

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

- Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/  
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/  
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

- Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

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

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

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. VII.

COBBOUR, MAY, 1853.

NO. 5.

A NARRATIVE  
OF THE ORIGIN OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.  
No. VI.

The following hints will be found in Neal's History, vol. 3. page 392—5.

"But the fiercest contention between the assembly and parliament arose upon the power of the keys, which the former had voted to be in the eldership or presbytery, in these words: "The keys of the kingdom of heaven were committed to the officers of the church, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut the kingdom of heaven against the impenitent both by the word and censures, and to open it to the penitent by absolution; and to prevent the profanation of the holy sacrament by notorious and obstinate offenders, the said officers are to proceed by admonition, suspension from the sacrament of the Lord's supper for a season, and by excommunication from the church, according to the nature of the crime and demerit of the person;" all which power they claimed, not by the laws of the land, but *jure divino*, or by divine appointment.

The Independents claimed the like power for the brotherhood of every particular congregation, but without any civil sanctions or penalties annexed; the Erastians were for laying the communion open, and referring all crimes to the civil magistrate.

Though the parliament did not deem it prudent wholly to reject the ordinance for excommunication, because it had been the popular complaint in the late times, that pastors of churches had not power to keep unworthy communicants from the Lord's table; yet the speeches of learned gentlemen made such an impression, that they resolved to render it ineffectual to all the purposes of church tyranny; accordingly they sent to the assembly to specify, in writing, what degree of knowledge in the christian religion were necessary to qualify a person for the communion? and what sort of scandal deserved suspension or excommunication? Which, after much controversy, they presented to the house, who inserted them in the body of their ordinance for suspension from the Lord's supper, dated October 20, 1645, together with certain provisos of their own, which stripped the presbyteries of that power of the keys which they were reaching at:—

"Provided always, that if any person find himself aggrieved with

the proceedings of the presbytery to which he belongs, he may appeal to the ecclesiastical eldership; from them to the provincial assembly; from them to the national; and from them to the parliament."

"It is further provided, that the cognizance and examination of all capital offences shall be reserved entire to the magistrate appointed by the laws of the kingdom, who, upon his committing the party to prison, shall make a certificate to the eldership of the congregation to which they belonged, who may thereupon suspend them from the sacrament."

By these provisos it is evident the parliament were determined not to part with the spiritual sword, or subject their civil properties to the power of the church, which gave great offence to the Scots' commissioners, and to most of the English Presbyterians, who declaimed against the ordinance, as built upon Erastian principles, and depriving the church of that which it claimed by a divine institution. The parliament observing their ambition of making the church independent of the state, girt the laws closer about them, and subjected their determinations more immediately to the civil magistrate, by an ordinance dated March 14th, 1645—6.

This ordinance of suspension from the sacrament was extorted from the two houses before the time, by the importunate solicitations of the city clergy; for as yet there were no classes or Presbyteries in any part of England, which ought to have been erected before they had determined their powers. The house had voted that there should be a choice of lay elders throughout England and Wales, and had laid down some rules for this purpose, August 19, 1645; but it was the 14th of March following before it passed into a law.

It was then ordained, "1. That there be forthwith a choice of [ruling] elders throughout the kingdom of England, and dominion of Wales.

"2. That public notice be given of such election in every parish, by the minister of the parish, a fortnight before; and that on the Lord's day on which the choice is to be made, a sermon be preached suitable to the occasion.

"3. Elections shall be made by the congregation, or the major part of them then assembled, being heads of families, and such as have taken the covenant."

The parliament apprehended they had now established the plan of the Presbyterian discipline, though it proved not to the satisfaction of any one party of christians; so hard is it to make a good settlement when men dig up all at once old foundations. The Presbyterian hierarchy was as narrow as the prelatical; and as it did not allow a liberty of conscience, claiming a civil as well as ecclesiastical authority over men's persons and properties, it was equally, if not more insufferable. Bishop Kennet observes that the settling presbytery was supported by the fear and love of the Scots army, and that when they were gone home it was better managed by the English army, who were for independency and a principle of toleration; but as things stood nobody was pleased; Episcopalians and Independents were excluded; and because the parliament would not give the several

presbyteries an absolute power over their communicants, but reserved the last appeal to themselves, neither the Scots nor English Presbyterians would accept it.

The English Presbyterians, having resolved to stand and fall with the Scots, refused peremptorily to comply with the ordinance, relying upon the assistance and support of that nation.

It was a sanguine and daring attempt of these divines, who were called together only for their advice, to examine and censure the ordinances of parliament, and dispute in this manner with their superiors; the commons, alarmed at this petition, appointed a committee to take into consideration the matter and manner of it; who, after some time, reported it as their opinion, that the assembly of divines, in their petition, had broken the privileges of parliament, and were guilty of a *præsumptio*; and whereas they insisted so peremptorily on the *jus divinum* of the Presbyterian government, the committee had drawn up certain queries, which they desired the assembly might resolve for their satisfaction. The house agreed to the report of the committee, and on the 30th of April, sent Sir John Evelin, Mr. Nathaniel Fiennes, and Mr. Browne, to the assembly, to acquaint them with their resolutions. These gentlemen set before them their rash and imprudent conduct, and in several speeches, showed wherein they had exceeded their province, which was to advise the house in such points as they should lay before them, but not to dictate to those to whom they owed their being an assembly.

## THE BAPTISTS IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

### THEIR DOCTRINES AND POLICY.

A dozen years since, I dedicated a few letters to a Baptist minister of this Province. His brethren considered him an educated, devout, distinguished man. Under the same impression, I sought the eyes and ears of his friends and admirers through his name and influence. His especial friends considered my letters impertinent; although to this day, I have neither found nor heard of the individual, that could specify a thought or sentence worthy of that designation! The only talent disclosed, in the ostensible notices of these letters, was that of keeping my letters, and our sentiments, from the attention of the Baptists. But there were some intelligent minds that *did* consider both sides; and the influence of the truth was felt: I did not know, until seven years after, how great the influence exerted by means so simple. Had I been aware of the fact, these feeble efforts would have been followed up hopefully and with zeal. In some instances, "The Christian" containing those letters, was borrowed by the dignitaries of the Baptist church from steamboat captains; and on another occasion one hundred copies were destroyed between here and Fredricton, and a letter appended to the package afterwards picked up, in the gutters of our now renowned Episcopal city! Others

in their zeal—pious Baptist sisters, committed the little pamphlet to the flames, because their husbands were becoming interested in the truths presented by them !

After these things had become known to me—seven years after our first effort—I *presumed* to address the “Baptist ministers of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.” I did more. I reminded them of the influence possessed and wielded by them, and expressed doubt whether it was always used in the cause of truth, and unadulterated christianity. This presumption on my part brought on my name—if not my head—a storm of ungracious epithets, and not a little displeasure.—The individual who was made the instrument of this opposition was an entire stranger to the past controversy, if not to the “disciples” generally. He wrote under the influence of unscrupulous advisers.—His sudden and melancholy departure to the world of spirits was as deeply deplored by me as by any of those who advised him to write against me. It is to me a source of no little satisfaction that I received, from under his own hand—some time before his death—a letter in which he referred to his former production as an “unhappy controversy,” and a voluntary offer of the use of his columns on the same terms of the most highly esteemed of the Baptist ministers. *O, si sic omnia. Requiescent in pace.*

For some time after the publication of these letters a marked cautiousness; I think, was manifest on the part of Baptist ministers generally when alluding to the doctrine inculcated by us as the ancient gospel. But we have had abundant proof of the existence of the same under current of misrepresentation and detraction. Few among the Baptists believe this. They say, “just as though our ministers would turn aside from their great work to notice you !” Would, for the cause of truth and righteousness, we were in their eyes such objects of indifference and contempt.

