the principle of brotherly love, are we not led to think there must be something radically wrong, where, instead of unity and cordiality among preachers, we find discord, envy, and sentiments of personal opposition, if not of absolute hatred? We could name two or three preachers—they do not, however, breathe Canada air, and perhaps never will—who turn a certain passage of Scripture upside down to justify their course; for when they find the Apostle saying "Let each esteem another better than himself," they whirl the Apostle's words into, "Let each esteem himself better than any other;" and if there be a congregation where a full salary, and perhaps some honor, can be obtained, they will not only press towards such a mark with avidity, but they are free to say, or cause to be said, that a certain other laborer is so and so, and not competent or worthy to fill such a place. "Do not even the publicans," in numerous instances, act more genteelly than this? And these are preachers. We groan in spirit for such men. Preachers they doubtless are; but Jesus neither asks nor accepts their labors. He never commits his messages to the keeping and delivery of such men of the flesh.—They may glory in the name Disciple; but the name will always be better than such worldly spirits.

Again—when we find a preacher who is free to expose the faults, criticise, and perhaps ridicule his brother preacher in his absence, very possibly among people who know nothing of him, thus making a unfavorable impression that the power and purity of an angel could not efface, we are naturally led to enquire on what principle of wisdom, or by what law of love one laborer thus treats his fellow laborer? Does such an one "do as he would desire another to do to him?" or is his love of that sort that "thinketh no evil?" For a laboring brother to seek a favorable opportunity, with the cause of the Lord at heart, to correct his brother preacher's fault by speaking of it to himself in the kindest and loveliest manner, is, indeed, according to the grace of the gospel; but O how chilling, how cruel, how paralyzing, how contrary to every christian sanction, to clatter and chatter about a brother preacher in his absence, when every word is calculated to sink him in the estimation of those who listen to such "evil speaking." Alas for the teaching of a preacher of this stamp, when he puts such a wild construction upon the language of the Apostle when he says, "Let your speech always be with grace." [Let good and true

men, by the frailty common to man, may blunder into something like this occasionally, ought not to be denied; but that a true preacher will be given to this sin, is not for a moment to be conceded.

Acquila and Priscilla may open to us a valuable chapter just here. They found Apollos very imperfectly acquainted with the reformation as pled by Jesus and his witnesses. He was only partially conversant with the reformation commencing with the Baptist—not the Baptist denomination, but the Baptist John, or John the Baptizer. But the faithful Acquila and Priscilla did not run over the city of Ephesus and blab out that Apollos knew nothing and was no preacher; but they took Apollos himself to one side, and there privately gave him such “lessons in theology” that enabled him to preach Jesus and him crucified. Here was faithfulness to Apollos, and zeal to the cause of the Master, on the part of Acquila and his christian companion; and here, too, was real humility and child-like teachableness on the part of the eloquent and learned Apollos. They told himself of his defects, and he kindly received instruction from them. He did not say to Priscilla, in fastidious mood, “Oh, you are a woman; you don’t know anything,” nor to Acquila, “you are a mere tent-maker, a layman, and you should listen to preaching, not try to instruct preachers.” No: they all acted their part humbly and honestly, and the Lord’s cause was prospered and his name glorified.

There is a wider evil still. In speaking of a fellow preacher, a friend remarks that he is a good man, a fine man, a devoted man, as the case may be. “Yes,” his brother preacher responds, “he is a good man —; *but*.” There is always an emphatic “*but*,” and some unhallowed sentiment after it, as though the preacher was determined that his brother should not be too well beloved, nor too highly esteemed. Poor human nature, it is as crooked as the wiles of the Arch Enemy, and as sour as unripe grapes; and, unfortunately, even preachers will not always let the grace of the gospel so sweeten them as to keep their bitterness from being felt by one another.

One of the blackest clouds in our horizon, in view of the great work of reformation, is made up of the fleshly elements to which we have just alluded. If we have not spiritual, noble, amiable, humble, God-fearing, Saviour-loving preachers, what can be expected, what ought to be expected, as the fruits of their labors? If, under all the sanctions of pleading for the same great truths, urging the same divine cause, and standing up as fellow-soldiers under the one great Captain of salvation, they cannot love and treat one another according to the unity, purity, and philanthropy of the gospel, is there any reason to

anticipate the blessing of the Lord upon their labors, or shall we hopefully look for better converts than they are teachers?

No selfish or worldly ambitious man should be recognized as a preacher of our Lord Jesus Christ. If a man loves gold, let him go to California or Australia; or if he has set his mind upon houses, let him journey to Lapland, where he may have the most fashionable sort by the half score, upon short notice and on easy terms; or if he wants soil, let him shift himself to Oregon, where he can have a mile square as a free grant from the "Heads of Department." But let no self-lover pretend to be a public servant of the Blessed One who died on the cross to save sinners. If he seeks earthly honor, and desires to glory in his own personality, and push his fellows beneath him that he may rise in the ratio that they fall, let him pursue the various policies of the world which may secure these objects; but let every preacher esteem his brother preachers at least equal to himself, and treat them accordingly.

D. O.

Kingston, 23rd August, 1852.

POSITION AND PRINCIPLES OF DISCIPLES.

No. IX.

Can any of our good friends who have so much to say about the claims of Moses and the law, tell us why Stephen was martyred?—Can they explain the dispersion of Christ's disciples first congregated in Jerusalem city? Can they give us the reason why Paul after his conversion, was harrassed, plotted against, and persecuted by his countrymen the Jews from city to city, during an eventful lifetime? The answer to one or to all of these questions, in one point of view, is the same—and when the answer is fully given, we need no Geneva Reformer nor Edinburgh Doctor to show the points of difference between the religion established by Moses and the religion instituted by Jesus Christ, Lord of Heaven and earth.

