

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

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

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

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

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

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.

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

Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

T·H·E·

CHRISTIAN BANNER.

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

VOL. VI.

COBOURG, OCTOBER, 1852.

NO. 10.

PREACHERS—PEOPLE.

NUMBER TWO.

Our next question is, How shall preachers deport themselves in their labours among their brethren and all whom they teach?

We read of no apostle, preacher, or teacher in the Christian oracles who aimed principally to let the people see how admirably he could please them. Neither do we find any one pursuing the very opposite course—speaking as by steam-power—determined to show all men his great boldness and independence. Nor will it be easy to point to a primitive preacher, whose evident desire was to be regarded "a smart man." These three traits are doubtless of modern manifestation. And, except in one instance, we look in vain for anything like the usurper's power or the influence of lordship among the preaching primitives. Demetrius built himself up and reached for power, even above the Apostles; and hence he could "prate against" them with a usurper's tongue. The meek and lovely John took his case specially in hand, and in due course exposed his "evil deeds."

May we conclude, then, that a preacher should guard against these four things—that of being a man-pleaser; that of priding himself upon his personal independence; that of angling and catering for the reputation of a great preacher; and that of claiming to himself large authority, and clothing himself with sanctified and awful dignity.

It is to be regretted that every preacher does not get his mental eye, or his eye of faith upon the Lord of Life, as he ministered to humanity before his crucifixion. Can any one think of Jesus, while he tabernacled among men, turning away from a man because he was rude or unpolished, or that he spurned him because he was poor, or despised him because he did not move in a high enough circle, or did not dress to suit him? Or can the most fastidious imagine for a moment, that the Saviour would pay great attention to a charge brought against "a rich brother," and no attention at all to the difficulties of a poor one? Or will any preacher cast a glance at the

Great Teacher while on earth in the midst of a multitude he is addressing, and suppose that he is attempting to show himself off to advantage before them?—that he is solicitous to speak fine words?—oratorical sentences?—or exhibit a degree of human boldness which may attract men and produce a species of fame?

Would it not be well, on the whole, for preachers in laboring either among saints or sinners, to enquire frequently in their own hearts, 'How would my Lord and Saviour do if he were here?'

But, to pass to the third question, it is the constant and conscientious reflection, uppermost in the mind of preachers, that they are under the ever vigilant eye of the Omnipotent One, and that they will on the Great Day give an account of their responsible stewardship, which operates as the strongest, the best, and the holiest motive in securing faithfulness and christian worth while attempting to "make full proof of their ministry." Even an apostle, inspired as he was, and strong as he felt himself in the power of the truth, watched himself as in the immediate presence of God, lest while being an instrument to convert and save others, he might himself "become a castaway." The man who labours as "seeing Him who is invisible," and constantly reminds himself that the Holy One sees him and takes knowledge of his doings, is divinely fortified against many of the weaknesses and imperfections common to men in the flesh.

For instance, a preacher is about rising to address an assembly, and he lifts up his soul in prayer—'Lord! here am I and this people; I am to speak, they are to hear; but soon both I and they will stand before Thee and render in our account;—help us all to realize that we must soon appear at the Judgment seat.' Would it be possible for preachers with such a solemn sense of the sublime realities of an eternal state, and in view of their accountability before God, to trifle with men's souls and attempt to exhibit their own expertness, learning, dignity, authority, and accomplishments, instead of the salvation which is through our Lord Jesus Christ? The preacher's themes, embracing God, heaven, life, death, transgression, salvation, justice, mercy, God's love, God's wrath, are the most grand and the most solemn topics in the universe; and yet we sometimes find the preacher taking pains to be as witty, funny, and smirky as though all these religious realities were related to the theatre. There is not wanting a specimen of preachers "of the reformation" who think it "smart" to be odd from everybody, and who while discoursing will travel forty-five degrees out of their way to bring in something as comic and mirthful as a scene in "Punch." Some of these men

instead of being teachers, should be sent to a reforming school, where they themselves might be taught reverence and godly fear. If they ever realize that they are in the presence of God, and have most responsible duties to perform, they are most unfortunate in making their "profiting appear unto all men."

Paul's preface to his charge to one of the primitive preachers was "I charge, thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom." The solemn charge itself was, first, "Preach the word;" second, "Be instant in season, out of season"; third "Reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine." And another preacher was reminded by the apostle that he was to "speak the things which become sound doctrine," a part of which teaching consisted in making even aged men "sober, grave and temperate," and young men "sober-minded." It would be a singular lesson that certain young, pert, spruce, play-actor like preachers, in the year of grace 1852, would teach upon sobriety and gravity. They forget the injunction to preacher Timothy, "Study to show thyself approved unto God."—What words these are! "Approved unto God." How many show themselves approved unto men, especially if the men have "itching ears" and relish a witty anecdote—how many, we say, are approved in the sight of men who are not approved unto God. Well might Paul exclaim, in closing one of his letters to his son in the faith and one of the Lord's workmen. "O, Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust" The things committed to his trust as a preacher and herald of Christ were the great and grave things of eternity.

A band of preachers who constantly cherish a living sense of the divine presence—who frequently enter in spirit into the Holiest of Holies—who look narrowly and carefully into heaven's looking-glass, are just the preachers and pleaders called for in times when a reformation is demanded. Their chief attention will not be a fine collar, a well-brushed coat, a smooth chin, a remarkable cane, or a swelling string of flowery words. They will rather carry with them the ornaments and attractions of the gospel, and the spiritual beauties and fashions of the Lord's religion. The odor of life is in all that they think, say, or do. Their powers, plans, and aims are consecrated to the Lord, and they lead, men to Jesus and to heaven. A score of such men must revolutionize any country in which God casts their lot.

And here we are led very naturally to offer a reflection or two upon the general character, bearing, and influence of preachers among all

classes and conditions of men, whether saint or sinner, infidel or christian. This is our fourth, and must be our last chapter of remarks upon preachers. Here we have much to say; but we must condense and study brevity, lest we should write more than will be read—an error into which both poets and prose-writers frequently fall in these days of keeping pace with steam, rail-car, and telegraph.

One very marked trait in every preacher should be the spirit of self-sacrifice—a strong, manly, bold inclination to spend and be spent in the cause of the Master, with his heart and his eye upon a reward most sure when human applause and bank bills shall be no more. A preacher, when he solemnly vows before God and before his brethren, that he enters the field as a laborer for the Divine Master, should remember that a cold and heartless world crucified the Lord of Glory, persecuted and put to death the Apostles, martyred whole armies of saints, imprisoned and starved the best men in the church, and that all who have rebuked the world and faithfully pled for reformation, have been compelled to suffer more or less, like the great Captain himself. No man, therefore, is worthy of the name of a preacher who is not willing to take his place among these sufferers, and prove himself a religious hero—a self-denying servant of the Faithful and True Witness. And having made up his mind “to suffer with the people of God,” and even more than some of God’s people, he should not permit himself to become a complainer—no, nor a boaster of his sufferings. The moment a preacher either complains or makes a boast of his sacrifices, he robs himself before God and man of any merit there might be in his self-denial. For in the one case every reflecting person must see that he regrets that he was self-denying, and in the other he takes occasion to make it only subservient to his vanity.

Some, indeed, complain in most sorrowful words that their brethren are narrow-minded, illiberal, and penurious in supporting them, or in rendering assistance to any who plead for Jesus. It may be all true—it may be more than true—we shall see, perhaps when we get our pen off the preachers; but in the meantime it must be seen that if we lack self-denying and self-sacrificing preachers, we cannot look for noble, liberal, free-hearted brethren. Let preachers “launch out into the deep”—let them labor and encounter trials after the primitive fashion—let them show that they are true ministers of Jesus Christ—and “in due time they will reap if they faint not”, even of the “carnal things” necessary for the maintenance of “this tabernacle.”

