

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 ce 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 headcr 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. X. COBOURG AND BRIGHTON, NOVEMBER, 1856. NO. 11.

---

CHARTERS AND CHURCHES.

The following portion of a letter written by a distinguished editor to a learned minister we have thought would be read with interest and edification by the readers of the Christian Banner:—

When a legislature grants a charter to a bank, a borough, or a manufacturing company, it incorporates them into a separate, independent body, with full power to manage their own concerns; and they may appoint and must appoint either directors, a council, or managers, who have full power to make as many by-laws as they please for the government of their body, provided these by-laws are sanctioned by the charter; but the charter itself contains no particular or special laws for their government. It merely erects them into a body known in law, and grants them the privilege of legislation, and full power to enforce their own regulations and by-laws; that is, the same power which the legislature itself possesses.

The following are some of the more prominent objections to your plan of church government:—

1. I object to considering the bible merely as a charter granted by a legislature or civil government, because the bible does more than erect congregations, or constitute religious bodies invested with peculiar privileges. It gives them many laws for their general and particular behavior. It authorizes the existence of congregations, or, as you call them, "corporate bodies," but it does more than any charter ever granted by any legislature ever did. It prescribes to the members in particular every requisite rule of behavior, for their thoughts, words, and actions. In fact it transcends any charter on earth in every res-

pect; for if it was like other charters it ought to have left every thing, but the definition of the powers and privileges granted, to the management of the individuals incorporated. Now all the apostolic writings are filled with matter and laws entirely subversive of such a representation of the matter. The apostles taught christians a thousand times more than any charter teaches; and while the constitution of the christian church is laid down most fully in these writings, every important item of christian duty requiring the attention of christians, either in public or private capacity, is also laid down. In representing the bible, then, only as the charter of the church, injustice is done to it as great as I can conceive of. And the book is divested of all its utility as regulating the conduct of individuals. For you know that charters regulate public bodies, and not individual persons; whereas almost the whole New Testament is engrossed with the regulations, and rules, and precepts which are to govern individuals. I am therefore constrained to differ essentially from you in this part of your plan of church government. But I hope, when you more maturely reflect upon this matter, you will differ from yourself as far as I differ from you; and indeed I must say, that I think you will agree with this view of the matter, and that your public lectures to congregations are at variance with your theory.

A second capital objection to your scheme of church government is, that it terminates in the same systems with those fashionable in Rome, Constantinople, and Edinburgh. In giving to the church the incorporated powers of legislation, even upon the subject of by-laws, the question is, Do the whole church, male and female, old and young—or do the rulers in the church make these laws? Or do you use the word church in the classic sense of the presbyterians, or the New Testament sense of a single congregation? As a Baptist, I suppose you use it in the latter sense. Well, then, the congregation in Washington city, for example, is chartered by the bible, and authorized to make its own by-laws or particular laws for the government of its members. The whole congregation must, then, make these laws, or their rulers. Now, to say nothing of the principles involved on either hypothesis, where do the sacred writings authorize or give directions for either? What command, law, or precedent, says, You may make your own by-laws or regulations? I must candidly say, I know of not one. If you know of any such, do, for the sake of the churches, declare it. The presby-

terians and episcopalians, when pressed on this subject, have universally failed. The command, "Let all things be done decently and in order," has been oppressed until it has refused to carry one pound of by-laws. For "the decency and order" are declared in the volume. The 15th of the Acts absolutely refuses to aid any of these Councils unless they could say that their decisions were infallible and suggested by the Holy Spirit. But if you will have a church representative of churches, in the popular sense, then you are off the ground on which the Baptists in former times always stood, and in union with the modern hierarchies.

But a third objection to this platform is, that if the charter authorizes a congregation to legislate in matters of faith and practice, it authorizes it to enforce, by proper sanctions, every act of disobedience or infraction of its by-laws. What then are the penalties? If no penalties, it all goes for nothing. And if the sanctions are enforced, then the decrees of the church are tantamount to the commandments of the Head of the Church. Divine institutes and human enactments are therefore at par. But I only glance at the incongruities of the scheme.

As I do not think you were aware of what was involved in this sentence, and state no other objections to it until I learn that you are disposed to defend it. These three are, in my opinion, invincible.

## CONVERSATIONS ON THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

(Continued from page 271.)

### ON THE ACTION OF BAPTISM.

A. What do you consider necessary to constitute Christian baptism?

P. The immersion of a proper subject in water, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, I believe to be essential to christian baptism.

A. As this is denied by so many professing christians why do you so positively hold it?

P. Because christian baptism is a *positive institution*, and must be obeyed by a positive specification, whatever that action may be.

A. Will you state the difference between a *Positive* and a *Moral* institution?

P. An Institution is an established custom or law; a precept, maxim, or principle. Positive, Divine Institutions, are those laws that God has given man as tests of obedience, without explaining to him their propriety. Those laws derive all their authority from the will of

God. Moral Institutions are those, the reasons of which we see, and the duties of which arise from the nature of the case, prior to the external command. Moral commands may be obeyed in different modes, according to expediency. Positive commands must be obeyed in the way marked out, and admit of no alteration. To our first parents was given positive law. God gave them no reason why they should not eat the forbidden fruit: it was enough that *he* forbade them. Abraham was commanded to offer up his beloved son on mount Moriah. God gave him no reason for this strange sacrifice. His will was all the reason necessary. Circumcision was a positive institution. When any action is positively commanded, any other action, however sincere the actor, is of no avail. When Moses erected the tabernacle, he was positively commanded to do all things according to the pattern shown him on the mount. Positive Institutions were used as tests of obedience, and sometimes pointed the obedient to Christ.

A. If Abraham went to the mount to offer up his son, it mattered not by what way: would not the same argument hold good in regard to the use of water in the name of the Lord?

B. If Jesus had merely told his disciples to go and *use water*, to believers this argument might stand; but if he told them to perform an action in water, any other action would not be obedience. Had Abraham chosen any other place than mount Moriah to offer up his son, he would not be obedient to the will of God.

A. But is it not very uncharitable to pass sentence on those who use THREE modes instead of one?

B. I pass sentence on none; it is enough to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. I hope, however, to be delivered from that kind of charity that insults reason, and contradicts revelation. But what authority has any to restrict it to *three modes*? Why not be more charitable and admit any mode that the ingenuity and caprice of men may invent, and most charitable in its exclusion altogether, as the use of water is to many, who are called good people, an offensive ceremony? Those who can shift to suit the people ought to select some other than a positive command of Christ for the purpose. Baptism is a positive obedience, but pleasing men is nothing less than a profane trifling with the dreadful name.

A. It is said the mode is not essential, being only the ceremonial part of a positive institution; as in the Lord's supper the number of

communicants, their position while partaking, &c., are not essential ; so in the use of water in baptism .

