

THE
CHRISTIAN BANNER.

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

VOL. X.

COBOURG AND BRIGHTON, JUNE 1856.

NO. 6.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DEDICATED.

The Apostle Paul having shown in Heb. 8th that *two* Testaments or Wills cannot be of force at the same time, and says, Heb. 10: 9, "He taketh away the first that he may establish the second." There was *no lapping over* then, as some will have it, from John the Baptist to the Cross. The Bible has kindly informed us, that "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made UNDER THE LAW." Gal. 4: 4, His parents circumcised him, or did for him "after the custom of THE LAW," Luke 2: 27. Jesus ordered sacrifices to be offered in conformity to the law; in these words, "then come and OFFER THY GIFT," Matt. 5: 21. He said to the cleansed leper, "show thyself to the Priest, and offer the gift that MOSES COMMANDED, for a testimony unto them," Matt. 8: 4. "Then Spake Jesus unto the multitude, and to his Disciples, saying, The Scribes and Pharisees sit IN MOSES' SEAT: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, *that observe and do.*" Matt. 23: 1, 2, 3. This last text renders it as certain as God himself can make it, that Jesus did not regard Moses' seat as vacated, a short time before his death: nay, the very night in which he was betrayed unto death, he kept the passover in compliance with *the law of Moses*. Luke informs us, that the woman who prepared spices and ointments for Jesus' burial, "rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." Matt. 23: 56. This is the *last time* any of the friends of Jesus ever kept the Sabbath or the passover in honor of the Jewish Law. The women had not yet learned that "the hand-writing of ordinances (Jewish Laws) had been taken out of the way, and nailed

to the Cross." Col. 2: 14. Never after this date did the Apostles command any man to keep the law in order to be saved: although Jesus had required it when the law was in force. Thus the good Book carries the law through, *in full force* to the Cross; modern Theology to the contrary notwithstanding.

As men are saved *now*, on the terms of the new testament only, it becomes a question of transcendent importance, "*When did the New Testament come of force.*" The Apostle fully aware of the importance of this question, has not left us in the dark on this subject. He says, "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a Testament is of force, after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." Heb. 9: 16, 17. Now by the aid of this single text, every child is safe against imposition, without the aid of the preacher. He *knows* the New Testament was not of force until after the death of Christ. No sophistry or cunning can bewilder him or make him doubt, if he has any confidence in the word of God. It must be matter of comfort to every lover of truth, that the Apostle has placed this point beyond all controversy. The Holy Spirit, by the mouth of the Prophets, the Evangelists, and Jesus, has always been uniform in placing the glory of the new institution *after the sufferings of Christ*. Peter says, "it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." 1 Peter 1: 11. This being so, we should naturally expect to hear some new announcement immediately *after the death of the testator*. We accordingly have

THE MISSION OF THE WORLD.

"And Jesus came, and Spake unto them, saying, all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Matt. 28: 18, 19, 20."

Let it be specially noted that this is the first commission, the last commission, and *only* commission, that ever embraced "all nations." It is the only commission, reader, that embraces you and me: unless, indeed, you are a Jew. The mission of Moses embraced the Jewish nation only; the prophets, at most, were sent, but to the "House of Israel and Judah;" and John the Baptist was sent only to the Jewish

Nation ; called " Israel." Such were the provisions of the Old Testament, that the Jews only were regarded as the children of God ; hence when Gentiles applied to Jesus for personal favors, he replied, " Let the children first be filled." Mark 7 : 27. " I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel." Matt. 15 : 24. Not only so, but the first apostolic commission (Matt. 10 : 5) given before the death of the testator, contained an express prohibition—" Go not into the way of the Gentiles." Is it not surprising that Gentiles should ever think of claiming salvation, under a commission that so positively excluded them ?

The two most prominent items in the first commission, the *prohibition* " Go not into the way of the Gentiles," and the proclamation, " The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," are not so much as named in the last commission. The imagination that can make these two identical, will find no difficulty in converting bread and wine into real flesh and blood. The last Apostolic Commission differs from the first in all essential features :—

1. The last Commission (Matt. 28) contains the announcement, " All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth ;" but the first (Matt. 10,) contains no such announcement.
2. The last says, " Go ye therefore and teach ALL NATIONS:" but the first said, " GO NOT into the way of the Gentiles."
3. The last says, " baptizing them :" but the first contains *no baptism*.
4. The last says, ' in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ;' but the first did not contain this trinity at all.
5. The last also, says, ' I am with you alway, even to the end of the world ;' but the first contained no such promise whatever.
6. The last says, " Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever *I have commanded you ;*" the last contains no such injunction ; but on the contrary, a short time before his death, he had said to them, (Matt. 23 : 2,) ' All therefore whatsoever **THEY** (the Jewish rulers) bid you observe, that observe and do.' What a wonderful change has a few days wrought ! What a wonderful change has the Cross wrought ! All extol the Cross of Christ, yet few understand the wonders of the Cross. Jesus has attained the Cross and the resurrection.—The veil of the temple is rent from top to bottom—' Moses' seat' is vacated forever.—The meek one has retired ; and the principalities and powers under him

are all reduced to a 'show.' They may, indeed, wilfully continue to officiate, yet it is but a show, a mere farce! Jesus has 'made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in his Cross.' Paul declares (Col. 2 : 14) in the most unequivocal manner, that Christ had 'blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances—taken it out of the way—nailed it to the Cross;' and as if to prevent all cavil, actually names the 'Sabbath days' among the ordinances which he had just said were 'taken out of the way.'

But there was a mighty change somewhere in the neighborhood of the Cross and the resurrection! That despised Nazarene, who was a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; who a few days before, had not where to lay his head, is now Monarch of the Universe. The Apostle could say, 'We HAVE known Christ after the flesh, but henceforth we know him no more.' He has triumphed. God has made him both Lord and Christ. Hear it from his own lips:—'ALL POWER IS GIVEN UNTO ME IN HEAVEN AND IN EARTH.' If all power in Heaven and in Earth, will not make a king, how much power, pray, will it require? Is it not the work of a king to destroy principalities and powers, and make a show of them openly? He encountered, in person, the king of terrors, and bore away the keys of his dominions; and Paul says he triumphed. Was not this the work of a king? a mighty king? Having obtained 'all power,' he proceeds to commission his officers of State. He sends out his 'Ambassadors' called also Apostles, whose commission we have just examined: but he adds 'tarry ye in the City of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.' They tarried accordingly in Jerusalem until Pentecost, when they were duly invested with the promised power. They then preached under the new commission for the *first time*. The astonished multitude enquiring 'What shall we do?' Peter, the man with the keys, replies:—'Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' Acts 2 : 38 'IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST.' This is the first time in the history of the Divine government, that sins were ever remitted *in Christ's name*. That no capital offender, in any kingdom, was ever pardoned, in the name of any one, except in the name of the *Reigning King*, is a fact, that never can be met by any son of Adam.

From the Cross to Pentecost, a period of fifty days, we have no record

of a single lip of public preaching. The reason is most obvious. The law which was not to 'pass until all was fulfilled:' had, now, been fulfilled by Jesus and nailed to the Cross. Of course, all previous commissions were in harmony with the law, had been given under the law, and had terminated with the law. The law had given up the Ghost with Jesus, and as their first mission had expired, the Disciples like industrious men, returned to their former employment. He who would censure the Apostles for neglecting a commission which they did not possess, greatly needs to be better instructed. Moral law was of course always obligatory; but we fearlessly deny, that, for this notable fifty days, there was any revealed system of religion on earth; nor was there any living man authorized to teach 'all nations,' or any nation, any message of salvation from God. The last Embassy of God to the Jewish nation, was executed in the person of his Son.—'last of all, he sent his Son,'—they murdered him—and God instantly closed the *parley* forever; and the word of the Lord for 'all nations,' had not yet been publicly announced. It is true the apostles had a commission to all nations some seven days before Pentecost, but they were expressly told to 'tarry' until endued with power from on high. It is astonishing, that religious teachers have so universally overlooked a fact so palpable. They certainly have not learned to 'mind their pauses.' Here is a pause not of four or six syllables, but of fifty days. Far exceeding 'Sheridan's pauses.' 'He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second,' is a truth the world are slow to learn.