The following correspondence will explain itself as it proceeds.—It needs no formal introduction ; but after we place it before our readers, a few chapters on its doctrines, spirit, and policy may lead to a more distinct appreciation of the great facts, commands and promises of the gospel.

*St. John, N. B., Jan. 10th, 1853.*

BROTHER ROBINSON : MY DEAR SIR :—You will very much gratify me, and I think greatly subserve the cause of truth by giving me a plain statement of facts in reference to the following allegations.

1. Persons friendly to both of us are reported to have asked you “What is the difference between your views and Mr. Eaton’s ?” To which, it is said, you have responded to this effect : “We (the Bap-

tists,) teach that persons should repent and believe before they are baptized ; but, Mr. E., that they should at once be baptized and *repent afterwards*.

2. In a social circle, you were understood to say, the reason so many fell off from Mr. Eaton's meeting was that they were taught or encouraged to receive baptism before they experienced a change of heart.

3. In a discourse delivered by you, on Lord's day, the 2nd. instant, many understood you to class Mr. Campbell with Dr. Pusey as a teacher of *baptismal regeneration*. The latter that of infants by sprinkling, and the former that of adults by immersion. And all the authorities cited, left the impression that you understood Mr. C. as teaching baptismal regeneration previous to a "change of heart."

We hear many things as coming from you to the same effect ; but the above statements contain the cream of the reports which I wished at present to bring before you. Now, the kindly manner in which we are always treated by you ; indeed, the favorable style in which you have often spoken of some of our number on the work of the Spirit have led me to listen to these statements with much surprise and astonishment.

If you will be so kind as to give me a written statement of what you have said on this subject, you will put it in my power to correct many peculiar impressions which have been and are being made on many minds.

In all kindness and respect, yours, in the cause of truth and righteousness.

W. W. EATON.

St. John, January 11, 1853.

DEAR BROTHER :--I received yours of yesterday, and at once comply with what you say will gratify you and subserve the cause of truth.

I never recollect any person asking about the difference of our religious views. I never said to any person that you baptized persons without their making a profession of faith and repentance. But I have, from your published and expressed views, said that you baptized for the remission of sins. And from Mr. Campbell's works, I have never doubted but he taught that the new birth and regeneration were connected with baptism. I have said, and do say, that we do not baptize persons to make them christians or believers, but because they are such. That we do not baptize them for remission of sins or regeneration, but because they are pardoned and regenerated. I have taught and do believe that no man can be in a pardoned, justified state but a believer ; and that no man is a believer one instant without being pardoned. For faith and justification, repentance and pardon, are united by God together.

In my discourse, on the 2nd instant, from Titus iii. 5. 6 ; on the design of baptism, I did give Dr. Pusey's views and the views of Mr. Campbell. What I said about Mr. C. I gave *verbatim* from his *Christian System*, pages 58 and 203. I am very glad I did. If the

person who thought I misrepresented him, had examined his works, they would have seen the justice of the statement. "Baptism is then designed to *introduce* the subject of it into participation of the blessings of Christ's *death* and resurrection. To the believing penitent it is the means of receiving a formal, distinct, specified absolution or release from sin." Page 203, "Surely there is no abuse of speech, but the greatest propriety in saying that he who is dead to sin and has been buried in water, when raised up again out of that element, is born again, is regenerated." The above was the quotation from Mr C., and if it does not connect an interest in Christ, remission of sins, the new birth and regeneration with baptism, I do not understand the meaning of words.

You refer to my favorable style of speaking of Mr. C. It is true I do and did on the 2nd instant, speak of him as a great man, and I have read his works with *interest* and *profit*, and hold many views in common with him. But I never believed in his views on the design of baptism. "Call no man Master" was the language of Christ. You seem to think that a person cannot be friendly to you or Mr. C., or your people, and believe and teach that some of your opinions are unscriptural.

In the social circle to which you allude, I do not think there was a disrespectful word said about you. A brother present said he heard you preach in Eastport against experience. I said I knew by our former correspondence you did not believe in it before baptism, and that I had no doubt but it had affected your church.

We must know that when we publish our sentiments they become public property. Between a man's avowed principles and his christian character there is a marked difference. I have spoken of you and your people as brethren, but I believe brethren in error, and I supposed such were your views of us.

I might with as much propriety ask you to give a plain statement of what you have said against the Baptists or their errors. But no, brother Eaton, preach the truth and if we are not scriptural, expose wrongs, and I only ask the same privilege.

I am yours truly,

SAMUEL ROBINSON.

P. S. I hope I have been plain enough, as you requested. If at any time you believe I have given offence (if you think I am a brother) take Christ's plan, but do not take hear-says. I believe there is no person living can say he or she ever heard me speak disrespectfully of you or your people. Can you say this has always been the case with your people? I do feel it to be the right of all to judge of a man's principles when he has published them to the world. Is not this the general practice of Mr. Campbell and brother Eaton? Why offended for me saying that Dr. Pusey's views and Dr. Campbell's are the same on the design of baptism, judging from their own writings?

S: R:

St. John, N. B., Jan. 14th; 1853.

BROTHER ROBINSON: MY DEAR SIR:—I am sorry to trouble you

again with any enquiries or complaints; but your response of the 11th inst. is not entirely satisfactory. The grand object of my note, and the motives which prompted it, seem to have escaped your notice. Indeed, you remotely hint, that if I esteem you a brother, I have not treated you according to the law of Christ!

Now, in reference to these points, allow me to explain myself, if possible, a little more clearly.

1. I have not charged you with any offence. I have not intimated that I have suffered personal wrong by anything you have said or done. If such had been my convictions, I should have certainly called on you in person; for "Christ's plan," (Mat. xviii. 15,) relates to individual and not to public offences of brethren. If I, in public, misrepresent your views, and prejudice my hearers against you, I should rather be amenable to the Holy Spirit's reproof, by Timothy, 1 Epistle v. 20, than to any other portion of the divine record now occurring to me!

2. I did not intend, in my former note, to intimate that I was offended with you; or that I had ever heard that you ever spoke disrespectfully of me or of any of my brethren. On the contrary; I am extremely happy to acknowledge to you, as I have often to my brethren and others, that I have always heard that your remarks in reference to us were usually fraught with great kindness. And I am happy to add, your treatment of me personally has been more respectful and kind than under all circumstances I have had reason to expect.

3. I did not complain because I had heard that you questioned or opposed anything that I or any one with whom I more particularly fraternize, have said or written. By no means. I more highly honor the man who brings every subject broached in the community, to the divine test—the word of God.

4. You are right in saying, that when a thought is written and sent abroad, or uttered before the world, it is then public property; and any one has a right to quote it and comment upon it at pleasure. But,

5. I had often heard that you *attributed to us sentiments which we never held nor advocated*, and the design of my note was to get from under your own hand a *confirmation, explanation or denial* of these reports. And at this very point you have strangely lost sight of my queries!

6. In reference to one of them you explicitly inform me, "I never said to any person that you baptized persons without their making a *profession of faith and repentance*." [I have marked as emphatic "profession." Did you intend that I should thus understand the sentence?] The substance of the question I asked was: Did you or did you not say that we *taught sinners to be baptized on a mere assent to the truth and to repent afterwards*? To this question your answer is very indirect.