*B.* This fallacy has only to be stated to make it apparent to all. It proceeds on the assumption that using water, and not performing an action, is the essential point ; this is not the fact. Our Lord told his disciples to perform an action, and by example as well as the word used, showed them what that action was ; they were, therefore, bound to perform that action. In the supper he told them all to eat of the bread, and drink of the cup, and showed them the example. Now if any argue that *using* bread, and not *eating* it, was the positive point, that some might eat it, and others, if they were so inclined, might lay it aside, and both equally please and obey Christ, as the *mode* was an unessential part of an institution : I appeal to the candid, if the argument would not be as valid as the one used for the different modes of baptism ? In baptism there may be non-essentials : some might prefer a river, others a lake—some might object to salt water, others prefer it : but as persons in primitive times were baptized at different places, and no objections made, provided there was “much water” all these opinions are unimportant : but what can be said of the assertion that an action, the very opposite to what Christ has commanded, is obeying him in a positive institution. For those who plead for sprinkling to adhere to it as the positive action commanded by our Lord would show, at least, some consistency. Two opposites cannot be the same. The man who had water sprinkled upon him, and the man who had water poured upon him, and he who was immersed in water, have not equally followed the example of Christ, unless he went through these different actions in his baptism. Neither are they equally obedient unless the command was to pour water, or sprinkle water, or be immersed in water according to the wish of the subject or its proxy.

*A.* If we are bound to follow Christ in one thing why not in another ? if in baptism why not be crucified ?

*B.* Because he has not commanded us to be crucified ; if he had we must as positively do it, and could not chose anything else.

*A.* Is it not surprising that the advocates of sprinkling do not adhere to that mode, and repudiate every other ?

*B.* To deny in this enlightened age that immersion is baptism, would be sheer folly : it is hence deemed safer to contend, that, although *Bapto* positively means dip, yet when it has another termination, it only means the very opposite, or in fact, anything the sect to

which they belong may chose to practice: thus making the word of God of none effect through their traditions. When the Romanist performs what he calls baptism, he makes the sign of the cross, and in some revisions of the scriptures the original word *Baptizo* is rendered *cross*—John the crosser. He that believeth and is *crossed*. Repent and be *crossed*, &c. Those who contend for water used in any but a positive way, put the virtue in the element.

A. I do not think they would make such a concession.

B. They believe that water used in the name of Deity is beneficial to the recipient—that any quantity is virtuous, from an ocean to the least drop, then the virtue is gone; but if the smallest quantity, from the hand of priest or layman, touch the subject, it is pronounced valid baptism. How often is it said “It is not the quantity I believe in.”

A. Do you not place the same virtue in water that they do who use it differently?

B. We believe that Jesus, by his example and command, has dedicated a certain action that is beneficial to believers so long as they abide by that action, and no longer—that water used in any other way is of no avail. They believe that he has dedicated an element: we believe he has dedicated an action in an element. The doing of a certain specific action is deemed baptism with us—the using a certain element with them.

A. You should be *certain* that immersion is the specific action, for an error on this point, by your own showing, would be a most grievous one.

B. To propagate in the name of Zion's King what he and his apostles have not commanded is second to no sin that can be named. If there is any circumstance that can single out and exhibit it as an atrocious seedling of untold horror it is the fact that its author stands forth on the closing page of inspiration branded with the forfeiture of eternal life, and justly fated to inherit all the plagues written in the book of God; and, what is very remarkable, the author, and he that loves the lie, stand together as co-heirs of the wrath to be revealed. It is no small offence to alter or modify the divine arrangements. The christian walks by faith not by sight. We never witnessed the Saviour's baptism, nor saw the apostles perform the action. With us it is neither a matter of personal knowledge, nor of opinion, but of faith. We understand it as the apostles understood the world's creation—by faith. Let us adduce the testimony. A fact must be reported to us

in a language which we understand before we can believe it. If it come to us in words we do not understand we must find out, from competent authority, the meaning of those words, or consult the standard dictionaries of the language. In the present dispensation the will of God was reported to the world in the Greek language. Had it remained in Greek a mere English scholar could not understand it; to him it would be a dead letter. A great part of the scriptures have been given to the English in their own vernacular, but some very important parts have been withheld. In order to ascertain the meaning of Greek words that have been transferred we go, not to an English, but a Greek Dictionary. Our Lord commanded his apostles to perform a certain *action*. Had the words *he employed* been translated into English the controversy would be at an end; but the word is left in Greek. When Greek Dictionaries are examined, they all, with one consent, say it means immerse. Some give it secondary meanings, but all standard Lexicons give it this meaning. My faith in the meaning of the word rests on the united testimony of those who are competent to give the meaning. There are many valid reasons for believing that these men spoke the truth which I will now state:—

1st, Classic History confirms its meaning.

2nd, Those who still speak the Greek language practice immersion for baptism and will not fellowship what they call "sprinkled christians."

3rd, The testimony of a host of pedobaptists, of acknowledged learning and piety, among whom are Luther, Calvin, Wesley, George Campbell, Doddridge and Chalmers; they say that immersion is the meaning of the word, and also the apostolic practice, their own practice notwithstanding.

A. But when they practised differently they showed dishonesty.

B. Not however in their testimony. Dishonest men hide their faults, honest men appear as they are. These men did not make choice of sprinkling; they were brought up to that practice, and although they had no authority from God's word for it, they seemed to quiet their conscience by calling it a non-essential.

4th, Many of the most learned and pious pedobaptists have renounced sprinkling altogether and have been solemnly immersed in the name of the Lord. These are astonished that they had not sooner seen their error, and are the most strenuous advocates for immersion.

5th, The signification of the ordinance—it points to the death, burial

and resurrection of Christ, and represents the believer to be dead to sin, buried and rising to walk in newness of life. Sprinkling has nothing in it to represent either.

6th, The tenor of scripture. When baptism is mentioned allusions are made to immersion—John baptized in the Jordan—in Faon because there was much water there, &c. We never read of water being brought for the purpose.

A. Some say that the much water mentioned in the 3rd of John was necessary to accommodate the multitude who came to hear John, and also supply their animals.

B. This cavil is scarcely worth notice. If John chose a place or much or many waters to supply man and beast it would be so stated. It positively states that John *baptized* in Enon, &c., and they came and were baptized. How contemptible the schemes to evade the truth!! Again it is called a washing, not a part of the body, but “our bodies.” Ananias said to Saul “Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord,” Acts 22 : 16. The washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit, Titus 3 : 5. That he might sanctify and cleanse it (the church) with the washing of water by the word, Eph. 5 : 26. Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water, Heb. 10. Sprinkling water on any part of the body is not called washing the body. The *heart* is sprinkled not the *body*, and by *Christ* not by his disciples. Jesus, however, baptized none himself, John 4 : 2. Again baptism is called a birth, John 3 : 5. Between sprinkling and a birth is no resemblance, but between coming out of the water and a birth is a striking likeness.

A. Do not many allege that it is spiritual water mentioned in the 3rd of John?

B. That this is baptism is unhesitatingly asserted by many ancient pedobaptists, and virtually acknowledged by all; as none will be received into their communion whom they call unbaptized: but some in their zeal for sprinkling do allege that this was spiritual water, which would make the passage read thus “Except a man be born of the spirit and in the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom,” &c. If the king himself were born of water, is it too much to require the same of his subjects?

7th, In every place where baptism is mentioned in the scriptures the subject is *active*, and the element *passive*—in every place where sprink-

ling or pouring is mentioned the element is *active* and the subject *passive*. We never read that water or blood was baptized, but water was poured or sprinkled, blood was sprinkled or poured, &c. Again persons were baptized, not sprinkled. We may pour or sprinkle sand, or grain, in a river, but how could we pour or sprinkle men or persons in a river?

Sth, In every place where baptism is named it would make good sense to put immersion in its place, but to put sprinkling would make perfect nonsense.