Not only a pause of fifty days, but God has set up the Cross—an everlasting *monument*, to mark the close of the old dispensation. The traveller, in passing from the British province of New Brunswick into the United States, meets at the head of the St. Croix with a pillar of marble or granite, with 'Great Britain' engraven on one side, and 'United States' on the other. Now, how can he contrive to mistake the dominion, if he only look at the monument? While he sees the words 'Great Britain,' he needs not to be told, that he is in Victoria's dominions; but when he has passed the monument, and turning round, sees the words 'United States' staring him in the face, no earthly power can make him believe he is still under the laws of the Queen. So the Bible Student, in passing from the administration of Moses, to that of Christ, cannot fail to discover 'Moses' inscribed on that side of the Cross, and 'Christ' written upon this. 'Law' upon that side, and 'gospel' upon this.—The mission to the 'House of Israel' upon that side, and the mission to 'all nations' upon this.

We have cited twenty texts in this little tract, and hope the reader believes them all; but if he believes only the one, that *a Testament is not of force until after the death of the Testator*, he will know how to estimate that teaching which sends the enquiring sinner *beyond the Cross*, to learn how to become a Christian!—*Leaves from N. Y.*

IS METHODISM DESPOTIC ?

A paper called the ‘Carolina Baptist’ seems determined to show that Methodism, viewed in its government, is both anti-American and anti-christian—a despotic organization to be feared by the people of the United States. As the discussion of this question is exciting no little attention in some quarters, we give a sample of the reasoning on both sides of the question. Let us first hear the ‘Baptist’ :—

“In ecclesiastical matters, the laity are but the tools of the bishops and priests—they may become so in political matters. It is a well-known fact, developed in the history of the world, that religious liberty must precede civil liberty; and it is no less true that an ecclesiastical despotism will, sooner or later, if permitted to exert its influence unchecked, beget *political despotism*.”

This is the direct tendency of Episcopal Methodism. For if despotism be right in the church, it is right in the state—if it be wrong in the state, it is wrong in the church. But Episcopal Methodism declares it to be right in the church, it must, therefore, encourage it in the state. So far as the influence of Episcopal Methodism extends, so far the true spirit of freedom is crushed, and our republicanism is endangered.

But again—the very organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church is dangerous to the liberties of a free people. Suppose a crisis to arrive in political action, in which the hierarchy of the Methodist Church is interested. From the dependence of all the parts on one great central power, it is easy to perceive how the suffrages of most of the members may be controlled by the bishops. Let the bishop suggest to the presiding elders that the interests of their ecclesiastical despotism will be subserved by the election of a certain set of men to office—the presiding elders use their influence over the preachers, the preachers over the class-leaders, and the class-leaders over their class-members, and thus

the balance of power in a political contest may rest in the hands of *seven Methodist Episcopal Bishops*. There is as much danger of this, as there is of Romanism accomplishing a similar result; provided the occasion required it. It may be said that the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church are too independent to be thus influenced; but, while they submit to the degradation to which I have shown they were subjected in Church matters, let them not speak of independence in political matters. Let them become ecclesiastically free, and then it may be hoped that they would *dare* to become politically free, if the bishops undertook to prevent it.

I have thus shown that Episcopal Methodism is anti-American in its spirit and tendency, and that it is a dangerous foe to republicanism. I have shown that it had its origin in *usurpation*—that its very organization provides for the support and extension of *assumed power*, and that this power may be *oppressively exercised without restriction*. I have shown that Methodist Episcopacy contains in itself the very elements of an *absolute despotism*, and therefore must ultimately, unless checked, subvert and destroy our republican institutions. In doing this, I have uttered no harsh epithets. I have insinuated nothing against the scripturalness of Methodist doctrine, or the piety and godliness of Methodist Church members. I have simply spoken of the *government* of the Church. I have spoken as an American citizen; and I call on every true American in the Methodist Episcopal Church to use his influence to effect a radical reform in this matter. The time has come when Americanism and Romanism are arrayed in hostile attitudes. Remember that you are not prepared to stand by Americanism while you are the subjects of a hierarchy. The truth will come with irresistible force from the vassals of the Pope: “Is despotism any more sinful or dangerous in the Romish Church than in the *Methodist*? Oh! then be *Americans—be free men*—throw off your ecclesiastical chains, and then you will be prepared consistently to aid your fellow-countrymen in breaking the yoke of ecclesiastical despotism with which Rome has bound her ignorant and degraded subjects!

Now read the following from a Methodist paper entitled “Zion’s Herald:”—

“The enemies of Methodism take great delight in harping upon what they are pleased to call its despotism. A recent Baptist writer, whose malice floats like scum on every page of his book, calls it a “na-

ked clerical despotism." A spiteful Congregationalist priest, whose views of our system are founded on the most superficial knowledge of its principles, says, the "theory of our church assumes that God has given all church power to one or more bishops, to *reign absolute over the whole body of associated Christians in a nation!*" Others take up the same cry, and thus, from Maine to California, our adversaries assail us with this charge of despotism for their battle cry. We think it possible some of them may be ignorant enough of Methodism to believe their own assertions. But with the more intelligent of our foes, this cry is raised for the purpose of raising the national prejudice against a church whose rapid growth and immense resources they both fear and envy. The numerical superiority of Methodism, as shown by the facts of the last census, has disturbed our enemies exceedingly. Knowing that the republican idea is justly popular, and the despotic idea justly hateful with the American public, they seek to persuade the people that Methodism is anti-republican, and despotic in its principles, spirit, and practice. Could they succeed, they would, doubtless inflict a deadly wound upon it. They would assuredly retard its progress.

But the charge is false. Methodism is not a despotism. True, its ecclesiastical forms were not cast in a republican mould. The democratic idea is not very legibly written in the letter of its discipline. A superficial observer, gazing on some of its arrangements, without taking into account the numerous checks which are everywhere thrown around those to whom it conveys power, might easily misconceive its principles, and misjudge its spirit and practical operations. While, to those who write in the venomous spirit of the writers referred to above, nothing is easier than, by exaggerating some features of the system and suppressing others, to make out the plausible semblance of a strong case.

But there is a strong, and as we think, unanswerable *a priori* argument against this charge, in the fact that those who are in the Methodist Episcopal Church are utterly unconscious of the pressure of this alleged despotism. No Methodist feels oppressed by it. Methodist ministers and laymen maintain as much self-respect, feel as free in spirit, and are as unconstrained in their action as the ministry and laity of the most ultra Congregationalist church in the land. No despotic arm terrifies them. No irresponsible authority oppresses them. No arbitrary inflictions gall them. How is this? How can this consciousness of freedom exist and flourish unchecked, if Methodism is such a system of despotism as its enemies declare it to be? It will not do to say that

our people are not sufficiently intelligent to distinguish between liberty and freedom; for we hesitate not to assert that the *average* culture of our people is equal to that of any other large denomination in the land. How is it then? There is but one answer. The despotism does not exist, save in the disturbed imaginations of our enemies.