But preachers who will not journey unless furnished with a fine horse and carriage, and who will not open their lips unless so many pieces of silver are guaranteed, should be religiously (not physically) starved until they learn something more about the Saviour they profess to serve. Doubtless some other calling would be better suited to their capacities and propensities than preaching. We would give one vote that all such preachers should be sent where Napoleon died—to St. Helena. And we should vote, too, that a school of Christ particularly adapted to give instruction to ease loving gentlemen preachers, should be erected there; so that in a few years they might come back to us “enlarged and improved” like the second edition of a book that has been revised by a liberal mind.

God and good men unite in inviting some men into the field of labor; and yet they move not—there are too many trials and self-denials to encounter. O that we had a genuine covering of charity which might shield them “in that Day.”

But we must have faithful, intrepid, zealous, trial-facing men, or none at all—men who “consult not flesh and blood”—men who can “endure hardness as good soldiers.” Puny, timid, faint-hearted, fearful, flesh-bound men are always where they ought to be when out of the field where Jesus calls chosen laborers. We insist upon having self-denying preachers; and no preacher can please his Master without self-sacrifice. And no woman is fit to be a preacher's companion who is unwilling to share trials and self-denials with him.—But, to the honor of the sisters be it said, that, so far as we are advised, they are always willing to take the lead in suffering nobly for the Lord who has done so much to elevate them in society.

Not to speak of the spotless moral purity to be maintained by preachers, their deep devotion, their solicitude for the cause, their warmth of love for all good men, their interest in whatever concerns the religious welfare of society, and the general amiabilities of a well ordered life, all of which serve to make preachers usefully influential,—let us touch upon another feature of character very essential to their acceptance to God and their success as workmen. When Jesus sent chosen messengers to announce good news in his name, he required of them to be “wise as serpents.” A certain species of wisdom was to be joined to innocence in their labors among men.—This wisdom has always been needed. It is needed now as much as in times past. For want of it the cause suffers and has suffered.

Logic is not this wisdom—rhetoric is not it—neither is zeal—nor knowledge, moral character, nor any kindred attributes. It is rather a

species of policy which is calculated to win men to the Lord. How often are men driven from a good cause by a harsh spirit! How often are men drawn to a bad cause by a kindly and winning spirit! Christ, then, in the affairs of his kingdom, has instituted something like what we may call a gospel policy.

To belch out against "sectarians," and to suddenly knock the props from idols' temples, may be very bold and very masterly, speaking after the manner of men; but the wisdom of which we speak is wanting. To cut off a man's ears, or to strike off an enemy's head, cannot be considered so glorifying to the Redeemer as to win them both to the life, love, and light for which he expired on Calvary. There is the "meekness and gentleness of Christ," as well as the cogent and supreme power of truth; and could preachers always "speak the truth in love," very many would be drawn to the Saviour who are now only excited to opposition through combative influence.

Perhaps some may say we speak from experience. What if we grant it? If we have thundered, and used cannon, and scattered logical fire-brands, we have at least partially seen the impolicy of this manner, and, what is more, we not only confess but forsake the sin. Reformation—personal, social, general, universal reformation—is what we plead; and to preach one thing and practice another, whether ourselves or others, is intolerable.

We know some preachers, men of great knowledge, moral purity, and Christian worth, who nevertheless have apparently such a barbarian spirit that a stranger might almost set them down for second cousins of old Satan. And hence those whom they are the instruments of converting are seemingly driven rather than drawn to Jesus. Are we not therefore justified in calling loudly for reformation even among those who stand in reform ranks? If our years, indeed, were half a score more, we might use still greater plainness of speech!

Let no one hinder us from praying, pleading, talking, writing, working for a pure, vigorous, zealous, healthy, self-denying, God-fearing band of preachers. Canada, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward's Island, the United States, America, the world, solemnly call for a noble and honorable army to plead for King Jesus, who is blessed for ever.

D. OLIPHANT.

Steamer "Bay of Quinte," 26th August, 1852.

P. S. We have not searched after apologies for preachers in their delinquencies. Our work has been of another caste. They will themselves, at any time, (D. Oliphant included), furnish their own apologies.

D. O.

MR. WM. HOOPER, UNIVERSALIST PASTOR.

[We extract the following from the *Halifax Sun*. It is explained by way of preface, that though written for the *Provincial Wesleyan*, it was not admitted into the columns of that paper, and hence sent for publication in the *Sun*.—D. O.]

HALIFAX, September 8th, 1852.

To the Editor of the *Provincial Wesleyan*.

SIR,—During my residence in this city, I have been with tolerable frequency a reader of the *Wesleyan*. With some of its selections I have been well pleased, and I hope profited; with its editorials, and communications, baring the bad taste displayed by the too frequent use of such expressions as "our beloved Methodism," &c. I have certainly no fault to find, with the exception of the leading editorial in the issue of September 2nd, where to my great surprise and grief I find the following language, which I think wholly unbecoming a Christian Editor to use, and to apply to a denomination of Christians as conscientious, as devoted, and as exemplary, if not as popular, as any denomination in the country.

"Surveying Dartmouth especially, where the demoniacal figment of *Universalism* has been doing the work of death under the specious pretence of opening the portals of life to all, whether good or bad," &c.

I, Sir, believe this same Universalism which, in the fulness of your sectarian charity, you are pleased to term a demoniacal figment, i. e., a devilish lie, to be God's truth; that patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, have given their united testimony in its behalf; that Jesus Christ himself lived for its development, and died in its defence; and that from his time to the present, his faithful followers have not shunned to declare it as the whole counsel of God. As may be expected, then, when I see it characterised as a demoniacal figment, in what I had before supposed to be a respectable religious newspaper, I feel grieved, not so much on account of any injury which I suppose it may inflict upon the system under consideration, as on account of the weakness and bigotry of the poor brother who penned the article.

Demoniacal figment! Just analyse the words, my brother, and see where their expression as applied to the system of Universalism will lead you. God hath spoken of the *restitution of all things, by the mouth of his holy prophets since the world began*, Acts 3 21.—Jesus Christ himself, when on earth declared—And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me, John 12. 32. Paul declared explicitly, in his letter to Timothy, that God will have all men to be saved, and come unto a knowledge of the truth, 1 Tim. 2, 4. Pause then, I entreat you, before, in the very face of this evidence, you call the sentiment in question a devilish lie.

One word with regard to your allusion to Dartmouth. It is true that according to its size and number of inhabitants, there are a considerable number of Universalists in the place; and I should like to have you to take the entire number who live in that town, and who

call themselves Universalists, then select with as much care as you please an equal number of Methodists or any other 'ists, and see how their characters will compare. As regards respectability, truth, and *even piety*, were this test submitted to a candid public, I should have no fears for the result. It would be strange, indeed, if the exemplary conduct of the Universalists in Dartmouth could be traced to the influence of a demoniacal figment; no, sir. The grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, (I quote from the version of the text approved by your own commentator, Dr. Clarke.) hath appeared, teaching them that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, they should live righteously, soberly, and godly in this present world: Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us that he might purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.