9th, Whatever prejudice was on the minds of the majority of those who made the Lexicons was against immersion and not for it; yet decided and united testimony is given in its favor.

Now the testimony is either true or false,—there is abundant reason to believe them, and nothing to contradict them. When facts and reason are on the side of testimony, and absurdity without facts against it, I am bound to receive it.

A. There are reasons urged against immersion which I would like to have examined.

B. Some are unworthy, but I would be glad to examine the most plausible by the word of truth.

A. It is said that there was not sufficient water for immersion in some places where baptism was performed.

B. This is asserted of Jerusalem, but not by any honest man who is aware of the fact, that in Jerusalem “beautiful for situation,” were pools of water, public and private baths, as well as the brook Kedron which was near. Others allege that the jailor could not be immersed for want of sufficient water, although a river was in the place, Acts 16: 13. All objections on that ground are apparent and not real. Some places had not a sufficiency, for places were chosen because there was much water.

A. It is said that it is an indecent ceremony, and also, that it unfits the subject for pious reflections.

B. No persons who understand the subject think it indecent to be buried with their Lord in baptism: if they be reproached for it they find a blessedness in bearing so light a cross for him who bore so much for them. The second is rebuked by the experience of all whom I have ever heard. The fact that they are giving themselves body, soul, and spirit to Christ does not unfit them for pious reflections. But these

objections come with an ill grace from those who assert that baptism came in the room of circumcision.

A. Others say that it was impossible for the apostles to immerse 3000 in part of a day.

B. I have heard it said that Peter baptized these 3000 himself, when asked for the proof, they had none. When asked to prove that Peter baptized one of them, it was equally wanting. There is no real difficulty in the case. If there were no other christian on the ground it could be all done in an hour. As soon as Peter baptized one, or twenty, he could authorize them to baptize others, and so on till the whole was accomplished; so that this objection is lighter than vanity.

A. It is said that John baptized with water and therefore the subject was not immersed.

B. This objection rests on the preposition *with*. All classical scholars know that this foundation is not good; for the Greek preposition *en* is more properly rendered *in* than *with*. Learned pedobaptists have severely blamed the King's translators for putting *with water* instead of *in water*. An object can be buried with an element more flexible than itself, so that this objection is lame in every leg.

A. It is said that baptism represents the gift of the Holy Spirit, and as the Spirit was poured on the apostles at Pentecost, pouring or sprinkling is more consistent than immersion.

B. The objection lays the most valid claims to a "show of wisdom" of any I have yet seen among the opponents of immersion. Baptism points to the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. The gift of the Holy Spirit is never called baptism, only in contrast with John's baptism. In a literal description of that gift the word is never used. But admitting that baptism was a broken word to denote the gift of the Holy Spirit it would argue nothing against immersion inasmuch as it fully expresses the idea in this case. The facts are as follows:—When the spirit came on the day of Pentecost a sound as of a rushing mighty wind filled the house where they were sitting. There appeared cloven tongues that sat on them and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and spake with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. I can see nothing here to oppose immersion.

A. It is said that the spirit fell upon the apostles and not that they were applied to it.

B. It matters not, so long as they were totally influenced by the Spirit or overwhelmed in it. There is nothing here that resembles

sprinkling a few drops of water on a part of the body, nor pouring a small quantity on a part: their whole mind was as completely connected with the Spirit as the believers body in his baptism is connected with water, no matter whether that water falls from the clouds or runs in the limpid stream. But I say again, baptism represents the death of Christ rather than the gift of the holy Spirit. Jesus says, I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it is accomplished, Luke 12: 50. This was accomplished when he died, was buried, and rose from the dead.

*A.* It is objected that the Old Testament represents pouring or sprinkling as beneficial and immersion as destructive; as in the case of the Israelites passing through the Red Sea. Psalms 77: 17 is quoted to show that the Israelites were poured; and the Egyptians, being immersed, were drowned; and to strengthen the argument against the immersion of the Israelites, it is said they went over on dry ground.

*B.* They were not baptized by the cloud alone, nor by the sea alone; but passing under the cloud, and through the sea, they were completely covered. That cloud was a pillar to guide them, and not the one mentioned in the 77th psalm which poured out water; if it had, how could they pass over on dry ground? So that this objection destroys itself. This is a beautiful type of christian baptism. The Israelites, when following Moses from Egyptian bondage, passed through the Red Sea; by which means God was pleased to destroy their enemies, and save them. Their enemies sink, they arose out of the sea. When men believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and are willing to leave their sins, they follow him in the baptismal grave, and rising from the water, they enjoy a purer felicity than did the Israelites when they sang the song of deliverance on the margin of the Red Sea, (compare Ex. 14 with Acts 2.)

*A.* It is urged that as Isaiah and Ezekiel mention sprinkling to be the work of Christ, it is the best mode of baptism.

*B.* The sprinkling mentioned in Isa. 52: 15, and Ez. 36: 25, is predicted of Christ, and is not baptism, for Jesus baptized none.

*A.* It is said that in cold climates and on death-beds persons, however anxious, could not be immersed, and that God would not appoint an ordinance that could not be obeyed.

*B.* In the coldest climates thousands have been immersed without injury to the subject or the administrator. Those who are converted on their death-bed, but cannot be immersed, are in the hands of him

who will have mercy and not sacrifice ; and who knew all these circumstances before he instituted christian baptism. God's commands are for those who are capable of obedience.

A. It is said that except sprinkling were right it would not be practised by so many of the good and great.

B. Many of the most learned pedobaptists declare unhesitatingly that immersion was primitive baptism. Booth in his treatise gives the testimony of more than 100 pedobaptists in favor of immersion. Their different practice may be imputed to early prejudice ; but I will be no judge of their case. Those who acknowledge that God has commanded believer's immersion ; and that there is no positive proof that anything else is christian baptism : and then stand up before God and man, and rantize a few drops of water upon the face of an infant, saying " I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" I do not wish to enter into their secrets. God will be their Judge.

---

### IS EGYPT IN CANADA ?

---

Our neighbor the " Messenger" at Brantford gives to the community the following epistle, written by Mr. Somebody . who corresponds with that paper :

I noticed in the " Christian Guardian" of August 27, an account of a baptism (?) which had taken place somewhere in the northern part of Canada. It appears that a Methodist minister had been sent for in great haste to baptize (?) a child, supposed to be dying. He accordingly repaired to the place, and proceeded to baptize (?) the dying infant, without even asking whether the parents were Methodists, or anything else. It appears that soon after a minister of the English Church administered the same ordinance to the same child, I suppose in the same way. The Wesleyan complains of his Episcopalian neighbor for repeating what he supposed was quite sufficient.

Since reading the " Guardian" on this matter, I have conversed with a Wesleyan minister of standing and intelligence, on this subject, and he says they never baptize the children of such unknown parents, only in cases where they are likely to die immediately.

In view of the above, I would like to ask what good the first baptism (?) did to the child, and what harm the second did ?

As you, Mr. Editor, are an old man, and somewhat grave in your reflections upon such matters, I would like you to give your opinion. I have had several dear children die while young, and never thought

of having one of them baptized, and think it would have been simple in me to have had it done.

Yours in the gospel of Christ,

A LOVER OF THE TRUTH.