It is somewhat striking, that the charge which resulted in the martyrdom of Stephen is the identical charge gravely preferred against the Disciples when they contrast the claims of the two covenants. "We have heard him speak," said the witnesses against Stephen, "we have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God;" and when they brought him up before the Council to be examined and dealt with, the accusation was, "This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law." Yes, Stephen, a man full of faith and the Holy Spirit, had testified that "Jesus was Lord of all"—had "all authority"

—the prophet raised up, whom the people should “hear in all things”—that in him was to be *fulfilled* all that was written in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms—that the Law and the Prophets were until the Reformer John, since which time Moses’ enactments and the teachings of the prophets were being superseded by the appearing and ministry of the Great Teacher, and that Pentecost was the final dividing day between Moses’ rule and Jesus’ reign. Both Stephen and Peter could tell their Jewish contemporaries, “To you, first, God having raised up his Son, *Jesus*, SENT HIM to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities,” at the same time testifying that “all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow, even as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days”—these days of a better covenant and better promises embraced in it. Stephen thus witnessing, was charged with speaking blasphemously against Moses and the Law, and his testimony cost him his life.

The Jews, as it respected Moses’ law, knew well what they were doing. They knew well that Stephen did not preach Moses but Jesus—not Jesus to be heard in part, but *in all things*. This was Stephen’s special sin. Hence we are in good company when we also affirm that “a prophet like unto Moses” has been “raised up” who is to be “*heard in all things*,” by all nations, as Moses was formerly heard by one nation. And although this doctrine will not in the year of grace 1852 bring a volley of stones from the multitude, as in Stephen’s case, yet the fullest award of persecution that the civil authorities allow may always be expected by Jesus’ disciples from Moses’ disciples.

Before turning to Paul’s labors in adjusting the debates and strifes which had their origin in a desire for the continuance of the Mosaic law, let us pay respectful attention to a verse often quoted in favor of the Jewish lawgiver. The language is from the lips of Jesus himself: “Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.” Many a sincere man reads the passage as though written thus: ‘I am not come to make an end of the law but to enforce it.’ A moment’s attention to the same discourse from which these words are taken, will show the irrelevancy of this interpretation: for does not the Great Teacher most plainly say that while the law said, ‘Thou shalt perform thine oaths to the Lord—thou shalt take an eye for an eye—thou shalt hate thine enemy;—these commandments were no longer obligatory or binding; and in direct opposition to them his hearers are commanded to Swear not at all—Resist not evil—Love and bless enemies. Of old, by

Moses it was said, Swear, Resist, Hate; 'but I say to you Swear not, Resist not, Hate not.' Thus taught Jesus. And at the close of this memorable discourse, delivered to a vast auditory on Mount Olivet, he announces that "Whosoever heareth these sayings of MINE, and DOETH them, is like unto a wise man who built on a rock." Was this anything like enforcing or obeying the law of Moses? These arguments, indeed, are so pointed that the only way by which the half Moses' disciples of our day can dispose of them, is by asserting that Christ extended or added to the enactments of the old law. This is but stepping out of one difficulty into another equally great; for the law of Moses was given in minute detail, most particular and exact, and not one iota of it was to be altered. Not one word was to be added to, nor taken from, the enactments and precepts of Moses. They were given as a whole, and they were to be honored as a whole.—Christ himself, while laying the foundation of his kingdom and elucidating the great principles of his coming reign, was an observer of the law, and his disciples honored and obeyed it until legally or divinely set aside. To put new wine into old bottles was neither approved nor practised by Jesus or his immediate ministers.

But for the sake of arguing the matter still farther, let us admit what is asserted, that Jesus amended or extended the law. Then the passage would read, 'I am come to enforce the law by adding to it.' The argument, put in this form, confutes itself, or rather commits suicide.

Now, a single sentence from the lips of the Divine Teacher on another occasion will show the true meaning of the word *fulfil* in the passage we have been considering: "These are the words that I spake unto you, that all things must be *fulfilled* which were written in the law of Moses and the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me."—Luke xxiv 44. He came to perform (*FULFIL*) those things which Moses and the Prophets had predicted, for which new and better things the whole Law and Prophecies were but a preface and preparation. They were *fulfilled* in being ended by Him—they were *fulfilled* in being proved true by his coming and kingdom.

Paul gives us a full measure of insight into these mysteries. He was well versed in them, and on some occasions he needed every divine argument, both to convince and confute the gainsayers. His opponents were both critical and cunning. He was able for the best disputers opposed to him. His pleadings *viva voce* were so successful, that his countrymen at Jerusalem mobbed him, and shouted, "This is the man who teaches all men everywhere against the people and

against the law, and against this place," (the Temple). The Apostle verily was no disciple of Moses, and well did the Jews know it.

Standing before Governors Felix and Festus, while still wearing the galling chain of a prisoner, simply because he preached Jesus and not Moses, he is reported by Luke to have said, "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law and the Prophets"—"witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which Moses and the Prophets did say *should* come." Acts xxiv 14 and xxvi 22. Thus Paul fulfilled the law and the prophets as he ministered to his Lord. The Apostle taught no other things than the very things that Moses, Samuel, Jeremiah, and Daniel said should be taught in the school of Christ. Moses intimated in most explicit terms that his own authority should cease, and a prophet take his place having all authority. The lesser and greater prophets, subsequently, all gave notice that in Christ's name salvation should be enjoyed. And hence Paul felt himself acting in happy unison with Moses and the prophets though preaching that all the things which they taught were old and had passed away; for his ministry was in accordance with, and in *fulfilment* of, the predictions of those faithful men of old who spake the things which the Spirit moved them to speak.

But it is desirable that we pursue the subject more pointedly and orderly. We are therefore willing to stand by the side of the Apostle to the Gentiles when he argues:—

1st. That two promises were made to Abraham.

2nd. That the Mosaic covenant grew out of the one promise, and the Christian covenant was the fulfilment of the other promise.

3rd. That so radical the difference between the two, that there was an entire change of priesthood and of law when the second covenant was ratified.