In the same article from which the above exceptionable language is taken, you proceed to give a synopsis of the Sermon of the Rev. Dr. Richey, at the opening of the Argyle Street Methodist Church, in which it appears that the good Dr. is "not far from the kingdom." I will give a short extract which will require neither note nor comment:—

"In the cross of our Lord, Jesus Christ," says he, "we recognize the atoning altar, and in his sacrificial death the grand propitiation of the Christian temple, a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the *whole world*. It is not only when we surround the table of the Lord, and receive the symbols and seals of pardon, and salvation, bought with blood, with blood divine, but as often as we lift up holy hands without wrath and doubting, to the throne of God and the Lamb, that,

"His offering pure we call to mind,
These on the golden altar laid,
Whose Godhead with the manhood joined
Far every soul atonement made,
And have whate'er we ask of God,
Through faith in that *all-saving blood*."

As a matter of justice to a denomination which you have gone out of your way to abuse, I ask you to insert the above communication in your paper.

WILLIAM HOOPER,
Pastor Universalist Church,
Halifax.

REMARKS.

The preceding is now public property. We therefore require not to offer anything like an apologetic reason for the liberty we have taken in transferring it to our pages.

Our readers—at least those who have long been readers—are apprized of the fact that we approve not, (either in word or practice) of the course which is frequently chosen by popular journals, in not permitting every man who speaks respectfully, to speak for himself. In

this instance, it was certainly anything but gentlemanly, to say nothing of morality, first to denounce the Universalian faith, and subsequently refuse one of its prominent friends and abettors to speak in reply. "We have no such custom." The cause of truth demands no such course; or if otherwise, we have yet to learn it. Even a Roman Governor and a Gentile King had justice enough to permit an apostle of the despised Jesus to plead his own case before them. Is it not unaccountable that even those who are set down as heathens are capable of teaching modern 'spiritual men' some of the cardinal principles of justice?

Mr. Hooper, it is true, is in singular company; and is engaged in singular work; but are these valid reasons for treating him as the Divine Master would not treat publicans and sinners? We have been zealous against Universalism both with tongue and pen, "above many of our age," yet where is the man who can say we have fought this doctrine unfairly as indicated by the rejection of the preceding letter?

We have a word to say about Mr. Hooper's faith. We are in duty bound to give him credit when he says to every reader in these Provinces who sees his letter "I believe Universalism to be God's truth." What then? Let us have the basis, reason, or evidence on which his faith rests. A few words to a Jewish audience in the Portico of Solomon's temple, as narrated in Acts iii 21, are made the groundwork of at least some confidence in Universalism by the Pastor of the Universalist Church at Halifax. What connexion there is between Peter's language and the salvation of all men, it will be difficult to perceive until some kind friend points it out. The apostle, after stating a number of events connected with the life, death, and ascension of Jesus, charging the guilt of his crucifixion upon the people who heard him, calls upon them to "Repent and be converted," that so their "sins might be blotted out." And continuing his discourse about Jesus and his exaltation, he informs them that heaven must retain him in his present position as the Saviour of men, ready to blot out sins, as specified, until a certain time—until the accomplishment, performance, or fulfilment of all things which were predicted by the prophets of God from the world's commencement. Is this Universalism? If so, we would like the world to be full of it.

The next basement stone on which Mr. Hooper builds is contained in John xii: "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." This is as true as any other part of the holy Book; but to say that Christ will draw all men to him, and to say that he will draw all men to

heaven to give them eternal joy, are two widely opposite sentiments. Suppose, by way of argument, we say that all men will be drawn to Jesus in order to be judged by him—"all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether good or bad," 2 Cor. v 8, and this judgment of all because "he died for all." What kind of Universalism would this be? Paul's Universalism, or Mr. Hooper's?

It seems that another pillar of the Universalian faith is formed out of 1 Tim. iii 3—"Who (God) will have all men to be saved." And is it not God's will that all men shall be saved from sin by the gospel in this present life? Are they all saved from present sin, at the present moment, because God will have them thus saved? Was it not God's will that Adam should not sin? These things are not within a thousand miles of the point. It is not necessary to prove that God has a most gracious *will*, nor is it essential to show that He manifests a widely-extending *love*; for the Bible from beginning to end is replete with the requisite evidences. But here is the question—*Is it God's will to save any man from his sins unless by the gospel as now proclaimed on earth in the name of Jesus his Son?* God will have all men to be saved: that is conceded: we rejoice in that great and benevolent truth. And we rejoice, too, that God has expressed his will so explicitly that all who believe the gospel shall be saved, and that all who do not believe it shall be condemned. And if any man wonder how we can rejoice that the despiser of the gospel should be shut out from God's joyful presence, we shall, if called on, give the reason of the hope that is in us upon this awfully grand topic. To our mind, it is as merciful to exclude from heaven those who hate Jesus the Divine Lord, as to gather into his courts and into his presence those who love him.

D. OLIPHANT.

POSITION AND PRINCIPLES OF DISCIPLES.

No. X.

Friendly reader, an honest effort is being made to show you the position the Disciples hold in reference to the Abrahamic, Mosaic, and Christian covenants. In speaking of the old institution by Moses, and the new institution by Christ Jesus, seven great points of contrast between the law covenant and the gospel covenant have been noted; and three of these, we have said, it is our purpose to amplify. They are,—the promises to Abraham—the flesh principle of the law and the faith principle of the gospel—and the restrictions of the

blessings of the first covenant to one people, and the extension of the blessings of the new covenant to all people.

One of these, the promises to Abraham, we have to some extent already considered. It has been shown that instead of God making only one promise to the honored father of the Jewish nation, he made to him two promises and confirmed them as covenants; the one having sole reference to the nation he should be the father of, and the other referring to the favor of heaven to the whole world by Jesus Christ the Lord. We have endeavored to emphasize the fact that the Jewish Church or covenant was the legitimate result of the one promise, and that the covenant embracing all the blessings of Christ grew out of the other.

This leads us in the next place to speak particularly of the law as being established upon the principle of flesh, or "not of faith," in contrast with the gospel which is "of faith." Here is a grand landmark. If no other difference existed between the Sinaic covenant and the covenant by Christ than this one, the difference would be sufficient to show that the first is wholly abolished by the second.

The law that Moses gave, or the covenant of which he was mediator, was simply an amplification or fulfilment of what we shall call the *personal promise* to Abraham. The gospel of the Lord Messiah, or the covenant of which he was mediator, was an amplification or development of what we shall call the *spiritual promise* to Abraham. 'I will bless *you* and *yours*,' is the personal promise: 'I will bless *the world* by you' is something more and something better than a promise to a person and the children of a person. The law covenant carried out the first to the letter; for all that was done had exclusive reference to those in whose veins Abraham's blood was found; the gospel covenant fully carried out the second, for every blessing it embraced had respect to Gentile as well as Jew, to bond as well as free, to the far off as well as the nigh, to the bondman as well as the civilized Greek. Strange, most strange, that such diverse, not to say opposite, covenants, embracing such widely different principles and objects, should be received as the basis of one church with certain amendments and variations. But so it is; and the people, influenced as they are, "love to have it so."

We be Abraham's seed was an expression of the Jews in response to Jesus which fully developed the fundamental element of the Jewish people and their religious position. "That which is born of the flesh," and boasts of the flesh, is certainly fleshly. This is so ably presented in a tract that we once perused, that we shall here permit

it to speak to the people. While developing the old covenant it speaks thus:—

“Men were by necessity members of it. There was no appeal to the understanding, no address to the conscience, no motives addressed to the heart to win over a people to the Jewish nation. They were Jews, not by choice but by necessity. They were compelled to be members of that church, just as they were compelled to be born.—They were indeed born of the flesh, and not of the spirit, as preparatory to admission into that church. No one preached to the Jews that they should be born again to enter into their kingdom of God. We have no regeneration in the law of Moses. The Jewish elect were all chosen in Abraham's flesh. Hence there never was a missionary sent out of the Jewish church to bring into it any one not of the flesh of Abraham. There was no gospel in the law but for the Jews. Their inheritance was on earth, and their title to it blood, and not faith; natural, and not supernatural birth. Hence the perplexity of Nicodemus, when he heard the doctrine of the necessity of intelligence, and a new birth, in order to entrance into the new kingdom of God.”

