



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. XII. COBOURG AND BRIGHTON, DECEMBER, 1858. NO. 12.

SPIRITUALISM, NO. 2.

—If Spiritualism had remained among the same class of 'mediums' and 'believers' first making a stir about it at Hydesville and Rochester, in the great State of New York, we should probably never have occupied two pages of this monthly in respect to it 'pro' or 'con.' It would not, in our estimate of things, have paid anything like cost. We well remember when first some excited friends asked us to account for the reported wonders of spirit-rapping. Our response was then, what it would be now, the premises being similar, that there was not enough in the whole affair to reward a review or pay the outlay in an attempt to account for it. The revelations rapped out from the 'spirit-world' were not big enough either in number or worth. Any man, for example, who had intellect to know whether he walked with his feet upward or downward, could tell, without a revelation, whether he was married or single; whether he had one child, a number of children, or none; whether he was twenty, thirty-five, or sixty years old, and all similar items. If very important, too, he could move a table, or get requisite help to carry it from one place to another, if a heavy one, without Spiritualist aid, celestial or terrestrial.

But let it be generously stated as well as conceded that the partly-formed Spiritualistic system has in latter years fallen into other hands, and now assumes a lofty place and a weighty work. Such men as Edmonds, Brittan, Parker, Newton, Hallock, Tiffany and others, are not

to be met successfully with a sneer, a frown, or a pooh-pooh. Some of these gentlemen are intellectually much above the average, and a majority of them, we believe, are respectably moral. Mr. Parker, of Boston, is, mentally, a full match for his tallest and broadest neighbor in that large city; and, on passing that way in 1856, we learned that in morals he stood at par or at a premium. Although justly to be regarded more as a theological eccentric than any one thing in particular, he is, in reality, within the Spiritualist circumference: for he is a chief advocate, if not the chief of all the advocates, of the doctrine of 'interior wisdom,' 'intuition-ism,' or 'inner sense' which the new class of progressives hold to be so complete a cure for every existing ill.

To show the amount of room these gentlemen require in which to operate, as well as to indicate their attitude to the religion of Jesus, it may be candidly stated that—

1. While they acknowledge the Bible utters a measure of truth, they regard not the Bible as the standard of religious truth. The volume contains, they avow, a stock of error, superstition, and unreliable data; and even the safe statements it embraces would be, they hold, as valuable if found in Voltaire's reasonings or in a common novel as in the writings of Isaiah or Paul. Hence, all sound Spiritualists tip the Bible, as such, down the same hill with Jack and Gill, while every item of faith founded on the volume must as a legitimate consequence come tumbling after.

2. Our Spiritualistic neighbors rely firmly and certainly upon their own rational deducements and current revelations, so-called, through 'mediums' termed 'suitable.'

3. They likewise claim the ability, authority, and sacred sanction embraced in the miracle-working power.

4. Their avowed basis-fact, (put forth as being at once the proof and strength of the system,) which tells of spirits in the spirit-sphere communicating with spirits in the earth-sphere, is depended on as the grand Draw-Bridge by which (with the 'interior wisdom') to step out and look beyond the present living world at what is immortal and celestial.

We put down these four elements of Spiritualism with the same candidness that we would place on these pages the like number of items pertaining to any system under review. Therefore, if in any particular they are incorrect, our gentlemanly friend of the 'Age' at Boston

is invited to offer to the readers of this work a chapter of correction. Meanwhile we quote the following from the pen of the editor, which will be found in his letter to us of June 8th, and published in the October issue:—‘My Spiritualism,’ says friend Newton, . . . ‘includes christianity, and is the elucidator and demonstrator of it; going further in the unfolding of certain departments of truth than Jesus and his apostles were able to go eighteen hundred years ago, for the reason that the world was not able to bear or to understand what is now made known.’ Let us likewise hear Dr. Hoyt, of Syracuse: ‘I have visited New York, and there found the precious boon I so much desired—a certainty, of not only immortality, but *the immortality of my dear loved ones*. I am now as sure of this one thing as I am of my own existence. Is not this a *pearl of great price?*’

From these sayings we deduce at least four Spiritualistic assumptions or positions: 1. That Spiritualism, speaking after the progressive style, is in advance of Christ’s religion; 2. That Spiritualism is so much wider and greater than christianity that the latter is ‘included’ in the former; 3. That the religion of Jesus is both certified and simplified by Spiritualism; 4. That the question of immortality is not certainly settled by the gospel, but by Spiritualism. If, too, we need other data by which to look with an intelligent eye upon the new doctrine, we may find an additional supply in the subjoined paragraph, which is part of a late speech by Dr. Hallock:—

‘Think you God’s work presses only upon the shoulders of twelve apostles? that the good of the whole is committed to the tender consciences of the few? Every ‘four-footed beast and creeping thing,’ aye, and the thing that cannot creep, utters its modicum of gospel, and whispers a divine truth into the ear of reason. Look into *their* Convention, and hear what *they* have to say on this subject of evil. They never lie—their language is their life. Look! one is food, and another is poison; one will preserve life, and the other will destroy it. Is not one good and the other evil?—is not food a saint and poison a sinner? . . . Poison is bad food, but good medicine. It plays a thousand parts in the grand drama of uses, besides that of destroyer. Inexperience forcing it out of the natural sphere of its uses, demanding, for example, that it shall do duty as food, insisting that strychnine shall perform the office of wheat, commits just the blunder which is the origin of evil! In this one example we have the exact character of evil, its undoubted origin and its absolute cure. The evil complained of consists of a disagreeable surprise communicated to the consciousness through the organs of sensation. The *cause* of it is ignorance of the

nature and uses of the plant. The *cure* of it is *knowledge* . . . . . Were evil a natural fact instead of a natural mistake, it would be incurable ; that is to say, were man intrinsically bad, he could never be made good. Iron never becomes gold ; good alone can be changed into better and best ; hence that which is improvable, is good, and not evil.'

So speaks and so reasons Dr. Hallock. And as we are gathering up documents and statements for reviewing purposes, it will not be amiss, just here, to give ear to a word or two from Mr. C. M. Plumb, whose utterance, like that of the gentleman's now given, is endorsed by a Convention of Spiritualists. Mr. Plumb tells us, that—

'One all-sufficient ground for the rejection of the Christian theory of the source of evil, is, the reflection it casts upon the wisdom and goodness of the great creating Cause. We cannot believe that the Infinite God would give existence, and with it the curse of an evil nature ; but must rather look upon whatever manifestations of opposition to right that humanity may exhibit, as indications of an unprogressed stage of development. . . . We have looked *within* for the source of evil, when it lies *outside*, and the soul's normal effort is to overcome it, just as the child strives to walk and run and climb. . . . Only remove all obstacles to its full and free manifestation, and mankind will show that the element of goodness *lives* though it slumbers within them. It is not a caged fiend, but a sleeping enfeebled angel that dwells in the human soul.'

Such is Mr. Plumb's line with which he measures, whether a good Plumb-line or not.

We refer to these public expressions of Messrs. Newton, Hallock, and Plumb not only to evince that our statements relative to certain chief elements of Spiritualism are authorized, but also to indicate to some extent how the system, as far as it is a system, practically contemplates man. From the Spiritualist angle, looking at the world's family of intelligences, we discover that—

1. Man is more capable of understanding celestial lessons at this day than during the period when christianity was established.

2. The human pupil, in his search for goodness, and in his inquiry for what is its apparent opposite, is not to listen solely to twelve apostles, but to the hundreds, thousands, and millions of apostles formed and fashioned of things animate and inanimate within the fabric of nature.

