

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	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. VI.

COBOURG, AUGUST, 1852.

NO. 8.

NEW VERSION—AN ADDRESS.

Every professor in America if not in Christendom should know that on April 2nd of the current year a Convention was held in Memphis, Tenn., by the friends of a new version of the Bible. It was an influential assembly. It was a solemn subject on which they deliberated—neither more nor less than the expediency and wisdom of attempting to get up a new and improved version of the holy scriptures for the Anglo Saxon race, and arrangements thereunto pertaining.

We are happy in the thought that we live at a time when such a Convention is held, and more especially when we take into account the number and character of the christian gentleman and scholars who honor such a conventional gathering with their presence and counsel. We thank the Lord. We take courage.

Many good speeches by gifted men, enlightened Christians, and eminent scholars were delivered during this Bible Union Convention. We have not room for any one of them entire; but the following lengthy extract of an address which may be found in the Millennial Harbinger for April, spoken by the liberal, masterly, and eminent editor of that large and widely circulating Monthly, is entitled to be served to our readers, though at the risk of hearing complaints that our paper is too limited for anything requiring so many pages. We could desire we had space for the whole address. It is rich, strong, learned, instructive, pointed, and highly interesting.— D. O.

A more suitable time has never been since the era of the Anglo Saxon language, since the rise of the Papal defection, than the present, for a corrected and improved version of the Jewish and Christian Oracles, in the living Anglo-Saxon language of the present day.

A concerted movement of all, or any of the Protestant parties, in such an undertaking, we cannot expect. It is not in living experience, nor is it any where inscribed on the pages of ecclesiastical history, that a plurality of denominations have ever agreed to make a common version, for common use. Romanists and Protestants, Episcopalians and Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Methodists, Baptists and

Pedobaptists, never have agreed, and, I presume, never will agree, to make in common a new version.

Indeed, the first version in our language, as also the second—which is virtually the present commonly used version—in the main, were made by individual enterprise and on individual responsibility.—Their merit, and the course of events, providentially gave them whatever popularity and influence, they have possessed.

King James' version is, at most, but a *correction*, not, indeed, always an *amended* correction, of the version of Wm. Tindal. No assembly ever made a new version of the New Testament. Conventions have met and read, have approbated or condemned, have amended or altered as the case may have been, versions made by individual men. But no convention has yet made a new or original translation.

Majorities, in the affairs of mammon, are worthy of all respect and confidence, because, in such matters, they have a single eye, a clear head, and a sincere heart. But in *Christ's Kingdom*, minorities are much more likely to be, and most generally have been, most worthy of public confidence, ever since the almost unanimous spiritual court of Israel delivered up the Lord Jesus Christ to be crucified. The history of mankind is full of admonition and warning on this subject. Ever since the days of Noah, Lot, and Abraham, majorities are not famous—rather infamous—in sacred story. Still, we flatter ourselves, and will present the flatteringunction to the souls of our contemporaries, that we all are exceptions to a universal rule. Still, I confess I am not without fear in this matter, while I look narrowly into the volumes of church history. One thing is certain, we have as yet no version of the Christian Scriptures made by convention.

"History, is but philosophy speaking by example." If history exemplifies any principle, it is that good men love light and wicked men hate light, in all matters spiritual and eternal. Hence, as already shown, every valuable effort to give a new version of God's own book, has been confined or doomed to individual enterprise, or that which most nearly approaches it. "In the multitude of counsellors," Solomon says, "there is safety." But he did not say in the multitude of translators there is safety. In giving counsel on *meum* and *tuum*, on "*miney* and *thiney*," there is much more facility, and much more safety, than in making faithful versions of company of select men, not selected by a King, a court, a metropolitan or an archbishop, but by a spiritually and heavenly-minded community, selected out of a Christian community, may be found capable and honest, single eyed enough, to guarantee a version true to the original, they are competent to understand and express it. Learned in their own language, they must be, as well as in the original tongues.

But it has been often asked, What may be the destiny of such a version? In other words, Who will receive it, and what will be its influence? This is a question, however dogmatically propounded, cannot be so dogmatically answered. We are neither apostles nor prophets; but we can freely express our opinion, and give some reasons for it.

In the first place, then, much will depend upon the reputed orthodoxy and piety of those who execute it. The Society under whose patronage, and by whose instrumentality it is proposed, is properly called the "*Bible Union*." Not the Baptist Union.

Already it has been opposed and misrepresented as a *Baptist Union* for *Baptist* principles. A new measure to carry out *immersionist* views of the action of baptism, by translating *baptism*, *immersion*, and all its family, root and branches, by *immerse*, *immersing*, *immersed*, *immersion*! This is about all the logic and all the rhetoric that has appeared in one hundred and forty-four paragraphs, written, printed, and circulated against it, "from Dan even unto Beersheba," from Boston to San Francisco, from Mulberry street, New York, to Old Jewry, London.

Truly immersionists have been hardly pressed, although now the largest community in the Union, and annually gaining more than any denomination in the number of its membership; fully equalling in population, wealth, and resources, one-fifth of the political and moral force of this great nation.

But why have recourse to a new version, for the sake of translating this family of *baptizo*? Have not all, or nearly all, the learned Rabbis and Doctors of the Pedobaptist communities, affirmed not only that *baptism* means immersion, but also that it was so administered in the Apostles' days? Ask Brenner, of the Church of Rome, what was the ancient apostolic baptism? He responds, that "immersion was practised for *thirteen centuries* almost universally, and from the beginning till now," in the Greek Church. Ask the English Episcopal Church how long did the church practice immersion as the representative of baptism? And Dr. Wall responds, for 1600 years. Ask Luther what is his judgment on the premises? he answers, "I could wish that all such as are to be baptized, should be carefully immersed into water, according to the meaning of the word and the signification of the ordinance; as also, without doubt it was instituted by Christ." Ask the great American critic, the late Professor Stuart, what is the English of baptize, and he affirms, "that it means to dip, plunge or immerse in water, and that all lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this." And does not ancient history aver, that both Wycliffe and Tindal were in their views immersionists? With all these venerated names—a mere cluster culled from the orthodox Pedobaptist vine—what need have Baptists themselves to form a Baptist Bible Union, to inculcate their views of immersion!!

But it will be whispered that other views than these—heretical and false—are cherished by the Bible Union, and that the Bible will be colored by these. This has been insinuated; nay printed and published by Baptists themselves opposed to it. And what is the proof, or the basis of such suspicion? Have not the leading movers of this Bible translation, as now digested and exhibited by the Bible Union, been always regarded as sound and orthodox on every vital doctrine of christianity? Do not they believe in the fall of man; in the contamination and guilt of sin, which, as a leprosy, has

infected every child born into the world? Do they not believe and teach the equal Divine nature and glory of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, as developed in the great work of redemption, in and through the death, the sacrifice, or vicarious sufferings of the Lord Jesus Christ? Do they not believe and teach that the Father works, the Son works, and the Holy Spirit works, in the redemption, illumination, regeneration, sanctification, resurrection, and glorification of man, through the grace of the Father, the Sacrifice of the Son, and the re-creative, renovating, regenerating influence of the Holy Guest of the Christian temple—the mystic house of God, erected for an habitation of God through the Spirit?