Again:—

“The ordinances attached to the first covenant are called “*carnal*,” while those appended to the new, are *spiritual*. The inheritance of the first covenant was worldly. Its blessings were in the basket and in the store, in the flocks and herds, in fruitful seasons and abundant harvests, in oil and wine, in milk and honey, in victories and triumphs over their national and personal enemies. Their tabernacle and their temple, with all that appertained to them—their altars and lavers, their tables and candlesticks, their censurs and incense, their gold and their gems, their priests and their victims, their blood and water, their oil and wine—their music and their dance, their trumpets and their cymbals, their feasts and their fasts—were all of the same sensible, fleshly, and worldly character, suited to a carnal, worldly, and unregenerate nation; every citizen of which, good or bad, was a member of the church: for the church and nation of Israel were not only commensurate, but identically the same.”

These extracts are exactly in point, and shew beyond dispute that the great element of the old or Mosaic institution was not faith, but flesh. And we require not to spend a moment in proving that the new institution is, first, last, always, and in all things, an institution of faith. A word from the sacred Book, however, may not be inappropriate in closing up our remarks on this one point. The beloved

John, in opening his narrative concerning Jesus, says, "He came to his own, and his own people did not receive him; but to as many as did receive him, believing in his name, he granted the power or privilege of being Sons of God; born not of blood, nor of the desire of the flesh, nor of the will of man"—not of any of these by which the children of the former kingdom were born—"but of God." No matter who was their natural father, whether Abraham or Nero, into this new and superior kingdom they could not enter unless "born again," "born of the spirit"; and it would be inconceivable to suppose one thus born without faith.

The sum of this argument is in one short sentence:—the man who had the blood of Abraham in him, was connected with and embraced in the old covenant; the man who has the faith of Abraham in him, is connected with the new covenant.

We pass to another point of contrast between the two covenants. One family, and only one family was contemplated, provided for, and blessed by the first; but all families are contemplated and provided for, and blessings offered, by the second or new covenant. The style of Moses by the authority of God, in addressing the Israelites, is on this wise:—"Thou shalt say to the house of Israel," "These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the house of Israel"; and when an ordinance was appointed, or a ceremony was imposed, the command was, "And all the congregation of Israel shall keep it." Moses says (Deut. vii 6) "The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people to himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth." This sufficiently indicates that God looked upon "Jacob as his lot and Israel as his inheritance." And if anything can be plainer, read the following eloquent extracts from Deuteronomy, chap. iv, "For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all that we call upon him for? And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law which I have set before you this day? * * * Ask now of the days that are past, of the days which were before thee, since God created man upon the earth, and ask from one side of heaven unto the other, whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it? Did ever people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard it, and live? Or hath God essayed to go and take him a nation from the midst of other nations by signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm, and by great terrors, according to all that the Lord did for you before your

eyes? * * * Because he loved your fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them, and brought them out in his sight, with his mighty power out of Egypt; to drive out nations from before thee greater and mightier than thou, to bring thee in to give thee their land for an inheritance, as at this day." How applicable, therefore, are the words of David's sacred poetry, "The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto himself, and Israel for his peculiar treasure." Thus the law covenant, or the law itself, was for one family, and only for one family.

Far different the new covenant. The Gentiles of the British American Provinces, and all the American Gentiles from Maine to Iowa, may rejoice with great joy that the days of the first covenant are ended, and that a far better one, with a far better Mediator, has taken its place. This new covenant, like its author, has no respect to persons. It pays no special regard to a Jew because he is a Jew; it gives no exclusive honor to the Israelite because related by blood to the father of the Jewish nation; for says ambassador Paul, "there is no difference;" "Jews and Gentiles are all under sin," and therefore all stand in need of the mercy and the pardon of the better covenant. O what comprehensive terms God has laid down on which to bless the wide world! Soon as the author of the new institution personally encounters and conquers the chief captain of the rebellious, his executive messengers are instructed to "Go;" yes he says "Go"—"Go, preach the news of salvation to the world, to all men." This is the widest message ever given. There is not one nation, not one individual man in all the nations or individuals on earth, but has an interest in this heaven-spoken message. It stands in bold contrast with the message from Sinai; the one presented for the acceptance of the sons and daughters who could claim the son of Terah as their natural father—the other offered or presented to every kindred, people, tongue and tribe within the compass of the whole earth.

Still, it has been contended, and is now most strenuously contended, that the Jewish church before Christ and the Christian church after Christ are one and the same church under different dispensations!

Those who thus argue, are pleased to lodge themselves or their logic in the branches of the olive tree that Paul speaks of to the Romans. We are not to afflict the reader with excruciating criticisms upon what the good old divines have manufactured from the apostle's mode of grafting from a wild to a tame olive, "contrary to nature."—It is evident that our modern graftsmen do not pattern from Paul,

who was well skilled in the science; for the "natural branches" according to him were "cut off," and the wild olive branch, contrary to nature, when engrafted into the good olive, bore the fruit of the parent stock—not the *flesh* but the *faith* of father Abraham. But our theological friends of the nineteenth century keep working at an olive which Paul has not described, being neither wild nor tame, but a part of both, on which they are constantly grafting its own branches, and, according to nature (not contrary to nature like Paul's) they bear their own fruit. We choose Paul's grafting and Paul's fruit.

Abraham, let it be said with all emphasis, is the root, whether we look at Sinai or Sion. With him were made two promises, as we have shown,—the law growing out of the one, and the gospel growing out of the other. Hence he was the father of the circumcision, and likewise the father "of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised."

In conclusion, then, we contend and insist upon it that the Jewish church and the Christian church are totally different in nature, object, and organization, and among other and various proofs these three are conspicuous—1st. They were founded upon different promises made to the father of the faithful; 2nd. They were constructed so that they were entered into on widely opposite grounds, the one receiving subjects born simply of the flesh, the other receiving subjects by faith; and 3rd. They were established upon foundations so different that the one was exclusively for the benefit of a single family, while the other was and is designed for every nation under heaven. The peculiar blessings of the new covenant, and especially the elementary or first principles which it discloses, will now be in place as we farther proceed.

D. OLIPHANT.

A NARRATIVE

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

No. II.