7. The next question was: Did you not leave the impression on the company that you understood us to teach, and to encourage sinners to receive immersion before they experienced a "change of



heart?" You do not answer this question. You merely say, "I do not think there was a disrespectful word said about you," and then tell me that some one heard me preach in Eastport "against experience." This witness is not true. I have a distinct recollection of the discourse. Instead of preaching against experiences, I related circumstantially, quite a number found in the Acts of the apostles; and I warned the people that unless their "experience" corresponded with these examples they were not genuine! In this way I may have spoken against some modern experience; but I never dropped an intimation that I believed any one was fit for immersion without a change of heart. The question that I ventured to propose was,—Did you or did you not say we encouraged persons to be baptized without a "change of heart"; and gave this as a reason why many fell away? This was the simple question, and I am sorry to say that it yet remains unanswered.

8. You admit that you did associate Mr. Campbell and Dr. Pusey as teachers of baptismal regeneration; and justify yourself by a *garbled* extract or two from the former's writings! But even at this point you evade—I trust unintentionally—my query, which in substance was: Did you not seek to make the impression on your hearers' minds, that Mr. Campbell taught regeneration by immersion without a *previous change of heart*? Whether you intended to make this impression or not, such was the effect of your remarks on minds not familiar with his productions. Indeed, what other impression do you intend to make, when you quote and comment on certain portions of the divine record, sometimes adduced by us in proof that baptism, as well as faith and repentance, is necessary in order to the enjoyment of remission of sins? For example: you express yourself, in substance, as follows: "The scriptures do not teach baptism for the remission of sins; but *repent* and be baptized for remission of sins. Here repentance is taught before baptism!" Now, by this remark do you not, in effect, say that the advocate of immersion in order to the enjoyment of remission *does not* connect repentance as indispensably necessary to that great blessing? If you do not design to make that impression, for what purpose do you make the remark? And, when you say, "The advocates of baptismal regeneration, quote in proof of the doctrine the language of Ananias to Saul of Tarsus, 'Arise and be baptized and wash away your sins calling on the name of the Lord' Here, you remark, "*calling on the name of the Lord* was joined with baptism! Here is prayer before baptism!" By remarks similar to these do you not say, that those whose doctrine you oppose, *do not* teach the necessity of "*calling on the name of the Lord*" as well as baptism in order to the regeneration of the soul? Can you—can any one—draw any other inference from such a comment, in such a connection?

Think of your teaching as you may, my dear sir, this is the impression that has gone abroad in reference to our real sentiments, through Baptist instrumentality! It is not, as you seem to intimate, in consequence of what we have ourselves taught and practised, but by such misrepresentations of our words and actions that false impressions

have been made. When I can get an honest ear open long enough, to hear an explanation of these things—the seeker after truth becomes perfectly astonished that he could have been so kept in the dark, relative to our real sentiments. And that any one could so completely characterize the pure gospel as to make it appear to the lovers of truth really hideous, seems almost past belief.

My dear sir, although it gives me great pleasure to discuss, with any intelligent man, the great questions of life and salvation, *in the light of God's word*, yet I seek controversy with no one. I hope you will not think I wish to annoy you; but I do wish to disabuse the minds of honest men in reference to what we do teach and practice; and those, therefore, instrumental in making false impressions, intentionally or unintentionally, must expect us to explain ourselves and correct misstatements in the best way we can. If, then, you are really friendly, and would do us good, let the people know that we preach the person, character, and work of Jesus as the only way of life: that we receive and baptize those, and those only who publicly confess that, with all their heart they believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God—that he died for their sins, and rose for their justification—that from their heart they have truly repented and have forsaken their sins, and aided by God's grace wish to obey him in all things,—that such persons are immersed for the remission of sins, calling on the name of the Lord; and that then they are taught to go on to perfection—to grow in grace and in knowledge &c.

Every one who wishes can understand this; “but if any man will be ignorant, let him be ignorant.”

In conclusion: I can assure you, my dear sir, that I wish to live in christian fellowship, and communion with all who love and obey our Lord and Saviour. Nothing would delight me more than to see all such, not only in heart, but before the world really and formally walking as brethren; but, to see this glorious consummation, we must know, love, and practice the *truth*. And until all who profess to be christians, “prove all things and hold fast (only) that which is good,” this day can never come!

I know not what you mean by your intimation that we say hard things about the Baptists. I have given publicity to my hard thoughts, and I have given to the same readers all they have written in defence! Can the Baptists say the same? My brethren that are “of age” must speak for themselves. They receive no encouragement.—either by precept or example, from me to say hard things of any one.

Please write again when convenient. Excuse my prolixity. With best wishes,

Yours for the truth's sake,

W. W. EATON.

St. John, Jan. 24th, 1853.

DEAR BROTHER EATON:—I received your last note of the 14th instant, in which you say my response to your first letter was not quite satisfactory. We may attach different meanings to conversion, the

new birth, regeneration, or even faith in Christ. I have read Mr. Campbell's works carefully, and your "Christian," and correspondence with myself and others. And I thought I understood you; and what I have said in public or in private has been what I believed the *truth* and the truth in *love*.

1. Does Mr. Campbell or Mr. Eaton in their writings teach that the Holy Spirit works a saving change in the heart, before baptism, and that faith and repentance are the effects of that change? And that change is the *new birth*, or being born again? If so, our views are alike and I have misunderstood you on this subject.

2. Do you believe, that the pardoning love of God, is experienced in the heart before baptism, and that remission of sins or justification is obtained by faith? or is that what you conceive to be the experience necessary before baptism? If so our views are the same, and I have misunderstood you on experience.

3. Do you believe that remission of sins is obtained by believing with all the heart, before baptism? and that there is no true faith where there is no remission of sins? If so our views are the same and I have misunderstood you on the subject.

You know that Baptists believe, and I believe, firmly the above in the affirmative.

I believe that the person going into the water of baptism in an unpardoned state will come out of the water in the same unpardoned state. And that the person who professes faith in Christ, but has not obtained remission of sins, his faith is not the faith of God's elect—the faith that justifies the ungodly.

I did and do say that Dr. Pusey's and Mr. Campbell's views on the *design* of baptism, are the same. I do believe, I have said, that Mr. C. and your people believe that remission of sins and being *born* again is obtained in baptism, or is connected with baptism. I heard one of your people assert this in the strongest language.

I have not given, as you say, a garbled extract of Mr. C's views on the design of baptism. I have for years vindicated Mr. C. and yourself, times more than I can recollect, when you were charged with the Unitarian doctrine, and meantime that you did believe in the Divinity of Christ and the work of the Spirit; but differed from us on the work of the Spirit before baptism.

I have been as plain in this as I possibly could;—as I understood your last note was written to elicit such plainness.

I do say that your views carried out would lead you to baptize persons without (what I consider to be) a change of heart, or being born again; for I believe, where a change is wrought in the heart, remission of sins must be enjoyed. I say more, if any person told you that I said you would baptize without a change of heart, he or she told you a falsehood. I said, on the occasion you refer to, that your objecting to telling an experience before baptism had injured you in this place. But if you have taken different views from what you took fourteen years ago, I do rejoice.

Any communication from you at any time, will be kindly received.

I am yours truly, SAMUEL ROBINSON.

St. John, N. B., Jan. 27th, 1853.

BROTHER ROBINSON: MY DEAR SIR:—I embrace my earliest leisure hour to acknowledge the receipt of yours of the 24th instant, yesterday.