What is despotism? It is absolute authority, irresponsible to constitutions, laws, or tribunals. But Methodism knows no such authority as this. Every man—minister or laymen—upon whom it confers power, is controlled by rules, and held responsible to proper tribunals for the right exercise of his authority. Every officer's duties, from a class-leader to a bishop, are *specifically defined*; and the greater the power bestowed, the more strict is the responsibility which is exacted. Hence while a member or preacher can be expelled for specific violations of the discipline only, a bishop is liable to expulsion for *improper* conduct. Should a bishop fully undertake to exact the part of a tyrant, should he wantonly abuse his appointing power to any appreciable extent, the General Conference has the power, as it certainly would have the motive and inclination, to expel him. While such restraints upon its authorities as these exist, Methodism cannot be considered a despotism. The grand fundamental element of despotism—absolute, irresponsible authority—is not found in the system.

Again we ask, what is despotism? It is irresponsible authority *reposing upon force*. The appeal of the despot is not to the consent of the governed, but to force. His authority is built, not on the enlightened affection of his subjects, but on the bayonets of his warriors. His arguments are chains, prisons, scaffolds. To talk about a despotism without force is to drivel, not reason. There can be no despotism where there is no power to coerce obedience.

SINCERITY SEEKING THE WAY TO HEAVEN.

CHAPTER V.

Our young friend was passing up Clinton street, Cincinnati, between Western Row and John streets, and he saw a Methodist minister, accompanied by some ten or a dozen persons, entering the basement of the chapel belonging to the "Christians," or "Disciples of Christ," as they call themselves, their regular preacher being present. Here a new subject presented itself to the consideration of young *Sincerity*. The little

company approached the Baptistry, the lids of which were folded back out of the way, and all eyes were directed down into an emblematical tomb, some ten feet in length, and four feet broad. The water was some two and a half or three feet in depth. All stood in profound silence, with their eyes fixed upon this solemn-looking place. Presently the Methodist minister, and two respectable ladies, all dressed in black, with countenance solemn as the grave, made their appearance near this lowly tomb, where the minister made the following address :

“Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, (and that which is born of the flesh is flesh; and they that are in the flesh cannot please God, but live in sin, committing many actual transgressions;) and that our Saviour, Christ, saith, None can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerated, and born anew of water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy church, and be made lively members of the same.”—Dis., p. 107.

The minister then made the following prayer :

“Almighty and immortal God, the aid of all that need, the helper of all that flee to thee for succor, the life of them that believe, and the resurrection of the dead, we call upon thee for these persons, that they, coming to thy holy baptism, may receive remission of *their sins*, by spiritual regeneration. Receive them, O Lord, as thou hast promised by thy well-beloved Son, saying, Ask, and you shall receive; seek and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you; so give now unto us that ask, let us that seek find, open the gate unto us that knock, that these persons may enjoy the everlasting benediction of thy heavenly washing, and may come to the eternal kingdom which thou hast promised by Christ our Lord. Amen.”—Dis., p. 107.

He then descended, with one of the ladies, into the baptismal water, and lifting his eyes and hands towards heaven, uttered in a strong, clear, and solemn voice, the following most fearful and awful of all the formulas ever uttered by human lips: “I baptise you into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.” As he uttered this profoundly awful sentence, with the little company standing round, and breathing almost suspended, he lowered the candidate gently down, till the waters closed above, thus separating her from the visible world. In the next moment, she appeared again, as the waters parted from above her, in the form of a resurrection from the dead, and an actual resurrection to a new life, and she was joyfully received by those standing by. The other lady passed through the same sacred ceremony. The

minister then ascended the steps, or, as the Scripture expresses it, "came up out of the water," and lifting his hands and eyes toward heaven, said, "May grace, mercy, and peace, from God, the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, be with us all—now, henceforth, and forevermore. Amen."

The minister walked away, apparently as if conscious of having done his duty. *Sincerity* stood by trembling, and the tears imperceptibly trickling down his manly cheeks. As he walked away he said to himself: "I thought Methodists did not believe in immersion! But this man seemed sincere in what he did—how is this? Besides, I have never witnessed any religious ceremonies that produced such an effect upon my own sensibilities as this. Possibly it is my duty to be baptized! I certainly should delight to do so, if I understood the matter, and thought myself prepared. I will see my friend, Mr. H., once more, and have a conversation with him on baptism."

In a few minutes he was in the *studio* of Mr. H., when the following conversation took place;

H. Well, Mr. S. have you become any better reconciled in your mind?

S. No, sir; I am as much perplexed and confused as I have been at any former period. I have had several conversations, and heard some preaching, since I saw you, but all without affording me the least relief. Did you know of the baptizing by the Methodist preacher in charge on——street, in the baptistry of the Disciples' church, on Clinton street, this morning?

H. Yes, sir; I know all about it. Were you present?

S. Yes, sir; it was a solemn and interesting scene.

H. The facts in the case are these: There were quite a number who joined our church, as you are aware, and, as our Discipline requires all to be baptized before they are received into full fellowship, it devolved upon myself to preach a sermon on baptism. This I did, and satisfied all, except the two that you saw dipped this morning, that sprinkling would do, and administered the ordinance to them in that way. But nothing would do these two, but they must be dipped; and, as my health is delicate, I cannot endure the least exposure to wet without imminent danger of violent cold, probably terminating in consumption, I would not consent to go into the water, at such a time as this, to gratify the weakness of anybody. The truth is, baptism is not a saving ordinance any how.

S. I am surprised to hear you say that, for your preaching brother told us this morning that our Saviour says that "None can into the kingdom of God except he be regenerated, and born anew of water and the Holy Ghost," and exhorted those present to call upon God to "Grant the persons to be baptized that which by nature they cannot have." He also prayed that they might receive remission of their sins, and that the Lord would receive them, from which, I thought, he regarded it as a saving ordinance.

H. You must have misunderstood him—he did not mean that.

S. But he had your book of Discipline in his hand, and I understood him to be uttering the precise words of the Discipline.

H. You do not understand this matter. We do not believe that baptism is essential.

S. Is it true, as your preaching brother said this morning, that our Saviour says that "None can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be born of water and the Holy Ghost?"

H. Certainly it is; it is so stated in our Discipline.

S. How can any be saved without it, then? If none can enter the kingdom of God without being "born of water and the Holy Ghost," and born of water is baptism, as you admit your Discipline implies, how can any be saved without it? Can they be saved without entering into the kingdom of God?

H. None can enter—none can enter—the kingdom of God there means—the fact is, the mode is not revealed.

S. Am I to understand you, that the manner in which baptism is to be administered is not revealed?

H. Yes, sir; no man can show from the Bible that any mode is revealed?

S. If it is not revealed how a thing is to be done, how is a person to know how to do it? or how can any man living know whether it is done at all or not?

H. I regard it as valid when performed either way, by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion.

S. But, my dear sir, if the manner of obeying the command to be baptized is not revealed, it is wholly in the dark, and there is no evidence that either sprinkling, pouring or immersion is baptism.

H. I can prove sprinkling from Scripture. It says, "I will sprinkle many nations."

S. I thought you said the mode is not revealed ! If it is not revealed, how can you prove it to be sprinkling ?

H. I am, sir, afraid your condition is lamentable. I fear you will turn into skepticism. You produced nothing but difficulties. The mode of baptism is plainly taught in the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The Lord said, "I will *pour* out my spirit." This proves that pouring is the mode."

S. Mr. H., I hope I shall not become a skeptic ; but if I can find something more consistent, and that I can understand better than what you have taught, I do not know where I shall land. You first tell me, of baptism, that no mode is revealed ; then, in the next moment, you are trying to prove that sprinkling is baptism. Then, again, you are trying to prove pouring. In the place of no mode being revealed, you would have me believe that two or three modes are revealed !