As THE Regular Baptist Confession of Faith is, in its doctrinal parts, but a mere transcript of the Westminster creed; and as the whole of it is founded upon the same principles of creed making—a narrative of the origin and formation of the Westminster, its grand model and parent, cannot but be highly interesting to the admirers of this creed amongst the Baptist community. It is true, however, that the drafters or copyists of the Westminster creed amongst the Baptists did not intend to bind it either upon churches or individuals, as the presbyterians or puritans do theirs; but only designed to show the puritans, who reviled them as damnable heretics, that their faith was substantially the same with their own. Yet many of the Baptists, ignorant of the design of their own little confession, wish to have it riv-

eted upon the congregations of their fraternity on pain of excommunication, as the system of truth taught in the holy scriptures. This occurrence in the history of the Baptists serves to show how dangerous it is to traffic in the merchandize of Babylon. "Can a man take fire in his bosom and his clothes not be burnt?" But to resume the narrative. It has already appeared that the Westminster confession owes its origin to a political contest; that the convulsions of England forced it into being; that it is a small morsel of the religious lava that belched forth from the crater of that political volcano which made Britain tremble from north to south, from the Orkney Isles to the Straits of Dover. It is also evident that the civilans and politicians that projected its formation, although abetted by the clergy, designed to help themselves to soldiers and munitions of war by the project; that they, being Erastians, had no objections to any form of ecclesiastical policy which might be adopted; that, indeed, that form was most eligible which would best suit the exigencies of the times; and, as every thing in the civil war, then levied, depended on Scotland, that creed and form of discipline was conscientiously to be preferred which would insure the co-operation of the Scots. Besides, two monstrous errors, arising, no doubt, from the mist of the dark ages, not yet dissipated, characterize the whole proceedings of the church and state assembly. The first is now so palpable that all men in this country reprobate it. It is the notion that the doctrine and worship of what is called the church, is to be regulated by acts of parliament; that the civil authority necessarily must take cognizance of the doctrine, discipline, and worship of professed congregations of christians; that the civil sword must purify the hearts of the worshipers, and regulate their devotions. The other mistake, no-less absurd, though perhaps not so manifest to all, was conspicuous in the clergy and laity, who indeed fostered and matured the assumptions of the civil rulers by appealing to them, and in constituting them arbiters and judges of what was sound doctrine and true piety. They appealed to them with all the confidence and earnestness that a christian appeals to the apostles, or as the Phillippian jailor appealed to Paul and Silas. The civil rulers erred most palpably in assuming such a jurisdiction over men's consciences; and the clergy and their supporters erred as absurdly in looking up to them to exercise authority in their behalf; and thus flattered them into the belief of a lie, that in decreeing what was sound doctrine and true piety they were serving God and his church.

We had in our last number left the divines in King Henry VII's chapel, regularly summoned, systematically hired, and patronized by the long parliament, waiting for their orders. Saturday, July 1, 1643, the assembly was opened with a sermon by Dr. Twisse; both houses of parliament being present. The ordinance for their convention was then read; and the members called by name after which they adjourned to Monday.

Among the rules by which they were to be governed, the following oath or protestation was to be taken by every member, and, to refresh their memories, it was to be read every Monday morning:

"I, A. B., do seriously and solemnly, in the presence of Almighty God, declare that, in the assembly whereof I am a member, I will not maintain any thing in matter of doctrine, but what I believe in my conscience to be most agreeable to the word of God; or in point of discipline, but what I shall conceive to conduce most to the glory of God and the good and peace of the church."

The parliament would not trust them without an oath, and they succumbed to the above form. But let the reader remember the distinction between doctrine and discipline marked in this vow. In doctrine they vowed to maintain what in their consciences they believed most agreeable to the divine oracles; but in discipline they were not under the same obligation—they were to maintain what they conceived most to conduce to the glory of God and the peace of the churches. They were in fact sworn to act, if not to believe, as Erastians. The form of oath is predicated upon Erastian principles; that is, that there is no fixed form of discipline in the Scriptures, but that it was left to the civil magistrate who has the keys. Yes, they vowed to make the Bible the standard of doctrine, and their own conceptions of God's glory and the peace of the church the standard in matters of discipline. Under this vow or oath they entered upon their work.

The parliament, on Thursday, 6th July, sent them farther regulations, amongst which it was appointed that two assessors be joined with the prolocutor to supply his place in case of absence or sickness. Those first appointed were Dr. Cornelius Burges and John White. It was also ordered by the parliament, "that all things agreed upon and prepared for the parliament, shall be openly read and allowed in the assembly, and then offered to the parliament to act upon (as the higher house) if the majority assent; provided that the opinions of the persons dissenting, with their reasons, be annexed, if they desire it, and the solution of those reasons by the assembly."

The rules being prescribed, and the matter of proceeding being settled, the parliament sent the assembly an order to review the thirty nine articles of the Church of England. Before the assembly began, they petitioned parliament to appoint a fast. Of this petition Bishop Kennett said, "Impartially speaking, it is stuffed with schism, sedition and cruelty." Our limits forbid us to publish this petition. The prominent features of which are: They petition the parliament in the name of Jesus Christ, "your Lord and ours," that "they would set up Christ more gloriously in all his ordinances, and reform all things amiss throughout the land." Besides praying for the fast, they pray the parliament to "suppress all the bold venting of corrupt doctrines; to charge all ministers to catechise the children and the ignorant adults; to have a care to punish all profanation of the Sabbath and of fast days, by unlawful labor or sports; to put down by a "through proceeding" all blind guides and scandalous ministers; to quicken the laws against swearing and drunkenness: to take a severe course against fornication, adultery, and incest; to abolish popery," &c. &c.

Friday, July 21, was appointed a fast, and three of the divines preached before parliament, and the fast was observed with great solemnity. Next day a committee was appointed to examine what amendments

were proper to be made in the thirty-nine articles, and to report to the assembly. They spent ten weeks in debating upon the first fifteen, before the arrival of the Scots commissioners. Their design was to render their sense more express against the Arminians, whom they cordially hated, and to make them more determinate in favor of Calvinism. They appeared as solicitous to condemn Antinomianism as to strengthen the churches against Arminianism, and appointed a committee to peruse the writings of Dr. Crisp, Eaton, and Saltmarsh, who drew out some of the most dangerous positions. The assembly then condemned them, and endeavoured to confute them in their public preachments.

The Scots in the mean time got up a general assembly to consider of the state of religion, as well as a political assembly, as conservators of the peace. The king gave them orders to confine their attentions to their own country, and to let England alone. The parliament of England sent five dignified laymen and two distinguished divines from Westminster, with letters to each of the Scotch assemblies, desiring their assistance in war, and some of their divines to assist those assembled at Westminster "to settle a uniformity of religion and church government between the two nations." These seven commissioners arrived at Edinburg on the ninth of August, and were well received by the Scotch Assembly, which (in profound policy) proposed as a preliminary, "that the two nations should enter into a perpetual covenant for themselves and their posterity, that all things might be done in God's house according to his will." The Scots appointed some of their number to confer with the English commissioners on the form of this covenant. This being done, they chose delegates for the Westminster assembly, and unanimously advised the convention of states to assist the English parliament in the war, for seven reasons, viz. "1. Because they apprehended the war was for religion. 2. Because the Protestant faith was in danger. 3. Gratitude to the English for former assistances to the Scots required a suitable return. 4. Because the churches of England and of Scotland being embarked in one bottom, if one be ruined the other cannot subsist. 5. The prospect of uniformity between the two kingdoms in discipline and worship will strengthen the Protestant faith at home and abroad. 6. The present English parliament had been friendly to the Scots and might be so again. 7. Though the king had lately established their religion, yet they could not confide in his royal declarations, having so often found *facta verbis contraria*, i. e. his deeds contrary to his words."