Can, then, our heterodoxy be alleged as an objection to any version that we may make? Then there is no vital orthodoxy, no real orthodoxy, in Protestant Christendom. My own individual orthodoxy is too orthodox for the orthodox prelates of a sectarian world. I thank God, as Paul once said of himself, in his own foolish way of boasting, I am more orthodox than any of them. I have all their orthodoxy, and a little more besides. And I know that the next generation—or, at farthest, the one after that—will acknowledge it.

We conclude, then, from our premises—and they are both large and liberal—that any version consummated by the Bible Union can never be objected to by any—the most orthodox party in Protestant Christendom—because of any theoretic or practical error held or propagated by any of those who participate in its consummation. I am fully aware that the wiles of the Devil will be in requisition, ready to strangle it as soon as born. But the Lord has always taken and subdued the Devil's wise men in their own craftiness, and shown that the weakness of God is stronger than man or the Devil; and therefore the preaching of old, stale, quaint, spectacle-bedrid orthodoxy, will be as impotent now as was Herod's decree to kill the new born king of the Jews, by the slaughter of the innocents of Bethlehem.

But seeing that the Bible Union is not a Baptist Union, nor is it an heterodox Union, but a Union for a pure, chaste, exact, faithful, and perspicuous version of the Christian Oracles, and ultimately of the whole volume of Divinely inspired truth, what is likely to be its fortunes, its future history, or its destiny?

To answer to this question, though somewhat in the spirit of prophecy, is not so very difficult as at first presentation might be assumed or imagined. If it be faithful and true to the original, and we assume that such it will be, in the judgment of all truly enlightened men, it must, then, in harmony with the history of man, and the progress of the age, gain a glorious triumph over its opponents. Their batteries will be silent, because they will have been silenced by the work itself. It may be condemned and reprobated—indeed it will be, by a mere sectary, who has taken the oath of allegiance to his present prejudices, for better or for worse, and who, in advance of its appearance, has not only thought but said, "no good thing can come out of Nazareth," and therefore never will. Such was the fate and the fortunes of Tindal's

version. He was persecuted and driven from England. He was put to death by the orthodox of that day. His translation was inhibited in England; and yet in a few years after, it was virtually the English Bible; enacted and ordained by the ecclesiastical and political potentates of England.

The present version was not, on its first appearance, a universal favorite. Some preferred the Bishops' Bible; others disliked both. One age burns heretics; the next makes them saints and martyrs, and erects monuments to their memory. No wise man, well read in civil or ecclesiastical history, can expect a different state of things.—The censure of one age, is all praise in the judgment of the next; as the praise of one generation is often the shame and the reproach of the following. Christians live for immortality, for eternity, and, therefore, to them it is a matter of little or no account how their contemporaries may think and speak of them. The only happy man is he whom the Lord approveth.

But what will be the fortunes of such a version, as we contemplate may be rationally anticipated? It will ultimately be received by all the Immersionists. Some of the elders, some of the scribes, some of the popular doctors, some of the man-worshippers, will, no doubt, say of it when issued, what they said of it before it appeared. This they will do to justify the false position which, in a fitful mood, they unfortunately took on the whole premises. This we expect, and will not be disappointed. Human nature, in the absence of Divine grace, runs in these channels. Yet we say it will be ultimately received by all the immersionists, and by a portion of the non-immersionists. But, in some instances, it will be read with more interest to find out its faults, than to perceive its fidelity or its general excellency. All who plead for perspicuous or faithful versions, into foreign tongues abroad, will be compelled to receive a perspicuous and faithful version in their own Anglo-Saxon at home. We, who are now actors in the drama will soon die. Our prepossessions and antipathies will die with us, and our labors will fall into more impartial hands. In one life-time, despite of all opposition, it will be generally read by all enlightened Christians of our language, probably in some points improved: but in those points to which special reference is had, just as we give it. Many may denounce it whose children will only wish, "as dutiful sons, their fathers had been more wise."

But in saying so much of a *new* version to be made in the present day, we are likely to be misunderstood. We do not really intend or wish for a literally new version. We much prefer, in all cases, the common Anglo-Saxon style and idiom, and never will capriciously change the verbiage, unless when defective or unfaithful to the original, or otherwise in bad taste. I am one, and have long been one, of the admirers of the Anglo-Saxon—of the Common Version. And although often corrected and improved in its defects, by such men as Campbell, Macknight, Doddridge, &c., neither the more sonorous and elegant Latinities of the former, nor the pure, and sometimes too complaisant Grecisms of the latter, nor the combination of them both, with less taste and vigor, by Doddridge, and other

modern revisionists, win my admiration nor command my respect and affection, so much as the pure Anglo Saxon of the fourteenth century, as it mainly appears in the revision of King James, and his forty-seven translators or revisors. With Macaulay and other distinguished writers of the present day, I believe that much of the power and effect of the common Bible, and Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, are owing to the fact that they are the only two good specimens of that style extant amongst us, and have thereby an easier and more direct passport to the understanding, the conscience, and the heart of English, Scotch, Irish and Americans, than any other books in our language.

Change, for the sake of change, in the Oracles of God, in any language, is, in my judgment, bad taste and worse philosophy; and ought to be eschewed, rather than cultivated or adopted, by each and every one who desires the Word of God to run and be glorified in our day and generation. Change, without improvement is, in most cases, and, most of all, in Bible translation, mere pedantry—more worthy of reprobation than of commendation, on the part of every lover of the Bible and mankind. I love the phrases and forms of speech in which our venerable and venerated forefathers were accustomed to clothe their conceptions of God and of Christ, and of the great salvation, when they tuned their hearts to the praises of God, or prostrated themselves before his mercy seat. I love, too, the forms of speech in which they expressed their conceptions of his grace and of his great salvation, when in their ecstasies they celebrated the wonders of his grace and extolled his condescension to a lost and ruined world. Magniloquence is the index of a weak and visionary mind; and a too precise and formal style, in complaisance to the verbal livery of the times, savors more of pedantry than of piety; more of the flesh than of the spirit. More of the wisdom of men than of the power of God—Much learning, real substantial learning, good common sense, much piety and spirituality of mind, and a profound humility and reverence, are essential qualifications of a good translator of the Oracles of God. We are, therefore, more disposed to ask who is fit for such a work, rather than to hasten rashly or presumptuously upon it as a matter of common concern or of ephemeral duration. It is a good work, a great work, a solemn work, and must be approached with great solemnity and self-examination. It is not a task to be hastily assumed, and despatched with expedition. It is as solemn as death and as awful as eternity. If God commanded his servant Moses, when he presented himself to him at Horeb, saying, "Draw not nigh hither; put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place on which thou standest is holy ground;" and if the captain of the Lord's host said to Joshua, when standing in his presence, "Loose thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place on which thou standest is holy," with what solemnity and reverence should we presume to touch "the ark of the covenant" of mercy, and to open its contents to our contemporaries and to posterity? Should not, then, such a work as is proposed, be undertaken, prosecuted and consummated, in the spirit of piety the most sincere, and of a reverence the most profound?