As our young friend walked away, he said to himself: "Is this the way ministers are enlightening the world ? Is there nothing in religion that I can understand ? If there is no clearer light than this, I am a miserable man ?"

JESUS—AND CHRISTIANITY.

Let me inquire of the reader whether he has ever seriously considered the object of his attachment or affection—in short, whether his affections terminate on *Christ* or on *christianity*. If on *Christianity*, then does he love a *theory*—if on *Christ*, then a *person*. For *christianity* is but a *theory*, however well it may develop truths, facts, and relations ; and however exalted and harmonious these may be, still it is but a theory or system. It is somewhat difficult to conceive how *men* can rationally *love systems*—things. They may consistently *regard* them very highly—but to *love* them is of a little questionable propriety. Our forefathers in England were much attached to *episcopacy*, and of Scotland to *the covenant*—perhaps they *loved* them more than they loved God. Certain it is neither *Episcopacy* nor the *covenant*, nor their regard for them, could destroy the desire of either party to cut off the heads of the other as they had opportunity. To love *Jesus Christ* our Lord, is equal to losing all desire to destroy or maltreat our fellow mortals. I do not wish here to confound either *episcopacy* or the *covenant* with *christianity*. But there was nothing in either of those systems which required its votaries to des-

stroy its enemies. Both Covenanters and Episcopalians were more attached to their systems 175 years ago than they now are, and neither party now is disposed to be a persecutor. This change appears to me to be produced by the parties having their minds and affections turned more to God & Christ than to their systems. The systems are the same yet, but the heart of the people is changed. God created man—and it is recorded that he *loved* man even while “dead in sins”—“God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son” &c. He also created the lion and the peacock. Can we say that he *loves* these? He cares for the *sparrow*, but does he love the ostrich or the humming bird? He “created *man* in his *own image*—in the *likeness* of God created he him.” Man assimilates to God—God *loves* him. God assimilates to man in Christ Jesus—and man loves him. “We love God because he first loved us.” We cannot love angel’s, because they are not assimilated in nature to us—We cannot love *horses* and *cattle* for the same reason.—Angels are above us, and we may *reverence*, but not *love*, them. Animals are beneath us, we may *regard* them in some degree, but not *love* them. We may love God and humanity—But besides these, whether angels, system, or things, nothing is really and properly a subject of man’s affections. It appears to me that the proper object of the christian’s love is the author of our religion—the author of christianity—and not the christian system. This engages a *personality* rather than *theory* or *system*.

Do any of the brethren think the distinction over nice—I will not contend with them. But let them remember that attachment to theories and systems is the life-principle of all the sects and sectarianism of the present day.

J * * * *

A BAPTIST MINISTER—HIS NAME AND WORK.

Owen Sound, May 29th.

MR. OLIPHANT:—I received your April No. of the Banner, addressed to me, I suppose, on account of its containing strictures on communications of mine in the Owen Sound Times.

You pronounce me “a strict Baptist, i. e., a Baptist and neither more nor less.” Where is your warrant? How did you learn also that it is my “business to make and keep Baptists?” I am acquainted with parties to whom this charge applies with full force: you will understand me. I never for once urged an individual to join the Baptists. What

say you now? I have understood that you claim to be more than somewhat imitative of Paul, Peter, and John; have they taught you the doctrine of *false judging*?

As Mr. Campbell's indiscriminate traducings of ministers—"the ministers of Christ" in the evasive language of the Banner excepted—and his teachings on the Spirit and regeneration, are patent before the world, I will not take up these subjects here. I did so lately, and Mr. Oliphant was *since* in Owen Sound; so he can keep his "new white handkerchief" for the present.

I should have honored the above animadversions with merited silence but for your perversions of my reference to the party who had been "sufficiently exposed to the natural air of Port Hope," viz., that I adduced the circumstance as proof that "the Baptists in London (C. W.) are not illiberal!" These marks would appear to better advantage, had your own perversions not prompted their use.

The fact is, I did not express an opinion on the propriety or impropriety of shutting Baptist chapels on Mr. Campbell. and I am satisfied that no careful and candid man would have preferred the charge. I referred to the "air of Port Hope" chiefly to meet the sarcasm of the Banner. This "very eccentric proof of Mr. McDonald's," then, is "proof" which rests with the logic of Mr. Oliphant. Your suggestion to "christen it McDonalddoxy" is therefore rather premature.

If you introduce my name again in the Banner, please be more cautious in *false judging*. Beware of charging me with "eccentric proofs" of your own framing.

Please insert this letter as a reparation for the past.

I remain, &c.,

P. McDONALD.

The foregoing will pass current at its par value in all the religious markets and among all the religious traders, according to the upward or downward tendency of this sort of stock. We claim permission to remark upon it—

1. That we have not judged our Baptist neighbor in any wise, either falsely or truly. We received certain testimony, a portion of it from his own pen and a portion of it from others, relative to the Baptist orthodoxy of neighbor McDonald, and we spoke of him accordingly. It is undeniable, we believe, that he is a Regular Baptist; and indeed whether a Regular or an Irregular Baptist, his work, we doubt not, if

he works at all, is to make and then to preserve just such Baptists as he is himself.

2. Mr. McDonald is not willing that we should give him credit for proving anything, or attempting to prove anything, when he brought out his opposition to our observations upon the want of liberality among the Baptists of our Provincial London. Very well. If it will suit him any better we can accommodate him by substituting the term *reply* for the word "proof:" and then the matter will stand thus:—The Banner states, and states it with sarcasm, that a Baptist congregation is illiberal. Mr. McDonald replies that there is a person who is called a disciple, only notorious for his disregard of prayer, for denying human depravity, for objecting to prayer being offered to the Lord Jesus, for asserting that the new birth is by water, and for maintaining that the righteous shall be literally destroyed or turned to nothing; therefore all this is no proof of anything, only it meets the sarcasm of the Banner in commenting upon Baptist illiberality!!!

3. Our friend at Owen Sound is not such a teacher on caution as will be likely to meet with much success. If it would pay cost, the preceding short communication could be shown to contain a greater number of reckless assertions, if not direct statements scarcely parallel to truth, than the writer has fingers on the hand that wrote it. Better preach caution on the principle, "Thou who teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?"

D. O.

THE MISSION OF INFIDELS.

What is scepticism or infidelity? So many references are made to infidelity, that one would suppose at first thought, that it was some system, doctrine, theory or creed, embodied, carefully digested, and set forth in due form; but such is not the case.

The mission of infidels is not to build anything, establish anything, or defend anything. They come not to show a more excellent way,—a high way of holiness—but to turn us out of the old way, without guiding our feet into any other way. Their mission is to pull down. They have no mission to elevate, enoble and organize, but one mighty to deteriorate, degrade and disorganize. They come not to save, but to destroy. The reason why their work is so easily done is because it is all pulling down, deranging, disorganizing, spoiling, and spreading desola-

tion. The common adage: "Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones," is not applicable to them. They do not live in glass houses or houses of any other kind. They have no house at all, or anything else to defend; but their work is simply to stand off and hurl fire-brands at the buildings of others. Their work is simply that of an incendiary—spreading destruction as widely as possible, and then tantalizing the man of God, because they can pull down faster than he can build up; or because they can destroy faster than he can save; or that they can spread contagion more rapidly than he can cure. But there is nothing strange in all this, unless it be that a human being should follow such a calling. It is not strange that the old proverb of the Bible: "One sinner destroyeth much good," should be found literally true, in all things, both temporal and spiritual. One enemy can sow more cockle, spanish needles, rag weeds, thistles and burrs than a thousand good farmers can weed out; or can sow more tares than a thousand can pull up. One enemy can tear up more railway, burn more bridges, and do more damage than a million can restore.