When the commissioners arrived in London they presented the covenant to the two houses, who referred it to the Assembly of divines — Some of the divines opposed some articles of the covenants. Dr. Featly declared he dare not abjure prelacy absolutely, because he had sworn to obey his bishop in things lawful and honest. Dr. Burges objected to several items, and it was with difficulty he was persuaded to subscribe after he had been suspended. The prolocutor and many others declared for primitive episcopacy. They refused to subscribe until a parenthesis was inserted declaring what sort of prelacy was to be adjoined, viz. (church government by archbishops, bishops, deans,

and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending upon them)

Bishop Burnet says the English commissioners pressed the Scots for a civil league, but the Scots would have a religious one. Sir Henry Vane put the word league into the letter, as thinking that might be broke sooner than a covenant; and in the first article inserted these words after the term reform, "according to the word of God;" but the Scots relief upon the next words, "and according to the practice of the reformed churches." When Mr. Coleman read the covenant before the house of Lords, in order to their subscribing it, he declared that by prelacy all sorts of episcopacy were not intended, but only the form therein described. Thus, says Mr. Neal, the wise men on both sides endeavoured to outwit each other in working the articles; and, with these slight amendments, the covenant passed the assembly and both houses of Parliament, and by an order dated September 21, was printed and published. Thus originated and progressed the solemn league and covenant, which is appended to the Old Confession of Faith, which must be identified with it because of the same character and emanating from the same source, and designed for the same end. The first two articles of which, as a specimen, we shall here insert:—

"We, noblemen, barons, knights, gentlemen, citizens, burgesses, ministers of the gospel, and commons of all sorts, in the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, by the providence of God living under one king, and being of one reformed religion; determined to enter into a mutual and solemn league and covenant, wherein we all subscribe, and each one of us for himself, with our hands lifted up to the Most High God, do swear—

"1st. That we shall sincerely, really, and constantly, through the grace of God, endeavor, in our several places and callings, the preservation of the reformed religion in the Church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, in discipline, and government, against our common enemies; the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government according to the word of God and the example of the best reformed churches; we shall endeavour to bring the church of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction, and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of church government, directory for worship, catechism; that we, and our posterity after us, may as brethren, live in faith and love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us.

"2d. That we shall, in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavor the extirpation of popery, prelacy, (that is, church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancelors and commissaries, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy,) superstition, heresy, schism, profaneuess, and whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness, lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues; and that the Lord may be one, and his name one, in the three kingdoms."

"Monday, September 25, 1643, was appointed for subscribing this covenant, when both houses, with the Scots' commissioners and assembly of divines, being met in the church of St. Margaret's, Westminster, the Rev. Mr. Whit, of Dorchester, opened the solemnity with prayer; after him Mr. Nye spoke in justification of taking the covenant from scripture precedents, and displayed the advantage the church had received from such sacred combinations. Mr. Henderson spoke next, and declared that the states of Scotland had resolved to assist the parliament of England in carrying on the designs of this covenant; then Mr. Nye read it from the pulpit with an audible voice, article by article, each person standing uncovered, with his right hand lifted up bare to heaven, worshipping the great name of God, and swearing to the performance of it. Dr. Gouge concluded the solemnity with prayer, after which the House of Commons went up into the chancel, and subscribed their names in one roll of parchment, and the assembly in another, in both of which the covenant was fairly transcribed. Lord's day following it was tendered to all persons within the bills of mortality, being read in several churches to their congregations as above. October 15, it was taken by the House of Lords, after a sermon preached by Dr. Temple; from Nehemiah x. 29. and an exhortation by Mr. Coleman. October 29, it was ordered by the committee of states in Scotland to be sworn to and subscribed all over that kingdom, on penalty of the confiscation of goods and rents, and such other punishment as his majesty and the parliament should inflict on the refusers. All the lords of the council were summoned to sign the covenant, November 2, and those who did not, to appear again the 14th of the same month, under the severest penalties; when some of the king's party not attending, were declared enemies to their religion and to their king and country. November 17, their goods were ordered to be seized, and their persons apprehended; upon which they fled into England. Such was the unbounded zeal of that nation. February 2, following, the covenant was ordered to be taken through the kingdom of England, by all persons above the age of eighteen years; and the assembly were commanded to draw up an exhortation to dispose the people to it, which being approved by both houses, was published."

Here we shall leave the Westminster assembly for the present, engaged in forming exhortations to induce all persons from eighteen years and upwards to swear to extirpate popery and prelacy, and to maintain presbytery, themselves and their children forever.

THREE LETTERS ABOUT LABORERS.

Cobourg, 10th September, 1852.

BELoved BROTHER SHEPARD:—By this time you are probably advised of the fact that it is the next thing to an impossibility for me to remain in the evangelical field continuously, and that therefore our much and always esteemed brother Black requires more assistance than can be given by me in his efforts to serve the brethren and the Lord as a herald of the gospel. The managing brethren for the cooperation have been informed by myself that neither my health nor

my general duties will permit me to labor constantly—as indeed I was free to state to them when requested to engage more fully as a speaker. It was problematical in my own mind from the beginning whether I could remain in the field even one half of the year.

But, my dear brother, will you permit me to unite with others in inducing you to continue in the Lord's harvest field in which you have been lately engaged. Will you allow me to speak words of encouragement to enlist your sympathies so that you will not say *No* to the invitation of our brethren whom we love for the sake of Him who loved us all.

It is not the importance of the work—it is not the need of laborers—it is not the pressing demands of the times for gospel light and truth—it is not any of these concerning which I am seated to address you; for all these are generally acknowledged, and by yourself well and truly appreciated. But it is rather to say that is *your duty* at this time, in view of the past, the present, and the future, to surmount all difficulties and put your hand to the plow without looking back. I shall suppose you have four strong objections—1st, The brethren need you at Dorchester. 2nd, A feeling that others are better qualified. 3rd, That a better laborer can be procured. 4th, Pre-arranged affairs at home demand attention. Now if I remove half of these obstacles, I presume you will remove the others—that is to say, that you and I will share alike and be co-workers in removing mountains!

I would state then, first, that so far as the good brethren in Dorchester are concerned, they are willing to make sacrifices for the common cause. I hear them testify that they are liberal and self-denying, and I know that brothers Bentley, Whittemore, Crane, Clayton, Ballah, and others will perform their part in keeping up the weekly meetings for a few months while brother Sheppard travels and tells poor wanderers that Jesus asks them to his house, which is large, to find rest with him and his rich fulness. Do not say that the brethren will not let you go, for if you say it is duty, they will believe you, and hence even more than *let*—they will *send* you. This therefore leads me to touch upon the duty of your engaging—yes, *your duty*. You have not in truth one word to say about not being qualified, for if brother Sheppard be recommended by twelve inspired and as many uninspired men, he will not only be in the minority in saying *No*, but evidently insist that his own judgment is better than the whole twenty-four. You see it at once—will you then “walk by faith?” Say Yes, and I know you will keep your word!

But again, what other laborer can be procured? Brother Jones is again in New York state. Brother Anderson is out of the field *from principle*—his reasons being found in the June Number of the *Christian Banner*, embraced in the Report for the co-operating churches. Brother Kilgour, at present, has aged relations to honor and care for, and I rather opine he has scruples about the co-operation similar to brother Anderson. Brother Scott has always declined leaving his family—thinking it duty to train them, up for the Lord. Brother Trout, who would make a good preacher, is not to be obtained for various reasons valid both to himself and others. Brethren Parkinson,

Mitchell, Royce, W. Oliphant, and some others do not regard themselves as in the speaking field, although every one of them is qualified to hold forth the gospel of God's Son.

Where then, my brother, are we to find a true "yoke-fellow" for father Black, who has at great sacrifice, and for the truth's sake, solely, consented to labor in the vinyard as a preacher and special witness for the truth at least during the present year? Are you not fully satisfied that the duty belongs to you to agree at the sixth hour to enter the field.

As to personal obligations at home, if your character will not suffer by breaking away from your domestic circle for a season, be entreated to leave all and join our beloved and faithful laborer. By another year it is to be hoped that our manner of co-operation will be on another and better footing—more done, the machinery less complex, and objections removed which are now in the way of those who feel justified by reason of them in keeping out of the field of labor. Should you object on the ground that if it be not right for others to labor, therefore it is not right for you, please bear in mind that to make your argument as good as theirs *you have first to labor like them*, and this is the very thing which is desired.