Upon the above, the editor of the "Messenger" offers the following reflections :

"All we have to say respecting the above case, is, that it shows, in a grievous form, the superstitious influence of the unscriptural practice of what is called *infant baptism*. These superstitious notions originated the custom at the first, and they still maintain a powerful influence on the minds of the ignorant at the present day. But the fact that men professing to be teachers of religion should have the temerity to avow that unless a dying babe is sprinkled with a few drops of water, and signed on its forehead with a watery cross, by an Episcopally ordained clergyman, it will go to perdition, is a most awful display of cruelty, ignorance, and bigotry. We question much whether the entire annals of heathenism can furnish anything more gross, deceptive, or erroneous, than this priestly dogma of pretending to save dying infants from perdition, by the ceremony of sprinkling and crossing."

For two reasons the preceding extracts are presented to the community that reads the Christian Banner.

1st. Our friend of the "Messenger," while devoutly attempting to convince his readers that the language of this paper is radically lacking in charity, seems at times to employ his pen as harshly and rudely as those whom he condemns.

2nd. All who study the Sacred Book and are earnestly at work copying primitive models, should see how much there is yet to perform ere our countrymen shall enjoy the liberty and the wisdom of christianity.

D. O.

### J. T. JOHNSON AND THE SALARY SYSTEM.

The subjoined letters deserve to be read extensively. The reply to brother Johnson is from the pen of the editor of the Gospel Advocate. It is very refreshing to find even one periodical standing up manfully for the primitive order of things, even though dear brethren have to be opposed in taking the stand. The singular spiritual commercialism encompassed in what is called the salary system, which was thoroughly exposed twenty-five years ago by the disciples, is becoming just as convenient and fashionable among the brotherhood of the reformation in

some latitudes as among any people out of the circle of the papacy. To see men who set out so resolutely for Canaan, not only looking back again to Egypt, but actually walking backwards in order to possess the flesh-pots, is greatly discouraging ; but we must bear it all patiently, and with the more earnestness seek to discover, work up to, and maintain the position occupied by the brotherhood formed and regulated by the apostles of our Lord. But let us hear and consider the letters.

D. O.

Sept., 1856.

BROTHER FANNING :—Inasmuch as there seems to be a difference of opinion amongst some of the most enlightened of the brotherhood, in reference to entering into definite engagements between Congregations and Evangelists or Preachers, I beg leave to submit a few reflections of my own mind, in the hope that more light may be elicited from others, and that the practice may become uniform and scriptural, if it is not so at present.

1st. In the first place, it will be conceded that the laborer is worthy of his wages.

2nd. It is as just and safe, it is as scriptural and prudent, to ascertain the amount of compensation that is necessary to sustain the preacher and family, before the labor is performed as after it—and in my mind fewer difficulties will arise in this case, than the other. Indeed as a member of a Congregation, no Preacher should labor for me, unless I knew beforehand, the least amount that would satisfy him. We cannot well be too definite in our own engagements. Indefinite engagements always engender strife, &c.

I do not know of a case where our preaching brethren have exacted too much. I have known many cases where the compensation has fallen short of an equivalent for the labor performed, and the sacrifice made. The compensation should always be over and above the mere expenses of the preacher and his charge, in order to meet the contingencies of sickness, &c. If the congregation should, after the labors of their preacher are over, present him with more than their engagement demands, it is a matter of their own, and would be commended or condemned according to prudence and liberality, or recklessness of the gift. I am not, and never have been personally interested in such cases, and I can therefore speak with more freedom.

The amount of compensation for labor is always a matter of judg-

ment. We can never ascertain the *exact* amount. We have to settle down upon something that is satisfactory to both parties. There are two parties, and both must be satisfied. The parties ought to understand each other as perfectly as possible, before they enter upon their work. As to the expenses of a family, no man can well tell what they are, or what they may be. No family will submit to the inspection, or supervision of another. It is best for both parties to conjecture, and agree upon the conjectured amount, than to leave it open for altercation, for it will inevitably end in strife, or chafed feelings. It is an easy matter to settle these things beforehand. Beware how you leave them unsettled till the expiration of the labors of the preacher.

3rd. If my opinion is of any value on another point, I am free to give it. Suppose a Preacher should be engaged in any of the vocations of this life during the week, and should preach for a congregation on Lord's day, is he entitled to compensation for such labor? My decided conviction is that he is not. If he is at any expense, the congregation should bear it. But the labor is such as every Christian is under obligation to perform and it ought to be rendered most cheerfully. We are all bound according to our ability.

4th. If a man spends all his time in the cause, he ought to be well sustained; if half or a fourth of his time, the laborer is worthy of his hire.

5th. I cannot see why all other engagements should be definitely settled, and christian engagements should be left indefinite. I never made an indefinite engagement that I now recollect, but what I suffered for it. But I must close at present.

Yours affectionately,

J. T. JOHNSON.

---

#### REPLY TO BROTHER JOHN T. JOHNSON.

---

Whilst no man of our acquaintance commands more of our love than brother J. T. Johnson, and whilst we regard most of his remarks as, at least, approaching the truth, we must assure him, that we believe he misses the mark, and the slightest error in regard to any teaching of the New Testament, must always be considered as at least dangerous. So far as logic and philosophy are concerned, we have seen nothing superior to our brother's teaching. Every thing seems plausible, and were he and I to make a religious system, by one standard of worldly

wisdom, no doubt, we would act precisely as we do in regard to the things of this life. Every one's salary would be settled and fixed, whether by the year, month, day, or by the amount of applause which the speaker might upon a fair *trial strain* at the beginning, be enabled to gain from well qualified critics on the fair proportions of preachers. We could offer many objections, but a few must answer our present purpose.

The New Testament is as silent as the grave in reference to settling at the beginning of the year, what a preacher may need. It is impossible in the very nature of things, for any one to tell, or even approach the amount which may be required for the support of the Evangelist or his family. The contingences of living are too great for determining such questions in advance. Men in all legitimate pursuits receive according to the labor performed. The farmer knows not what he is to reap; but he labors in faith and God gives him such a reward as pleases Him. It is always right, though it may be more or less anticipated. In religion no one knows what he shall receive in the world to come, but the confidence that we shall be as our Lord, is altogether satisfactory; and in reading the Scriptures we discover that even on this earth, ministers like the faithful ox that treads out the corn, plow in hope, sow seed in hope, and in the performance of the labor can say with Paul, "If we have sown (not what will you give us to sow a year,) unto you Spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?"

But few of the partizan world are disposed to walk by faith—every thing must be a matter of sight or feeling. Hence they fancy that they make bargains with Jehovah to the effect, that, on the condition the Lord will first give them religion, remission of sins, and fill their hearts with the Holy Spirit, they will condescend to be baptized, and will even join the church, because they have wrestled with God till he has saved them. Do these people believe, or trust the Lord? It is well known that the authorities make the converts tell that God has met them in the grove, at the altar or elsewhere, and given them a christian's reward, although they have not taken the first step to enter into Christ. The same principle, to our mind, seems to govern the brethren generally, upon the subject we are considering. Brethren before they will preach, having really not proper confidence, as it seems to us, in the Lord, His cause, or His people, are disposed to make mat-

ters sure before they start. The effect upon inexperienced men who can get no bidders for their service is, that they are not encouraged to go forth trusting God and his people for bread. We know this to be the reason for at least some well disposed brethren refusing to preach. The brethren will not say how much they will give, and to walk by faith, is attended with too great uncertainty.