The mission of infidels is not to enlighten, civilize and enoble the nations. They have never enlightened, civilized or elevated a nation or a people since the world was made. They have never organized society, established peace and order in any place on this earth. They have established no civil institutions, no system of morals, no code of laws, no system of education, and no institutions of learning that deserve the name. Even the literature of the country has almost entirely been left to the believers of the Bible. It is an easy work to pull down civil government, subvert the foundation of organization, condemn the means of enlightenment, and object to them. It is an easy matter to deny everything and prove nothing; to doubt, vacillate and fear. It is an easy matter to distrust, fill others with distrust, destroy confidence, throw everything into confusion and uncertainty. Some men have fallen so fully into this state, that they hardly will venture to say they believe anything, have confidence in anything, or know anything. One man, under the blinding, benumbing and stupifying influence of unbelief, when asked whether he knew that he existed, hesitated to say he did.

What ability, knowledge or learning, does it require to deny everything? The most ignorant, illiterate, and stupid can deny as stoutly as the most learned, enlightened and talented. It requires no strength of mind to stand and deny—to declare in the most pertinacious manner

disbelief, want of confidence, doubts, distrusts and uncertainties in everything. A man who never read the Bible once through in his life, nor ten other books, who has the most corrupt character, can talk of inconsistencies, incongruities, contradictions and absurdities, in the Bible, as stoutly as anybody. Any blockhead can leap over the Falls of Niagara or from the Suspension Bridge below. In the same way any man, with or without much mind, learning or talent, can leap into the dark abyss of unbelief, rejecting, contemning and despising all evidence; but would it not be the part of prudence, of wisdom and discretion in such, to look before they leap? It is a fearful experiment they are making. If the step is a mistaken one, it can never be retraced beyond this life. He who makes the experiment, obtains nothing now, only the unbridled privilege of declaring the Bible false—religion priest-craft—that man will never be called to account, hence all men can do as they list.

The mission of infidels is to risk, and induce all men to risk, the loss of everything, without the possibility of gaining anything, in this world or the world to come. They have no worthy object—they can have no worthy object in opposing the Bible. They have no reason for opposing it, for they do not propose to make the world any better. They have no proposition to make the world more true, kind, affectionate or happy. Indeed, the very fact of their malignity towards the Bible shows that it is no fable. The land abounds with acknowledged fables; why are they not enraged at these? They are read by the million; but sceptics are no more enraged at them than other men. If they are satisfied the Bible is all fiction, false or human, why trouble us about it? Why not let it pass? We hear thousands contending about the “signs in the moon,” but we care nothing about them, and do not even trouble those who believe in them; the reason is we are well and fully satisfied that there is nothing in them. Why do they not let the believers in the Bible pass in the same way? The reason is obvious; they are in doubt, not fully satisfied, and feel that there is uncertainty in their position. They see and are constantly impressed with the fact, that if the Christian could be mistaken, that his mistake amounts to nothing—that he is as happy now, and has as high assurance in regard to all beyond this life, to say the least of it, as they; and that if the sceptic should prove mistaken, his mistake is an irreparable one. They see that a mistake on the part of a Christian involves no danger, no serious consequences in this world or the world to come; while a mistake on their part, involves eternal consequences. They are not constantly impress-

ed, too, with the fact, that they are relying upon that which amounts to anything like certainty; for a large proportion who have occupied their position, before death have repudiated and renounced it—many of them in the immediate expectation of death,—and warned all their friends against it. They find on the other hand that all who believed the Bible when in health, also believed it when approaching death, and that no man who has contended for its truth till he was in the immediate expectation of death, has then denied it. They must, then, see that their mission is simply to fill the world with doubts and distrusts, involving all in darkness and uncertainty.

B. F.

DOES THE BOOK OF GOD CONTAIN NON-ESSENTIALS ?

The following article are strictures on a discourse delivered in the Town Hall, Pictou, on the 8th January, 1851, by B.— and having lain in manuscript for some years, it was thought proper after due consideration to have it printed.

Mr. B. remarked in the outset of his discourse that the doctrines of the Bible were not laid down in a systematic manner, but scattered over the scriptures like flowers in a field. He then divided them into essentials and non-essentials, and to explain his meaning he compared them to a house; the essential doctrines he compared to the material parts of the house, such as the foundation, walls, roof, &c., the non-essentials he compared to a beam, pin, or rafter, &c., he remarked that although a beam, or pin, was taken out of a house, yet if the roof was good, and the foundation firm, it would still be a house, and might still be comfortable enough to live in.

Now I freely admit that it is very common to divide religion into essentials and non-essentials, but I cannot see that such teaching can be honoring to God or profitable to men. When people are told that certain things in religion are not essential, it is very natural to undervalue and neglect what is not essential, especially if obeying non-essentials, involves any difficulty or disgrace and in this way rebellion, which is as the sin of witchcraft, is not only connived at, but openly taught, and the most positive ordinances of religion are despised and rejected, from the supposition that they are non-essentials. But this is not all. It leads to contention and strife, and mystifying of religion, for although there is a general agreement among the leaders of the sects to divide

religion into essential and non-essentials, they are far from being agreed about what one teacher calls non-essential, another calls it essential, and the common people who are not versed in these mysteries of essentials and non-essentials, are often set by the ears against one another; not one of the teachers as far as I learn, can bring any certain *line of demarkation* from scripture to prove what is essential from what is non-essential.

As a proof of the contention about essentials and non-essentials, I shall submit the following as a sample. The people called Baptists contend that immersion is baptism; they contend that immersion is essential to the right administration of that ordinance; nothing short of this will please them; all those who are not immersed, are unbaptized according to their belief, I cordially agree with them. The people called Pedo-baptists although they generally admit immersion to be valued baptism, contend that immersion is not essential, and that the ordinance may be rightly administered by sprinkling a little water on the face, and this has been a bone of contention for centuries between these bodies, and although the former body are yearly thinning the ranks of the latter; the controversy is far from being at an end. Is it any wonder then that several sects should have risen up, who have laid aside baptism altogether, and this is actually the case; and many of those who do not go this length consider baptism as a very insignificant ceremony.

How often are we asked, What makes you Baptists so tenacious about immersion, thus sowing strife and contention in the community, and dividing the real people of God about a mere outward ceremony, not essential to salvation. The following are some, but not a tithe of the bitter fruits that has risen from dividing religion into essentials and non-essentials. But if teachers of religion would tell the people that God is the fountain of wisdom, knowledge, and goodness, and that His Wisdom and Goodness would forbid appointing non-essentials in religion; that the salvation of men is the end God has in view in giving ordinances of religion to men, and that all these ordinances are means in God's hand for accomplishing the end he has in view, namely, *salvation of men*, that each and every one of these ordinances has a certain bearing towards accomplishing this great end: if the people were farther told that God has connected a blessing with obedience, [Rev. 22: 14.] and that in keeping of His commands there is a great reward [Ps. 19: 11];