I am not a little surprised that you cannot perceive the object of my notes to you. I thought when I sent the second, that you would give me plain and explicit answers; but I have gained comparatively nothing yet, in relation to the information sought.

I did not commence this correspondence either to give you an outline of our faith and practice, or to correct any errors, into which I may have supposed you to have fallen. Neither did I propound questions to get information relative to Baptist views of conversion, regeneration, faith, &c. Had the last been my wish, your letter before me would have been very satisfactory; for, you express your views, whether right or wrong, sufficiently plain. But I wrote for the following reasons:

1. I found impressions prevailing extensively among your people that we neither teach the necessity of "Evangelical" faith, repentance, love to God, nor a "change of heart" previous to immersion—that all we are anxious for is to get persons immersed—as the "Visitor" of May 3rd, 1850, announced that the Disciples "taught baptism by immersion makes a man a christian."

2. I wished to know what agency you have had in bringing about this state of things: but, judging from your letters, you have never said anything either in public or in private; that would leave any such impression on a single mind!!

Having commenced this research, I am determined, the Lord being my helper, to probe the matter to the bottom. I have long been convinced, that the man has not yet lived, who can successfully oppose God's truth without first misrepresenting it. Leading men among the Baptists have either *knowingly* or *ignorantly* misrepresented the faith and practice which we seek to inculcate; and, then, have refused to give us an opportunity of speaking or writing to the same people, to correct such misstatements. I know exactly the course which you pursue;—I have pointed out in my second note, the manner in which you make such impressions. But you seem not to understand me! Allow me, then, to "change my voice, for I stand in doubt of you!"

Will you say that you have represented to others, that we believe, teach, and practice as did the apostles and first disciples, as recorded in Acts 2nd-chapter? That we preach the death, burial and resurrection of Christ—all he did, and said, and suffered—that men thro' this instrumentality may believe in him—turn from their sins—love and obey him; in order to enjoy remission of sins and the Holy Spirit?

I ask, my dear sir, is this the testimony which you have borne relative to our views and practices? Will you answer this in the affirmative? If you can, then you have treated us fairly; if not, your testimony has been the reverse of what it should have been.

In reference to the queries now before me, I would say, if you are really in doubt as to our sentiments, as a people, or mine as an individual, I shall be most happy to answer any question that can be drawn legitimately from the word of God, or anything that we have ever uttered or written; but I must not in this way be turned from my present purpose, nor by any such queries or insinuations that my views may have materially changed in the course of "fourteen years!"

As I have narrated the points which I wish considered, I shall anxiously anticipate a speedy response to the above interrogations. But while I thus write, I would at the same time bear in mind, that I have no more claim upon you for an answer to my queries, than you have upon me for a similar service.

Ever anxious to give a reason for all I write, teach, or utter; I am emboldened to ask questions of others—especially, where their influence may be for or against a cause dearer to me than life itself.

In hope of the triumph of truth, yours &c.

W. W. EATON.

*St. John, Feb. 2nd, 1853.*

BROTHER EATON: DEAR SIR:—I received yours of the 27th ult., and regret to see such a want of Christian courtesy and insult from any one professing to be a disciple of Christ. I would have treated it with the silence which it deserves, but for the conviction that the truth of God requires me to answer your questions.

You enquire, 1st. "Will you say that you have represented to others that we believe, teach, and practice as did the apostles and first disciples, as recorded in the second chapter of Acts?" Answer, *No, no*; I have not represented you as believing, teaching, and practising as did the apostles and first disciples. I do not believe you do. I should rejoice if you did.

2nd. "That we preach the death, burial and resurrection of Christ—all that he did, said, and suffered, that men through this instrumentality may believe on him—turn from their sins—love and obey him, in order to enjoy remission of sins and the holy Spirit." Answer: I do make it a practice to represent what you or others teach or believe, except truth requires it. But whenever I have represented, at any time, what you believe, teach, and practice, it was in substance, what is embraced in your last question.

Part of your belief and teaching, I consider Bible truth; and part of it dangerous error:—to make turning from sin, love and obedience, conditions, in order to remission of sins, and the Holy Spirit, was not the teaching of the apostles and first disciples.

Did they not teach "We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanses us from all sins." "The love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost given unto us?"

No, sir, you never find them mixing up our works or obedience, with Christ's merits and blood in order to pardon or justification before God.

You will take this as my final response, to what you call your interrogatories. I am yours in the belief of the truth, as it is in Jesus,

SAMUEL ROBINSON.

*St. John, N. B., Feb. 8th, 1853.*

BROTHER ROBINSON: MY DEAR SIR:—Your "final response" of the 2nd. came duly to hand. I have since then been pondering on what I have written—especially in my last note! What could I have written so destitute of "Christian courtesy?" Taken in connection with what I before addressed to you, I certainly know not to what you refer; but as these notes are obviously disagreeable to you, I have thought of a plan, which, with all due deference; to your age and profession, I submit for your correction, acceptance, or rejection.

But, I would first observe, that I did not *intend* to treat you *discourteously*, much less to "*insult*" you! I do not think that any thing in my last note *can* be legitimately so construed; and I, therefore, propose that we submit our correspondence to an examination of a few select brethren at any time and place agreeable to you.

I await your acquiescence,

Respectfully yours,

W. W. EATON.

*St. John, March 6th, 1853.*

BROTHER EATON: DEAR SIR:—I received yours of the 8th ult. and would have replied immediately, but I thought it would be better for us to talk the matter over ourselves.

I have lately thought that neither the plan you propose, of referring our correspondence to a few brethren, nor my own; of us talking the matter over ourselves, would be the proper way, of removing any unpleasant feeling that may exist.

What I think would be right, would, be for you and me, to meet the persons, who gave you your information, face to face, and let them state what I said about you, or your brethren, or your religious views, that you have not said or written yourselves. I will attend such a meeting if you see fit, and think best to call it. I could not do any thing to get them together, as you have not given their names to me.

SAMUEL ROBINSON.

*St. John, N. B., March 7th, 1853.*

BRO. ROBINSON: MY DEAR SIR:—Yours of the 6th inst. has this minute come to hand! Having permitted four full weeks to pass before noticing my last, I some time since, came to the conclusion that you had made up your mind to take no farther notice of my letters. I had, therefore, resolved to give our correspondence to the public and abide by its decision. Feeling conscious that I sought only for truth and *purposed* nothing "discourteous" I had no anxiety as to the result.

Although I am not at liberty to call upon any one, from whom I have heard what you have said—some, indeed, are not in the city—yet I will seek that liberty on the following conditions: That you

notify the audience, who heard your discourse on Titus iii. 5,—that your assertions, on that occasion, have been called in question by Mr. Eaton; and that such is your *consciousness* of TRUTH and IMPARTIALITY that you are willing that he should occupy your pulpit to give as public an explanation.

This would be necessary on your own proposition, for from many of them I "received the information" which induced me to write my first note.

Recent developments, however, have convinced me, that we have little reason to hope for impartiality or justice from Baptist Clergymen! For even after you had publicly announced Mr. Campbell an advocate of "baptismal regeneration," brother Bill refused to publish as mild and as kind an explanation of Mr. C's views, on the subject, from his own pen, as could be written; a paper, too, that cast not one unkind reflection upon a single Baptist.

Notwithstanding this you may possibly agreeably disappoint me. Whatever may be the result, I shall be most happy to give my *earliest* attention to any amendment which you may choose to suggest.