The very name Bible Union has a charm in the ear of every friend of truth, of every friend of God and man. The Bible is God's own foundation for the greatest Empire in creation. It is the constitution of the Empire of Redeemed Humanity! We have had every other sort of union but an unity for a perfect English Bible.—The Christian world, so called, may co-operate in the work which it proposes. And that a perfect English Bible, for an English people is needed for three great purposes, will, I presume, on a proper exposition of the premises, be very generally conceded. The first for the union of true Christians; the second for the conversion of the world; the third for the perfection of the church. To illustrate what we mean in such a broad affirmation, take an example or two:—1. Let all Englishmen read immerse for baptize, and then would not the baptismal controversy cease upon the action of baptism? 2. Let them read *congregation* for *church*, and where the basis for the patriarchy, for the papacy or the prelacy? Let them read *love* for *charity*, and where that spurious tolerance of error, as a substitute for brotherly-kindness and love?

First, we say, *for the union of true christians*. The most insuperable barrier to this are the three prevailing baptisms—baptism in water with faith; baptism in water, without faith, and baptism with the Spirit without either faith or water. There are, therefore, three meanings attached to Christian baptism. The first is, the *immersion* of a professed believer *in* water. The second is the *aspersion* of water *upon* a person, with or without faith. The third is, the affusion or effusion of the Spirit of God upon a spirit, antecedent to and independent of, either knowledge or faith. Thus the word *baptize* becomes a perfect enigma.

Baptize is neither Hebrew nor Greek, neither Latin nor English. It is a modification of the Greek *baptizo*, the Roman form of which is identical with the Greek. Hence the Greek and Roman Church practised immersion down to A. D. 1311; and the Greek Church, still older than the Roman, and vast in its territory, still practices it.

The English Church, too, practised immersion down to the reign of Henry VIII., and it was so ordained by statute of said Henry, in his Holy Manual or Guide of A. D. 1530. The statute of Henry VIII., 21st, thus speaks, "*Let the priest take the child, and, having asked the name, baptize him, by dipping him in water thrice.*"

Indulgences were given, in after reigns, to pour water upon weak babies; and, very soon after, all the babies became weak, and could not even stand the shock of pouring. Then John Calvin mercifully interposed, and commuted *pouring* for *sprinkling*. The priests, English and Scotch, immediately commenced a new kind of oratory, under the shield and the star of the rhetorical figures of a *synecdoche*, which puts a part for a whole, and of a *metalepsis*, which authorizes old names to be applied to new things. And so Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Episcopalians and Methodists, liberal spirits all, in general, have availed themselves of the tolerant indulgence of the falsely styled "*intolerant Calvin.*"

The Edinburgh *Encyclopædia* is high authority in this case.—Hear the article on baptism, in the words following, to wit :

“ In this country (Scotland,) however, sprinkling was never practised in ordinary cases, till after the Reformation ; and in England, even in the reign of Edward the VI., trine immersion, dipping first the right side, secondly the left side, and lastly the face of the infant, was commonly observed. But during the persecution of Mary, many persons, most of whom were Scotchmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there greedily devoured the opinions of that church. In 1556 a book was published at that place, containing the ‘ form of prayers, and ministration of the sacraments, approved by the famous and godly learned man, John Calvin,’ in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand and lay it upon the child’s forehead. These Scottish exiles who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin ; and returning to their own country with Knox at their head, in 1559, established sprinkling in Scotland. From Scotland this practice found its way into England, in the reign of Elizabeth.”

The second great object of a new version is the *conversion of the world*. Our Redeemer, in his intercessory prayer, as reported by John, the beloved Apostle, has declared that the union of his friends and followers is essential to the conversion of the world “ I pray, Holy Father,” says he, not for the Apostles only, nor for these only that now believe on me, *that they may be one as we are* ; but “ I pray for those also who shall believe on me through their word, (or teaching) *that they all may be one*—that as thou, Father art in me, and I in thee, they also may be one in us, *that the world may believe that thou hast sent me*, and that I have given them the glory which thou gavest me, *that they may be one even as we are one* : I in thee, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one ; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me.” Though we had a thousand arguments to offer in the advocacy of the necessity of the union of Christians, in order to the conversion of the world of unbelieving Jews and Gentiles, we would not on such an occasion, adduce one of them in corroboration of this one. They are all as the twinkling of innumerable stars in a cloudless heaven, compared with the splendors of a meridian sun, blazing in all his noontday majesty and effulgence on our world. The simple declaration of the fact, that the union of christians is necessary to the conversion of the world, by such a person on such an occasion, is as strong as the strongest mathematical demonstration of a physical truth, subjected alike to the senses and the understanding of men.

So long as the Lord Jesus Christ—the Founder of the Christian Church or kingdom—has made its union, and spiritual communion in one God, through one Redeemer, and by one Holy Spirit, a means of the conversion of the world, it could not be made more essential to that end by any enactment, ordinance, or oracle in earth or heaven. It is, therefore, now, and for forty years past has been, with me, a fixed principle, that if a hundred sects or schisms in Christ’s Kingdom

were to send out their respective myriads of missionaries into all the nations of earth, *the world*, in our Saviour's sense, could not be converted, or be made to believe that Jesus is the true Messiah, the only Saviour of the world. I might shew, in volumes, the evils of schisms, and so might another, and another, as conversant with these themes as any of us; but the simple utterance of this prayer, for the union of all believers in the Divine person and mission, and work of Jesus, *in order to the conversion of the world*, eclipses, and will eternally eclipse them all. It is an end, a consummation most devoutly to be wished, but which never can be gained while the Christian profession is severed and divided into innumerable parties, in perpetual conflict with one another. The sword of ecclesiastic strife must be sheathed, and the halcyon flag of Zion must wave its peaceful folds on every Christian altar, from one extremity of Christendom to the other.

Whatever, then, tends to the true interpretation or translation of the Living Oracles into the languages of our Christendom, is an object of transcendent, nay of paramount importance, to the answer and accomplishment of our Redeemer's prayer; to the health, peace, prosperity, and ultimate triumph of our most holy faith, over all the superstitions and idolatries of earth. How much, then, need I ask, depends upon such a version of the Holy Oracles as will give an exact and perspicuous interpretation of every passage connected with each and every one of those unhappy sources of error that have occasioned, or given any countenance to, those paralyzing schisms, which have, more or less, frustrated our missionary enterprises since the establishment of the first domestic or foreign mission in Christendom?

The third great object to be gained is the *perfection* of the church. "That they may be made perfect in one," is a portion of the burthen of our Lord's intercessory prayer. Perfection is, therefore, the glory and felicity of man.

The perfectibility of human nature, by human instrumentality, has long been the fascinating dream of visionary philosophers. A true philosopher, or a true Christian, never cherished such an Utopian vision. But there is a true, a real perfectibility of human character and of human nature, through the soul-redeeming mediation and holy spiritual influence of the great Philanthropist—the Hero, the Author and Perfector of the Christian faith. And there is a transforming power—a spiritual, a divine energy, adequate to this end, in the gospel of Christ, as now dispensed by the Holy Guest of the Christian temple.

It is first a spiritual, and finally a physical transformation of man, in his whole physical, intellectual, and moral constitution. It is, in the measure of his spiritual capacity, a perfect conformity to the perfect image of the spiritual beauty and loveliness of the Divine Father himself. This is the glorious destiny of man under a remedial economy of means and influences, expressed or suggested in the teachings of the Messiah, and fully developed in the writings of his ambassadors to the nations. Our divine Master had this in his eye,

when he prayed for the perfection of Christians in and through himself.