But we must close. We have no doubt Bro. John T. Johnson, and every really successful preacher in this great nation, have labored mainly in direct opposition to the plan submitted. We believe Bro. Johnson possesses the goodness of soul to say, that when he started no church or people promised him a salary, but he went forth in faith that the God who feeds the ravens and clothes the lilies, would protect him and his wife and children. In no other spirit, in our judgment, can a man preach the Gospel of Christ.

Our objections to the bargain and settled salary are too numerous to state a single one in this brief reply.

T. F.

---

### CATHOLICS AND PROTESTANTS.

---

In the possession of all the first principles of the kingdom of God, we stand with primitive union before us; Protestantism on our right hand and the Papacy on our left.

Let us analyze the Papacy—the apostacy—for the apostle declared that the Lord Jesus would not return to this world until there had occurred “the apostacy.” 2 Thess. ii. History and prophesy prove this Vine-of-the-Earth to be that “apostacy.” Its most remarkable features are the following, namely:

1. Its Creed—or the constitutional “lie,” on which it is founded.
2. Its Popedom, or religious despotism.
3. Its great strength.
4. The enslavement of its people; and
5. Their ignorance and crimes.

Reader, can you guess the “lie” on which the Papacy is founded? for as the true Church is based on “the truth,” the false Church is based on what the Holy Spirit calls to *pseudei*, “the lie.” 2 Thess. ii, 11. Perhaps you think it is auricular confession, or purgatory, or transubstantiation, the celibacy of the clergy, or penance? No, it is none of these. These, we grant, are all lies, great lies; but not

*the lie* by way of eminence, not the constitutional falsehood on which the whole superstructure of the Papacy rests. Can you unriddle it, reader? If you cannot, then I must expound. It is that a man, not God's Son, is the foundation of the Church. It is that the Church is built on Peter—not on Christ! The whole Catholic world is, as Scripture foretold and we behold, given up by God to believe this radical, this constitutional falsehood. 2 Thess. ii, 11. The reason for it is, that they did not receive the truth in the love of it. They were not satisfied with God's Son as the basis of the Church; they were not delighted with this jewel, and God, therefore, gave them up to believe in ashes—that Peter was the foundation of the kingdom—a lie to all intents and purposes.

By mistranslation and non-translation our present version of the Scripture conceals, in a great measure, the most significant points of this great and startling prophesy in 2 Thess. ii. Let us look at these points. First: The apostle assured the brethren that the second advent of Christ would not occur until *the apostacy* had obtained. After a description of some of its most striking features, he next says, that "the mystery of the iniquity," *tes anomias*, was already at work; and in conclusion adds, that the false Christians should be given up unreservedly to believe "*the lie*," that they all might be damned who had no pleasure in the truth, but delighted in unrighteousness.

At a very early period of christian history, as we learn from Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, the brethren began to confound ministers with Christ, and to place them on a level with him. One said, "I am of Paul;" another, "I am of Apollos;" and "I of Peter;" and "I of Christ!" 1 Cor. i. Thus we see, as the Apostle says, "the mystery of the Iniquity" beginning to work even while the Apostles were present to rebuke it. But we may receive more light on this matter, by inquiring into the meaning of the untranslated word "*mystery*." What does this term signify? I answer the question thus. It stands, in the New Testament, for a revelation, or opened secret. For instance, "Behold, I show you a *mystery*," said Paul. What is that? Something that we cannot understand? No, no: it is only something that you have not heretofore understood—it is a new revelation. It is this: "We shall not all die, but we shall all be transfigured." 1 Cor. xv. Again. "Without controversy, great in the *mystery* of godliness." 1 Tim. iii. Here, again, it means a new revelation; that is, Without controversy, great is the secret opened to men in godliness, or Christian-

ity. What is that? It is this: "*God was manifest in the flesh.*" When, therefore, the Apostle, speaking of the apostate church, calls something "*the mystery,*" not of iniquity in general, but "*of the iniquity*"—of the apostacy particularly, what does he mean? Undoubtedly he uses the term "*mystery*" here as in other places, and means that the false church was to replace the constitutional truth of the true Church by a new revelation, or by a falsehood, which, on account of its constitutional position and significance, he designates, by way of eminence over all other falsehoods, "*the lie*"—"The Church is built on Peter," this is the "*to pseudos,*" "*the lie*" of Catholicism "I am," it says "of Peter!!!"

To make Peter the basis of the Church, and the Pope his successor, was to create a spiritual despotism. The Pope, as every one knows, is as very a despot in religion as the Czar is in the empire; and can, therefore, have no more sympathy with Protestantism, original Christianity, or freedom, than the emperor of Austria. The false church cannot be converted from her favorite dogma: hence Providence, we are told, will reach her heart's life by the kings whom she has deceived; and they shall "*hate her, eat her flesh, and burn her with fire.*" Rev. xvii, 16.

*Protestantism* errs mainly in not holding the Creed of our religion to its destinies. Its principal features are these:

1. Divers Creeds.
2. Divers Sects.
3. Inter-Ecclesiastical war.
4. Weakness.
5. The Non-conversion of the world.

Their inability to convert the world, is a striking characteristic both of the Papacy and Protestantism. Upon the whole, we see that the original Apostolic Church was based upon the *jewel*—that her Redeemer is the Son of God. The Catholic church, upon the *fire and brimstone* that Peter is the "*rock*" of the church, and Protestantism on a bad commixture of *ashes and jewels* conjoined. We stand, then, with the Apostolic Church, as portrayed in Scripture, before us; with Protestantism on our right hand, and the Papacy on our left. Such is our position. We make no comparison between Protestantism and Catholicism, as if they had any affinity or bore any resemblance to each other. They are antipodes, as opposite as light and darkness. We look at both through the medium of Scripture. The apostacy, the Apostle

affirms, rises into being by the strong "working of Satan," in signs and false miracles, therefore it is of Satan. Now Protestantism rose by opening the Bible. It, therefore, nobly places the Bible above itself, and makes it the sole arbiter in religion. This is great in Protestantism; and the fact would have brought about its Union, had it not at last placed its creeds above both itself and the Bible.

—Walter Scott.

### THE FAITH THAT OVERCOMES.

No man can be a thorough proficient in navigation who has never been at sea, though he may learn the theory of it at home. No man can become a soldier by studying books on military tactics in his closet: he must in actual service acquire those habits of coolness, courage, discipline, address, rapid combination, without which the most learned in the theory of strategy or engineering will be but a school-boy soldier after a'l. And, in the same way, a man in solitude and study may become a most learned theologian, or may train himself into the timid, effeminate piety of what is technically called "the religious life." But never, in the highest and holiest sense, can he become a *religious man*, until he has acquired those habits of daily self-denial, of resistance to temptation, of kindness, gentleness, humility, sympathy, active beneficence, which are to be acquired only in daily contact with mankind. Tell us not, then, that the man of business, the bustling tradesman, the toil-worn labourer, has little or no time to attend to religion. As well tell as that the pilot, amid the winds and storms, has no leisure to attend to navigation—or the general, on the field of battle, to the art of war! Where *will* he attend to it? Religion is not a perpetual moping over good books—religion is not even prayer, praise, holy ordinances; these are necessary to religion—no man can be religious without them. But religion, I repeat, is, mainly and chiefly the glorifying God amid the duties and trials of the world,—the guiding our course amid the adverse winds and currents of temptation, by the star-light of duty and the compass of divine truth,—the bearing us manfully, wisely courageously, for the honour of Christ, our great Leader, in the conflict of life. Away then with the notion that ministers and devotees may be religious, but that a religious and holy life is impracticable in the rough and busy world! Nay rather, believe me, *that* is the proper scene, the

peculiar and appropriate field for religion,—the place in which to prove that piety is not a dream of Sundays and solitary hours; that it can bear the light of day; that it can wear well amid the rough jostlings, the hard struggles, the course contacts of common life,—the place, in one word, to prove how possible it is for a man to be at once “not slothful in business,” and “fervent in spirit, serving the Lord.”