Yours faithfully,

W. W. EATON.

REMARKS:—These must be deferred till next month. I have not heard one word since from brother R. But his manner of quoting authors—Baptist views of regeneration—their policy to keep the people ignorant of the real sentiments which we advocate, and their general treatment of us, demand a record, that at least the rising generation may be placed upon their guard lest they be led away from the simplicity of the gospel.

W. W. E.

*St. John, N. B., April 8th, 1853.*

### AN EPISTLE ON TEMPERANCE.

To the Editor of the *Temperance Advocate*, Montreal.

*Alnwick, 20th January, 1853.*

RESPECTED SIR:—Last evening I had the honor of addressing a number of the inhabitants of Alnwick on the subject of the Temperance Reform at a meeting called for said purpose by that good friend of the cause, Mr. T. Solomon, Reeve of the Township. This morning a lady put into my hands a copy of the *Canada Temperance Advocate*, January, 1852, now twelve months old, never before seen by me, in which I find language employed by the editors of the "Temperance Advocate" and the "Watchman" at Toronto evidently intended to show that I am a heretic so far as the Temperance Reform is concerned. Alluding to certain statements which I published, and speaking of the paper in which they appeared, you say—

"While it professes to be devoted to the interests of religion, we

understand from the Watchman, that the editor has been at considerable pains to damage the Order of the Sons of Temperance. Of course they will prosper for all that, but it is a melancholy thing to see men claiming to be Bible advocates [you have it "Bible Christian"] above their fellows, writing and uttering the stupid stuff we sometimes see and hear. Take the following sanctimonious paragraph as a specimen"—

And you then quote a portion of a paragraph from my pen, and allow the Toronto Watchman to watch its wanderings, and endorse his strictures, which, upon the whole, are gentlemanly.

Had you fairly understood my position as a Disciple of the Lord upon this very interesting and commanding topic, I have so much confidence in your general charity and magnanimity that I doubt not you would have been far from placing me in any other position before your readers than the position I honestly occupy. And it is with the assurance that you do not wilfully misrepresent any one on your pages, whatever "stupid stuff" he may utter, and the assurance that you will most readily hear even a heretic in his own defence, which induce me to lift my pen to fill with your consent a limited space in your columns.

1. Any controversy between myself as the Editor of a religious paper and those who style themselves Sons of Temperance has never been of my seeking. When called in the discharge of duty to consider the subject shortly after the "Sons" began their career in Canada, I unequivocally, fearlessly, and conscientiously stated my views and convictions, and in the utterance of these views, spoke in *favor and not against* the Sons of Temperance, most freely admitting that they had done and were doing good.

2. While cheerfully acquiescing in the moral reform, sought and carried out by the "Sons," I took and still take the simple ground that the true friends of Christ ought to seek as much good and do as much good as the Sons of Temperance *in the department of Temperance*, from the very fact of their vows and professions as the friends and followers of the Lord Jesus.

3. With me, Christianity is not only a perfect system of spirituality in order to the joys of another and brighter world, but includes within it all morality; and as reforming the poor inebriate and preventing the manufacture of inebriates belong to morality and benevolence, those who are governed by Christian principle should be most active in these benevolent works.

4. Christianity does not condemn moral men in their efforts to reform the world morally; and hence Christians, while they have



higher aims than simple morality, should countenance moral reforms in all suitable ways, taking care not to dishonour Christianity itself.

5 I co-operate with temperance men and Sons of Temperance so far as lies in my power, and so far as their rules will permit. Very many of the *watchmen* in Canada West appreciate the fact that I am theoretically and practically, that I am by speech and by example, a temperance man.

6. While I teach Christian brethren that their principles as Christians require no aid from any human source to lead to the carrying out of any moral reform, I have not been conscious of dropping a word to discourage men of the world or men of morality from engaging actively in that which appertains to their moral welfare in connection with the common temperance society or the organization of the Sons.

7. It must, I opine, be acknowledged that there is the width of the poles between saying to the Lord's Disciples, "your principles should make you active temperance men, more zealous than all others," and saying to those who have not such principles, "you ought not to be Sons of Temperance." I say the former, but I do not say the latter. Nay, so far from saying the latter, I actively co-operate with all temperance men according to my opportunities. Only a few weeks ago, one of our Upper Canada temperance editors, in company with a friend, upon being enquired of whether I was a "Son," the gentleman of the temperance press replied, "No, Mr. Oliphant is not a Son for some reason, but he assists in our cause." The gentleman deserved credit for his urbanity and candor. His remark was in grand contrast with those unjust traducements of my views by men who are either purposely or unwittingly ignorant of the ground on which I stand.

I doubt not you will be able to gather an idea of my position by a candid consideration of the preceding without farther specification. The observations of my friend the *Watchman* which you gave your readers shall be copied into the *Christian Banner* with a few comments. Had I the whole article it should appear, for I believe in the justice of letting a man be heard in full in his own behalf. Be pleased to mark on your exchange list "Christian Banner," Cobourg, and I will return the compliment—so that when you give me a broadside I may realize the sort of mental you discharge. My sentiments may be and have been distorted and wrested out of their place; but when fairly presented, I am neither ashamed nor afraid to acknowledge them, or to defend them when this duty is required.

That the views I hold are not very popular, I have no particular objections to grant; but you will not measure truth or goodness by

popularity, else you must place yourself in a very unenviable position. For I doubt not you say with me that the cause you have steadily and nobly advocated for nineteen years has been all along the same good cause—though it was far from being as popular nineteen years ago as at present. In this instance you take the tenable ground that the cause is to be regarded upon its own intrinsic merits, being precisely as valid when unpopular as when popular. May I hope therefore that you will give me a candid hearing, and offer your objections candidly. I promise that your arguments and objections shall be laid before the thousands who read the *Christian Banner*, and if commented on (as probably they will be,) my strictures will be forthcoming in a spirit designed to elicit truth and not blindly to gain a victory.

Up to this date I have had one and only one opponent, as it respects what I plead on the subject of *Christian temperance efforts*. He is a gentleman well known at your office, a great friend of temperance and a man of much worth in many respects—a friend whom I highly esteem—Mr. A. Farewell. He gave me two brief letters sometime ago upon my temperance heresy; but either his logic or his patience failed him after the second running fire.

You will permit me to say in closing, that the perseverance and assiduity you have shown in pushing forward the cause of Temperance in the face of all opposition, claim not only my respect but my admiration.

Sincerely and respectfully,

Yours, D. OLIPHANT.

The *Temperance Advocate* in laying before its readers the seven cardinal points in the above letter, thus speaks:—

Early last year we published some strictures on certain sentiments quoted by the *Watchman* from a religious paper, edited by the Rev. D. Oliphant. Not until the January of 1853 did our remarks come under the notice of Mr. Oliphant, and now in a communication received from him, justice is claimed at our hands. Mr. O., thinks himself misrepresented. Perhaps he is, but after carefully considering the matter, we do not think our friend orthodox, or prepared to go our length of orthodoxy. We believe Mr. O. to be a good temperance man in his way, and may do good to the extent of his influence. But his platform is not large enough to include in one common effort, all who agree with him and with ourselves, on the one important principle of entire abstinence from the sale and use of intoxicating drinks.

Diversity of opinion on other matters separates Mr. O. from us, and although he may work well in his own harness, it seems to us he would work better could he manage to put on ours, or one of a similar pattern.

Mr. O. will excuse us in not printing the whole of his communi-

cation. He has defined his position in seven points which we give in full. Justice does not require more at our hands than the publication of these. We believe Mr. O. honest in his advocacy of "Christian temperance efforts," and we do not think any good would arise by any continued discussion of the differences between us. However, Mr. O. has the command of a press "the *Christian Banner*" of Cobourg. We shall place it on our exchange list, and if in the advocacy of his views, we find anything injuriously adverse to the cause of temperance, we shall not hesitate to say so, wishing it also to be remembered that we are "set for the defence of the Gospel."