3. Man, properly instructed, cannot find evil, simply because there is, really, no evil to be found.

4. Evil is not in man, nor does he receive evil positively—he makes mistakes, the fruits of which are only *seeming* evil.

5. Man's reason, duly installed as sole Arbitrator between things that differ, is to hear what the elements of nature say in their ten times ten thousand voices, and then distinguish between intrinsic good and apparent evil.

6. Every man's inexperience or ignorance is, to him, the origin of evil; and, hence, every man's intelligent experience or knowledge, is, to him, the cure of evil and the origin of good.

7. Man, as such, is an improvable or progressive intelligence, and therefore not inherently bad.

8. The account of the source of human ill, as set forth in the scriptures called sacred, is unreliable and to be rejected.

9. Man's manifestations in the sphere of wrong are indications of an unprogressed stage of development.

10. The element of goodness, like an angel asleep, dwells in every soul of man.

These ten specifications are enough. There are other items fairly deducible from the premises, but these are quite sufficient for the purposes of this review. The materials of the edifice are now collected in such abundance, that the size and nature of the Spiritualist Temple, may, with a fair measure of certainty, be determined.

But while the premises are fresh before us, we deem it in good order to observe that these ten specific ingredients of doctrine are in nowise closely related to the avowed foundational fact of Spiritualism. It would take, doubtless, a very adroit believer in the doctrine that a spirit out of the body engages in speaking with a spirit in the body, to build upon this basis a superstructure of such form, weight, and dimensions as the ten capital items we have named. And harder still for any Spiritualist to show that these are ten branches which spring out of one root. To say, for example, that a spirit in the angelic-sphere talks to a spirit in the human-sphere,—*therefore* man must listen to every element of nature to be instructed in moral or spiritual excellence, would, in our judgment, be a degree worse than a logical nullity. Or first to affirm that Sir Isaac Newton's spirit has conversed with Mr. A. E. Newton's spirit,—*therefore* man is not evil, but commits faults which appear bad, would not pass for healthful logic in any part of Canada, at least among judges of the article. Whatever therefore is built upon the chief fact of Spiritualism, or that which is assumed as such fact, it is perceivable that the ten items we have noted do not rest upon this basis, nor are they legitimately related to it. With us, then,

the so termed basis-fact is in one spot, and the main structure of Spiritualism is somewhere else!

Thus, while still at the threshold of the investigation, to prevent mistake, we are particular to classify the materials of Spiritualism, putting the primary fact in one chapter, and the essence of the embryo system in a distinct chapter. Suppose we grant, then, that our Spiritualist friends have a basis-fact?—we say at the same moment that the basis is alone, without one stone upon it of any material value. But the elements of doctrine to which we have directed attention, evidently form a separate chapter of philosophy, be the same good or bad, sound or unsound, healthy or sickly. For the sake of being understood, then, we desire all discriminating readers to mark our off-hand division of Spiritualism into two leading chapters, consisting, first, of an avowed something called a fact, and, secondly, of a large pile of rationalism. Or, if any one prefer it, rationalistic philosophy.

Things there are, whether true or false, which concern us so triflingly that they must be viewed as of no vital moment. We pitch the primary 'fact' of Spiritualism among these trivial materials. In our most liberal mental or devotional moods we are unable to perceive religious importance in a spiritual entity in one world talking to another spirit in a different world. Whenever we hear of a new and practical revelation being uttered by a spirit of the 'upper-plane' to a spirit in this 'earth-plane,' we will pay marked attention to the 'fact' of such communication; but the mere circumstance of one spirit talking to another, if the talk embraces no better sense or greater value than what has been hitherto reported, is such a circumstance, whether provable or not, that we cannot muster interest enough to regard.

Far otherwise is the philosophical chapter. This embraces such an analysis of man, and such a doctrinal dose for him, as necessarily compels elaborate or at least patient review. We are on hand for a moderate engagement in this work. Because, whatever deals with good and evil, in view of man's present and subsequent life, or whatever is proposed to augment joy and diminish grief, either in this world or in any world, having a plea which attracts the public sympathy and draws various classes of men to a new standard of thought and action, must undoubtedly be sufficiently worthy to claim free examination.

Viewed from one point of observation, we reluctantly open our batteries upon these rationalistic gentlemen, for two reasons. They are, we opine, generously minded men, apparently made, not on the two-

penny scale, but on the wholesale principle ; and again, they do see so many actual sins and sanctioned errors emanating from theologic Rome, London, and Geneva, that there are two quarters of an apology for them. Nevertheless, as it appears to us, they greatly sin against both fact and reliable philosophy, and there is therefore no alternative—we must speak out. But we cannot afford to spare a larger slice of time to-day.

Yet we may spend a moment in turning right-side-up a sentiment very roughly handled by Dr. Hallock. He says, 'Were man intrinsically bad, he never could be made good : iron never becomes gold ; good alone can be changed into better and best.' There are two fallacies in these few words, each of them as tall as the highest peak of Spiritualist philosophy. The first fallacy is wrapped in the saying relative to man being 'intrinsically bad.' Every one who is acquainted with man freely affirms that his faculties generally, or his powers, ordered and arranged by the Great Architect, are not bad but good in the proper import of the term ; but man, possessing these powers, and responsible for them, looked at by an Eye that beholds all things in their bearings, is accounted evil or disloyal because he misuses or abuses these noble powers. But to talk about man being intrinsically bad is very like an intrinsic absurdity.

The other half of the sentiment, embracing the second fallacy, is still more out of parallel. Who talks of changing man so that the change would resemble a transformation of iron into gold ? What demented son of the church seeks to take a specimen of humanity composed of body, soul, and spirit, and change him into a seraph who feels not, thinks not, acts not as a child of flesh and blood ? No, no ; we ask not gold where iron only can be found, nor do we even ask the best iron where the best is not obtainable ; but we do labor to make the best iron that can be made out of the material on hand, and to consecrate it to plows, pruning-knives, and pen-blades rather than to cannon, pistols, and daggers. To 'render to God what belongs to God' instead of devoting the God-given powers to a kind of service opposed to God, or, which is the same thing, averse to Good, is precisely the length and breadth of the change sought.

Let therefore our friend roll up and lock up out of sight his religion of changing iron into gold. No one asks Dr. Hallock to be changed into Gabriel ; but we are quite certain that were he to employ his faculties in pleading and living Christ's spirituality rather than at-



tempting to hammer something valuable out of the soft ore of rationalistic grace, he would enter upon an enterprise which would yield to him a revenue of satisfying joy very much beyond his present arithmetic to estimate. For doubtless we shall yet find, if adequately patient, that every ennobling, benevolent, attractive, disinterested, and hallowed trait calculated to make man a jewel of goodness among his fellows as well as render him individually contented and glad, can be furnished from the Temple which rests upon twelve Living Pillars and one Chief Corner.

D. O.

---

### CONCERNING C. W. ALLISON.

There is a gentleman, or rather citizen, in Allisonville who comes the nearest being a model coward of any one within our knowledge. Like all who are easily made afraid, he is exceedingly boisterous, noisy, and threatening when no contact is in prospect; but he appears greatly alarmed at the idea of meeting an opponent.