4th. That while the ground or basis of the first was flesh, the great principle of the other was faith.

5th. That the laws embraced in the first covenant were written on stone, while the laws of the second covenant were written on the heart.

6th. That while the grace of the former was restricted to a single family, agreeably to one of the promises made to father Abraham, the grace of the latter was designed to extend to all families and nations of the world.

7th. That the characteristic differences between the two covenants

are comparable to the difference between a bond woman and a free woman, or between Mount Sinia in Arabia and Mount Sion in Canaan.

Of these seven capital items, we select only three on which to remark at length for our present purpose. And first, the promises to Abraham. Our patience has been tried and our heart satiated by learned disquisitions upon the "Abrahamic covenant," as though only one promise was made to the great father of the faithful, and this one promise partially fulfilled by the lawgiver Moses, and the balance by the Lawgiver Jesus—as if God had made a covenant with Abraham like a promissory note, part payable at Sinai, 2513, and the rest at Sion, 4037. It is here where the cardinal error commences, which multiplies into ten thousand times ten thousand. The Abrahamic covenant, as used by the popular divines, is a pure figment, as we shall immediately attempt to show; and if we appear presumptuous in paying so little respect to the ponderous influence of learned theology which props the subject in its present popular form, we can only appeal to Moses and Paul for redress in the premises; for though the one is in the old school and the other in the new, they will both give evidence in our favor.

"I will make of thee a great nation; I will give unto thee all the land of Canaan; I will bless or curse them that bless or curse thee or thy seed" were the grand items of the first or fleshly promise to Abraham, which formed the basis of a covenant, ratified, as may be seen, Gen. xvii. "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed, or, as Paul has it, "In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed"—constituted the promise concerning Christ, which was the single sublime idea of the other covenant. An oath confirms both promises as presented in Gen xxii. That these two covenants were entirely distinct is clearly evident from a sentence from Moses and a few words from Paul. When the family of Abraham was on their journey to Canaan, God's language to them was "I will bring you into the land concerning the which I did swear that I would give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob." Ex. vi 8. The consolidation of Abraham's children into a nation—their national code called the law—and their being put in possession of the land of Canaan—were all linked and connected with the promise to Abraham respecting his natural posterity, their greatness and glory. Now hear Paul: "The promise that he should be the heir of the world [or that in him all the nations of the earth should be blessed] was not to Abraham or his seed through the law." Rom. iv. Hence the law grew out of

another promise than the one concerning Christ; for the law never did, and never was designed to, bless all nations.

Moses and Paul being judge, then, what becomes of *the Abrahamic covenant* so eloquently talked of by the D. D's., seeing there were at least two covenants made with Abraham.

A bird's eye view of these wide and most comprehensive topics can be given in a few sentences. God determined to bless Abraham by making him the head of a distinct and peculiar nation—also to bless him by making him a blessing to all nations. Two promises were made to him in accordance with these purposes, which were duly ratified or confirmed. When Isaac grew up, and afterwards when Jacob took Isaac's place, the promises in their proper form of covenants were repeated. After this, for between two and three hundred years, the twelve sons of Jacob were multiplied to twelve large tribes—a nation numbering its millions. The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob now became the God of the nation—gave them a national law—led them as a nation to Canaan—subdued seven nations and put them in possession of the inheritance, according to promise. The national law, let it be noted, was as perfectly suited to the whole nation as the patriarchal enactments had been suited for a family or families, and was therefore independent of antecedent authority.—For the nation no longer looked to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, or Joseph's sons for practical enactments; but to the lawgiver of the nation, Moses, the minister of God.

Thus the promise to make Abraham a great nation was fulfilled at Sinai nearly four and a half centuries after the promise was made. The other promise—that concerning Christ—could not yet be fulfilled. Six hundred years elapse, and David is king of Israel. But the time is not yet. Five hundred years come and go after king David's death, and the last Jewish prophet dies. And still no fulfilment. Four hundred years transpire, and then the great Reformer—the second Elijah—the Preparer of the way—lifts his voice to the thousands of Israel, saying “Repent, the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” Through the Cantons of Judah, and over the distant Province of Galilee, the strong voice of John is heard, exclaiming, “Think not, Israclites, to reason within yourselves that we have Abraham for a father—the axe is now at the root of the tree; and every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is to be cut down.” Strange doctrine to the sons of Abraham; the haughty Pharisee and the supercilious scribe heeded it not. Still, multitudes press to the new preacher and the new baptism. A stranger from Galilee at length appears on

Jordan's banks. John Baptizes him. But, lo, the heavens are opened, the Spirit descends, it rests upon the head of the Galilean, embodied and dove-like, and a commanding voice from heaven is distinctly heard, saying, "This is my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased." Here is the Anointed One—the promised Son—the heir of all things—the Messiah of God—the Mediator of the New Covenant, by whom and in whom the greater promise to Abraham is verified or made good. Thus, on Pentecost at Sinai, in the year of the world 2513 the one promise to Abraham was fulfilled; and at Pentecost at Sion, 4037, the other and larger promise was fulfilled. The Jews—Sinai—Moses—the old covenant are all in one group, and inseparable: all nations—Mount Sion—Jesus—the new covenant—are also associated together; and "what God hath joined let no man put asunder."

And yet the half Jewish and half Christian teachers of our times talk perpetually of "*the promise made to Abraham,*" and "*the Abrahamic covenant.*" If they will put the *ic* to Abraham's name, why not speak the truth and say "*the Abrahamic two promises*" and "*the Abrahamic two covenants*"?