Now, in order to this divine scheme of redemption and transformation of a fallen and ruined world, the whole volume of the Christian Scriptures is, in the wisdom of God, inspired and fashioned as happily, as wisely and as benevolently, as light is to the eye, or harmony and melody to the ear. To have the full-orbed sun of righteousness, mercy, and life, shining in all his moral and spiritual splendors upon our souls, in the light of a life divine and everlasting, is the choicest boon of heaven, and the richest treasure almighty love ever imparted to any portion of God's intellectual and spiritual universe. Ought not, then, these animating and cheering rays of Divine light be permitted to shine into our souls, in the clear and cloudless atmosphere of a pure and transparent interpretation or translation of the Divine originals of our most precious and holy faith! And what conscience purified from guilt, what heart touched with the magnet of everlasting love, and sanctified by faith, does not pant after the full fruition of the light of God's countenance, reflected upon us in the mirror of Divine Revelation?

If, then, there be an object that supremely claims our concentrated energies and our most vigorous efforts; if there be happiness, honor, and glory in our assimilation to the Divine image; if the union of all the children of God in one holy brotherhood; if the conversion of the world to the obedience of the faith; if the perfection of the Christian character, through faith, hope, and love—through an ardent zeal and devotion, be objects of paramount value and importance—be pre-eminently desirable, ought not all the talents and learning and grace, which God has vouchsafed to his church of the present day, be consecrated and devoted to the consummation of this transcendent work!

POSITION AND PRINCIPLES OF DISCIPLES.

No. VIII.

Those who speak of the zeal of Disciples as too frigid and too philosophical, may speak what is true; but it does not follow that they are good judges of Christian zeal and its legitimate fruits, either in sentiment or practice. True zeal, according to knowledge, is a rarity; and, if permitted to say it, we, as a people, are disposed to go all lengths for a reformation in religious zeal, as in all things else pertaining to the religion of the Supreme King.

Zeal, let it be said, is a principle—not a passion; a steady and reliable power—not a meteor-like impulse. The enthusiastic outbursts of to-day succeeded by the lukewarmness of to-morrow, or the glowing warmth of the present hour followed by the cold chill of the next hour, cannot be honoured with the name of Christian zeal. Christianity is subject to no such fever and ague. Hysterics and spasms

form no part of the religion of our Lord. And without the least disposition to exaggerate, misconstrue or misrepresent any of the practices common to our fellow professors, what, let us candidly ask, are all our modern "revivals" and "cold seasons" but so many sinkings and risings in the spiritual thermometer, indicating the most sudden and marked contrasts between the lively life of one day and the nearest thing to death the next? Yet is it not true that if we were to fall in with this cripple and limping system our zeal would be taken at par?

We praise not our own zeal. It is not held up as a model to others. It is behind the primitive standard. It therefore needs amendment. We plead reformation for ourselves as well as for others. And on this principle, can we not, shall we not, invite all sterling men to assist us in finding and following the inspired pattern?

But this is not the point aimed at when it is testified that the Disciples are wanting in zeal. Connected with this imputation, there is a fearful foreboding that we are rationalists, deny holiness of heart, and positively lack those spiritualities which form the groundwork and soul of zeal. German rationalism, tinctured with a cold sentimentalism, form, it is believed, our religion. Come then, objecting reader, and let us diligently enquire into this very grave department. We at once agree that if deficient here—if we have not the mind that was in Christ Jesus—all our knowledge, attainments, aims, and labors are idle, futile and fatal. Without spirituality in the inner man—without righteousness and true holiness—without the Lord's spirit in the soul—without the occupancy of the heart with the things of God—it matters little how any man prates about reformation.

The reader will be surprised to learn that we are led and impelled to oppose the popular denominations on the very ground that they are so barren of piety and spirituality. Such, nevertheless, is the case. We maintain, and we think we are able to maintain, that all spiritual life, and all the means of this spiritual life, come from, and are inseparably connected with, "the Lord from heaven." He is law-giver and life-giver. We need no other. Light, love, law, life, are in his precepts, his institutions, his attributes. With him are all the treasures of knowledge, wisdom, power, grace, Divine excellency, and the riches of the Spirit. He is the "Minister of the True Tabernacle." They have "the mind of Christ," and are therefore "spiritually minded" who attend his ministrations. They have the spiritual law "written on their hearts." The whole machinery of the Gospel,

indeed, exists for this one great end—to make men spiritual, lovely, holy, God-like. The vineyard and the vine-dresser, the vines and the grape clusters, are not prized for their own sake; but for what they produce—the pure wine. It is even so with the Gospel. The whole of its power, every one of its precepts, all its ordinances, contemplate one grand result, and this one grand result is, to fill the human heart with Jesus' spiritual love; for in every heart where this love reigns, that heart is made living with heavenly life, ready to pay acceptable homage to God and overflow with good will and good deeds to all men. And “whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him:—he that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked.”

And shall it be objected—shall the words be solemnly spoken in the hearing of the great King—that we have rationalist views and are not spiritual men in Christ, because we depend exclusively upon the Lord Jesus and his gracious and spiritual gifts? “Boys in the market-place” could not make a more incongruous and unhappy complaint. It leads us to think of an Italian husbandman and his two servants. He told them both to go to his winepress and prepare a flagon of wine each, and bring to him. The one filled his vessel with the juice of the grape as commanded; the other worked the press until his flagon was one-fourth full, and then filled it up with water. On returning to the master, he who had the mixture of wine and water complained of his companion; saying, that his vessel contained impure wine. The master, on making strict enquiry, finally ascertained the truth, that he who was accused had the pure article, and the accuser the impure; but on charging the adulteration upon the accuser, he received this extraordinary answer,—“My flagon is pure, for water is purer than wine; that servant's flagon is not pure, for it contains nothing but wine.” The reply of the husbandman may be anticipated,—“When I send for water, it is water I want; you have neither pure wine nor pure water: you are no longer my servant.”

The best counsels and wisest expediencies of men may diminish, but cannot increase the spirituals of our Lord Jesus: and assuredly that people must be the most devout, the purest in heart, who free themselves most from the devices of a corrupt age and the expediencies of sinister men, and cleave with scrupulous care to the Lord's own enactments.

We have said, and we ought to say again, that the religion of Jesus, from first to last, has but one design, and that one design the filling

of the heart of man with pure, spiritual, heaven-born love. And here it should be emphatically stated that no one can possess or enjoy this love in its power and richness without hearing the words, receiving the laws, observing the ordinances, and following the footsteps of the Divine Master. These ordinances and laws of the one Lord are as necessary to the enjoyment of Christ's spirit as the body of a man is necessary to develop the human spirit. A human spirit is not found without a human body, unless, indeed we go to the Rochester school, and give all diligence to wait upon and believe the "Rappings," which we cannot do until the spirit of delusion is extracted from them. As a man's body is not his spirit, so the body of religion is not its spirit; but to find its spirit without its body, would be like finding a man's spirit in the absence of his body. To secure the wine, we must have the vineyard and the vine, the husbandman and the winepress: and so it is that to secure the spirituality of the Saviour, we must needs find and enjoy it through the very means he has himself ordained to that end. Here, too, we are happily popular, at least in meaning; for what is more common than to hear of the "means of grace"?