It will be retained in memory by all regular readers, that, about two years ago, being invited to labor in Hillier, while at that point we were free not only to hear a sample of the preaching of Messrs. Allison and Madden, but also took occasion to review their efforts in a Letter which was printed and circulated. Not only did Mr. Madden affirm that the Letter was a 'tissue of falsehoods and misrepresentations,' but his brother Allison, the more intelligent and arrogant of the two, took special pains both in public and in the social sphere to utter strong invectives against it. He variously intimated that he was ready to meet us publicly to maintain himself and expose our errors. In divers manners and at different times he exercised his eloquence to this effect; but we paid no active heed to it, believing that our friend, if attempted to be brought to the test, would be sure to 'run away' to live for 'fight another day.'

The close of 1856 and all the months of 1857 passed away, and then a letter was received from a friend who resides within sight of the gentleman of Allisonville, which revealed to us in plain words that Mr. Allison was ready to contend earnestly against us and in favor of the faith of himself and the fathers. We responded to our friend's epistle, asking him to assure Mr. A. that we were prepared for an attack at short notice. But lo! back came another letter from this friend, tell-

ing us that Mr. Allison objected so and so, and so—and so—! We then wrote to neighbor Allison as follows:—

Brighton, 11th May, 1858.

MR. ALLISON: Minister:—Permit me to communicate with you as a Wesleyan preacher.

Ever since I wrote an epistle to the friends of the Lord's truth in Hillier, Nov., 1856, in which there was a brief review of your preaching and that of Mr. Madden, at Hillier, it appears there have been public and private murmurings against me on the part of yourself and others who co-operate with you in the cause you advocate. Recently a letter was sent to me by a friend which contained the following language:—"Mr. Allison has made a proposal that he wishes you to send him word whether you will meet him in public, and the subject you wish to discuss. Friend Allison's great plea is about you thinking it wrong of Mr. Madden preaching to sinners out of the Book of Mark. And now he says that you dare not meet him in public."

To the gentleman who thus wrote to me, I responded in a letter which embraced the subjoined paragraph:—"If friend Allison desires me to send him word whether I will meet him in public, as you intimate in a late note, I hereby inform him, through you, that I consent to a public interview having for its object the developement of heaven's truth. I agree to affirm the following question,—In the Inspired Scriptures do we first find the whole gospel of this dispensation in the Acts of Apostles?"

This proposition, it will be observed, was framed not only to indicate the error of our friend Madden, but likewise to elucidate and bring out the unmixed gospel of Jesus. It appears however that you are not inclined to say so to this proposition; and hence the gentleman who addressed me previously, now writes to the following effect:—"Friend Allison says there is a new birth without water, and he says there is baptism by water without immersion. He says if you will send him a challenge to that effect, he will meet you."

Let me observe, Mr. A., that should you desire to make good these statements during the forthcoming interview, the privilege ought to be granted; but since you and your friends have spoken so loudly, so positively, so persistently, and I may say so erroneously against my Letter of 1856, I am in all kindness resolved to meet you, if you have courage to be met, on some question legitimately growing out of the contents of the aforesaid Letter. I therefore submit another proposition as follows:—Is that which is preached for the conversion of sinners by Wesleyans very materially or essentially different from the gospel of Christ? I take the affirmative; will you take the negative? Or turn the proposition thus, if you prefer:—Is that which is preached by D. Oliphant to sinners for their salvation the gospel of Christ? I will say Yea; do you say Nay?

By making either of these propositions the cardinal centre of our public review, all that you have to affirm relative to the new birth and

the new baptism, together with every principal point in my said Letter, can be opened out, examined, re-examined, and weighed in the divine balances.

Allow me to state very distinctly that I have not one untoward feeling in my heart against my friends the Wesleyans. I respect and highly esteem many a Wesleyan known to me. The spirit of my Master would lead me to show them all much kindness. Still, I must, according to my knowledge of religious obligation, and in accordance with my opportunities, stand up faithfully for the unadulterated gospel as it is found in the Inspired Creed. I would simply add, that if both of us supremely desire the pure truth of heaven, we will certainly not be fearful of meeting one another and comparing our sentiments not only with each other but with the infallible standard.

Trusting to hear from you shortly,  
I am respectfully,  
Yours, D. OLIPHANT.

Being in Hillier sometime after the preceding was forwarded to the gentleman, we were induced, under all the features of the case, to write again to our friend as follows :

MR. ALLISON : SIR :—You having stated that you have never given a challenge for a public discussing interview and dare not do it in consequence of the great responsibility that it involves, and that you never so intend ; and having also stated that you believe I *dare not* challenge you, I hereby state that I am prepared to meet you and invite your acceptance of this proposal (which is my challenge) to meet me, at any convenient time and place—the time to be within the current year—for the purpose of discussing the differences between the two systems respectively advocated by us.

With respect,  
D. OLIPHANT.

Hillier, 14th July, 1858.

We have only to add, that our too fearful but boastful neighbor was pleased to state, before witnesses, that he would be on hand if we should send him a challenge. We did so, knowing full well that from what the gentleman had previously averred, the community would determine aright where the responsibility of the challenge rested, and where it should have come from. We conclude, on the whole, that friend Allison is perfectly satisfied in his own mind that he can explain, eulogize, and defend Wesleyan faith and practice fully better by himself than when confronted by any one who is familiar with the religion of Jesus as exhibited in the sacred writings. But in due time the Lord will examine and measure us all by his own gospel.

D. O.

### THE PREACHING REQUIRED.

The age demands, loudly and imperatively, from the public teachers of Christianity, a forcible and impressive style of speech. A preacher who cannot impress, may as well hold his tongue; for his instructions, however wise and excellent, will be as water spilled on the ground. No amount of truth will be of the slightest use, if addressed to sleeping ears. But, on the other hand, it is equally true, that if the preacher can *only* impress, not instruct, he may as well hold his tongue too; for he impresses to no purpose. Whatever the age may demand in the style of preaching, human nature, in every age, demands divine truth as the one thing which can renew and save it.

Rhetoric, fancy, dramatic power, oratorical splendor, wit, pathos, originality, pointed sarcasm, and all other forms or instruments of eloquence, will never compensate for a defective exhibition of divine truth. That truth is not to be snatched up, at a glance, from the mere surface of Scripture. It will not reveal its harmonious symmetry, and majestic proportions, to a shallow, impatient intellect, even though allied to a fervent and sincere heart. Inasmuch as it is spiritual and moral truth, it cannot be apprehended by mere intellect; but, inasmuch as it is truth, it cannot be apprehended without the intellect. "He that loveth not, knoweth not God:" but it is equally true that we can love God worthily only as we know him. And we know him only as we love him. And we know him only in proportion as we know all that he has revealed of himself—of his character, laws, designs and dealings—in his word.

Prose, poetry, history, proverbs, parables, discourses, letters, predictions afford the ever-varying media through which successive ages made their slow and unequal contributions to the sum of inspired teaching. Truths the most distinct are found inseparably interwoven, and kindred truths widely separated; a law involving a promise, a history vailing a prediction: the casket lying in one book, and the key, a thousand years later, in another. But, to infer from this that there is no systematic unity in Scripture, would be as unwise and unwarrantable as to conclude that there is no system in creation, because the creatures are not distributed, either geographically or numerically, according to genera and species; but as if by chance, or, at most, for convenience and beauty; the whale having its home among the fishes and the sea-

weeds, and the humming-bird being placed, in nature's cabinet, among butterflies and blossoms.

God is one. His manifestations of himself are infinite ; but he is in them all ; he cannot be unlike himself, nor can he do the least act, or produce the smallest work, but what is worthy of himself, and bears the impress of his infinite wisdom, and is by the very fact in necessary harmony (whether our dull eyes and ears can discern it or not) with all things else in the universe.