But why speak of one promise and one covenant? The answer is at hand. "Other foundation can no man lay" on which to build a church, to engraft all the infants in creation. The gist of seventy times seven volumes of old stale divinity is just this:—God made a promise to Abraham and confirmed it by covenant; and upon ratifying this covenant, the church was established—the "Abrahamic church." The Abrahamic church was somewhat enlarged and widened by Moses' law; and Christ extended and liberalized the same church still more by his gospel; hence we are still in the Abrahamic covenant, with a splice to it by the Jewish lawgiver, and a second addition by the Christian lawgiver. Kind reader, this is the "sound doctrine" of our own times. This is the issue of the "Abrahamic covenant"!! Papal Rome and Episcopal London, with their millions of votaries, have their origin in this sort of Judaism, mixed with a little heathenism, and duly tintured with politics.

We do not wonder that three-fourths of all that Paul writes to the churches are taken up with these themes. The Holy Spirit knew that Popery would be born, that Episcopacy would be popular, and that tens of thousands of Judaizing teachers would spring up in the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, to amalgamate the covenants and make a puzzle of them; making the church all world, and the world all church, after the fashion of old

Israel. Hence the promises to Abraham—the law of Moses—the nature and object of the first tabernacle—the change of priesthood when Christ became High Priest—the change of law—the better promises—the faith principle in contrast with the flesh—the removal of the wall which separated Jews and Gentiles—the perfection of Christ as a sacrifice—the purity and power of the great salvation—the wide design of the gospel, being not for one people but for all people—the personal acceptance of the message of life before membership could be enjoyed in the new church—all these and other vital questions are freely elaborated by the Apostle to the Gentiles, by which he magnified his office and made himself equal to his responsibilities.

But to keep the reader from thinking that we design to be “as long as the moral law,” we must break off suddenly, and call up the covenants again.

D. OLIPHANT.

Brighton, September, 1852.

WHAT WAS DONE BETWEEN 1640 AND 1645.

We have concluded to lay before our readers a very instructive narrative of events which ultimated in the Westminster Confession. The series of articles is from a work originally in a periodical form, but now bound, seven volumes in one, and forming a useful library itself. It was the first published advocate of the reformation we are pleading. We think we are engaged in a good work in re-publishing the following highly useful history from the *Christian Baptist*, the work to which we above refer:

D. O.

A NARRATIVE

OF THE ORIGIN AND FORMATION OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH.

No. I.

It will be necessary, before any notice is taken of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, to state a few historical facts relative to those times.

Charles I. had dispensed with the call of Parliaments, and had acted the tyrant in church and state for twelve years previous to the sitting of the long parliament. During these twelve years the puritans, or non-conformists to the English hierarchy, had suffered much from the Court of High Commission, the Star Chamber, and especially from the arbitrary, cruel and tyrannical proceedings of Archbishop Laud, who was at the head of the English church. The insolence of the archbishop, supported and patronized by the king and court, terminating in the famous *et cetera* oath decreed in his convocation for preventing innovations in doctrine and church government, had arrived to a degree beyond the endurance of a great proportion of the king's subjects in England and Scotland. Tumults and insur-

rections in Scotland, together with the embarrassed state of the king's finances, obliged the king to call a parliament once more.

This parliament which assembled A. D. 1640, kept their seats for about eighteen years. It was as anxiously looked up to by the church for a redress of grievances as it was by the state for a redress of hers.

As we are more concerned at present with the religious views and proceedings of this parliament, than with its political, we shall advert to these

The king, if he had any conscience at all, was hampered, says Neal, with conscientious attachments to divine right of diocesan episcopacy; but the parliament, almost to a man, excepting the bishop, were Erastians. "Erastus maintained that Christ and his apostles had prescribed no particular form of discipline for his church in after ages, but had left the keys in the hands of the civil magistrate, who had the sole power of punishing transgressors, and of appointing such particular forms of church government from time to time as was most subservient to the peace and welfare of the commonwealth." Indeed these were the sentiments of our church reformers, from Archbishop Cranmer down to Bancroft. And though the Puritans in the reign of Queen Elizabeth wrote with great eagerness for the divine right of their book of discipline, their posterity in the next reign were more cool upon this head, declaring their satisfaction if the present episcopacy might be reduced to a more primitive standard. This was the substance of the ministers' petition to the parliament, in the year 1641, signed by several hundred hands. And even those who petitioned for pulling down the hierarchy, root and branch, were willing to submit to a parliamentary reformation till the Scots revived the notion of divine right of presbytery in the "assembly of divines."

A few historical facts, characteristic of the views and spirit of the parliament and of the times, will be of importance in this narrative.

All the members of parliament took the sacrament from the hands of Bishop Willams, in the episcopalian order, shortly after their meeting.

They appointed committees to receive petitions on grievances on religion.

They resolved that, without act of parliament, a convocation of the clergy could make no canons binding on the clergy and laity of the land.

As the parliament increased in popularity and power, the Puritans stiffened in their demands, and accommodations between them and episcopal bishops became more and more impracticable.

Two petitions of great note were sent up to the parliament; the one called the Root and Branch Petition, signed by fifteen thousand citizens and residents of London, praying that the whole hierarchy might be destroyed. The ministers' petition, signed by seven hundred beneficed clergy and an incredible number of citizens from different counties in England, prayed that the hierarchy might be reformed. Nineteen petitions, signed by one hundred thousand hands, of which there were six thousand nobility, gentry, and beneficed clergy, prayed that the hierarchy might be continued as it was. In

these nineteen petitions it was stated, "that there can be no church without bishops; that without bishops there can be no presbyters, and consequently no consecration of the Lord's Supper; that a bishop has a character that cannot be communicated but by a bishop; and that the church had been governed by bishops for fifteen hundred years." The tacking of one hundred thousand names of freeholders to such petitions only prove that the honest countrymen acted too much with an implicit faith in their clergy.

Loud complaints were made to parliament of unfair means of obtaining names to petitions. The Puritans are said to have drafted a petition for remedying some palpable grievances, which obtained thousands of names to it, and afterwards cut off the names and prefixed another petition to them praying for a destruction of the hierarchy. This is affirmed by Lord Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 204. But be this as it may, when the House of Commons appointed a committee to examine into these matters, so many faults of this kind appeared on both sides, that the affair was dropped.