So speaks the *Advocate*, and so have we spoken. Thinking men will now have an opportunity of judging of our "considerable pains to damage the Order of the Sons"—which was the previous indictment against us. As an orator of a peculiar mould once said, we "challenge the universal world" to show, by any essay or letter from our pen, or any lecture or discourse by us, that we have sought to damage the Sons. We have sought and still seek to impress upon the Lord's chosen, that they should *even in Temperance* be examples to the "Sons" instead of the "Sons" being examples to them. Should this result in damage to the Sons' cause, of which we have yet to be convinced, the result is not of our seeking. We seek the perfection of the Lord's people according to their Christian pledge—which is our single aim.

D. O.

---

### MATHETES ON MARRIAGE, FOLLOWED BY SENEX.

(SEE VOLUME V, PAGE 51.)

A long period having elapsed since I wrote on this subject, a second article from me upon the subject may perhaps be deemed out of place, especially as the subject has been discussed during that period by two Seneces. I have however a few remarks to offer upon it, which I hope will be read with candor and charity by all parties.

A member of the Church of Christ is a son of God. A Church of Christ without God's children is a nonentity. A child of God on earth not in the Church of Christ is not at *home*; he is not in his required position. They "are born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." No hereditary descent confers this relationship. No fleshly connection exalts to this honor. It is from above. It is by God's Spirit. Yet what cannot produce may sometimes destroy. The will of the flesh or the will of man has robbed thousands of their spiritual title, and spiritual possession, though they never conferred them upon one. "The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but

is of the world." "They are of the world." "We are of God." What then, I ask, will induce one who can say, I am of God, to unite himself to one who says, I am of the world? What? The lusts of the flesh, and these alone!

Unmarried Christians, read John's first general Epistle. The whole world is made up of single individuals, as a mountain is made up of atoms. Voluntarily to ally ourselves for life to one who is "of the world"—is to give up Christ. Pause and consider—you who may be about to take this step. What do you see in the object of your choice?—Beauty, riches, honored connections? One of these, all of these? What makes you desire them? I answer, *the lusts of the flesh*, and for these you reject one who has the moral beauty of Christ, the riches of a meek and quiet spirit,—one who is a child of *God*.

Well indeed would it be if you would follow the advice given to the daughters of Zelophehad in reference to this alliance;—"Let them marry to whom they think best; only to the family of the tribes of their father shall they marry."

Marry not out of the family of your Father, and you will not marry out of the church;—the Church is his family, composed of his sons and daughters.

Christians do you love Christ? Can you love one who sets his laws at defiance? Do you wish to be united to one by marriage, with whom you cannot unite at the Lord's table? Do you wish to be the father or mother of children who will have the example of disobedience to the laws of Christ in their own parents? Do you wish to risk being weaned from Christ yourself? If so, marry a votary of the world. If not, marry "only in the Lord."

The world, with all its allurements, all its riches, will soon pass away,—and all our connections in this world, which are only fleshly, will soon be dissolved. All friendship not immortalized by God's Spirit, must soon end. But there is a union which has no end, a friendship more enduring than the sun, a connection which shall never be dissolved.—The word of God with its effects endure for ever.

MATHETES.

BROTHER OLIPHANT:—From various delays and hinderances, over which I had no control, I could not respond to Another Senex before now. Upon reading his second article I made up my mind not to respond to it, as I understood it was to be his last on this question: but when his third article appeared I viewed myself as called upon in defence of the truth to respond.

And now, Brother Senex, I have to acknowledge the obligation that I am under by your pointing out the blunder I have made, 1 Cor. vii. 39 with respect to the words "only in the Lord"; for although they are not connected with what precedes them in the chapter, certainly they are connected with what follows them; and I find no fault with you for making all the capital you could out of this blunder, notwithstanding I do not think that this blunder has in any way impaired my other arguments that are supported by scripture.

You say "As a reasoner Senex is not to be trusted." I ask no man to trust me except I give him good security; or in other words, if the word of the Lord does not accompany my arguments directly or indirectly, let no one believe what I say.

Another Senex asks, "Do you think it proper to publish to the world and record in a book that Enos the son of Seth who was born in the 235th year of Adam's life, was an infant in the days of Noah, his own descendant of the eighth generation." Now, brother, you have written the above, and caused it to be twice recorded in a book, purporting to have been written by me. There is no such language nor idea to be found in any thing that I have written upon this question. It is therefore wholly your own property, and as such I return it to its rightful owner to dispose of as he thinks best. Again, in connection with the above extract, by adding the words "who" and "have," you make me say that all who have set up the regular worship of God to the present day are all of Cain's posterity with the exception of Adam and Seth; whereas my words are these, that with the exception of Adam and Seth all the men that are said (this has reference to Gen. iv. 26), to have set up the regular worship of God were all of Cain's family; the same men who are said in the text to have taken them wives of all which they chose. The events recorded in this portion of Scripture and noticed by me in my first and second articles are comprised in that space of time that intervened between the creation and the birth of Enos.

You say "The distinction which he makes between what he calls spiritual marriage and temporal, the first being in the Lord, and the other out of the Lord, I do not admit." As you have not favored us with your reasons for not admitting this distinction, I will give you my reasons for making it. The Apostle Paul informs us that through faith, repentance, and baptism we put on Christ. The same Apostle informs us that those who are dead to the law by the body of Christ are married to him who is raised from the dead; and there is nothing in this world not in any way connected with it that can dissolve the

union and marriage that exists between Christ and a penitent believer. It enters with them into the future state, into the world of spirits. I therefore believe that the scriptures authorize me to distinguish this as a spiritual marriage, and, as a consequence it is in the Lord. As to temporal marriage, it is a compact entered into between two to live together as husband and wife, and this compact is in force as long as both of them live. But upon the death of either the compact is dissolved, as if it had never been. It is therefore literally a temporal marriage, and as both saint and sinner have equal privilege of entering into it, therefore it is a marriage out of the Lord and is not connected with the worship of God directly nor indirectly: and for these reasons—acceptable worship must be of faith. Then of consequence it is spiritual, and the result future. The compact which we are treating of begins and ends in this world, and is therefore temporal, and cannot be incorporated with eternal life; but as this assertion covers nearly all the disputed ground, I will examine it a little further. If a person who is married and believes the gospel, and desires to be baptized and added to the church, the scriptures authorize the church to baptize and receive such an individual into the church, although the partner may still be in unbelief as to the gospel. In this case marriage is not connected with worship: but if an unmarried person being a member of the church should marry one who is not a member, they are looked upon by many as having committed a great sin; and some churches go so far as to separate them from the body of Christ. Now in this case temporal marriage is connected with worship, and is made a test of union with the body of Christ. I know of no scripture that authorizes the distinction that some make as to the above case. I will now call upon the Apostles Paul and Peter to give their testimony on the premises. “If any brother hath a wife that believeth not and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away; and the woman &c., 1 Cor. vii. 12.”

Now if temporal marriage was a religious ceremony, as the man and his wife are one flesh, it follows that they must both be believers or they could not be lawfully married, nor worship acceptably. If so, then Peter would not have given the command quoted, 1 Peter iii. 12: “Likewise ye wives be in subjection to your own husbands, that if any obey not the word they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives, while they behold your chaste conversation, coupled with fear.”