Closely bearing upon the preceding, the subject of the Sabbath is brought up, and a vigorous attempt is made to prove that we as Disciples of Christ are heretical because we disown and then break the Sabbath, the Christian Sabbath. Now if the friends who declare themselves thus, would take a little trouble to read the oracles of the Christian faith, they would discover that there is no such language and no such idea in Heaven's Statute-Book, as the Christian Sabbath. Dr. Wardlaw, with all his learning and all his divinity to support him, utters the grandest absurdities when he lays himself out to prove the change of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first. A good reasoner could as easily sustain the assertion that Dr. Wardlaw is the Prophet Daniel, as prove that the Christian dispensation recognizes a Sabbath. And even if there was such a day under our present covenant of favor, the Dr. ought to know that he breaks the Sabbath every time he enters his pulpit.

While the Jewish religion was in vogue, the observance of the Sabbath was as authoritative as any part of the law; but the abolition of the old economy, abolished everything connected with it, Sacrifices, Altars, Tabernacles, Priests, Feasts, Jubilees, Sabbaths, together with all nationalities and fleshy affinities, circumcision among the rest. A change of covenant, a change of priesthood, a change of law, and a new order of things founded upon these, relieve us wholly from the jurisdiction of the faithful Moses, whose legislation was intended

especially and exclusively for Israel according to the flesh. We find no fault with Moses, the man of God, nor with any of his enactments; but we place him and them where they were placed by the Lord's inspired heralds on and after Pentecost.

All this goes further to indicate how great the necessity for religious reformation. Millions of honest souls talk as sanctifiedly about a Christian Sabbath, as though the Lord's ambassadors had set apart such a day; and they themselves, on the subject of the Sabbath, are no nearer keeping it after the directions of the lawgiver Moses than they are in keeping a consecrated day of Mahomed's. In fact, while the law of Moses is constantly appealed to and held in imaginary reverence, the great bulk of it is totally overlooked or despised in practice. Let us have a little consistency. Shall we go to Moses and hear him?—be schooled by him?—be religiously directed by him? Then let us obey him. If he has the authority to appoint a Sabbath for Christ's people, it is not right to make a mockery of it; but let us make it a day of rest, do no work, not even kindle a fire, on pain of being "surely put to death." When Israel was in the wilderness, the first transgression in breaking the Sabbath was dealt with in the following summary manner:—"And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses." This was the old-fashioned way of administering discipline to a Sabbath-breaker; but our Sabbath advocates are exceedingly degenerate in carrying out the laws in this day and age. In fact, in the whole history of Canada, or any of our British Provinces, we question if one instance is to be found where any poor mortal has been thus put to death; proving one of two things, either that we have no Sabbath-breakers, or no true disciplinarians according to the school of Moses!

The Puritans, in the days of Cromwell, were so Mosaic in their tendencies, that they appealed to the law as pious proof that they should fight the battles of the Lord; and the good Puritan was found under his military commander with his Bible, Prayer-book, musket, bayonet and sword all arranged for service according as the exercise might be in place. The law of Moses and the Prayer-book were fitting exercises for the morning and evening, and during any portion of the day when the bayonet was not needed; but powder and ball, cavalry and artillery, constituted the worship of all other seasons! More devout and conscientious men in their own way, the world has never seen. Bible reading, fasting, sermonizing and praying were as faith-

fully attended to among these Puritans while marching to and preparing for their enemies, as though they had been missionaries. It must have been a singular sight to see the Scottish Covenanters and the English Puritans meeting in deadly struggle on the battle field, when both armies had been reading their Bibles, praying, and feeling moved by the Holy Spirit previously. Such are the extremes and the contradictions of men who profess to be guided by the Messiah, and then look to Moses. And can it be believed that the very sons and daughters of these Puritans who were taught by Moses to fight for Cromwell, and waded through fields of blood, glorying in the weapons of the flesh instead of the weapons of the Spirit—is it to be believed that these children who pride themselves on the purity of their fathers, will now appear before us and make the solemn charge that the Disciples are not sufficiently spiritual? We ask no better proof that we are attempting a good work in employing our energies to effect reform, when we see men hurrying away to Sinai to learn spirituality—then blame their friends and contemporaries for being too carnal because they appeal to Jesus and his holy twelve.

This whole question of the old law and the new law must be enquired into diligently, and frankly discussed. Paul's labors in contrasting the old and new covenants, and separating the one from the other, are much needed. There is a life and death struggle, even in this famed age of light, to make Moses the arbitrator upon almost every religious question; and as the Disciples are noted for free enquiry, and have set out with the firmest resolution to take nothing upon trust, but everything upon the testimony of God, we are at least consistent with ourselves in endeavoring to decide whether according to the authority of the Oracles, Christ's people are to listen to Moses *in anything whatever*.

Do we condemn Moses? No; simply keep him in his place.—Every teacher has his appropriate sphere. Moses' place was a large one, whether we consider the number and character of his pupils, or the period of time he taught. He was a legitimate teacher, divinely accredited, from the moment he came down from Mount Sinai with the two tables of the law, to the time when Jesus said "It is finished," and expired with a groan which was heard by saints in their graves, at which moment the veil which separated the Holy from the Most Holy place in the temple was rent in two pieces, never again to be joined, indicating with inspired certainty that a Most Holy place was no more needed on earth. Thus, the Jewish lawgiver held his office by authority of God, from the year of the world 2513, down to the

year 4037—or something like 1524 years. The number and character of the Jewish people, too, show us that Moses received a mighty commission. When he came down from the mount of God's revelations to him, several millions of people responded to him as lawgiver. God then took them over Jordan to Canaan—subdued their enemies—gave them a large inheritance—wrought scores of miracles for them—exalted them as a nation above all the nations of the world—blessed and multiplied them for their father Abraham's sake—and made them from generation to generation his chosen and honored people. Never before or since were such favors poured out from the hand of God upon any nation; and the might and the glory of the nation were the might and glory of Moses, as its chief Prophet and Lawgiver.

God was their King, Moses their Prime Minister, and they themselves were subjects of the kingdom by relationship to father Abraham. It was a national church, and the only national church that ever existed which was established by divine authority. The church was all state, the state was all church. Their religion was politics and their politics religion. They were called upon to do or not do "as the Lord commanded Moses." Every member of the church was a member by birthright; every Priest or Levite was a Priest or Levite by being of the appointed tribe; and every duty performed by priest, individual, or congregation, was performed in obedience to a great Covenant made *with* and *for* MEN IN THE FLESH—which Covenant or Constitution was ratified or made good *between God and the nation* at the foot of Mount Horeb. A Jew, therefore, was a Jew because his father or his mother was of the stock of father Abraham; a priest was a priest because he was descended from one of the twelve great-grand-sons of Abraham; and every act of obedience was required to be done according to a covenant which grew out of one of the promises made to Abraham, which guaranteed that his children should be constituted a great nation.

The entire arrangement was fleshly. No religious obedience or rite made one of Abraham's children a member of the church—no disobedience excluded him, unless, indeed, putting him to death for disobedience may be so considered. Circumcision, so often called the "initiatory (introductory) rite into the Jewish Church," had no more to do in introducing any descendant of Abraham into the old church than it had with the introduction of father Noah into the ark which saved him from the flood. The theology which tells us that circumcision introduced into the Jewish church, and that baptism has come

in the room of circumcision, and in like manner introduces into the Christian church, is overthrown in a moment by an extract from the pen of the great historian and lawgiver who presided over that first church: "The uncircumcised man-child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; HE HATH BROKEN MY COVENANT."—Gen. xvii 14. The child was *among his people* at birth; and if at eight days old he was not circumcised, he was to be cut off from his people; the covenant was broken. Does any one think the covenant could be broken by a person who was not *in or under or within* the covenant? Can any man break the rules of a society of which he is not a member? Every one knows that we must be under or embraced in a covenant before it can be broken by us; and hence it is certain that the Jewish babes were all included in the Jewish national covenant; and hence circumcision did not *put* them there, but *kept* them there.