### STRICTURES ON "DR. WHATELY'S PHILOSOPHY OF A FUTURE STATE."

For the Christian Banner.

In perusing that highly interesting work, "Dr. Whately's Philosophy of a Future State," two points of more than passing interest present themselves to the careful reader:

1st, That which is commonly believed, namely, That the same body which is laid in the grave will at the last day be called to life again and be re-united to the soul.

2nd, The condition of those who have departed this life until that eventful morn.

The first, though commonly believed, is not well supported by scripture. It seems to rest for proof mainly on the evidence given by the sacred historian of Our Lord's resurrection, and involves a difficulty not easily disposed of. It is written of Him, in Luke 24 : 39 ; "Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have. And while they yet believed not for joy and wonder, He said to them, have ye here any meat, and he did eat before them, &c." From this and other passages in the new testament, it may be fairly inferred that it was the same body that was laid in the tomb by Joseph that was raised again from the dead. The tomb was found vacant ; the clothes laid by themselves ; and one who sat in shining raiment stated, "He is not here, but is risen." "Behold the place where they laid him." "Now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept." If it was not that body which was laid in the sepulchre, which was raised again, there is no doubt but that the evangelists inclined to that opinion, and if, as Paul argued, He was the first-fruits, there could be no good reason urged against the great harvest being like to it.

The second point referred to,—the condition of those who have departed this life,—Do they remain quiescent or unconcious till the general resurrection? We admit that this topic is most ingeniously handled by that great master of logic; yet not dogmatized. He thinks Paul argued as if he was convinced that immediately after this life ended, there was no consciousness of pain or pleasure experienced by those who rested from their labours until they were called up at the last day by the sound of the archangel's trump.

In his advocacy of this part of the subject, he may possibly have overlooked the statement, that on the mount of transfiguration, more than one of the worthies who had acted on this stage of existence at periods differing by the lapse of hundreds of years apart,—we mean Moses and Elias, the latter of whom was, no doubt, either the prophet of that name, or the great forerunner himself, John the Baptist, appeared and talked with Jesus; and talked with him too concerning a most important coming event, that of his decease which was to take place at Jerusalem. Here is the most direct and satisfactory evidence of existence apart from the body, and also of an intelligent existence. It will also be remembered that this transpired previous to the event recorded by Matthew 27: 52, 53, where it is written, that "the graves were opened and many bodies of saints which slept, arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city and appeared to many." Does not the appearance of Moses and Elias furnish data for conclusions at once pleasing and we think incontrovertible,—that those who die in the Lord immediately on leaving the body enter into His joy and felicity?

May it not be said with propriety: what holds good of Moses and Elias will most assuredly hold good of all those who like them, through faith and patience, seek for a better country, that is an heavenly one? That they were indeed present on that occasion we think cannot very well be explained away; and that they were, so to speak, raised up for that specific purpose would be too much to affirm. The case is one of absorbing interest. The contest in which the Saviour was engaged was one in which the cause of suffering humanity was deeply involved. The struggle was between light and darkness, truth and error, freedom and oppression, and the successful result in the triumph of Love, was of such mighty interest as to make it the desire of angels to look into. No wonder, then, that Moses and Elias were present with words of encouragement. No wonder that not only on the Glorious Mount, but in the

wilderness and in the Garden—in his humiliation also—did these ministering spirits hold communion with and strengthen him. Well might the apostle exclaim, “are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister to them that shall be heirs of salvation.”

S. E. LEGATE.

Durham, C. W.

---

### READING.

It is written by the finger of God (Rev. i, 3.), “Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things written therein.” Paul says, “wherby when you read, you may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit: That the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel.” Eph. iii. 4, 6. Again, the apostle not only said to his son Timothy, “that from a child he had known the Holy Scriptures which were able to make him wise unto salvation,” but he exhorted him earnestly “to give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine,” to “study to show himself approved unto God,” and to “continue in the things he had learned.”

But if there is any obligation in this age superior to all others, it is the requirement to read the sacred oracles. We can indeed entertain but little hope that the world can be improved morally, where the people regard enlightening influences like the wind blowing upon forests; and this must be the condition of all who close their eyes against the word of life, and look for religion to come direct from heaven, expect it to enter their souls, not through their minds, intellects, understanding and heart, but to gain admittance like water into the sponge—by absorption, or thrill through their physical systems like lightning through the oak, or the gases through the vegetables. The attention must be arrested from such low and animal conceptions of religious influence, before true spirituality can abound. We ask the brethren, why is it that many amongst us are inclined to speculate? Why do not all progress in spiritual light faster? Why do the disciples differ? and why is it that so many complain of coldness? The answers are easily given. The book of God has been closed or neglected, and Christians have

depended upon their own reason, *their* views, and religious *policy*. Whenever churches or individual Christians substitute their own policy, for the authority of the Scriptures, moral death is the inevitable result. The moment we turn from the light of God—the Bible—we are in midnight darkness. All men, great and small, learned and ignorant, fall under the same impenetrable cloud.

When the children of Israel returned from captivity, ignorant in many respects, of their own law, “Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation, both of men and women, and all that could hear with understanding. And he read therein from the morning until mid-day, and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law, and the people stood in their place. And the Levites read in the book of the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, (Translated the words, the meaning of which they had forgotten or never knew, T. F.) and caused them to understand the reading.” Nehemiah, chap. viii. We certainly need an earnest and continued effort to induce the brethren and others to read in order to understand and know the Truth.

We regard it as in keeping with our most important Christian labor to offer a few thoughts in regard to the study of religious papers and periodicals. Their uses are various, and yet they may be productive of much evil. They have proved for the last forty years, the most efficient agents to call the wandering from systems of speculation, to the contemplation of the spiritual oracles; secondly, they have proved valuable in exposing false theories which have taken the place of heavenly wisdom; thirdly, they have been means through which brethren become acquainted; fourthly, the reports of evangelists, found in our papers, have been of immense value in encouraging the brethren; and lastly, we are disposed to regard religious periodicals as very useful works on Bible criticism. We are much surprised though, to see how few read the religious journals. We doubt not there are a half a million of persons in the United States who have declared themselves in favor of the Bible alone as authority in religion, and we have no idea there are thirty thousand readers of religious periodicals amongst us. Not more, we presume, than one in twenty of the people called Christians, subscribe for a paper devoted to religion, and of that number, perhaps not one in five reads with the view of understanding what is under examination among the brethren. It is said our civil government was built,



and still rests "on the virtue and intelligence of the people," and be this true or false, we feel conscious that the success of the cause we plead, depends mainly upon the INTELLIGENCE of its professed friends. No people on earth can feel deeply, who do not personally examine the ground of their faith. If we feel free to exhort our brethren on any topic it would be on this subject. Mr. Wesley, we believe it was, who said eight hours for rest, eight hours for labor, and eight for study and devotion; and this is an admirable division of time. How many professed Christians read even one hour in twenty-four; and how many meditate an hour in the week?

When will the beloved disciples become aroused to greater diligence in reading and study? Would it not be well for writers and speakers everywhere, to give special attention to this department of our high and holy calling. Read, and study the Bible, brethren, and read every thing you can calculated to advance the cause of the Saviour.

—Gospel Advocate.

### EVANGELISTS AGAIN—LET ALL LISTEN.

[O. D. Williams has recently brought forth into this American world through one of our exchanges certain articles pertaining to a class of workers named evangelists. J. D. Benedict, a lively, whole-souled, hard-working, sarcastic, fervent friend of reform, reviews neighbor Williams after the following fashion. We offer no immediate comment. All our readers shall have the pleasure of hearing a sample of the reputed strong men among the brethren as they express themselves upon this topic.—D O.]