—Caird's Sermon.

### PUNISHMENT OF THE WICKED.

Ever since the Lord put enmity between the seed of the woman and the serpent, there has been war between them, which will continue till the serpent is subdued; and so also a strife for mastery is waged between truth and error, which can only end when error has fled from earth to whence it sprung. Error, like its author, seldom likes to appear in its own native deformity, and hence it would borrow the garb of truth, that it may strike its darts more certainly and deeply into its victims. Like all things of an earthly origin its appearance can be modified, and its author, the only being to whom it is of any real importance, knows very well how to suit it to every age. This the “lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life,” enable him to do very successfully. Hence the errors of one age are augmented by others more imposing in succeeding ages, till human folly seems to culminate in an attempt to teach that the bible is true, and yet deny some of the great fundamental truths it announces. Such is the position of those who teach that there is no wrath in store for the wicked, and no place in which the nations who fear not God shall wail, enduring the wrath of God forever.

We now enquire, Will the wicked be punished, and will their punishment be endless? To this we reply in the affirmative, and invite attention to some reasons for such reply. If the wicked were not to be punished, they would not have been threatened with punishment. The government exercised by the Lord over all his creatures being based on the unalterable principles of equity, purity, truth and love, it became necessary that every deviation from these should be punished or atoned for; else anarchy would invade every part of his dominions. Hence he not only sent his Son to die for sin, but has warned man that if he continue rebellious he shall be punished. Read and ponder the following scriptures, and let every tongue be silent, and every heart submit, when

the Lord speaks. "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." 2 Peter, 2: 9. "Who shall be punished with an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power." 2 Thes. 1, 9. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into eternal life." Matthew 25: 46. In Psalms 9: 17, it is said, that "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away." Matt. 24: 35. From these scriptures it is undeniably certain that the Lord has threatened punishment, and that it will be executed upon the wicked. Human reason, philosophy, and all the cunning infidelity of the age may combine, and may deceive many, but out of the Bible these awful threatenings cannot be removed; and every system built on a denial of punishment will prove a baseless fabric, resting only on a perversion of truth. They are systems without a centre, without light, beginning with confusion, and ending in the ruin of all who rely upon them.

We next proceed to consider whether the punishment threatened will be momentary or of an enduring character. Some while they admit that punishment will be inflicted deny that it will be endless; but this the Lord's word must be allowed to determine, and to it we refer every one for a decision. In the prophecy of Daniel, 12: 2, we are informed that a time is coming when "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Here, the shame and contempt are just as everlasting as the life, and placed in contrast; and if life has any happiness, then shame and contempt will have affliction. The prophet Isaiah says, chapter 33: 14, "The sinners of Zion are afraid: fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire?" Here the prophet evidently refers to the punishment of the wicked, and introduces it as dwelling with devouring fire and everlasting burnings, which agrees with Daniel's prediction of shame and contempt. As recorded in Matt. 25: 41; the Saviour says to those on his left hand, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," and in verse 46, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." The fire here was not prepared for the punishment of material mortal beings, but for spirit beings, and will be as enduring as the beings for whom it was prepared; and this place of punishment is to be the abode

of the wicked. The punishment spoken of in verse 46, is as enduring as the life, for in the original the same adjective is applied to both by the Saviour. Hence if the wicked are not punished forever, the righteous will not be happy forever. Again in Rev. 14 : 10, 11, we read "The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb, and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." Here we have the fate of the wicked plainly declared, and its duration definitely fixed by the inspired word. "The smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever, and they have no peace day nor night." Here evasion can find no groundwork on which to rest a plea, and guilt no palliation. Much more might be added to show that punishment awaits the wicked, and that everlasting burnings will be endured by them, with the devil and his angels as their only companions in their doleful abode of misery extreme, from which mercy will ever be absent. "Everlasting burnings;" "everlasting fire prepared for the devil;" "a fire which is not to be quenched;" "a torment whose smoke ascendeth up forever and ever"! What a choice when made by creatures to whose lips mercy's cup has been pressed, and whom mercy's voice has besought in earnest and melting tones to choose life, light, and glory.

As the fool, contrary to the strongest evidence, "has said there is no God," so many affirm that there is no hell; and on this unproved and unprovable assumption, they found the conclusion that there is no punishment. That there is a place of punishment admits of no doubt; and it is only because it is feared that men have tried to doubt it, and persuade themselves that the Bible does not mention such a place. We do not design to discuss the meaning of the various terms translated "hell" in the common version of the scriptures, nor to investigate the propriety of such translations, but simply to show that the Bible does teach that there is a place in which the wicked will be punished for their sins. We already called attention to Psalms 9 : 17, where it is said, "the wicked shall be turned into hell," which shows that the Psalmist knew there was a place in which the wicked will be punished. It is said in Mat. 13 : 49, "So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just,

and shall cast them into the furnace of fire : there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Also in Luke 12 : 5, " Fear him which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell ; yea, I say unto, fear him." " And whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the lake of fire." Rev. 20 : 15. In these quotations a *place* of punishment is plainly taught, and if these portions of the sacred Word are not believed, and do not convince the doubtful, no other portions are likely to do it. If there is no place where the wicked will endure the just retribution of their crime, then there is no heaven—no place where happiness will be enjoyed by the righteous ; for the evidence of the one is just as strong as for the other. Heaven and its life of blissful glory are not more everlasting, than hell and its torment enduring. Well will it be for those who sport themselves with their own deceivings to remember, " The word of the Lord endureth forever," and that by it all shall be judged and rewarded according to their deeds.

J. B., jr.

---

### PATERNAL DUTY.

---

The father who plunges into business so deeply that he has no leisure for domestic duties and pleasures, and whose only intercourse with his children consists in a brief word of authority, or a surly lamentation over their intolerable expensiveness, is equally to be pitied and to be blamed. What right has he to devote to other pursuits the time which God has allotted to his children ? Nor is it an excuse to say he cannot support his family in their present style of living without this effort. I ask, by what right can his family demand to live in a manner which requires him to neglect his most solemn and important duties ? Nor is it an excuse to say that he wishes to leave them a competence. Is he under obligations to leave them that competence which *he* desires ? Is it an advantage to be relieved from the necessity of labor ? Besides, is money the only bequest which a father can leave to his children ? Surely well cultivated intellects ; hearts sensible to domestic affection ; the love of parents, and brethren, and sisters ; a taste for home pleasures ; habits of order, regularity and industry ; hatred of vice and and vicious men ; and lively sensibility to the excellence of virtue—are as valuable a legacy as an inheritance of property—property purchased by the loss of every habit which would render that property a blessing.