Circumcision was, indeed, as popularly expressed, a *seal*; and he must be a dull observer and a worse learner, who is ignorant of the use of a seal. To seal up a letter after it is written, is natural and right; but to think of producing a letter with a seal is a simpleton's thought. Legal men make a bargain with each other, and when it is written out, they affix to it their seal—they do not make the bargain by a seal! Neither was a Jew made by the seal circumcision. He was a Jew by birth, or because one of his parents was; and circumcision was a sign, seal, or mark in the flesh to indicate and show while he lived that a bargain had been made between God and his nation, and that he was one of that nation. All the baby doctrine and baptism of babes, therefore, which grow out of the volumes and piles of theology about introducing the Jew into Moses' church by circumcision, and all the strong pillars erected to bear up popular churches, founded upon this untenable idea, are swept with a "clean sweep" into regions as fanciful as poets see. Can, therefore, our friends not perceive at a glance what loads of nonsense and what a deluge of unsanctioned practices have resulted from the unmeaning affirmation "Baptism has come in the room of circumcision"?

But we must leave the subject for to-day, promising its prosecution and a full chapter upon it in our coming number. Lest any kind friend, however, by being too kind, should say that we fear to speak our views respecting the First Day of the Week, let it be distinctly understood that we firmly believe in the ordination of the Lord's Day, for the Lord's people, for the Lord's worship. D. O.

Belleville, August, 1852.

UNTRUTH EXPOSED.

The following has been waiting its time for the last two months or more. It needs no introduction or explanation:—

In a number of the periodical last year, there appeared a letter from Mr. L. N. Holmes, and no doubt it was quite a novel affair to those who read it. They must have come to the conclusion that the Disciples in this place are puseyites or something little better, if they could believe what was affirmed. As every person should pay a strict regard for truth, and especially those who profess christianity, that gentleman had been better engaged had he spoken differently. Mr. Holmes certainly knew when he penned such a sweeping assertion as the following, viz: "One Disciple endeavoured to convince me that baptism is conversion," that he was doing him gross injustice—it being far from truth; and those that doubt this can appeal to the person so represented for their own satisfaction. As I am perfectly acquainted with the individual alluded to above, the assertion is untrue. He holds no such dogma. But he holds that faith and repentance are pre-requisite to baptism, such as we find on Pentecost, Acts 2nd chapter. Such is the heresy he holds, if such be heresy according to Mr. Holmes.

As Mr. Holmes is a Pedo-Baptist, and they sprinkle children (and that without faith) is it not for their regeneration, and that they are in danger without it? But the person he misrepresents holds that faith is one of the pre-requisites to baptism. Mr. H. ought to consider the old adage. "Those who live in glass houses," &c.

A second charge is, that "another (Disciple) contended that no man should pray before conversion." As this regards myself, I will do like Paul of old; I will "answer for myself." In the first place, I wish to say that the above is not my language; but this I did say, that the Apostles never told any person to pray for religion or for conversion. If this be heresy, we will show how it accords with the living oracles. I will first summon Matthew Levi: "Go ye, therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them," &c., Math. xxviii. And, again, hear Luke: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached among all nations, *beginning at Jerusalem,*" Luke xxiv. That city was the starting point; for thus had the Prophet predicted, Mich. iv. Now, as Jerusalem was the place of beginning, we will hear what was spoken to those that were addressed on Pentecost. The Apostle said "Repent and be baptized * * * * in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," &c. "Then they that gladly received the Word were baptized." Now suppose friend Holmes had been there that day, how would he have acted? If he had believed Peter's declaration, he would have obeyed the Lord and took him at his word, and given a proof of it like the Corinthians, of whom it is said, "Many of them hearing, believed, and were baptized," Acts xviii. They showed their faith by their obedience. Because I discard the penitent bench, perhaps that was his reason for charging me with denying prayer.

Again, "some say that feeling is no evidence of pardon." To this

charge I will plead guilty thus far—that a person may rejoice in believing a lie as much almost, if not altogether, as in believing the truth, and may be just as sincere. For proof that we may be deceived, I will call another witness at once—Saul on his way to Damascus, Acts ix. He breathed out threatenings against the followers of the meek and lowly Saviour, and he thought he ought to do so. But feelings like the three thousand in Jerusalem, or the Jailer at Philippi, or in the household of Lydia, are genuine. They had obeyed the Lord's voice, and therefore they relied with confidence on his promises.—“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my Word shall not pass away,” says Jesus. All feelings, therefore, are not to be discarded.

We should examine the ground we occupy, and see if we are on the foundation, which is the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Christ himself being the chief corner stone.

When I read the charges against us here, my spirit stirred within me, and thus I have delivered myself. This should have appeared long ago, but by some accident misplaced. H * * * *

Walpole, March, 1852.

So far our correspondent. But we are not yet done with Mr. Holmes. He has become a champion of another stamp since he was pleased to make the charges and propose the queries in the epistle to which our brother now refers. It will be remembered that we were disposed to treat Mr. H. as an intelligent correspondent and as a gentleman—that his courtesy and apparent candor were entitled to respectful demeanor. Whether he received this from us, we leave others to record what verdict they choose; but whether or not, the following extract of an epistle from his pen, written immediately on his reception of our answer to his interrogatories, will show that our treatment of him was at least sufficiently careful and cautious. We take this extract from a longer extract of a letter the gentleman wrote and sent to a christian brother in Walpole. It was put into our hands to make of it what use our wisdom might suggest. On mature reflection, we have decided to put it on record, as the officers of the Registry say:

“On the first of December last, I received from you a transcript of Oliphant's letter. I addressed Oliphant in July, telling him how long I should remain in Rainham. I asked him particularly for a private answer, but lo! and behold! the good man sees proper to defer answering my letter until he had every reason to believe I was far away, and then, like a cowardly wretch, he betrays the confidence of his correspondent and publishes my letter. Is this the conduct of a gentleman? Far from it; he had no right to publish my private letter. As a man, I despise the course he has taken.

I can now plainly say that the Disciples (if Oliphant is truly their Herald) will receive the same charity from me that any other misguided people will receive, but I cannot recognise them as fellow-christians. I do not say that there are no true christians among the Disciples,

but I do say that if they believe as Oliphant writes, they will never be likely to be instrumental in making such christians as St. Luke describes.

As to the letter of Oliphant's, I think it a very weak, paltry thing indeed. There is no regular answer to any of the questions I proposed, but the whole is a combination of evasions. I heartily despise such duplicity. Let every man be something or nothing; but give me none of your half-way men. I shall answer Oliphant's letter, and request him to publish my answer. One thing is certain, he did not answer my questions, but he said enough to satisfy me of the error he is in. I hope the time will come when this Herald will see himself as he is, and escape from the error by which he is now entangled. His mind is active, but a little more study would give him more penetration of thought."

Thus far our friend Holmes. There comes a day when the secrets of *all* hearts will be revealed, but some of the secrets of Mr. Holmes' heart are hereby revealed to our readers before he anticipated such a revelation. We doubt not he feels all he expresses, and hence he has our sympathy—for he needs it. We have not touched him at all argumentatively; and he is in awful agony because he is unhurt!!