if the people were also shown the heavy judgments God poured down upon those who ventured to call His holy ordinances non-essential; that in every age those who revered God's authority and obeyed. His Laws received His blessing, while those who despised His authority found by experience that the way of transgressors is hard, 1 Sam. 2 : 30 chap. 15, 17, 24; if teachers of religion would open up to the people the difference between those who *serve* God and those who *serve Him not*, people would then be able to see the difference; they would love religion for the good it conferred upon those who engaged in it. But to tell people that certain things in religion are not essential, is the very way to lead them to despise religion to the ruin of their souls. I shall now refer to a few portions of scripture which proves to my satisfaction that there is no such thing as non-essentials in religion. Noah believed this and acted upon it; for we are told, thus did Noah according to *all* that God commanded him, Gen. 4 : 22. After Moses received instructions to build the tabernacle, he received this additional command, See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the mount, Exod. 25 : 40. Moses complied in every punctilio, for thus did Moses according to all that God commanded him, so did he, Exod. 40 : 16. The books of Exod., Lev., and Deut., contain a multitude of laws minutely described, and it appears that Moses considered every *jot and tittle to be essential*, and his earnestness to impress the same belief upon the nation of Israel, is manifest from many portions of the book of Deut. too numerous to mention here; see in particular Deut. 4 : 2, chap. 6 : 2, chap. 8 : 1, chap. 10 : 12, 15. In the 6th chapter of Joshua the Lord commanded Joshua to compass Jericho once every day for six days, and on the seventh day they were to compass the city seven times; they were also to observe a certain order of procession, priests blowing seven trumpets of ram's horns were to go before the Ark, blowing as they went. The people in our day, in all probability would consider these things or at least some of them non-essential. Joshua thought otherwise, and observed every iota; see the chapter throughout. Even Moses the servant of the Lord who was faithful in all His house, deviated but in one instance from his instructions, and for this he was debarred from entering into the land of promise, Numbers 7 : 13. The case of Saul, king of Israel, is a clear proof of the danger of calling anything that God commands non-essential. Saul divided his instructions into essentials and non-essentials, when sent to destroy the wicked Amelikeites.

He obeyed what he deemed essential, and neglected what he considered non-essential; he returned home with seeming confidence, and he says to Samuel when he meets him, "I have performed the commandment of the Lord," while the proof of his disobedience was sounding in his ears, (the bleating of the sheep and the lowing of the oxen,) he excuses himself that the cattle and sheep were for sacrifice to the Lord, but Samuel tells him that "to obey is better than sacrifice and to hearken than the fat of rams; because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord hath rejected thee," 1 Sam. 15: 22, 23. I marvel that any man in the face of these scriptures would venture to call anything that God commands non-essential. We shall now turn to the New Testament, and see if the Lord Jesus and His Apostles divided religion into essentials and non-essentials. Jesus at the conclusion of His sermon on the mount compares those who hears his word and does it not, to the man who built his house upon the sand, Mat. 7: 24, 28. This does not seem to savour of non-essentials. Jesus says, "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you," John 15: 14. Again Jesus says, "Teach them (the disciples) to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded," Mat. 28: 20. Paul in addressing the Ephesian Elders, says, I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God,— I have showed you all things, Acts 20: 27, 35. When writing to Timothy, I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ and the elect Angels, that thou observe these things *without preferring one before another*, 1 Tim. 5: 21. We have also many instances in scripture of persons *trifling with God's commands* counting them non-essential and bringing ruin upon themselves, I refer to the following, Gen. 2: 16, chap. 3: 6, Lev. 10: 1, 4, Josh. 6: 18, chap. 7, 25, 1 King 13: 9, 21, 22, 24.

The preacher after dividing the doctrines of scripture into essentials and non-essentials, in enumerating the essential doctrines, that of being saved by faith alone he named as one of the essentials. I am well aware of this being a popular doctrine. Some of the leaders of the sects have formed what is called the Evangelical League, in opposition to the Pope, and those who bring this doctrine (saved by faith alone) are received into the League as orthodox, and all those who do not believe this doctrine are rejected as heretics. This league seems rather calculated to strengthen the Pope. I am now an old man, with nearly half a century of experience in the Christian profession, and I cannot

find in scripture that men are saved by *faith alone*. But I find in scripture that people are saved by *grace*, Eph. 2 : 3., by *faith*, Eph. 2 : 8 ; by *baptism*, 1 Peter 3 : 21 ; by *hope*, Rom. 8 : 24 ; by the *renewing of the Holy Spirit*, Titus 3 : 5 ; by *calling on the name of the Lord*, Rom. 10 : 13 ; by the *gospel*, 1 Cor. 15 : 2 ; by *His* (Christ's) *life*, Rom. 5 : 10, and by *enduring to the end*, Mat. 10 : 22. In the above we have salvation ascribed to nine causes, and I believe I might add a few more. I ask, then, how can any man ascribe salvation to faith alone, when the Spirit of God ascribes it to nine causes. I might as well say, that men are saved by calling on God *alone*, or by hope *alone*, or by baptism *alone*. I conclude then that each and every one of these nine causes has something to do with the salvation of men, and I dare not say that people are saved by any one of them *alone* ; and any person that says so manifests great ignorance of the scriptures. But if people are saved by faith alone, then eight of the above causes would seem to be needless. The whole round of Christian duties would seem to be needless. See also James 2 : 14, 17, 24.

Let us examine if Noah was saved by faith alone. Was he not saved by *grace*, Gen. 6 : 8. Was he not saved by *faith* and by *fear*, Heb 11 : 7, (was it not fear that moved him to build the Ark.) And was he not saved by *hope*, (was it not hope that encouraged him to go on with the undertaking.) Was he not saved by gopher-wood, (would any other wood answer) and by making the Ark 300 cubits long, 50 cubits broad, and 30 cubits high, (would any other fashion do) and by pitching it within and without with pitch (if he had neglected this order, would not the water rush in and drown him, *even* in the Ark.) And was he not saved by gathering to him of all food that was eaten (otherwise would he not have died.) Was not the door essential, otherwise how could he enter. Again, if he had not entered at the command of God would faith alone save him ; also the Lord shutting him in was equally essential. Noah was also saved by water, so the scripture says, 1 Peter 3 : 20. The very wind that assuaged the water was essential to his salvation. But the salvation of Noah from first to last was wholly of God, and wholly of grace.

In the common affairs of life, men could never be deceived in this manner. The bluntest farmer in the country cannot be persuaded, that he could raise a crop by faith alone, no, nor a single ear of corn, neither is there a mechanic in our country, that could be made to be-

lieve that he could make a mill, or a time piece, by faith alone. Truly the children of this world are in their own generation wiser than the children of light.

The reader is respectfully requested to examine the above and compare it with scripture; then receive or reject as it agrees with that divine standard.

JAMES SILLARS.

River John, N. S., May 19th, 1856.

PRAYERS, NOT WORDS MERELY.

Prayers should not be long in public or in the family. In private you are at liberty, but not in public. Others are concerned as well as you. Study their capacities and dispositions. *Allure* them to the Saviour. Repel them not by your discursiveness. Mock not God by drawing nigh to Him with your lips. Consider what you and they need. Go upon your knees, and, as briefly as possible, make known your desires—the desires of your very heart. And when you have done this, rise instantly, for “much speaking,” after it has ceased to come from the heart, is a direct insult to the Almighty. Here are two things very different—bending the knee, and making known the wants we feel; and bending the knee, and considering how we shall make a prayer. An answer to the former will arrive at the proper time, but the latter will draw down vengeance, if mercy interpose not!

Reader, be aware of listless, heartless, discursive, theological prayers. More infidels are, perhaps, made at the “family altar,” and in “the house of prayer,” than in all the infidel lecture-rooms in the kingdom! Parents and masters, let your devotions be instinct with life, love, variety, and earnestness, if you would not be charged with the *infidelity*, ruin, and eternal damnation of your children and servants! Tremble under a sense of your responsibility, and under the constraining influence of the love and example of Christ; pray differently from this very hour! “Pray without *ceasing*” in private, if you would pray without *sinning* in the family or in public.—*British Messenger*.