## A SINGLE SENTENCE.

There died in Edinburgh a venerable Baptist pastor, Mr. James Alexander Haldane, in his eighty-fourth year. In his early life he commanded the man-of-war, Melville Castle. While engaged in an action one day, the decks of his ship were cleared by the broad-sides of the enemy. Captain Haldane ordered a fresh set of hands to be "piped up," to take the place of the slain. The men, on seeing the mangled bodies of their comrades scattered over the deck, instinctively drew back; at which their commander poured forth a volley of oaths, and wished them all in h—ll. One of the seamen who had been religiously educated, shortly afterwards said to the Captain, in a respectful and serious manner, "If God had heard your prayer just now, where should we have been?" The engagement terminated; but a greater victory had been achieved *over* Captain Haldane than *by* him. The old sailor's words were winged by Him who never smites in vain; and from that day the gallant and reckless officer became a changed man. He lived to preach the gospel for fifty-four years. Among the early fruits of his ministry was the conversion of his brother Robert, well known as an able, learned, and pious commentator. Robert went to Geneva, and during a sojourn there of several months (about 1814) he laboured with unwearied assiduity to reclaim the pastors and theological students, whom he met with, from their rationalistic errors, to indoctrinate them in the evangelical faith, and to lead them to seek a personal interest in the Saviour. The blessing of God was with him. A considerable number of young men became zealously pious; and among those in whose conversion he had a main agency were Frederick Monod, now one of the pillars of the Evangelical Church, in France; Felix Neff, the devoted young pastor of the High Alps, whose memory is held sacred in both hemispheres; and Merle D'Augbine, the eminent historian of the Reformation. To pronounce these names is to show how impossible it must be for any created mind to gather up the results of that single conversion on board the Melville Castle. And that conversion was brought about through a *single sentence* addressed by a sailor to his commander, firmly but courteously reproving him for his profanity!

This case is a strong one. But is it not instructive? Does it not shame our remissness in the great duty of bringing men to Christ? Does it not hold out the amplest encouragement to fidelity and zeal in

the most important work?—"They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars, forever." How glorious a crown, then, will adorn the brow of that poor seaman who maintained his loyalty to Christ at the hazard of offending his Commander, and whose faithfulness has already told with an efficacy so powerful and so auspicious upon the church and the world!

---

### METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN CANADA.

This body has a General Conference which meets once in four years, and is composed of a number of Elders equal to half the number of members composing the Annual Conferences. There are two Annual Conferences, called respectively the Bay of Quinte and the Niagara Conference. From the minutes of these two Conferences, just published, we gather some important statistical information relative to the present condition and prospects of the Church. The aggregate membership is eleven thousand three hundred and ten, there being this year an increase of about one thousand. The number of preachers, including probationers and superannuated, is one hundred and twenty-seven. Twenty-two were admitted into the Travelling connection at the last session of the two Conferences. The number of stations, circuits, and missions within the bounds of the connection, is eighty-one. There are one hundred and thirty-six local preachers, a number of whom are officiating with acceptability as deacons and elders. The Church is presided over by two General Superintendents, or as they are generally called *Bishops*.

---

### THE LIFE-BOAT.

We remember a gentleman telling us of a life-boat he once saw used successfully. It was a Sabbath morning; a severe storm had raged for two or three days preceding, and the sea was tossed into mountain-like waves. As he went along the cliffs which overlooked the shore, he found a group of excited spectators watching a large ship which was drifting before the storm, and would soon be on a ridge of foam-covered rocks, about a mile from the shore. Evidently the sailors had lost all control of the vessel; again and again, during night, they had fired their signals of distress, and now they could be seen, when the dashing spray permitted, clinging to the sides of the ship. Soon she was in the

breakers—she had struck—a heavy sea rolled completely over her. A cry of agony burst from the gazing crowd—three out of five of her crew were overboard! One still seemed to guide the helm, and another had ascended the rigging. Just immediately afterwards, a voice exclaimed, “The life-boat! the life-boat!” We looked in the direction, and hope thrilled each heart, when, round a headland, manned by ten brave fishermen, and steered by a veteran of a hundred storms, floating like a bird over the boiling swell, amid foam and spray, the life-boat was seen nearing the wreck.

They were at the breakers. Now only the one who held to the rigging survived. How could they reach him? the vessel was lying over on one side in the water; every wave swept her deck. By dexterous and strong effort the boat was brought round to the windward. They called to the poor fellow to be ready to drop, and then sent her like an arrow over the waters under him as he hung by the mast. It was in vain; he had not courage to seize the right moment and drop into the boat! Again these stout seamen brought the life-boat round, and urged him to seize the only chance for his life. How earnestly they were watched from the shore! The people leant seaward against the wind, and gazed in silence. The boat’s prow was turned; the oars flashed; and as she shot past, the poor sailor was seen to drop into the boat. A shout burst from the crowd—“He’s safe!—he’s safe!”

So God brings, each Sabbath, Christ, the only life-boat for guilty sinners, near to you, still clinging to a perishing world. He calls to you to let go your hold, and commit your soul to Christ. Thus alone you can be saved. Will you do so?

---

### PREACHING.

---

Even in this day of current defection there are some warm-hearted and primitive-minded preachers among the populars. Mr. Beecher, of Brooklyn, is one of this stamp. In giving an account of his first effort, or what he calls his first real sermon, hear him recount the means by which he prepared himself for the work:

“Why should not preaching do now what it did in the Apostles’ day? Why should it be a random and unrequited effort? These thoughts grew, and the want of fruits was so painful that we determined to make a careful examination of the Apostles’ preaching to see what it was that made it so *immediately* efficient. We found that they laid a

foundation, first of historical truth, common to them and their auditors ; that this mass of familiar truth was then contrated upon the bearers in the form of an intense personal application and appeal ; the language was not philosophical and scholastic, but the language of common life. We determined to try the same. We considered what moral truths were admitted by everybody, and gathered many of them together. We considered how they could be so combined as to press men towards a religious state. We recalled to mind the character and condition of many who we knew would be present, and then, after as earnest a prayer as we ever offered, and with trembling solicitude, we went to the academy and preached the new sermon. The Lord gave it power, and ten or twelve persons were aroused by it, and led ultimately to a religious life."

---

#### EPISTLE FROM RALEIGH.

---

Raleigh, 7th Nov., 1856.

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT:—I send you a few remarks on the reception which your addresses met with in this region of country, although I must acknowledge being unable to do the subject justice, and much wish that it had fallen into abler hands.

Your addresses generally were much relished by the generality of hearers, although the more zealous partizans availed themselves of every occasion of finding fault by misrepresentation : a sample of which is as follows. In the Meeting House at Raleigh, you had occasion to remark that the Apostles' Writings in the Epistles, being exclusively to believers, were not in the present day applicable to unbelievers. The misrepresentation was this,—That the Epistle to the Romans being written to Rome could not be applied to believers now. I may state however that the idea conveyed was so absurd that it defeated its own intention altogether.

I think your discourses generally have had a tendency to arouse a spirit of inquiry, and I hope also of searching the scriptures as the Bearers of old, to see if these things are so.

In Chatham also, where you preached three times, several are convinced of the superlative excellence of the apostles' gospel to the popular sectarian preaching which is retailed every Lord's day from the pulpits in our town.