The parliament resolved "that whosoever would not swear to support their liberties and the Protestant religion, was unfit to bear office in the church or commonwealth."

That the Puritans, afterwards called the Presbyterians, did not at first think of contending for presbyteries, or indeed for presbyterial church government, is evident from the plan of church government which they proposed to this parliament for their ratification, at an early period of its session. This plan was pretty similar to Archbishop Usher's. The outlines of this plan were as follows:—

1st. "That every shire (or county) should be a distinct diocese or church."

2nd. "That in every shire or church twelve or more able divines should be appointed in the nature of an old primitive constant presbytery."

3rd. "That over every presbytery there should be a president, let him be called bishop, or overseer, or moderator, or superintendent, or by any other name, provided there be one in every county for the government and direction of the presbytery, in the nature of the speaker of the House of Commons, or Chairman of a committee."

Accordingly it was resolved, July 10th, 1640, "that ecclesiastical power for the government of the church be exercised by commissioners." July 31. "Resolved; that the members of every county bring in the names of nine persons to be ecclesiastical commissioners, on whom the power of church government shall be devolved, but that no clergyman be of the commission." This shews that the Puritans of those times did not intend the presbyterian government, but only a reduction of episcopacy to a more moderate standard.

The parliament willing to reform faster and farther than the king, and to limit and circumscribe the prerogative beyond the desires of the king and bishops, became obnoxious to the king's displeasure, and finally the king left his palace and retired to York; and his queen, a bold and resolute Catholic, having absolute dominion over him, together with some of the English bishops and members of the court, drove the king into a war against his own parliament; so that the

nation was divided—one part for the king and the other for the parliament. It were tedious to go farther into a detail of the causes of this civil war, which brought so many calamities on the nation and the king to the scaffold, and it is unnecessary to our present object.

The king, in the prosecution of this war, was reduced to the necessity of accepting the service and affection of the Papists; and on the other hand the parliament took all possible care to cultivate friendship with the Scots, and to secure that nation to their interests. The king rejected a mediation, offered by the Scots, to affect a reconciliation between him and the parliament, because the Scots insisted upon the abolishing of episcopacy, and a uniformity of presbyterian government in the two nations. The members of parliament, being Erastians, as before observed, were under no conscientious scruples about a change of discipline, believing that the civil magistrates had the keys, and might establish whatever form might be conducive to the public good, readily complied with any propositions made by the Scots, readily accepted the mediation, and wrote to the Scots assembly, which was soon to meet, desiring their advice and assistance in bringing about such a reformation as was desired.

August 3, 1642, the Scots parliament wrote to the English parliament expressing their desires "for unity of religion, that there might be one confession of faith, one directory of worship, one public catechism, and one form of church government." The Scots parliament say, "that they were encouraged to enter upon these labors by the zeal of former times, when their predecessors sent a letter to England against the surplice, the tippet, and corner cap, (worn by the clergy) in the year 1566, and again 1583, and 1589. They therefore advise to begin with a uniformity of church government; for what hope can there be of one confession of faith one form of worship and catechism, till prelacy be plucked up root and branch, as a plant which God has not planted? "Indeed," add they, "the reformed kirks hold their form of government by presbyteries to be *jure divino* and perpetual, but prelacy stands by *jure humano*."

The English parliament bowed to all these overturns, as they well knew they needed the Scot's assistance in carrying on the war, and as they wished to engage them on their side against the king. Lord Clarendon observed very justly, says Mr. Neal, vol. 2, page 571, that the parliament were sensible they could not carry on the war but by the help of the Scots, which they were not to except without an alteration of the government of the church, to which that nation was violently inclined. But then to induce them, says Mr. Neal, to consent to such an alteration, it was said the Scots would not take up arms without it; so that they must lose all, and let the king return as conqueror or submit to the change. From this source sprang the Westminster Creed. The policy of war, the fears of conquest, and the hopes of victory, gave birth to the meeting of the divines. In fact the meeting of the divines at Westminster, and their proceedings, at the instance of the English and Scots parliament, was as perfect a political measure as was the queen's pledging the crown jewels on the continent in order to rise gunpowder and firearms for

her husband to fight his subjects into a belief that the hierarchy of England was of divine origin, and that the king reigned absolutely by *jure divino*, or by a divine right.

The necessity of receiving assistance from Scotland in carrying on the war, and the condition on which the Scots parliament agreed to lend that assistance, obliged the English parliament to pass an ordinance for the assembling of divines to determine on a uniformity of doctrine and discipline for the two nations, or to establish a system of doctrine and discipline for the church of England that might assimilate it to the views of the kirk of Scotland.

The ordinance bears date June 12, 1643, and is thus entitled, "An ordinance of the Lords and Commons in parliament, for the calling of an assembly of learned and godly divines and others, to be consulted with by the parliament, for settling the government and liturgy of the church of England, and for vindicating and clearing the doctrine of the said church from false aspersions and interpretations."

The ordinance ordered one hundred and twenty reverend gentlemen, ten peers, and twenty commoners of illustrious birth, whose names are all mentioned in the ordinance, and now lying before me, to assemble at Westminster, in the chapel called king Henry VII's chapel, on the 1st of July, 1643. Forty of those persons were to be sufficient for doing business, or to compose a competent quorum for the purposes of parliament. They were prohibited from introducing any topic of discussion from among themselves, and were to be confined "to such matters and things concerning the liturgy, doctrine, and discipline of the church of England, as shall be proposed by either or both houses of parliament, and no other." They were "not to divulge their opinions or advices touching the matters aforesaid, either by printing, writing, or otherwise, without consent of parliament. If any difference of opinion arose, they were to represent it to parliament, with their reasons, that the house might give further directions. Four shillings per day were allowed for each one during his attendance. Dr. William Twisse of Newbury was appointed prolocutor; and, in case of sickness or death, the parliament reserved to themselves the choice of another." The ordinance concludes with the following proviso: "Provided always, that this ordinance shall not give them, nor shall they in this assembly assume or exercise any jurisdiction, power, or authority ecclesiastical whatsoever, or any other power than is herein particularly expressed." The divines were chosen out of such lists as the knights and burgesses brought in out of their several counties, from each of which the parliament chose one, or at most two.