Prompted by a feeling of duty, as well as the solicitation of very many of my good brethren, both East and West, I am desirous of entering my protest, and that publicly, against this growing heresy and popish assumption of 'the evangelist's power,' that appears to be growing up in our midst, and unless checked and put down, may lead to serious consequences. I repudiate, with all my soul, the whole of this baseless fabric, sought to be foisted upon the reformation by a few restless spirits, who have not (as it appears to me) 'denied themselves,' but have brought the 'old man' with all his lust for power into our midst, and appear in some degree, at least, ambitious for a whip to lash us poor 'irresponsible volunteers' around the world. I have been waiting for No. 3 of O. D. Williams on '*the evangelist's office*,' but I have not met with it (if published), and for want of No. 3, I will proceed with

No. 2. Bro. Williams professes to walk in the 'footprints' of brethren Sheppard, Errett, Milligan and Anderson, and not having seen all that these brethren have written upon the subject in hand, I can not say whether he treads squarely in their tracks or not; but this I do know, that Bro. W.'s positions are untenable, and wholly faulty; and can not be maintained by any man, by the living oracles, either in substance or form. The first thing that presents itself is this question: Is there (in the common acceptance of the term) such a thing as 'the evangelist's office' at this our day and generation? If so, then he is an officer, and his acts and deeds are official; and any act or deed done by another man, pertaining to this office, is nugatory and void for lack of official sanction, virtue or dignity. I would ask, are we reduced to this alternative? But says our brother: "I have reference alone to *properly constituted evangelists, not irresponsible volunteers.*" Very well! What constitutes a properly constituted evangelist? And can there be an evangelist at all, if not properly constituted? And if properly constituted, is he not clothed with all the official power of the office, and a right, by virtue of the office, to do *all* things pertaining thereto that any evangelist may or can do? Or are there *degrees* in this evangelistic power?

Let us for a moment learn of our brother what power, or powers, this office confers on the properly constituted evangelist. 1st. He has power to organize congregations. 2d. And when he, or a congregation, gets out of order, it requires the same amount of power to put them in order that it did to set the machine going in the first instance. 3d. He has the power of oversight, to some extent, of the congregations. 4th. He has power to enforce the faithful execution of the laws of the kingdom of Christ. 5th. He has power to correct all false doctrine in the congregations, and correct the teaching of them. 6th. He has power to provide for the temporal wants of the bishops, and their families. 7th. He has power, by virtue of his official dignity and excellency, to make, constitute, dignify and empower other evangelists as great and powerful as himself, and clothe them with like official importance and dignity. For, "whatever is the duty of an evangelist to do, that he has the authority to do, and this by virtue of his office; the power that enjoins upon him the one clothes him with the [power to do the] other." The brother humanely and charitably thinks that these eight positions will be astounding paradoxes to many of the brethren. That they are eight astounding positions, and will be so esteemed by the brotherhood in general, I have no doubt; but that they are paradoxes, is yet to be proved, in order to elicit faith in any of us.

The brother, notwithstanding all that he had previously advanced on this subject of "properly constituting and making and evangelists," advertises us that in the 'third place' he will undertake to settle the question 'how' evangelists are properly constituted or made. It is to be recollected that he has already informed us *who* are to make them, viz.: evangelists, but now he proposes in this 'third place' to inform us

how the properly constituted evangelist goes to work to make a "properly constituted" fellow evangelist, not one of your "irresponsible volunteers," but genuine "like to himself, of stately mould." The answer to this important question, he informs us, is illustrated in the example of Timothy. He says, "Timothy was a youth of piety." This appears to be a description of the *material* out of which the evangelist was made, rather than the 'how' made. Then it follows that the material for a properly constituted evangelist among us must have been a youth of piety, and that of such a kind as runs somewhat in the blood, so that he may inherit it in some good degree, even from his grandmother! It must be a kind of family heirloom. And the brother further says, in informing us of the *how*, that this pious youth was commended to Paul by the brethren who were at Lystra and Iconium. Must, then, our properly constituted evangelists have been, in their youth, commended by two congregations to an Apostle? If not, what has this to do with informing us how one properly constituted evangelist may make another? But more still, for it is said by our brother that "Paul took him with himself in his travels, which afforded him a practical knowledge of the duties of the office, and at a proper time ordained him to the work, in connection, doubtless, with the presbytery of one of the congregations that first introduced the youth to the notice of the Apostle." At this point our Bro. Williams, who has been hitherto exceedingly clear and comprehensive, runs into an impenetrable fog of mysticism. "At a proper time." What, I ask, is the proper time to make of such a pious youth such a tremendous creature? What is the proper time to put these youths in full possession of such fearful power that they may sway the present and future destinies of the church of Christ? If he, Timothy, is an example of the *how made*, why not tell us who *ordained* him? And why this equivocal word "doubtless" introduced just here, to throw a cloud over this most important point of *ordination*? Had this one congregation any thing to do in conferring this fearful power? Or was it the Apostle Paul who conferred it? And if it is the business of evangelists to properly constitute evangelists, what has an Apostle or a congregation to do with it, and what is this history introduced here for, but to darken counsel by many words? Let not the brother and his friends dodge here at this important point, but walk straight up to it, and tell us plainly (not with a *doubtless*) *how much* of this tremendous power, by them claimed for an evangelist, was conferred upon Timothy by apostolic power, and *how much* by this one congregation, and how much by the power of the "properly constituted evangelist," and who that "properly constituted evangelist" was who presided on this *samplar* occasion?

Bro. Williams may claim that he has fully expressed himself upon this point, for he says that, "Paul placed him over the church at Ephesus, investing him with all the powers of the office." If this be so, then the powers of a properly constituted evangelist are apostolical, and not evangelical or congregational; and so the answer to his question, "Why is not a similar order now observed in making evangelists?" is simply

this : We have no Apostles. But in order to annihilate himself and his whole positions on this topic, the brother says : "But by no other plan can a young man be prepared for an evangelist." "It would not do to send him out [who sends him out?] on his own account to learn wisdom from his own blunders ; neither can the congregation train him and retain him in her own bosom. \* \* \* Schools, too, are wholly inadequate to that work." Alas ! alas ! for the poor Timothy, whose piety has not run through the blood of a pious grandmother. How grievously, too, have our brethren erred upon this matter ! What a rebuke to those who have litterly encompassed sea and land in order to raise funds to build schools and found colleges to make and empower that very thing that the brother says now "they are wholly inadequate to do." And worse still—for this blows to the moon the great and philanthropic scheme of Bro. Errett, and other good and great brethren in northern Ohio, who are at this moment most zealously engaged upon the gearing of a theologic mill to grind and duly bolt *properly constituted* evangelists to supply the place of the *improper* and *irresponsible volunteers*, who are not adequate to the performance of the duties under the present greatly improved and improving ecclesiastical policy. How wonderfully the religion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ has changed since the day of the Haydens, Bosworth, Bentley, Moss, Scott, Henry, Bartlett, Lowell, etc., etc. "Let all who would have a scriptural and normal state of affairs, be sure never to encourage, in any manner whatever, self constituted and [these old faithful and well tried] *irresponsible volunteers*."