On last Saturday my wife and I went out to see brother Dugald Campbell, being infirm in health, through whom we learned that brother Sheppard had been proclaiming the truth during the week in that section of country. He also immersed in the beautiful waters of lake Erie a very interesting and intelligent young lady, who is at present a School Teacher. We also learned that brother S. had engagements to preach in Morpeth, and Ridgetown. Accordingly we hastened to Morpeth, a distance of about twenty miles from our home, where we met with the disciples of the Lord Jesus, (numbering I think sixteen,) assembled in the Episcopal Methodist Meeting House, which was kindly given on the occasion, even dispensing with their own preaching at this time. There was a large assembly and an attentive audience while brother Sheppard held forth the word of life. The sisters and brothers in the Lord afterwards partook of the emblems commemorative of the broken body and shed blood of the Lord. I could not resist the impression that where believers are so situated that they can meet as a church observing all the ordinances of Christ's house and walking in all his commands, that they must exert a powerful influence where they are. The brethren here however have not got sufficiently far from popular mist to think it duty to observe the ordinances only when such as brother Sheppard or Elder Sinclair can visit them.

From Morpeth we hastened to Ridgetown where we found the meeting already commenced in the Presbyterian Meeting House, which is a commodious and neat building, highly creditable to this new country.

We passed the night in the hospitable home of a friendly alien, who with his amiable family, I hope will soon come out fully on the Lord's side. I think he is at present misled by the preaching of the times, as he thinks himself not good enough to obey the gospel, and no doubt waiting for further illumination and operation of th Spirit before obedience.

In the hope and promise of the gospel,

Yours,

D. M.

---

#### NEWS FROM WILLIAMSVILLE AND LANCASTER, N. Y.

Newstead, Eric Co., N. Y., Nov. 4th, 1856.

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT:—Forty five years ago last April I enlisted into the service of King Jesus. A few years after I was called by the church to act as a recruiting officer, which pleasing post I occupied un-

til about two years ago, when, by reason of sickness in my family, I had to lay by; but circumstances being more favorable this Fall I went to Williamsville to our yearly festival—there met our good friends from Canada, also formed acquaintance with brother Munnell and King, who are doing all they can for our Prince. We rejoiced together for awhile, and not forgetting my former employment I stayed a few days and we won seven new recruits who were added to the number of the faithful.

Learning at this meeting that the Enemy had led into captivity quite a number of Christ's soldiers at Lancaster, and that the little band of the faithful there desired a little help to reclaim them and to enlist others to fill their broken ranks, I repaired to that post and labored in company with brother Hayes and Munnell, and our weapons being superior—not carnal but mighty through God to the pulling down of the strong holds of satan—the victory turned on Zion's side. Thirty two new recruits were gained and organized into the army of the Lord by baptism. Two noble souls came to us from the Baptists.

Eight-deserters from the church, held in captivity by the Enemy, returned to their allegiance to our King, and think you not there was rejoicing? Sure there was. And now let me tell you that I rejoice greatly that I may labor still in my Master's cause. But this is not all that gladdens my heart. When I read in the last Christian Banner your views of the qualifications of an Evangelist, I said, brother Oliphant is right, and if I can not keep up with the learning of the day, if I am able to read the English and know what is written in the Bible and with love and earnestness tell it to a perishing world, it may do good. I was almost discouraged. I knew I had been successful time gone by, but sometimes thought old veterans like myself would have to stand aside for learned dandies. But let me say, with the Bible in my hand and the love of God in my heart, I will still fight on.

Yours truly,

AN OLD SOLDIER.

---

#### NEWS FROM HILLIER.

Within a few days after returning from my western tour, a request came from Hillier, twenty-five miles east of Brighton, for me to labor in the gospel. Although pressed for time in attending to obligations at home, it appeared on the whole to be duty to make a visit to Hillier

and lift the voice of truth. On making my way thither I found an overflowing excitement in the community arising from a continuous meeting by the friends of Wesleyanism. I remained there a week—addressed the people five times—thirty made the gospel confession and were immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus. The former converts and the new converts had a joyful season, notwithstanding the many not very lovely things uttered against all of us by the friends and advocates of the Wesleyan religion.

There is now a large congregation of disciples in Hillier, and by watchfulness, study of the oracles of heaven, prayer, exhortation, and daily conformity to the living examples of the Lord our Righteousness, they will not only share in the blessings of the salvation of God, but have the honor of so recommending the religion of Jesus that many by them may be saved.

D. O.

---

J. A. BUTLER.

---

Our fellow-laborer who until recently has made his head quarters in Okaloua, Mississippi, is now away into regions of Arkansas, where he "has gone laboring" as saith one of the inspired. His adieu to Mississippi, is, in some respects, touching. Read the following and profoundly consider what it imports :

I have labored thirty-two years in the pulpit, and twenty-four of them in the Réformation, and thirteen of them in Northern Mississippi. And, thank God, that amid all the vituperation, *ingratitude*, opposition, and hostile resistance from foes without, and *summer* friends within, my little Gospel-bark, cargood with my future patrimony, has rode high the waves, and bids fair to find its destined home ;—the port of bliss. My congregations have increased to the *Amen*. I have spent twenty thousand dollars in the good cause, and never received five hundred as compensation. And all the scribes in Israel may write about the duties of the churches towards the *laborer*, but until the churches are purged of the Mammon and Shylock spirit, and until the pulpit is purged of men, who are moved to duty by Randolph's *seven* omnipotent arguments, *five* loaves and *two* fishes ; the wheels of Zion will move heavily ! The churches and pulpits need purging, as sure as "God will be sought unto by the house of Israel."

Is it so that the soldierly, sprightly, and fervently equipped brother Butler is driven out of his old field of labor by that kind of mammonism which keeps food and clothing from the public worker ? Is this so ?

We have a sad impression of it, and all the charity we can muster cannot drive the impression away. O Lord Jesus! what fearful accounts will be to settle with Thy people when Thou comest again!

D. O.

### THE HOLY SPIRIT—MISTAKES CONCERNING IT.

An intelligent writer in one of the Baptist journals visiting the office of the "Christian Banner," speaks thus scripturally and correctly—

There are two practical evils to which we are liable, in the views we take of the Holy Spirit's connection with the salvation of men. The one is to overlook, to forget, the necessity and divine efficacy of that Spirit, in the work of regeneration and sanctification, though in theory it is all granted; and the other is, that of attempting to analyze and define, with exactness, the method of this working, and to make the understood laws of mental science the rules of his operations.

Both of these evils are greatly detrimental to the development of piety, and the maturity of Christian character. The first is reprehensible; the second is absurd.

### SISTER HOOD GONE.

Our brother A. McArther, of Nottawasaga, writes to us saying, that—

"On the 9th day of August last, departed this life our beloved sister Margaret Hood, wife of brother James Hood, Nottawasaga, a native of Scotland, in the 68th year of her age. She was of an amiable disposition and humble in her behaviour. With meekness and in the exercise of christian faith she ended her protracted sufferings, which had continued five months. Without a fear did she at length commit her spirit to her Gracious Creator and Redeemer."

Of all modifications of manner which are to be met with in society, perhaps the most general pleasing is simplicity, even as that water is the purest which has no taste—the air the freshest which has no odour.

↪ A letter to Messrs. Madden and Allison, of Hillier, ministers of the Wesleyan Conference, is preparing for the press and will appear next month. We anticipated having it for insertion in this issue of the Banner, but other duties interfered.

D. O.