"Before the assembly sat, the king, by his royal proclamation of June 22, forbade their meeting, for the purpose therein mentioned, and declared that no acts done by them ought to be received by his subjects. He also threatened to proceed against them with the utmost severity of the law. Nevertheless, sixty nine assembled in king Henry VII's chapel the first day, according to summons, not in their canonical habits, but chiefly in black coats, and bands in imitation of the foreign protestants. Few of the episcopal divines assembled; and

those who did, after some time withdrew for these reasons: First, "Because the assembly was prohibited by the royal proclamation." Second, "Because the members of the assembly were not chosen by the clergy, and therefore could not appear as their representatives." Third, "Because their was a mixture of laity with the clergy, because the divines assembled were for the most part of a puritanical stamp, and their business, as they apprehended, was to pull down that which they would uphold."

Very different characters are given to these divines by ecclesiastical writers. Perhaps they are all exaggerated. We shall, however, give the statement of one on each side. Lord Clarendon says "About twenty of them were reverend and worthy persons, and episcopal in their judgments; but as to the remainder, they were but pretenders to divinity. Some were infamous in their lives and conversations, and most of them of very mean parts and learning, not of scandalous ignorance, nor of no other reputation than of malice to the church of England." Mr. Baxter, on the other hand, affirms, "they were men of eminent learning, godliness, ministerial abilities and fidelity."—As politicians, we may say, from their works, that they did not understand the principles of civil liberty, for "they would allow no toleration to those whom they called sectaries;" and had they understood the Christian religion they would never have assembled in king Henry VII's chapel to help the parliament to make a creed that would be the means of attaching the Scotch parliament to the English in carrying on a war against their king; nor, indeed, would they ever have been induced to meet for the purpose of establishing any creed or form of discipline for any community holding the apostolic writings as of divine origin. We shall resume this narrative in our next.—Every thing we have stated or may state on this subject is derived from the most authentic source. We pledge ourselves for the accuracy of every fact stated on historical grounds, the vouchers being of the highest reputation as historians.

TRUTH AND NEWS FOR ALL READERS.

Milton, Queen's County, Nova Scotia,
August 21st, 1852.

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT:—I have often thought of contributing something for the pages of the *Christian Banner*, and from various considerations which it is not necessary to enumerate, have as often delayed it. Indeed I know not how much longer I might have continued to "resolve and re-resolve," had not your very acceptable letter reminded me of my intention.

You wish to know in Canada, something of the state of the cause of the Lord in Nova Scotia. I fear I shall not be able to meet your anticipations in this matter, my knowledge of it being quite limited in consequence of being obliged to confine my labors almost exclusively to Milton and vicinity. I visited Cornwallis and Falmouth last winter, however, and can say something in reference to the state of things in that region. In the former place the brethren are still holding fast, though there are but a few of them. Time was when the word of the

Lord had free course and was glorified among them; but dissensions, removals, deaths, &c., have left the church but a mere fragment of what it was there, and in Falmouth the brethren do not even meet together. If some faithful and devoted Evangelist could spend a few weeks there, I think he might succeed, under the blessing of God, in calling them together again, and in adding a few more who seem to be waiting for the moving of the water. Brother D. Crawford has been laboring in Cornwallis, and the region round about, for the last two years: latterly, however, he has been in Digby, Bear River, and Weymouth—an entirely new field. A letter from him, received in June, informed me that he met with much opposition from the Baptists and others, but upon the whole, the prospects of ultimate success were promising. He is circulating the *Christian Banner* among them to some extent, and wrote me that many were highly pleased with it. Brother C. is a workman who needs not to be shamed, as he rightly divides the word of truth; but I fear he does not meet with the sympathies and aid of the brotherhood in those quarters in proportion to his self-denying efforts in the good cause.

Indeed I fear that there is not among our brethren a clear understanding of their individual responsibilities as disciples of Jesus our Lord. The tendency towards the "one man system" is still too strong, while the disposition to support those who labor in "the word and doctrine" is, in many places, far too weak. O when will the brethren learn that they are "kings and priests unto God!" When will they learn the importance of putting forth their own energies, and striving together with their Evangelists for the grace of God! How fearfully responsible is the position we occupy! And yet few of us realize it! The primitive disciples were not guilty of the apathy and the indifference of us modern professors. They were awake to a full sense of the duties and privileges of their high calling. The Phillipians wrought out their salvation with fear and trembling—holding forth the word of life. From the church in Thessalonica "the word of the Lord was sounded out, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place their faith toward God was spread abroad." The Corinthian converts were the Apostle's letter of commendation, known and read of all men. When shall this be said in truth of the Disciples in Nova Scotia and every where else! When shall our zeal, energy, and devotion come up to that of the saints of the apostolic age? Well has it been said that the reformation for which we plead is a reformation of the whole man, soul, body, and spirit. Is it generally so understood by our brethren? Then where is their bible reading—their faith in God—their efforts to spread the truth, and make known the Saviour's name among their fellow men? If we give full credit for all that is being done, there yet remains a fearful lack compared with the saints and faithful brethren of primitive days. Why this conformity to the spirit and customs of the world—this grounding our arms before we have well taken them up? My brother, I hope you will speak out on these momentous matters when you have opportunity. We all need an awakening call. Let the brethren know that *they are the Lord's*—that they "are bought with a price," and are called upon by the highest considerations to "glorify God in their

bodies and spirits which are his." Call our attention to the importance of studying the word of the Lord more thoroughly, and to that entire devotion to the Lord of all our powers, without which we cannot hope to endure unto the end. But I am digressing.