Again you say, “I only said and I now repeat it, the marriage spoken of in 1 Cor. vii. 39 is that in which a believing widow may enter.”

We are agreed upon this; for it is what I have been and now am contending for—"and that nothing concerning spiritual marriage can be found there." For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus "for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ," Gal. iii. 26. That this believing widow had put on Christ and was married to him who was raised from the dead, and at the time the apostle wrote was married only in the Lord, I have already fully shown. I therefore believe that the scripture authorizes me to call this a spiritual marriage or union, for certainly it is not a temporal one. As to your two reasons I must admit that I have not been able to discover wherein their invincible strength lies; but as you have based so much upon them I will give them a passing notice.—Your first reason: "because the apostle gives directions to those who were already married to him who is raised from the dead, and could not mean what Senex says it does." Let us see what directions the Apostle has given to those who were already married to him who is raised from the dead. "I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, it is good even for them if they abide even as I," verse 40 "only in the Lord; but she is happier if she so abide, after my judgement." Now, brother, you will see that what I have already said is in accordance with these two quotations, and for your further information read the 32nd, 33rd, and 34th verses of this chapter. Your second reason is "because Paul could not judge it happier for a widow to abide so, than to be married in the Lord in Senex view of that phrase." My view of this passage is this: that the widow alluded to was married in the Lord, and Paul has judged it to be happier for her to abide so.

In this and the preceding essays I have been endeavoring to show that the marriage that God instituted at the creation permitted the sexes to form attachments agreeably to the principles implanted in their nature, without any restraint being put on them. Those who oppose my views contend that believers are permitted to marry only believers. Now if this was a law from God, there would also have been another law or rule from God whereby believers could with certainty know that those they were about to marry were believers in the scriptural sense of the word (believer.) But the latter being absent proves that the former does not exist: as it is written, "They are not all Israel who are of Israel," neither are all believers who say they are. But it may be said that it is only contend that members of the church marry members; but that won't alter the case: for if members are not believers they are hypocrites. Let it be supposed that there is a plain precept in the New Testament command-

ing members of the church to marry only members. Now all the religious sects in the world believe that they are or belong to the church of Christ, and this command would be as good authority to them as it could be to us; and by it every denomination would have a circumvalation around them which would be an insuperable barrier to the spread of the gospel, and that too by divine authority. The Lord when he was in this world said "Every kingdom or city divided against itself, can not stand."

THE FIRST SENEX.

\* \* There is a sentiment in the above that we feel called upon to review. We shall endeavor to offer our remarks in as friendly a spirit as we are pleased to observe in the preceding paragraphs.

D. O.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

BELOVED BROTHER OLIPHANT:—As it is pleasing to the friends of Christ and all his people to hear of the prosperity of the cause they love, and of the spread of the principles of primitive christianity, I now embrace this means of communicating to you some items of intelligence, which I trust will make you rejoice with us. For we are assured that there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth: for our Saviour and all of the holy angels view with emotions of pleasure the returning wanderer to his fold, and I am sure that all the saints will harmonize in their feelings with them.

Some weeks after the return of the Evangelists there were two more made the good confession, and were buried with Christ and rose to walk in newness of life. May the Lord bless them and keep them from evil. Permit me to say that this brother and this sister live in Townsend. I wish it could be made convenient for some of our preachers to visit that section soon. I think that there can be much good done there.

In the good hope,

ASHER HOLMES.

*Pompey, March, 1853.*

BROTHER OLIPHANT:—It is to inform you of the progress of the cause of truth in the vicinity of Pompey Hill.

Through the assistance and labors of Brother Belding, of Ohio the disciples of Christ in Pompey conducted a meeting of about two weeks, closing about the 20th of Feb. with the most flattering result both to christians and the world. The brethren of this congregation have been very much edified and strengthened, and were never in a better condition to advance the cause of Christ than at present.

From the sectarian schools and the world, about forty persons have come forward to taken their place in the christian church, rejoicing in Christ the Lord with the hope of immortality and eternal life.

H. KNAPP.



*Brewerton, N. Y., March 29th, 1853.*

BROTHER OLIPHANT:—I want to inform you something of the progress we are making in Brewerton. The Disciples' Meeting House is in process of building, and will be finished on or before the first day of June next. Our brethren meet regularly on the first day of the week to exhort, admonish, comfort, and edify each other the best that we are able. We have no stated preaching, but generally a good and attentive congregation.

Lately I visited brother J. M. Shepard in Ira. He has been very feeble, and though much more comfortable, he does not think he is really any better.

Yours in the bond of the Christian hope.

GEO. WALKUP.

"The Lord's will be done;" but we had hoped that brother Shepard would enjoy life and health to be a blessing to others for many years. Young, talented, and fitted for usefulness, we could wish that his stay on earth might be prolonged; but as this prerogative belongs to Him who is the Highest, and who does all things well, however different from our conceptions of wise arrangement, we should all reverently bow to the Divine will. Who of us will be on this side of Jordan after a brief year or two? And "it is better to depart" if we are fitted "for the inheritance of the saints in light."

D. O.

#### THE DEATH OF A SAINT.

Near Ira Corners, March 7th, of Consumption, Amelia, consort of Wm. B. Noble, and daughter of Edward Allen, Esq., of Clarksville, aged 40 years.

She departed in the full triumph of the Gospel, giving the most perfect evidence during her last illness, as for the last 20 years of her life—which was the time of her profession of Christianity—of the power of the Christian Faith. It is seldom that the spirit of the Gospel is so powerfully demonstrated, as by the life and death of the subject of this notice. It may be said of her more emphatically than any other person I have known, that she went about doing good. Though in a feeble state of health for many years, she always seemed more mindful of the sufferings of others than her own, and was ever ready, to the utmost of her power, to alleviate the afflictions of all. In her case, death had no terror. Though taken away from her family in the meridian of life, and feeling all the anxieties that a wife and mother could feel, she appeared uniformly resigned to the will of her Heavenly Father, and from the appearance of the first alarming symptoms of the insidious disease which was preying upon her she conversed as freely on this as on any other subject. "The grave," she would say, "never appeared to me as to many—it always looked pleasant to me. What is the use of the promise of God, if we are afraid to die?" "You appear alarmed," she said to her husband a

short time before her departure, "I have no fears." So glorious did the future life appear to her, that for years she aimed to make the present only subservient to that, and it is from a desire that her example may be followed, and not to eulogize the departed, that this memoir is written, by one who for years has witnessed her disinterested and untiring efforts to ameliorate the condition of mankind. W.

Many obituary notices are exaggerated and untruthful; but we do not think so of the above. We knew sister Noble; and we sincerely believe that her name is not only written and inscribed upon newspapers and periodicals, but in the Book of Life. We sympathize with our zealous brother Noble in his past and present trial. The Lord be a companion to him!

D. O.

### THE MEETING IN JUNE.

For the Christian Banner.

The brethren and friends are reminded that the annual meeting this year will be held here, commencing on the third Friday in June. In order to make it interesting and profitable to us all, the brethren in this vicinity would earnestly invite the brethren and friends at a distance to come and exchange sentiments, and exhort and edify each other.

We invite the speaking brethren D. Oliphant, J. Black, A. Anderson, J. Kilgour, J. Lesslie, T. C. Scott, J. Doyle, E. Sheppard, and others whom we have not the honor of being acquainted with. We believe it will be the means of doing honor to the cause of Christ to have a goodly number of speakers, all having the one faith, and one hope, and one design in sounding out the word of Truth.