LOST—WANTED—FOUND.

1. LOST—By the churches generally, much of that zeal for God and his laws which characterized the ancient Disciples. And, also, their first love, and assurance of faith, that heavenly-mindedness, possessed alone by those who are in quest of honor, immortality, and eternal life.

The articles were first missed soon after neglect of family prayer ; and were doubtless lost in the path of disobedience, as the owners were running tilt and main after a God-forgetting world.

2. WANTED—In the churches generally, men and women who will keep their covenanted row, made to the Lord when they “put him on;” and will watch over each other in love, and admonish each other, and be diligent in every good work. Further, is wanted, a good conscience for a number of church people, who have spoken evil of one another, neglected the stated duties of the Lord’s house, cheated their neighbors, and done many other things too numerous to be mentioned, thereby defiling their old conscience.

3. FOUND—On the highway to death, a package containing a ball of selfishness, so hard that it cannot be broken or melted by any human means. A list of objections to the gospel of Jesus. A large amount of prejudice against truth and holiness, and a vessel of self and self-conceit, which, being broken, has stained the other articles in the package. The finder has deposited the articles in his heart, and unless the same is claimed by the owner, the devil, they will eventually become his by *limitation of law.*

J. A. B.

PRESIDENT FANNING LOOKING WITHOUT SPECTACLES.

Reader! the following two sentences are worthy of profound reflection. They are from the pen of brother T. Fanning, of Franklin College :—

“As matters of worldly wisdom, an Endowed Orphan School, an Endowed College, and an Endowed establishment to educate preachers may promise much, but we doubt if the Churches regulated by the Gospel, are not the best Orphan Schools, and by far the best Schools for educating preachers. Yet, we are willing to see what improvement the brethren can make.”

☞ As the memory relieves the mind in her vacant moments, and fills up the chasms of thought with ideas of what is past, we have other faculties that agitate and employ her upon what is to come. These are the passions of hope and fear.

TRAVELS AND LABORS.

NUMBER FIVE.

After arriving at home from the westward tour, a week was spent at my own domestic circle, and then I proceeded to fill some appointments eastward. The first was at the Union Stone School House in Sophiasburg, County of Prince Edward, not many miles from the new residence of Mr. Roaf, late the Pastor of the Congregational church in Toronto. Mr. Roaf preaches regularly in the aforesaid Stone School House; and I made it one of my duties to attend and hear him in the forenoon previously to delivering a lecture in the afternoon of the same Lord's day. The discourse in the former portion of the day was got up eloquently and orthodoxly, in the usual significance of these terms: and concerning the effort in the after part of the day, which was intended to lead to some marked reflections upon the religion of Christ, it is not expedient for me to speak particularly.

The next evening, the last Monday evening in March, I was at the West Lake, and spoke an hour to a friendly congregation, and then parted with the audience apparently on pleasant terms, making my way to Brighton the next day at eventide, as our old English ancestors are wont to say.

Only a short halt at home, sweet home. The second week of April saw me across Ontario's waters, among friends and brethren in the State of New York. Nearly three weeks were occupied variously with private and public interests on that side of the Lake, during which time I called at Cato, Brewerton, Tully, and Pompey, remaining long enough at each of these points to speak to the people publicly. I was pleased and refreshed to meet with brethren such as Cook, Benton, Petty, Everets, Rockwell, Walkup, Stevens, Wilson, White, Winegar, Fancher, Shew, Crandall, Nearing, Nobles, Wells, Smith, Knapp, Vail Cavan, Chase, and others whom memory and affection will retain until the one is no more needed and the other is perfected.

It was my design when in New York to see the friends in Butler, in Tyre, in Waterloo, in Auburn, and in some sections not named; but every man of sound sense and even some who have scarcely any sense can readily understand that it is one thing to purpose and another thing to execute. I calculated upon meeting and greeting a multitude of other brethren south of Ontario, but the time, it appears, had not yet come. May gifts and blessings in unceasing abundance be meted out by the Lord to his own people!

D. O. T.

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL ON THE OCEAN.

From the Christian Age.

Circumstances try the man, and opportunities enable them to develop what is in him. Many persons have considered brother Campbell as merely a learned man professing religion, whose rational nature assented to its evidences, but who has always been deficient in the bursts and breaking up of a deeply affected emotional nature. Of this latter development not much can be said while a man remains on earth and very little can be tolerated by society from the man himself. It is an outrage on modesty to hear a man telling how intensely he feels this, that, and the other. In this way, as Solomon says, "Every man proclaims his own goodness." It is the most sickening form in which the cant of the times can be served up.

Glancing lately over my book of notes of our tour to Great Britain and Ireland in 1847, I was struck with the narrative of several matters which I considered might be interesting to the readers of the *Age*, and our papers generally, if they thought it worth the copying. I shall give the notes as they were written on the ocean, "*verbatim et liberatim*," so that it will appear nothing is now set down for effect.

FIRST LORD'S DAY AT SEA.

"All serene and beautiful the morning dawned upon us, and after a good ablution in the waters of the ocean, we peered upon deck and found a fair wind and a steady sea. How beautifully sublime is the sea. Always grand; in calms, majestic; in the stiff breeze, awful; and in the raging storm, terrific. On this lovely morning about ten o'clock our good captain invited brother Campbell to preach, and called all that wished to hear him into the cabin. It was an imposing sight. There stood the veteran of many hard fought fields, now for the first time about to speak to men on the bosom of the great Atlantic! We sang an appropriate Psalm, and after prayer brother Campbell preached an excellent discourse from 1 Cor. xv. 1—11. All were greatly pleased and benefitted. We concluded by a hymn and prayer. The captain remarked to me, "That man understands his business well," which struck me as being very appropriate, and as evincing the sound sense of that class of men who follow the sea for a livelihood. My mind was touched with tenderness while I thought of those happy spirits in Virginia, and in the world who worship God on this hallowed day. May the Lord smile upon our mission and bless it to both saints and sinners.

"*Monday Morning, May 10th.*—Arose refreshed and well, after a good night's rest, and found the "Siddons" bowing politely to the waves, but almost entirely still. She constantly keeps her prow, however, towards the rising sun. On the night of yesterday brother Campbell and I retired after supper into our state-room, and had some private conversation on our mission. Brother C. suggested that, as in the providence of God we had been called to this work, it would be necessary for us to commune together about the most successful mode of prosecuting it. And after an interchange of views on the plan of operations, we agreed to make it a constant subject of prayer; and that we commend ourselves daily to the Lord, praying him to impress our own hearts with the importance of the work to be done; calling upon him for his guidance and protection, so that in all our labours God may be glorified, the saints comforted and edified, and poor sinners turned from the error of their ways. Brother C. then laid the matter before the throne of grace in a very impressive manner, and we felt the sweet influence of the good spirit of our God. Oh, that the traducers of this Reformation, and the revilers of this good man could have felt what we enjoyed upon the broad bosom of the mighty waters!"

From the Christian Union.

OPEN AND CLOSE COMMUNION.

QUERY TO J. S. LAMAR.

After carefully reading the first three numbers of the "CHRISTIAN UNION," I am convinced that there is very little difference between your views and those entertained by the majority of Baptists. I think we should all strive, instead of widening the breach, to close it, and if possible, to become one. We are apt to imagine that we are further apart than we really are. For one, I am in favor of attempting to remove the obstructions which hinder our union; and will, therefore, state to you some points of difference, upon which I desire your opinion. We understand you to believe in open communion; and, with the views you hold upon baptism, I am frank to tell you, that I think this is inconsistent. Will you confer a favor upon me and others, by giving us your position on this subject, with the reasons for it, in your next issue? With Christian regards,

I am yours in the Lord,

.. BAPTIST.