The Church in Milton numbers some forty members, *eight* of whom have been added within the last two years. Our last addition to the Church was that of two brothers in the flesh and in the Lord, who had formerly been immersed, one by the Methodists and the other by the Baptists. Breaking away from the customs and traditions of men, they have united with the brethren "upon the foundation of apostles and prophets," to be guided in future by that unerring light "which God from his palace threw down to earth, to guide his wandering children home." We are not retrograding, and yet I fear we are going forward but slowly. The cause has had a hard struggle from the first. The opposition of the surrounding denominations has been strong, and yet one unfortunate misunderstanding among the Disciples themselves resulting in the separation of some ten or twelve members from the body, has operated more fearfully against the Church than all other influences combined could have done. The weapons of our warfare will never fail us so long as we fight lawfully. Engaged in pulling down strong holds, casting down vain imaginations, and bringing every thought into subjection to Christ, no weapon formed against us shall prosper. 'Tis only when the children of God strive and devour one another that their strength fails, and they fall easy captives to the wiles of the adversary. The opposing influences surrounding us have served rather to hold us back, than to nerve us with fresh energy for the combat; yet without apologizing for any thing like apathy or indifference in the brethren, I see cause of gratitude to our Heavenly Father in that our circumstances are as favourable as they are. The church is as well united as most churches, and the same devotion and engagedness of heart and life that characterized the brethren here at first, would, I doubt not, soon impart a healthy tone to the body, and enable them to rise above all that now opposes their growth in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In point of liberality, the brethren here come behind no church, and were their piety and knowledge proportioned to it, their influence would be mighty indeed. I am persuaded that nothing tends to neutralize the power and influence of the gospel so much as the jarring and discordant lives of its professors. Oh, that we would think more about the honour of the Lord and less about our own; then we might see divisions and dissensions speedily healed, or what is better, we should have no quarrels and difficulties to heal. But the Lord still lives and reigns. His eyes is still on the righteous and his ears are open to their prayers. The foundation of the Lord stands sure.—Whatever may be our lot on earth, God will take care of us if we are his, and will guide us through all this dreary pilgrimage to that rest that remains for all the obedient. To Him be all the glory. Amen.

We would be remembered by all the dear brethren in Canada and elsewhere. Brethren, pray for us, for we trust we have a good con-

science, in all things willing to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present evil world.

In hope of eternal life,
Yours in the Lord,
DAVID O. GASKILL.

THE EDUCATION OF THE HEART.

It is the vice of the age to substitute *learning* for *wisdom*—to educate *the head*, and to forget that there is a more important education necessary for *the heart*. The reason is cultivated at an age when nature does not furnish the elements necessary to a successful cultivation of it; and the child is solicited to reflection, when he is only capable of sensation and emotion. In infancy the attention and the memory are only excited strongly by things which impress the senses, and move the heart, and a father shall instill more solid and available instruction in an hour spent in the fields, where wisdom and goodness are exemplified, seen and felt, than in a month spent in the study, where they are expounded in stereotype aphorisms.

No physician doubts that precocious children, in fifty cases for one, are much the worse for the discipline they have undergone. The mind seems to have been strained, and the foundations for insanity are laid. When the studies of maturer years are put into the head of a child, people do not reflect on the anatomical fact, that his is not the brain of a man; that the one is confirmed, and can bear exertion—the other is growing, and requires repose; that to force the attention to abstract facts—to load the memory, to expect a child's brain to bear with impunity the exertions of a man's, is just as rational as it would be to hazard the same sort of experiment on its muscles.

The first eight or ten years of life should be devoted to the *education of the heart*—to the *formation of principles*, rather than to the acquirement of what is usually termed knowledge. Nature herself points out such a course; for the emotions are then the liveliest, and most easily moulded, being as yet unalloyed by passion. It is from this source that the mass of men are hereafter to draw their sum of happiness or misery; the actions of the immense majority are, under all circumstances, determined much more by feeling than by reflection; in truth life presents an infinity of occasions where it is essential to happiness that we should feel rightly, very few where it is at all necessary that we should think profoundly.

Up to the seventh year of life, very great changes are going on in structure of the brain, and demands, therefore, the utmost attention not to interrupt them by improper or over excitement. Just that degree of exercise should be given to the brain at this period as is necessary to its health; and the best is oral instruction, exemplified by objects which strike the senses—*London Quarterly Review*.

AN EXAMPLE OF ZEAL.

Opening the "Report of the Wesleyan Missionary Society" for 1851 a few days ago, and happening to glance at the words 'Mrs. D. Oliphant' as among the contributors, the very name of this interest-

ing Christian lady operated so much like a charm upon us that we were induced to look hastily over the columns and figures of the Report to calculate the united collections of said Missionary Society for one year. Let it be remembered that the fund called the Missionary fund is wholly distinct from quarterage, special and general collections, and all other collections. It is a fund collected in the main if not exclusively by the zeal and perseverance of females connected with the Wesleyan church; contributions being politely solicited from all who are likely to give. And what is the sum obtained in this manner by only one body of the Methodists in Canada West—the Wesleyans? Could any one suppose it is within a trifle of \$17,000? It is even so. And all this fund is the fruit of the solicitation and agency of a few female members.

As a general rule, not a dollar of this amount goes to the support of a minister where there is a church, but it is appropriated in sustaining ministers in localities where their churches are not established. Can we not learn something from these facts? Are we not willing to increase in zeal as in all other graces and Christian accomplishments? The Canadian field is being occupied—let us be on the alert that we fail not to occupy it as far as in us lies. The time is short; much is to be done; our opportunities are—now.

D. O.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

*New Glasgow, Prince Edward Island,
August 19th, 1852.*

To the Editor of the Christian Banner, Cobourg:

DEAR SIR:—There is nothing very particular in the Island at present. We, for some years past, have not increased any. This year and last we lost four by death; in that time there has been an equal number added. The last death was my partner in life, a sister who filled up the relations in a very high degree. We had lived together fifty-three years and nearly four months. It is just as long except three years since she and I were baptized into the death of Jesus the Christ. We were then in Paisley, Renfrewshire, Scotland.