Yours in Christian love,
D. OLIPHANT.

(The following is not a response, or at least was not written as a response to the above; but as it has been handed to us either to publish or not, we think it expedient to submit it in connexion with the foregoing)

D. O.

South Dorchester.

BELOVED BROTHER :—Your letter of the 17th instant, came to hand on the 21st. I hasten to reply.

I trust the brethren who form the Committee of the Provincial Co-operation will not think that I am indifferent to their anxious call; or to the interests of our Redeemer's kingdom when I state the reason why I cannot fulfil their anxiously expressed desire. I trust that to some extent at least, I appreciate the truth that I am "not my own." I wish to serve Christ and my christian brethren. If Christ through his Church should *clearly show* to me that it is my duty to go *any where*, or do *anything* for the glory of his name: there I will go. *that* I will do. I should not any further "confer with flesh and blood," but endeavor to do the Lord's will. In a cause so good as to draw the admiration of Heaven, so precious as to cost the blood of Christ, so effectual as to be the "power of God unto salvation," all selfishness should stand abashed, and all secular interests be dissipated as the morning fog before the sun. That it is the will of Christ that I should preach the gospel is plain, but *where* I should preach the gospel is not so evident. The beloved brethren in Eramosa whose judgment I esteem, say it is as an Evangelist through the wide field of Canada West. The brethren here say where can the Lord open for you a door wider and more effectual than in Western Canada. The experienced say also you cannot leave the church in its in-

fantile state. Those recently converted say you must not leave us. I tell them that the brethren who bid fair to be useful in the church will visit them often and speak to them and for them. They answer their experience in speaking is not sufficient to keep alive the interests and advance the cause; while their locality and occupations would often prevent them from being here.

To lay aside my difficulties might be comparatively easy, but to lay aside those of my brethren is more difficult. In fact I see that to act contrary to their voice at the present time would cause offence and wound the cause of Christ in this place.

You call on me to "look at the state of the case." I look, and my heart is pained—sinners dying around and none to carry the pure gospel to them. An association formed to be an instrument for providing for the wants of laborers and no laborers to be found; believe me, dear brother, I am ready to do the work of an Evangelist if freed from my obligations here. I still look forward to the time when some one will take my place here and set me at liberty—till then I will endeavour to labor more diligently and more widely, and I hope that the brethren will not only pray to the Lord of heaven to send forth more laborers, but to bless the work of those in circumscribed fields who labor in word and doctrine for the edification of the church and preach the gospel for the conversion of sinners.

My Christian love to brothers Anderson, Kilgour, Mitchell and all the holy brethren and sisters.

Yours affectionately,

E. SHEPPARD.

For the Christian Banner.

DEAR BROTHER:—A subject is referred to in the report of the "Committee of the Provincial Co-operation," to which I desire to direct the attention of the churches. In that Report, (see Banner, page 164) the Committee say:—"They cannot properly close without directing attention to the nature of certain difficulties or objections presented by brethren who were solicited to labor for the co-operation. Those brethren are devoted to the Lord, and willing to spend and be spent in his service. They reason thus:—'We desire to serve the Lord, not simply for a few months or a year but for life, or so long as God shall grant ability. We stipulate for no monthly or yearly allowance. If the brethren will say to us the Lord has need of you; do the work of an evangelist, and we will provide for you and yours, the things that are needed—we will leave all and labor to the extent of our ability. But to labor for a few months as ministers of the gospel; then to resume our secular pursuits with diminished ability, but increased necessity arising from the derangement of our business; and again to serve as evangelists—our affairs meantime becoming more and more entangled, this appears like a fruitless attempt to serve two masters. We must therefore decline accepting the call of the brethren until a more scriptural system is introduced.'

"Your 'Committee felt they had no authority to say 'leave all and you will be provided for.' But they leave it with the brethren to say whether or not it is practicable, to modify the present system of employing evangelists, so that those employed could give themselves wholly to the work."

This subject was brought under the notice of the brethren at the annual meeting, but the time was too short for its proper consideration and therefore its discussion was not entered upon. But it is too important to be neglected; and it is now brought into notice for the purpose of bringing out the mind of the brethren.

It is evident that unless laborers can be obtained the churches will discontinue making contributions for their support, and almost equally evident that unless they thus contribute, they will soon cease to feel interested in the missionary enterprise, and will retain but the name of Christian, without the reality. If a method can be discovered by which able workmen can be *constantly* maintained in the field the co-operation will go on with increasing vigor; if not, the prospect is gloomy indeed.

There are among the churches a number of brethren qualified to labor as evangelists, some of whom have been employed and have labored successfully; and on the decision of the present case, depends in a great measure the question as to whether those brethren will still be employed.

The present committee are willing and anxious to carry out the expressed or understood wishes of the brethren. The greatest difficulty they have met hitherto, is the difficulty of obtaining laborers. This has more than once brought them almost to a complete stand, and caused them to pray with more earnestness, 'O Lord, send forth laborers into the harvest' The difficulty has been increased by two considerations, 1st, the understanding that the brother employed is expected to distribute his labors among the churches scattered throughout Canada West, and 2nd, that through some such contingency as the dismemberment of the Provincial Co-operation; its management passing into other hands &c., a devoted and useful evangelist may find himself at the end of "his year," allowed quietly to resume his worldly calling.

It remains with the brethren to say whether or not these difficulties can be removed or lessened. They may think, that to alter the present arrangement, will produce greater difficulties than those sought to be removed. But let them speak out. What is required, is a system of co-operation so efficient and practicable, that it can be vigorously carried out from year to year until the Master shall appear. Some are disposed to do away altogether with the present system and substitute smaller and more manageable co-operations. The present has been voted for another *year*, at the expiration of which it may, or may not, be discontinued. Much depends on the proper settlement of this subject, and it should occupy the serious attention of all concerned.

Meantime let it be remembered that the question before the brethren

ren is,—can the present system of employing evangelists 'be so modified,' that those employed can give themselves wholly to the work?

W. OLIPHANT.

Eramosa, September, 1852.

AN EPISTLE TO AN EDITOR BY AN EDITOR.

To the Editor of the Canada Christian Advocate.

RESPECTED SIR:—My respect for you, your paper, and many of your brethren, inclined me some time since to make a resolve to address you in order to correct a notice published in your journal. The notice, if I remember right, was in language to this effect—

"The CHRISTIAN BANNER: Edited by D Oliphant, Cobourg, and W. W. Eaton, St. John, N. B.: devoted to the principles of the Disciples or Campbellites."

In the first place; you will permit me to tender you my cordial thanks for having courteously announced the reception of the *Christian Banner* at your office almost every time it was sent. This courtesy on your part justifies the testimony I have always heard respecting you, as being a gentleman well balanced with Christian magnanimity and frankness. Many of our brother editors willingly omit to notice this periodical, because their journals (perhaps being somewhat Jewish) might be made unclean by the operation. Yours however, being ostensibly a *Christian Advocate*, has no such fears.

But by some cause you have been led into error by grouping the Disciples with the Campbellites. They are not of the same origin, order, or character. If you look at a late Quebec Gazette, where the returns of this year's Census appears, you will discover that Campbellites and Disciples are a separate people,—for while in the whole of Canada West there are but fourteen Campbellites, the brethren calling themselves Disciples number according to the Census between two and three thousand. If you will allow me, I will lay before your readers a brief running history of the Disciples in this the noblest and largest British American Province.