Brethren coming by way of Hamilton can take the stage to Jarvis, which lies west of Williamsville some eleven miles. The Rainham brethren will have teams there awaiting their arrival on Friday, and also at Dunnville, which lies east some seventeen miles; and those coming from the west can take stage at Port Dover on Friday morning at 6 o'clock. And those waiting at Dunnville (Saturday) can take stage at 6 in the morning, the stage running within a few rods of the Meeting House.

ASHER HOLMES.

*Williamsville, 2nd May, 1853.*

\* \* Just as we were preparing a notice of the June Meeting for this Number, the above came to hand; and it is so definite and suitable that as the apostle says "we need not speak anything." It would doubtless minister to the joy of all could the brethren of Notawasaga, St. Vincent, and Owen Sound find their way to Williamsville in Rainham. Brethren Trout and W. A. Stephens, we doubt not, will do what they can to send themselves and the brethren with them to the meeting. And it is probable brother Platt will do and

say all that is requisite to be done and said to secure his own and others' attendance from the region of Pieton. It may be, too, that brother Morison of Chatham can attend. To all the holy brethren grace and peace !

D. O.

### NEW YORK STATE MEETINGS.

*Tully, N. Y., Dec. 23rd, 1852.*

BROTHER OLIPHANT : DEAR SIR :—I acknowledge that the brethren in the central part of the State of New York are not as communicative as they might be, or ought to be ; in order to the welfare of the good cause of the Lord, or their own happiness and enjoyment.

There is much in every congregation that is a source of deep interest to the brotherhood generally, and if known by the several congregations would serve to give a new impetus to the cause of truth, wherever it is being plead.

I think sir, we as a people do not sufficiently realize this fact. I suppose it to be owing to the fact that we are mostly taken from the farm, the workshop, the anvil, or the counter ; and consequently we have not been accustomed to the use of the pen in order that we may express ourselves clearly or properly.

I do not think that we are so Democratic in our feelings and partialities that we will not correspond with those who are willing to live under a woman's government !! There is no doubt you have some among you who are as much Democratic in feeling as those across the line which divides your people from ours.

I rejoice to hear that the *truth* is finding its way to the people of British America. I think you are doing more for the cause of the Lord than we are, according to our numbers ; but we are getting the brotherhood more united on this subject and labouring to arouse the dormant energy of the brethren to a more effective system of co-operation for the spread of the gospel.

Our State Meetings have done much for the cause in our State, and we are confidently looking forth to the time when we shall see greater results than we do at present.

When that short notice was penned and by you published in the *Witness*, I did not expect to see such a hearty response from our brethren in all parts of our State. In accordance with the call for a Convention, the brethren came to our meeting from nearly all the congregations in the State, with their hearts full of the love of God and of man.

There, in that our first State Meeting, in the midst of the saints, I spent some of the happiest moments of my short life ; true we were strangers in one sense of the word, yet we were brethren, all possessing the same love in our hearts, and struggled together for the faith of the Gospel of the Son of God. The associations formed and begun at that meeting I trust will never be forgotten in this life nor that which is to come.

The old tried veterans of the cross were there to give an interest to the meeting and counsel to the young. Strong in the Lord, full of courage and zeal, the two extremes of our State met in council with us of the centre, to confer upon a subject of far more importance than any that was ever presented for discussion in our State.

It was a new era in our history, we would from that meeting almost begin to count time; the people saw that our numbers were not as insignificant as they supposed them to be, their attention was also called to the gospel by the warm appeals which characterize our speakers wherever they go, and these appeals are not in vain; from our first Convention to the present there has been more energy and activity among our brethren.

Since you was here we have enjoyed much of the presence of the Lord in our meetings; our congregation has nearly doubled within two years. Just before the Convention of which I have been speaking, the brethren in Tully felt as though there might be something done for the cause of the Lord; we therefore called in the aid of our brother Jones of Williamsville, who is a "workman that needeth not be ashamed, for he rightly divides the word of truth." He spent two Lord's days with us in connection with brother J. M. Shepherd and Bartlett. Our meeting closed with nine additions to the faithful; it had a very salutary effect on the brethren and on the community at large. Here I will break off the thread of my narrative and wait a short time lest I weary you with too many words in one letter.

Brother, I think the reason why the cause is so weak and sickly, in some places, is because there is not a devotional spirit manifested by its advocates, and they are not willing to make a sufficient sacrifice for the truth.

My sheet is full, so adieu.

H. A. CHASE.

---

### "AND THEY WERE ADDED TO THEM."

From the *Christian Record* we learn that some two hundred have been added to the saved in Indiana within a short period; and doubtless there are others yet to be reported who have united with the brotherhood during the period of these reports in the Record.

In looking over recent Numbers of the *Western Evangelist*, we see that the cause of the Lord prospers in some sections of Texas, ninety-five being reported by one preacher; one hundred and eighty are reported as additions in various sections of Illinois; fifty-four in Ohio; and ten in Iowa.

Reports from other periodicals anon.

D. O.

---

### THE ATONEMENT.

We have received "Tracts for the Times No. 2," designed to show that the friends of Calvin are fearfully in error while advocating what is called a limited Atonement—a Sacrifice for some and not for all.

It is a good work to kill Calvin; we mean his theology. One of the most gloomy doctrines as well as the farthest from the Divine philanthropy is that which tells us that the Lord came from heaven and offered himself on the Cross to justify and save a particular number of Adam's sons called the elect. All this sort of Divinity should be packed up in one great package and sent to Geneva to be laid in the same tomb with Calvin's bones. D. O.

MR. N. L. HOLMES has favoured us with another epistle recently. It will be laid away with old letter files. As intimated in our remarks when his last was published, we take our leave of him till he offer us something more captivating and far more edifying than mere personals. Mr. N. H., if he would accept of a little reformation, would not only appear to better advantage, but would be happier and more useful. D. O.

~~W~~ We trust to have room in our next for one of the speeches delivered at the New York State convention of Disciples held last autumn at Troopsville. Our pages are crowded. Correspondents will please let patience have its perfect work. D. O.

A GRACEFUL COMPLIMENT.—It was a judicious resolution of a father, as well as a most pleasing compliment to his wife, when, on being asked what he intended to do with his girls, he replied:—"I intend to apprentice them to their excellent mother, that they may learn the art of improving time, and be fitted to become, like her, wives, mothers and heads of families; and useful members of society."

~~W~~ The habitual recognition of a principle in our actions, is the mark of a healthy conscience—but all palterings with our likings, or compromising principles with expediency, marks an unhealthy state of the conscience.

TWO PAGES IN THE APRIL NUMBER.—By an oversight in our usually attentive printer, pages 105 and 107 of last No., after being read in proof-sheet for correction, were omitted to be corrected. The first line of page 106 contains a term for which Walker or Webster, Ainsworth or Fisk will be examined in vain. "Auffite" is neither Latin nor English, neither Greek nor French. The puzzled reader however need not call for a new dictionary, as, if he will substitute *awfully* for the literary stranger "aufull," the grammar and the meaning will be passable. Another mysterious word may be discovered on page 107—"Presipent." It will make English to read it *Presidents*. Other errors must pass unnoticed except by the reader. Each of the editors may say with Byron when travelling and sending his manuscripts to an English publisher, whose vocation led him at times to print words that the poet never wrote; whom the famous man of rhyme once reproved by saying, "I am not so great a fool as your printers make me." It seems it was the practice in old England occasionally to make mistakes in print; and certainly it ought to be as easy with Scotland's or England's sons in America. D. O.