As the brother has utterly failed to inform us as to the *how* one evangelist makes and empowers another, we must hear him further on the subject of *evangelical power*. And on this interesting topic, he speaks in this wise : "The authority of the evangelist never can transcend that of the tribunal that invests him." That is to say, Paul could not make a greater thing than himself out of Timothy ; and as the brother says that evangelists have power to make evangelists, we are properly advertised—that our fears may not get the better of our judgment—that he can not by any possibility make a more powerful creature than himself ! This is humane in the brother, and the advisement is in good time, for if they are not "popes" nor "presiding elders" now, we need not fear that they ever will be. But the brother proceeds to give us an illustration, and says : "For instance, if he is sent out by a single congregation, he can have nothing to do with others that are fully organized." I would ask, why not ? Is he not an officer, and are not his acts official ? Is he not to put down heresy, sit in judgment on elders, withstand a brother to the face, because forsooth he is one of the *irresponsible volunteers* ? and if his youthful piety moveth him to think that the laboring brother is wrong in any wise, is his zeal not to put a stop to it, and at once put the man of gray hairs down ? I would like to be informed, just here, whether our brother used the term 'sent out' as the equivalent of 'properly consti-

tuted?' but whether or not, it must be plain to all understandings not warped by prejudice that the 'sender' is greater than the 'sent;' and if he uses these terms as synonymous, then in his own words, "the authority can not transcend that of the tribunal that invests him." And this, I think, is his idea of the matter: that if an evangelist is properly constituted by one congregation only, he is but a one-horse power evangelist; and if he is properly constituted by two congregations, he is a two horse-power evangelist; and so in proportion; and the way to adjust precedent and prerogative among these young aspirants is, to record on their several diplomas their respective horse-power, and all will then go on like clock-work!

I am, with the views of brother Williams before me, led to exclaim in his own words, truly, "circumstances have greatly changed since we commenced our career as a distinct religious people;" and if he is right, our ecclesiastical policy will need to be modified, most assuredly.

J. D. BENEDICT.

### THE LATEST AND STRONGEST ARGUMENT.

The best because the latest argument in favor of the newly appointed means to MAKE and KEEP a class of stated workmen no where spoken of in the Lord's instructions to men, is embraced in the following language, taken from the Review:

"If any one thinks we can not answer any issue Brother Oliphant is making with any thing we are doing, he has a right to think so. That the Missionary Society is a legitimate means through which for us to send preachers to foreign countries, we entertain no more doubt than we have that Brother Oliphant has a right to publish the Banner or the Review. This matter is settled among us in this country; and, from several letters we have received from Canada, we think it settled there. But we leave our readers to judge."

'Settled'—listen again—yes—'settled.' That is the word, 'settled.' The question is settled 'AMONG US.' By whom? When? Where? By what authority? For how many? Any penalty, physical or ecclesiastical, against dissenters? Settled, is it, in Cincinnati? Settled by gentlemen living one dozen and a half centuries after inspiration ceased? And who have settled the matter in Canada? We, too, have received a few letters!! What a Summer's growth they have had at Cincinnati! Last April the organ of the mission works declared that the subject between us was important and should be investigated—full soon the same organ became too considerably occupied to investigate, notwithstanding the importance of the subject—and now the identical organ announces that the question is settled. A first-class Irishman once bent the barrel of his gun to shoot round a corner; but what shall be said of the fugling, aiming, firing, and missing that appear to be satisfactory at the missionary castle?

Not much wit is needed to take the Cincinnati premises and show that this question never can be settled. The Bible is avowedly laid

aside as not containing data to decide the matter, and convenience prettily perched upon prudence is made umpire. And when or where was the law of convenience ever settled?

Some real good men hold that this mission question is of no vital import. These friends not only differ with the popular missionary doctors and bye-law makers, but they differ with themselves—for they get either angry or a trifle sulky if others disagree with them, which they could not do if the matter was of no consequence in their sight. As for us, when we find a reckoner who says two and two are four and a half, and takes the ground that the Book of Arithmetic is not to decide, we must conclude that he is not simply an untrusty accountant in this particular, but that he is liable to make and *will* make other important errors.

D. O.

### BAPTIST AGAINST BAPTIST.

We met with the subjoined in the 'Intelligencer,' of Charlottesville, Virginia. It is worth reading a first and second time. Before our brethren the REGULAR Baptists preach a score of additional sermons upon the differences among those who eschew unauthorized creeds and plead reform, they may suitably prepare for the work of opposition by coming to oneness among themselves. Two Baptist D. D.'s, men of renown and doctrinal weight, take opposite sides upon a question of vital and practical import in the economy of redemption. Listen:

Dr. Duncan R. Campbell, President of Georgetown College, and one of the honored Rabbis of the Baptist ranks, says in commenting on Mark 1: 4, Luke 3: 3, and Acts 2: 38—"Now we maintain that the proper construction is, to connect *eis aphasis hamartion*, for the remission of sins, with *metanoias, repentance*, and not with *baptisma, baptism*, in the two former of these; and with *maenoestale, repent ye*, and not with *baptistheetoo, be baptized*, in the latter."

Dr. Hackett, a star of the first magnitude in the Baptist heavens, says of the words "*eis aphasis hamartion*," in Acts 2: 38—"This clause states the motive or object which should induce them to *repent and be baptized*. It enforces the entire exhortation—not one part of it to the exclusion of the other."

To whom can our Baptist relatives appeal to settle such disagreements among their Doctors?

D. O.

### "REV. J. B. FERGUSON."

"The many friends of this able advocate of the Spiritual philosophy will be glad to learn that he is completely restored to health and is able

to resume his pastoral duties. We learn that he will permanently reside in Nashville, Tennessee, where arrangements will shortly be made to secure a house at which he will hold worship regularly."

These words we take from the 'unfoldings' of a journal that recently greeted us. Some time since, it was our lot to travel with a gentleman who resided at Nashville; and he gave a glowing description of the oratory and social acceptability of friend Ferguson. We take for granted that many of our readers will be interested in knowing something in respect to this gentleman, formerly editor of the 'Christian Magazine.'

D. O.

#### ANOTHER GENTLEMAN IN NASHVILLE.

The following appears in the Toronto 'Christian Guardian.'

The notorious Rev. J. R. Graves, author of the villainous book against Methodism, called the "Great Iron Wheel," is undergoing a trial at Nashville, under charges for libelous, slanderous, and schismatical acts. The Richmond Christian Advocate says: "If they cannot find cause for moral execution in the faults and misdemeanors committed against the peace and dignity of his own Church; we are persuaded, if they will go outside, and try him for his falsehoods against Methodism, they will find proof enough to hang him as high as Haman." Only we do not wish him punished for his offences, at all, and certainly not 'without benefit of clergy.' Those who smiled it may be, at his caricatures of Methodism, are not stoical enough to be quiet under his assaults upon themselves. We hope for the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Christianity, they will teach him, at least, to speak the truth, to walk honestly towards all men, and hereafter, to set an example of Christian excellence before his brethren."

#### EXCLUSIVENESS.

For the Christian Banner.

By this term is meant a disposition in any one school or ism of the church at the present day to arrogate to itself the right or the authority to denounce or proscribe or by combined effort to crush and subvert everything else not in accordance with its mandates.

Each separate member of society, should have a right, not only to cherish his own opinions, but also, to propagate them by whatever means he chooses, provided, there be nothing which infringes upon the rights of others. That person or that association of persons, who would

deny to any other person or association of persons, all that is claimed for himself or itself, is justly chargeable with exclusiveness, with bigotry, tyranny, &c. This is as true in religion, as in medicine or politics. A sect in religion (or party in politics) which will use its power to crush all opposed to itself in principle, is no more chargeable with bigotry or tyranny, than is a party embracing any one system of medicine, which uses its combined strength to crush every other system and every other medical association.