But there are a few personals and logicals in the preceding extract to which we must call attention with all despatch.

1st. Our betrayal of confidence in making public what was only private. Will Mr. Holmes deny that he gave us permission to publish his communication? Alas for the veracity of some who are so thoroughly guided by feelings that the very turbulence of their feelings not only cause them to forget what they say, but to disown their own hand-writing! Listen to Mr. Holmes' words written and sent to us over his own signature: "I should have no objections to this letter being published, but . . . I wish you (if consistent with your circumstances) to answer it privately as soon as you can." Thus, Mr. Holmes himself being judge as well as jury in the case, it was at our option to answer privately or through the Press. Besides, did the gentleman, according to his own grave confession, follow his feelings so that the expression of them in public would betray him? Surely he has proved traitor to himself!

2nd. Deferring our reply until he had removed from the locality where he wrote his communication. We published his letter immediately, and it was only because we had not room to insert our reply at the same time that occasioned its delayed. But did the communication and our response make him appear before the public in a different light because he changed his locality!!!

3d. The weakness of our reply, together with our duplicity. We

answer this in a word — Every reader can form his own opinions respecting these.

4th. Concerning “a little more study to give us greater penetration of thought.” Assuredly Mr. Holmes would not ask this until he has the penetration himself to answer our obtuse and very weak production. Why does he not make manifest that he has the greater penetration by “more study?” We judge it unnecessary to acquire any new or additional penetrative power either by more study or a greater knowledge of the *Betas* or *Omicrons* to handle such logicians or theologians as our friend Holmes. We have always medicine enough on hand for imbecile patients who groan and agonize just because no one has touched them !

D. O.

AN APPROPRIATE PETITION.

“We mourn before Thee, O Lord, on account of our worldly-mindedness.”

This was part of a minister's prayer at Bellville, a few Lord's days ago, whom we heard with all patience deliver himself upon the words —“The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent.” As a portion of the prayer and a part of the sermon served to stimulate reflection in our own mind, we give a hint or two to others for acceptance or rejection. We mention no names, and tell no personal tales out of school, and therefore the man who was the minister and the denomination for which he ministered will remain to our readers, so far as we are concerned, a secret; simply adding that our ministering friend belonged not to either of the so-called established churches.

“We mourn on account of our worldly-mindedness” struck us as peculiarly applicable when we recollected that on entering the spacious building we observed a large, long, finely finished steeple, coated with zinc or tin, and adorned with the worth of many pieces of the precious metal. “We mourn on account of our worldly-mindedness” operated upon us sensibly on reflecting that the splendid chapel, recently built, was nearly twice the size that the members of the congregation required, and hence splendor was the moving principle in all that was superfluous. “We mourn on account of our worldly-mindedness” sounded in our ears on hearing the varied tones, semi-tones, and double-tones of the newly erected Organ, and the enchantations of the “men-singers and women-singers” composing the well trained choir. Nor could we forbear thinking of this suitable portion of the preacher's prayer on surveying the gallery, the pulpit, and the people, all decorated and adorned as though ‘outward adornment’ was the chief beauty and sign of sacredness in the sanctuary. The

disciples generally are known to be very severe people in their criticisms, and hence in view of all that we saw and heard we will not surprise friend or foe if our opinion is expressed that the minister had real occasion to "mourn on account of worldly-mindedness," more especially if it be taken for granted that these things justly indicated their devotion.

The sermon was like the prophet Jeremiah's basket of figs. It was not all good—it was not all bad. Repentance was defined and dwelt on at great length. It signified "a grace of the Holy Ghost," "a work of the Spirit of God," in the vocabulary of the preacher. We endeavored to read the whole passage with that definition: "But now he commandeth all men everywhere to 'a grace of the Holy Ghost,'" or, "But now he commandeth all men everywhere to 'a work of the Spirit of God.'" Our mind revolved the question repeatedly, Was this what the apostle meant? Did Paul ask the Athenians, in the name of his Master, to lay aside their idolatry and serve the living God by their performing "a work of the Spirit?" Can any man repent, or can any man be called upon to repent, we still silently asked, if repentance be such a work?

Such theology—such unmitigated mysticism—such awful mangling of God's word—might sadden and sicken the pure heart of an angel. 'The times of *this* ignorance' should be like the alarm-trumpet to every lover of divine light. Week after week, year after year, these church-going people are hearing just such divinity, and live upon this sort of religious fare;—meantime lulled by sweet songsters and pious Organ tones into total indifference whether the preaching leads to paradise or pandemonium. And the thought—O what an impressive one—that from hundreds of pulpits in our land at that very hour the assembled people heard the like unmeaning and mystical mixture, unprofitable and unedifying to saint or sinner, was a thought that could not add to any good man's pleasure in view of the premises.

Brethren! there is much to do. Protestants have the Bible, but they often make it a dead letter 'by their traditions.' They kill the living Word by their theological poison. Much divine restorative is needed. Many who teach require themselves to be taught the "first principles of the oracles of God." Let us awake and work.

D. O.

CHRISTIANITY EXPERIENCED AND ENJOYED:

Christianity is not a mere science. It is, indeed, scientific. It is the classified knowledge of Christ, as Mediator between Jehovah and fallen man. It is not, however, a mere speculative view of God, of man, and of a Mediator, however correct and Biblical that spec-

ulative view may be. It is neither orthodoxy nor heterodoxy. Satan and his confederate fallen angels, are more orthodox than the Pope of Rome or the Prelate of England; more learned in Biblical lore, more profound antiquarians, than any Christian philosopher or sage. They could say, and they did say, "Jesus, we know thee whom thou art—the Holy One of God." Demons believed the gospel, and they trembled, too. Do not many professed Christians believe and tremble? Both believe the same facts, precepts, and promises. But neither of them do appropriate them. The demons cannot, and many professors do not.

Christianity has its theory and practice. But it has also, that which is far better: It has its enjoyments. And this is, indeed, by far much better, for both its theory and its practice are for its enjoyment. These three, however, comprehend all. The first two are means, the last its end. It must first be understood before it can be received, and it must be obeyed before it can be enjoyed. These are as inseparably associated in every real Christian man, as body, soul, and spirit, in every real man.

Men live by eating, but not by eating alone. However good the food eaten, it must be assimilated, and appropriated by the system, before it can give either health or life. Millions, indeed, die by eating that which they ought not to have eaten; and no doubt, millions perish forever, by believing that which they ought not to have believed. Still, it is only he that eats that can live. The Messiah carried this figure very far when he said, "He that eateth me, even he shall live by me." Many, no doubt, will still ask: How can this be? "Will this man give us his flesh to eat?" We will respond as he did: "Verily I say to you, the words that I speak to you are spirit and life." They have a spiritual meaning, and require a spiritual discernment. But the imagery is both correct and beautiful. Faith is to the inner man what the hand is to the outer man. Faith apprehends, receives, and appropriates the spirit's food, and conveys it to the soul, as the hand receives and conveys to the mouth the bread of this life. Hence, we may say with a venerable saint of sacred story, "I found thy word and I did eat it." This process we usually call "*appropriation*." And I hesitate not to say, that evangelical faith is neither more nor less than an appropriation of the gospel promises, which have been understood and believed to be true.