The two principal men—in the providence of Him that rules all things—who first labored in our cause in Canada, were Elder James Black and David Oliphant, Senior. They were both natives of Scotland, the former from the Highlands and the latter from the Lowlands of that country. In 1821, father Oliphant settled in Dundas, four miles from where you now publish the *Advocate*, where he faithfully preached for a period of years, neither asking nor accepting reward. He had been a Scotch Baptist. But he would not or at least he did not unite with the Baptist Association in this country: for he found the Baptists of Canada very different from those who associated with Haldane, Low, and McLéan, in Scotland. Elder Black had also been a Scotch Baptist: and after being in this country for a time, united with the Baptists, losing however none of his taste for the liberal views received while under the ministry of Dugald Sinclair, then of Scotland, but now of Lobo, Canada.

Elders Oliphant and Black met in 1832, the former having removed to the vicinity of Guelph, and they began to co-operate upon the

most liberal views that each had learned, indifferent whether they were called Scotch Baptists, Canadian Baptists, or no Baptists, but fully persuaded that it was high time to contend for the apostolic word independently of the counsel and commandments of men. About this time a most valuable reformatory periodical was read by father Oliphant, entitled the *Millennial Harbinger*, the principles of which he accepted as his own, although placed in a clearer, fuller, and more commanding light to his mind than ever before. The irreproachable character, biblical attainments, and prayerful effort of these two men were honoured and blessed by the Lord; and although their work was not rapid, yet it was solid, steady, and sterlingly progressive. One congregation grew up under their labors—a second spread from that—then a third—meantime a Baptist congregation was charmed into union—and finally at the present moment there are five churches and several hundred Disciples in that centre of the work of reformation in Canada.

Father Oliphant took his departure to a better world early in 1841. He died as all faithful men die, with the full assurance of meeting his glorified Redeemer. All his family expect soon to be with him—where all Disciples of the Lord will be, but where, it is feared, Campbellites will not be able to enter. Father Black still lives and still labors in the Lord and for the Lord.

Our principles are frank, bold, and simple. We accept of the Bible as our only written doctrinal confession—the New Testament as the infallible oracle of the new or Christian Church. We view all ecclesiastical legislation with distrust. We strenuously oppose the fancied idea of a stream of clerical grace beginning with the apostle Peter and reaching to Bishop Strachan, Toronto, or Pius IV. of Rome. The legitimate authority of preachers we endeavour to distinguish from their usurped authority, the latter, in our view, being awfully prevalent. We are deeply impressed with the necessity of proclaiming the pure word of Christ to sinners, instead of theories of salvation whether our own, Calvin's, or that of Arminius. We are assured that the people of God should be much more humble, simple, and spiritual than they are generally, and that they should assemble weekly to celebrate the Lord's death as they honour his resurrection by the observance of the Lord's day. We hold that "faith without works is dead," and in this sense reject the system popularly called "faith alone." We believe that men are converted to Jesus Christ by having confidence in, and obeying his gospel; and that the Divine Spirit is enjoyed in, with, by, and through Christ's gospel. We urge that christianity is calculated to unite men, not separate and fractionalize them into parties; hence we labor for union; though it ought to be frankly avowed that some called disciples have an unfortunate method of showing their love of union. To effect this unity we endeavour to make manifest that the lovers of truth are not to be united in their personal opinions, but upon the truth itself—which is distinguished from opinion.

I have not leisure, nor have you space, for details. Concerning the unique and Divine character of Father—Son—and Holy Spirit—I

need say nothing, as we agree with Baptists, Congregationalists, and Methodists on the sublime manifestation of Deity, saving that we refuse to use some of the terms and language that our cotemporaries are pleased to employ.

The Disciples as a people have been in sundry sections of the land most sadly represented and the cause we plead cruelly wounded by the erroneous teachings and aberrations of certain unworthy advocates. But every candid man can distinguish between the principles and character of a body of people and the character of those who finally prove themselves to be the betrayers of the cause they espouse.

I need not say more. You will receive the cordial thanks of a misrepresented people by inserting in your widely circulating journal, these few explanatory observations—a kindness which will at any time be willingly reciprocated. Perhaps I should have added that our publications are always open and free for every professor of any religious school who speaks with becoming respect.

Yours sincerely,
D. OLIPHANT.

Cobourg, 4th September, 1852.

LABOURS OF EVANGELISTS.

REPORT NO. X.

Wainfleet, Oct. 5th, 1852.

BROTHER OLIPHANT:—Since Brother Sheppard and myself parted as you see by our last report, I spent only a few weeks in the service of the co-operation. My time was occupied in visiting and preaching in several places, and though nothing particular has occurred which would interest the brethren to know, I believe that good must result from the seed sown.

I had an opportunity of speaking twice in the neighborhood of Chiltenham in Chingacousy township, where I know the truth has made impressions which have already resulted in good. The friends there strongly urged that brother Anderson and myself should spend a week with them in order to present the whole Gospel system so as to remove the prejudice of some honest minds who love the Saviour and the Bible. I encouraged them to expect us if at all convenient. The views which we advocate are rapidly extending, and now instead of the dread which prevented the community from listening to us when we come to their doors, they are inviting us from all points.—I heard that a Methodist minister lately referred in public to a great outpouring of the Spirit where we laboured, and though some Methodists were baptized he prayed to the Lord to bless us. I baptized two in Eramosa since I wrote you last.

JAMES BLACK.

REPORT NO. XI.

BROTHER OLIPHANT:—Our meeting in Wainfleet commenced according to appointment, on Friday the 24th ultimo, and was concluded on Monday 27th, at noon. Brethren Brown of Newstead,

N. Y., Anderson, and myself, were the speakers. Through the whole of the meeting, especially on Lord's day and Monday, we were much cheered with the presence of a goodly number of brethren and listeners from Jordan, Rainham, and all the country round; some from N. Y. State, and two brethren from P. E. County.

The weather was favourable to a good turn out, and on the first day of the week the Congregation was estimated at above 500. Brother Bradt's barn and shed were well seated and filled with as fine a specimen of intelligence, respectability, and comfort, as could be produced among the yeomanry of any country. We endeavoured to be faithful to the cause in which we are engaged, and they seemed to realise it. Sunday night the claims of the Saviour were pressed home upon them, and four presented themselves as candidates for Baptism. The same course was followed on Monday, and three more were added. Several others stated that they were convinced, but they put off submitting to a more convenient season!

The seven volunteers were led to Lake Erie, eight miles distant and were baptized without delay, as all who received the word of the Lord should be. They will find a home and faithful brethren and intelligent and exemplary Pastors in Wainfleet. We hope they will prove faithful to the end and they will receive the crown. Amen.

I need hardly add that we all parted with mingled emotions of pleasure and regret; those of pleasure greatly predominating, because we hope by a patient continuance in well doing to meet in our home in heaven where there are pleasures forever more.

Though this was written by one of us we would present it as our Report.

JAMES BLACK.

A. ANDERSON.

CALL FOR LABOURERS.

The following comes from a member of a large and popular church in the state of Maine. We give it simply as a sample of the demand for the Lord's workmen in the times in which we live:

Do you ever expect to come this way? I cannot but think that the Disciples will visit this region. There is a great deal of preaching here such as it is, but it seems to me that it does not commend itself to "every man's conscience in the sight of God." I attended meeting last Lord's day, when I really wished that the desk was filled with one of the preachers of the reformation. Really, it was all sorts of preaching, mingled and intermingled.

Yes, friend, if the Lord spare and prosper us, we shall see many a hill and valley in Maine, and speak with more than a few in Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, and Massachusetts. The names of many precious souls are familiar to us, some of them personally known, in these territories.

D. O.