Sectarianism, as I conceive, has its home in the *heart*, not in the *head*. Among its developments, are a hard and bitter spirit towards others who are not rallied under our own standard, but who are humbly striving to serve the Lord—envy and jealousy, lest other religious bodies should be equally as prosperous as ourselves.

I am not strenuous for any name; I wish that the *cosmos literati*, would dispense with the different isms and be known as the disciples were at Antioch—Christians.

There is an evil, arising imperceptibly perhaps, out of the use of such numberless names, by the different branches of the professing church. It suggests to the mind of the skeptic and infidel the idea of intricacies and absurdities in the theory of religion, and in the doctrines of divine revelation, as also that of animosities among the disciples of Jesus. And probably it makes the members of these different branches of Christ's family feel their exclusiveness, and that they must care solely for their own particular party.

Diversity of doctrine has occasioned diversity of religious bodies; doubtless each in turn condemns the intolerant pharisaic spirit of the other; and thus you have the whole body of christians at war with themselves on the ground of real or fancied exclusiveness.

First, there is the Churchman, wasting his energies exclusively in vindication of the succession, &c. Second, there is the Baptist exclusively poring over the dusty tomes of the fathers, learnedly discanting upon the philology of Bapto, and its cognates, and barring from church communion all who do not side with him in his partiality, for a particular mode of baptism. Thirdly, the Pedobaptists, who fain would secularize the world by uniting Church and State, and advocating sprinkling of infants, so as to receive them in the church militant that they may become heirs of the Church triumphant. Instead of pinning our faith on any predetermined theory and following in the wake of a pro-



fessional luminary, we acknowledge no man Master, and receive no special dogmas as the rule of our practice, but

“Sieve upon truth wherever found,  
On christian or on heathen ground.”

Let us, one and all, lay aside all personalities, put shoulder to the wheel ; assist in propelling the great car of salvation (the gospel) that when we bid farewell to the realities of life, the world may be benefited from our having an existence in the same.

CARMEN M. GOULD, M. D.

Castleton, Dec. 4th, 1858.

P. S.—I saw some paragraphs in the Aug. No. of the Banner under the caption of the “The Throne of grace Besieged.” I would like to have you explain yourself in your increduloussness that “the word of God was not preached” “or that heaven’s promises were not pleaded.” I also noticed in your late epistle to the ambassadors in Athol and elsewhere, that you do not believe in the special means that are now in use by the different evangelical churches at the present day—an altar for prayer—and sinners invited to that altar—to encourage them to offer themselves “living sacrifices, holy, acceptable unto God.” Surely you can not see any impropriety in this mode of procedure in revival meetings, more especially, as we see that it requires all the pathos, sympathy, and exhortation that the churches can muster in these days of jargon and lethargy.

Yours in haste,

C. M. G.

\* \* \* It is not doubted by us that a full stock of ‘pathos, sympathy, and exhortation’ should be inwrought in the labors of every gospel proclaimer. For this we plead. Divine affection is electrical and fervent. ‘The love of Christ,’ of which we have specimens in the standard oracles, is a warm and spirit-stirring entity—full of the energized essence of life. It is not the zeal, but the use that it is put to, in these ‘revival’ operations, that we most determinedly oppose. Warm food we want ; but unwholesome food, however warm, we persistently reject.—The gospel workmen whose ministrations are chronicled in the Pure Volume, were models of living zeal ; but, so far as known to us, they never attempted to pray sinners into saints. The gospel that promises to the sinner forgiveness by prayer and the gospel that promises salvation by faith, are, we devoutly conclude, two distinct gospels :—the

proclamation from our Governor, Sir E. Head, which offers pardon by petition, and the proclamation from him which offers pardon by belief of what he proclaims, are two separate proclamations. We only know one genuine because divine gospel—one proclamation in order to salvation; and we conceive it not only unsafe, but a grand insult to heaven for pious men either to pray the Lord to become gracious when he is already so, or to ask forgiveness for sinners in a manner different from what he has designated in his own oracles.

Do we not love our fellow-citizens in thus speaking? We love all men, especially all sincere men, and still more all devout men; and the greater our love to them, the larger and purer will be our labors to persuade them to exchange the sanctions which are of the earth and therefore earthly for the pure and delightful sanctions which are from heaven and hence heavenly.

The oracles of truth fail to tell us of the Throne of God ever having been besieged: at least by good men. It is, indeed, a most rebellious conception. When men besiege a city, it is to overthrow and conquer it. But this was not meant, you will say—God's Throne was not warded against. What then was meant? That fervent friends encompassed the Mercy-Seat and implored God to convert sinners *in a way he had not appointed or promised*? And can we call this less than religious rebellion—granting that it is pious rebellion?

The first and inspired workmen, it will be admitted, converted men from sin to salvation. They employed revival praying operations to effect the change, or they did not employ such means. This is a simple question of fact. It is provable one way or the other. The living oracles must decide. It is heaven's prerogative to teach—ours to hear. The questions, What constitutes a christian or Christ's man?—how is he made?—are questions which seem to us not only settleable, but very easy to settle; and the moment these two simple questions are set at rest in the public mind, an everlasting veto will be put upon exclusiveness. But there must of necessity be exclusiveness—which is a sprout of selfishness—while there are parties and partyists.

To us, Dr. Gould, it appears more than simply awful for a man or a number of men to assume the responsibility, without God's authority, to promise a sinner pardon. For example, your neighbor who is ORDAINED TO PREACH tells a sinner to kneel down and pray, and he kneels also and prays for him,—and these prayers are for the forgiveness of

the unconverted man's sins. The preacher, like all his brethren, promises forgiveness thus. Who authorized such a promise? Did heaven? Or did men? And will any bible student demur at our plainly intimating that heaven's promises are not pleaded when it is provable that only men's promises are pleaded? For our part, we would not take ten worlds and promise *in the name of the Lord* what the Lord has not promised.

And can we not all see, doctor, that so long as different men take upon themselves to make promises of salvation for which there is no sanction in the Sacred Writings, we must always remain in disunion? Parties live and thrive upon human aliment; and the various classes of man-made promises are so many foundations on which rest the different temples consecrated to the worship of sect-men. Cut off all these humanly authorized promises—lead every man to the pure and safe precepts, promises, and pleasures of the inspired volume—and what follows? Union! What a blessed word! When the christian religion was uncorrupted, the friends of Jesus participated in the blessings of brotherly union and brotherly love. We need the same union, the same love, the same joy. To this end we labor. We criticise not for the sake of criticism. But, in faithful though stern affection, we must plead God's word for purity. We must plead it for unity. We must plead it for the Spirit's sacred joy.

Doctor Gould, let us ask you a question. Were christians made eighteen hundred years ago as we described in the second letter in the October Banner? If so, our work in these days is to make converts after the like manner, and then we shall have a harvest of purity and unity.

D. O.

#### SPURGEON'S GOSPEL.

"If any man here, should be in doubt on account of ignorance, let me as plainly as I can state the Gospel. I believe it to be wrapped up in one word—*substitution*. I have always considered, with Luther and Calvin, that the sum and substance of the gospel lies in that word, Substitution—Christ *standing in the stead of man*. If I understand the gospel, it is this; I deserve to be lost and ruined: the only reason why I should not be damned is this, that Christ was punished in my stead, and *there is no law to execute sentence twice for sin*. Christ took the cup in both his hands, and

"At one tremendous draught of love,  
He drank damnation dry."