I recollect brother Hood you referred to in a late Number of the *Christian Banner*.

Meantime I remain yours for the truth's sake,

JOHN STEVENSON, SEN.

Western Star, September 12th, 1852

BROTHER OLIPHANT:—Our yearly meetings on the Western Reserve have just closed. Of these meetings I have not been able to attend but two, those in Cuyahoga and Summit counties; they were both well attended, and many saints were strengthened, and sinners trembled at the word of the Lord.

At the Cuyahoga county meeting there were some twenty who confessed their faith in Christ and were baptized into his death. A number also of the Baptists laid aside the creed and united with us.

We had a time long to be remembered at our meeting in Stow, Summit County. The brethren here are fewer in number than in Cuyahoga Co., and have to stand up against strong oppositions.— There were some twenty-five baptisms at this latter place. To the Lord be all the praise of our Salvation.

As ever yours in the Lord.

A. B. GREEN.

PERIODICALS AND WEEKLIES.

The *Harbinger*, Bethany, is still a faithful visitor, carrying with it the accustomed rich variety of the good things of the better world.— The *Age*, Cincinnati, is behind its age in regularity to us; and it never comes direct to Cobourg. The *Disciple* is timid in its visits. It has been changed from a monthly to a semi-monthly, and from a pamphlet to a sheet more like a weekly newspaper. The latter change we fear will be unfortunate. We desire for the *Disciple* a fair, full, and honorable field. The *Christian Union* darts upon us now and again; but it is shy of the atmosphere or habits of Canada: published in Pennsylvania. The *Evangelist*, changed from the *Western* to the *Christian Evangelist*, now of Fort Madison, Iowa, is regularly received. Its profiting appears unto all. It is improved in size, form, matter and utility. The *Christian Sunday School Journal*, Cincinnati, is a welcome messenger; and the *Ladies' Annual* edited by brother Challen, has paid us its No. 1 visit. The *Annual* is a typographical beauty. The *Ecclesiastic Reformer*, Lexington, Ky., shows itself now and then at our office. The *Nashville Magazine*, the *Montreal Presbyterian*, the *Toronto Observer*, the *Amherstburg Evangelist*, and the *Canada Christian Advocate*, are also among our exchanges—all of them welcome and regular in their greetings. And there has lately been added to our list the *Golden Rule*, Cleveland, a monthly, whose merits we have not yet fully examined.

D. O.

A WORD ABOUT POSTAGE.

Without any serious counsel on the subject with any one, we have come to the grave conclusion that our quarterly postage bills are somewhat too large. Unlike most editors, we have never troubled our readers with the very authoritative words, *All letters to the editor must be post-paid*: indeed, a decided majority of our corresponding friends have realized that any postal tax upon us would be contrary to every Christian and courteous rule. These good men need no hint inducing amendment. They may pass over this paragraph. All, too, who can write but cannot pay the mail carrier, may use all liberties, and we will settle all costs cheerfully. Those who can pay and who ought to pay their postage, will please do themselves that honor, so that their conscience may not hereafter accuse them of acting unworthy of themselves. Are we not all honorable men?—! So far in reference to kind friends on British territory.

Concerning letters from the American side we have two things to say. 1st. As a general rule we feel free to pay all communications from our friends in the United States. 2d. Many of our correspondents there, and more than two-thirds of the Post Masters on the other side, are unacquainted with the late international postal law. Letters come to us marked *Paid*, and the money might as well be in the purse of the generous writers and agents who send them. Why? For the very simple reason that our Canadian Government and the American Government have arranged that *the postal charge of both countries shall be collected at one office—either at the office where the letter is mailed or at the office where it is delivered.* Formerly, each Government collected its own charge; but since July, 1851, each Government has collected the charge of both Governments *at one and the same time and place.* When the law went into force, the sum of 5cts. was the postal rate on the American side, and 5cts. also our Provincial rate—10cts. the united charge, or the charge of the two Governments. Hence, then, the American writer sending to Canada, or any writer on this side sending to the United States, pre-paying 3cts, 5cts, or anything less than 10cts, may as well scatter his money on the streets, *for neither Government takes any notice of it.* The Post Master therefore who receives from our American correspondents 3, 5, or 8cts. as pre-payment of a letter to Canada, is either ignorant of a postal law in force in his own country for more than twelve months, or otherwise must be desirous of a little extra change for private use. To our correspondents on that side we therefore say—Pre-pay 10cts. or none. Send us the letters—we will pay them.

D. O.

POPULAR FAITH.—“A religious professor boasting to Roland Hill that he had not felt a doubt of his safety for many years, was answered by Mr. Hill, ‘Then, sir, give me leave to doubt for you.’”

Mr. Hill made a sharp and happy reply—strictly applicable according to popular belief; but he was nearly if not fully as far wrong as the professor he rebuked. It is not good to *boast* of having no doubt, neither is it very wise to make doubting a test of faith. To boast is bad—to doubt is bad also.

D. O.

OUR LETTER TO MR. TAWS.—The expediency of publishing our Letter to Mr. Taws, minister in King, is fully justified by a few facts. Mr. Taws, previously to its publication, was misrepresentating said Letter to ‘his flock’ and to others—since its appearance in print the honest men of King can read and interpret it for themselves. All the ministerial grace of our friend, therefore, will not save him from just exposure in attempting to put a false color upon the lines we sent him. We expected him to be profoundly silent upon the affair so far as concerns an effort to give us a word of reply. It is the business of “clergymen” to rebuke a ‘messenger of satan’ only in private and with words very like backbiting! Why is it that so few of Mr. Taws’ cloth are manful, open, and frank? Do they love “darkness rather than light” because their deeds are so good?

D. O.