ANSWER.—We regard it as very unfortunate that the subject upon which our brother Baptist writes with so much frankness and kindness should ever have been mooted. The terms open and close communion are unknown to the scriptures. They therefore indicate a state of things which did not exist in the first or Apostolic Church. We deem it modest, to say the least, not to dogmatize upon a question which, from the nature of the case, cannot be directly answered by the scriptures. To meet the difficulties of the case, we simply ignore the whole question, in its controversial aspects; we take sides with no one. If it is required that we define our position in the consecrated terminology of sectarianism, we say that in a certain sense, we believe in both open and close communion; but in the sense appropriated to these terms, we believe in neither. We believe the communion table is “open” to all real Christians, of every age, sex, color and race—but that it is closed against all others. We do not invite moralists, nor even those who merely “repent of their sins,” as others do; and they may, therefore, say that we believe in close communion. We simply invite all Christians to partake, and when any one comes forward and puts forth his hand to receive the solemn momentoes of his Lord’s flesh and blood, we do not draw them back and say—“Stop, sir, have you been baptized? have you repented? have you received the Holy Spirit?” But we say as Paul directed—“Let every man examine himself and so let him eat.” These are questions for him. Christ said to his disciples,—“Eat ye all of it—drink ye all of it;”—so say we. Christ invites ALL his disciples, we can do no less. If there is a Judas among them, he does not injure us. If our Master would dip his hand in the dish with him, let us not be over scrupulous, especially as he tells us to judge not. If such an one presents himself and eats and drinks unworthily, we thank the Lord that we are not responsible for it—but that he “eats and drinks condemnation to himself.” We do not invite such a man; he comes when Christians are invited; he comes of his own accord: we do not know his heart, and if we err it is on the side of charity.

The Apostle teaches us that it is the communion of the body and blood of Christ. It cannot be such, unless it is partaken of by the proper persons, in the proper spirit. And now we beg our Baptist brother, and all others, to notice this remark—it is an idea we have never seen advanced by any one, viz: that *unless the emblems are ta-*

ken by the proper persons, in faith, discerning the Lord's body and blood, it is not communion. For instance—A. eats the loaf, and gratefully remembers that body broken for him—he drinks the cup and his heart is stirred with joyful emotions, in thinking of the blood shed for the remission of his sins; he raises his heart and voice to Heaven, and communes with his living Saviour. All is gratitude and joy in the present, and faith and joy in the future. B. goes through the same formality, but his heart is on his farm or his merchandize. He has been washed from his sins in that blood; he has never realized that his iniquity was laid upon that “crucified one,”—and hence, he has no feeling of gratitude; no emotion of love; no communion with Christ. Need we ask, does B. commune with A.? If he does, the supper is a mere ceremonial—all outward, all body and no spirit. This by no means meets our views of the case.

The same is true with respect to praising and praying. We commune in this way as well as in partaking of the Lord's supper. A. sits and offers a song of praise to the King Immortal; his heart is in it; he feels what he says; he sings with the spirit and with the understanding also. B. sits by him and utters the same words, but with no heart no spirit, no understanding. Do they commune? C. sings like A., and their spirits are in unison; they are in communion; but B., we think, is left out. Thus we act consistently. We do not go out into the world and employ sinners to do our singing for us. It is a part of our own worship—our *social* worship, our communion. If we cannot make the melody in our hearts, to the Lord, we think it poor worship which we offer by proxy—a proxy, too, of worldly-minded men and women. But when such engage with us in singing, can they be said to commune with us? Certainly not.

We think, therefore, that our brother will see that, if we are inconsistent in communing at the Lord's table with those who have not been immersed, he is equally so, in communing with them in everything else but the supper.

We never invite Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians or Episcopalians to eat with us; we invite Christians—all Christians. If a Baptist, Methodist, or Presbyterian presents himself, he comes as a Christian, and is welcomed as such.

☞ Time, with all its celerity, moves slowly on to him whose whole employment is to watch its flight.

EVIDENCE—LOGICAL AND SPIRITUAL.

The Christian religion is not dependent on any one kind of evidence, or any single class of arguments for the establishment of its truth. Yet, though many methods of proof are at the service of a Christian for the defence of his faith, all are not equally satisfactory to every individual, or to the same individual at different times.

It is always desirable to bring to the proof of any proposition its most direct and natural evidence, but this is not always practical or efficient. It can, for instance, be ascertained to a certainty, that the distance to the sun is nearly ninety-five millions of miles. The proper proof is the *Geometrical* demonstration, but to a man deficient in mathematical knowledge this proof cannot be understood, yet upon the testimony of scientific men in whom he has confidence, or from his observation that transits and eclipses of the heavenly bodies are calculated with the utmost precision long before they occur, or other considerations, he very properly believes that astronomical distances are measurable. Here the inferior proof has the superior force.

If this is true in a single proposition of an exact science, much more is it true in relation to Christianity, which includes many propositions, and has an infinity of aspects and relations. Various men approaching it from different angles, and having different points of sight, are not equally affected by its claims. In great kindness has it been arranged that the evidences of the truth of the gospel are graded to meet our varied capacities and incapacities; and the want in us of sufficient moral purity, or spiritual elevation, to apprehend the highest proof, does not operate as a bar to all conviction, for there are considerations to meet us on a lower plane. One man is influenced by historical proof, another by miracles or prophecies, and a third accepts at once and finally, the demonstration mentioned by Christ in John 7:17.

One man requires a logical argument with all its terms nicely adjusted, he builds his faith upon syllogisms, and prepares himself to give a *reason*, or forty of them, why he believes. Another man with an intellect less hardy, but with a finer and more impressible moral nature, accepts Christianity, not upon its being demonstrated, but upon its being *explained* to him.

There are persons so simple, child-like, and transparent, that they are illuminated by the light that beams from the Saviour, the instant they come within its sphere. There are others on whom the light and

love of Christ, fall with as little effect as if they were encased in hardened and opaque shells. Of that class of evidences accepted and satisfactory, only to a cold and stubborn intellect, and that must be digested into a series of formal propositions; and of that other class that appeals to, and is accepted by a truthful and trusting heart, the latter we think the more consolatory and sure. "And hereby do we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments."

He with whom Christianity is not a mere investigation of doctrines, not merely a ceaseless controversy, but a vital and personal acceptance of the truth as it is in Jesus, needs no intricate and multiplied arguments to support his faith. He may be a man of simple understanding; he may not be able to state in set terms the grounds of his conviction, you may puzzle him with cavils and objections, but you cannot disturb his faith. He has walked with Christ—he has sat at his feet. The culmination of all demonstrations is the gift of the Holy Spirit.—Exchange Paper.

☞ If thou art rich, then show the greatness of thy fortune; or what is better, the greatness of thy soul, in the meekness of thy conversation; condescend to men of low estate, support the distressed, and patronize the neglected. Be great; but let it be in considering riches as they are, as talents committed to an earthly vessel. That thou art but the receiver; and that to be obliged and to be vain too, is but the old solecism of pride and beggary, which, though they often meet, yet ever make but an absurd society.—Sterne.

☞ A newspaper is the history of the world for one day. It is the history of that world in which we now live, and with it we are consequently more concerned than with those which have passed away, and exist only in remembrance; though to check us in our too fond love of it, we may consider, that the present, likewise, will soon be past, and take its place in the repositories of the dead.—Bishop Horne.

☞ Writers who correspond shall not be neglected, nay, nor slighted. Let all friends who can handle the pen communicate freely, and every one will be heard in his turn.

D. O.