—Ought not Spurgeon to go to school? A single day at the Academy.

of the Apostles would cure him of such philosophy as the preceding. He may be an effective orator, but he is a very incompetent preacher if this be the pith of his message to the people. D. O.

---

### RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

---

Pompey, N. Y.

Having been absent preaching the blessed gospel of Jesus to an audience of anxious listeners, we will give a detailed account of the same for publication.

One year ago there were but four disciples of Jesus in Marilla, Erie co., N. Y. These few were persecuted. Elder Brown was sent to labor among them. His labors were remarkably successful. He was shut out of every proper place of worship, and finally proclaimed the glad tidings of a world's salvation in a large Ball Room, generously opened by its liberal proprietor. Many confessed Christ during last Summer—the brethren rallied, and with the assistance of favorable outsiders erected a large and commodious House of worship. We were invited to “dedicate” the same, and continue a meeting. We continued with the brethren twelve days, and there were 32 additions, 27 by immersion and 5 from other churches.

Leaving there, we were invited to go to Aurora, where we have no church, and preached under the most favorable circumstances for one week in the Universalist's House. We had an audience of from three to four hundred, mostly unbelievers, and the most intelligent citizens in the town, most of them for the first time hearing the gospel of Jesus, as they themselves acknowledged, and many admired the harmony of God's word and are studying the same with a better key to its interpretation. We expect much fruit from this effort in the future.

W. T. HORNER.

---

—Very happifying are such reports. And it also gratifies the soul to learn that brethren Kilgour and Lister in their late labors at Jordan, Smithville, and Lake Shore have taken the confession of about 70—some of these having already been reported.

---

The last days of November and first days of December we were occupied in making known Jesus to the people at the Town Line between

Hillier and Sophiasburgh. Seven lectures were spoken during seven evenings to the citizens of that locality. A house-full gave heed to the word from night to night, and we cannot be mistaken in testifying that numbers were made to answer the question, "What think you of Christ?" in a different manner than before. D. O.

Brother S. Boyer, of Lot 48, Prince Edward Island, under date of Nov. 23d, thus writes:—"I am glad to have to say that we have had a season of refreshing in the turning from their sins of a goodly number of precious souls in this place, being baptized into the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of their sins by brother John Knox."

---

### UNION! UNION!

A meeting designed for union purposes is appointed to be held in the village of Consecon, County of Prince Edward, Canada West, upon the first Lord's day in February, 1859. The meeting will be in the Academy Building in the Village named. This meeting legitimately grows out of labors performed last July at the Consecon Lake, Melleville. Two or three intelligent friends, forming part of a congregation of some 25 or 30, formerly called Adventists, but now calling themselves the Church of Christ, heard us from six to eight evenings at Melleville; and not long after it was proposed by one of these zealous friends to have a meeting to see where we all stand. We know not what may grow out of it; but we are bound to be hopeful. Cannot some of the brethren at Athol and Hillier arrange to attend? D. O.

---

### BETHANY COLLEGE.

Before us we have the Catalogue of the officers and students of Bethany College, 17th Session, ending July 4th, current year. A. Campbell is still President; W. K. Pendleton, R. Richardson, R. Milligan, J. D. Pickett, C. L. Loos, and P. W. Mosblech occupy their various places as Professors and Teachers. The whole number of Graduates between the Session for 1844 and the close of the past Session have been 238. The number of students in attendance within the last College year, 127—a very creditable number in view of the circumstances.

The main College Building, destroyed last December, is re-erected, and we learn by letter from Bethany that the sum of \$30,000 has been paid or pledged toward defraying expences and making further improvements. To make up losses and put up all the buildings which are requisite, the testimony comes to us that over three times this sum will be necessary. Messrs. Campbell and Pendleton, at last accounts, were actively employed in visiting churches and individuals at sundry points to obtain contributions. Who will assist? D. O.

COMMENDATORY.—One of our valued exchanges, in serving up to its readers our No. 10 upon mission matters, makes use of the following words:—

“ We earnestly recommend to the consideration of the brethren the following apposite article from the pen of our excellent Brother D. Oliphant, of the ‘Christian Banner,’ published at Brighton, Canada West. He talks like a man who had confidence in God’s way of doing His work, in preference to all human schemes. We rejoice to know that we have so earnest and hearty a co-laborer for the authority of the oracles, while so many are either non-committal, or are ready to accept any scheme of wordly expediency instead of standing up firmly and unflinchingly for Heaven’s order. Read the article, brethren and sisters. He talks like a man who loves the Truth.”

BAPTISTS IN NOVA SCOTIA.—In the three Associations—Western, Eastern and Central—the Baptists in Nova Scotia number eleven thousand, eight hundred and forty-one.

☞ In justice to the excellent Knox, of Prince Edward Island, it is proper to say that the sentence in his pamphlet which we recently quoted, contained, in the copy sent us, a two-fold misprint. It was written, it appears, correctly.

☞ We have some documents in the form of very sensible and useful communications on hand, which must hereafter be permitted to speak abroad.

## CIRCULAR.

Banner Office, Brighton, C. W., Dec., 1858.

**FRIEND OF TRUTH:**—A word with you on the King's business, if you please. Your earnest attention is invited to the proposal to publish a periodical of 48 pages, commencing with the close of the ensuing January, to be issued six times during the year 1859. Why not monthly? Because financial affairs generally are at present out of joint, and because a favorable speaking field requires increasing attention. Perchance, with your help, a monthly may be re-commenced hereafter. What is the publication, to be henceforth called **BANNER OF THE FAITH**, designed to urge or achieve? It is intended to be a medium of setting forth Jesus as the living salvation,—to save the sinner, to save the saint; and to rebuke, as the movements of society may seem to demand, every custom, old or new, which operates as a barrier to the free enjoyment of the rich Prince of Life.

After laboring twelve years through a monthly paper, the conclusion is arrived at that it is neither gospel nor commercial policy to send the paper five, seven, or ten years to friends without receiving either thanks or funds. A change of administration, as statesmen affirm, will therefore be instituted. No one will receive the 'Banner' more than two years without hearing from him—either by way of funds, or by learning that he is entitled to it because unable to send payment. Every helper who sends us the names of ten payers, will be entitled to send the names of three who can read but cannot pay; and with all others we will deal upon the principle that 'the liberal soul deviseth liberal things.' Some able and active friends have already pledged two dollars each for 1859, and hence the poor may enjoy the 'riches of their liberality.'

It is particularly desired for the ensuing year that active helpers in every locality, sometimes called agents, but which we would rather call publication messengers, will give us their hearty and their prompt assistance. During 1859 we shall depend upon these free and friendly co-workers more than ever before. Every friend who receives this Circular with his name on the cover, is both authorized and invited to be a helper.

A new Book for Subscribers' Names will be used after the December 'Banner' is mailed; and any friend who has received the monthly for two, four, or eight years, but has esteemed it too highly ever to think of paying for it, need not be surprised if we should in turn esteem him so highly as to discontinue sending to him.

The Banner has choice workmen to give variety and value to its pages. Naming them in the order when their assistance began, we have J. Butchart, T. Munnell, and W. T. Horner. They are sterling men. They are worthy workers. They are stars of an honorable magnitude.

All which is spoken in behalf of our Lord Jesus Christ's cause, not 'our' cause, unless our cause is the Lord's also.

D. OLIPHANT.

\* \* The **BANNER OF THE FAITH** is only one dollar per year to each subscriber able to pay, and will be furnished for exactly nothing to the poor as far as those who are able will aid us in supplying the demand.