But a question will arise in some minds; and has already risen in many minds. It is this: "Why do not all that believe the gospel to be true, appropriate its promises to themselves?" Aye, this is a question that needs a very profound consideration. It might, indeed, be argued, that all that do *really* believe the gospel to be true, do really appropriate its promises to themselves. But the facts, it is alleged by many, do not fully warrant the conclusion.

To assent to the gospel on what is sometimes called "*mere probable evidence*," is, perhaps, not easily contradistinguished from real faith. Some incline to be on the safer side, and, on the whole, conclude, that it is more prudent, to be in the church than out of it.—They are not fully assured that the gospel is unquestionably true, but, thinking it most probably true, prefer to make a public profes-

sion of it and join the church. They reason thus : Men invest large funds in stocks, on mere probable evidence, and why may I not, on the same amount of faith, profess Christianity, and make the sacrifice ; not, indeed, a very great one, which it requires. " If," as said one of our contemporaries. " I have taken ten thousand dollars of stock in banks, and an equal amount in railroad shares. may I not risk a thousand or two dollars in church rates. and my Sundays to meetings, on the more than equal probability that there is a heaven to gain and a hell to escape?" In some such way as this, and upon the same peradventure, that it may all be true and right, it is to be feared many make the Christian profession. Such professors cannot enjoy the Christian hope, or have the joyful anticipations and prelibation of everlasting blessedness. So true it is, " that he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him." We must have a full and unwavering assurance that the gospel is true—not that we are of the elect but of the invited to partake of the Salvation of God. Then, indeed, coming to Christ fully persuaded that he is all that apostles and prophets affirmed of him : that we are personally invited, in the proclamation of mercy and eternal life, to come to him and placing ourselves under his auspices and authority, we shall realize the truth as it is in Jesus, enjoy the pleasures of hope and the smiles of the Lord.

This is then, in our view of the premises, to enjoy christianity or the gospel. This is to rejoice in the Lord, and in hope of eternal glory. Christianity, then, has its theory, its practice, and its enjoyments. It has its earnest here, and its full-orbed glory and blessedness hereafter. Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, &c.

God is infinitely happy, because he is infinitely holy. Angels are, each one in his own capacity, perfectly happy, because perfectly pure. Man, as God made him, was also, in his capacity, perfectly and completely happy, because absolutely perfect in his whole constitution—body, soul, and spirit. Ransomed and redeemed man under the Second Adam, will hereafter, to the full extent of all his powers and capacities, be perfectly, completely, and immutably happy, because absolutely holy. As thus we advance in Christian knowledge, faith, hope, love, joy, and peace—celestial fruits of the Holy Ghost dwelling in us—we rise in beauty, holiness, and happiness. The path of life, then, is the path of peace, holiness, and happiness. In this path may the Spirit of God guide us, the hand of Jehovah lead us from glory to glory, now, henceforth, and forever ! Amen. A. CAMPBELL.

RESPONSE TO ANOTHER SENEX.

BROTHER OLIPHANT:—As an essay has appeared in the June number of the *Christian Banner*, subscribed " Another Senex," and is a response to what I wrote in the 3rd No., with your permission I would offer a few remarks by way of reply. Well, then, our brother inquires " what is Senex driving at?" I will inform him that I am endeavouring to find out what the restriction is, that he says I am attempting to explain away. I would here say that all my desires are opposed to such an undertaking ; but I do not think that God can be honoured

by adding amendments to his laws, however much we may think them expedient; and as I expect this question we are examining is something of the nature of an amendment, we must therefore examine it a little more.

Then, let it be remembered, that this record, Gen. vi. 12, relates to the first period of the world; that is, "when men began to multiply," not after they had multiplied to a large amount. Prior to the flood, there is only the genealogy of two families recorded. Cain was the head of one, and Seth the head of the other. Now this period comes down to the birth of Enos, for certainly his birth was a new period in the history of the world. Well, then, there was only one family in the world at this time in which marriages could take place, for Seth's family of the male sex, consisted only of an infant son.—Then how could inter-marriages take place that would call for the disapprobation of God? "To support his notion, brother 'Senex' labors to show that the phrases of *God*, of *men*, are equivalent." I now state that the phrases of *God*, of *men*, as they stand in the passage alluded to, are not only equivalent, but they are also identical; but you will say that this assertion requires proof. Well, here it is: "And to Seth, to him also there was born a son, and he called his name Enos; then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." Gen. iv. 26 You will observe that this passage does not say that the sons of God began to call upon the name of the Lord; and it will be further illustrated by this fact, that with the exception of Adam and Seth, all the men that are said to have set up the regular worship of God, were all of Cain's family—the same men who are said in the text to have taken "them wives of all which they chose;" which shows that the phrases alluded to, are only a figure of speech used by Moses. My view of the passage is, that it neither approves nor disapproves, but is simply a record of what happened at that time.

"His second witness (1 Cor. vii. 39.) he says, beyond all dispute, to be married only in the Lord is a spiritual marriage. I, and I think almost all except himself, dispute this." Brother, I think that this is somewhat too comprehensive an expression, but let it be as you say it is. To dispute any thing, implies disbelief in the thing disputed; then you, and almost all except myself, disbelieve that to be married "only in the Lord," is a spiritual marriage. Then you believe in, or contend for, its opposite: for if you do not this, there is no dispute between us as to this point. There are only two kinds of marriage spoken of in the scripture, one spiritual, the other is temporal; or the one is in the Lord, and the other is out of the Lord. I am aware that a person can be married in the Lord and out of the Lord at the same time; but in that case, the word "only" cannot be applied.—Then you, and almost all except myself, believe that to be married only in the Lord, means to be married only out of the Lord, or that the word spiritual means temporal; but how does that agree with the scripture? As to your first reason, I am at a loss to know what you mean to make me say; and as to your second reason, here I am at a greater loss to know what you intend my views to be. Indeed I almost think that you do not know yourself, so that I can see no better way of coming to an understanding, than to refer again to the text

"but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will." When the Apostle gave the widow this liberty, he knew that she was married "only in the Lord;" and he adds "but she is happier if she so abide after my judgment." Now here is the question: What was the widow to abide in which would make her happier according to the apostle's judgment? The legitimate answer is, married "only in the Lord." To prove that this is the answer, read the eighth verse of this chapter. "I say therefore to the unmarried and to widows, it is good for them to abide even as I am." Here the same question comes up, What did Paul abide in? We understand from the scripture that Paul abode married only in the Lord, (that is, he never entered into temporal marriage) That this is the idea the apostle conveys in the first question, is further confirmed by the 34th verse of this chapter.

"I pass to his third and last witness." Yes, at the gallop—condemning everything at a single glance; but I cannot think that this is the best way to find out what the mind of the Lord is concerning anything about which there is any dispute. There are more ways than one of examining a witness. *Dut. vii, 3.* The enacting of this law presupposes that inter-marriages were general or customary amongst the nations; but the whole of the twelve tribes had the privilege of marrying those they thought best. There was also a law given by Moses, that the property of the tribes should not pass from one to the other, and when the case of the daughters of Zelophead was referred to the Lord, the oracle was, "Let them marry to whom they think best." So far the oracle is in accordance with the general law; but as the previous law concerning property could not be broken, there was an exception added, that heiresses should marry only in the tribe of their fathers. Let it be remembered that to constitute an heiress, she must inherit through her father a part of that property, that God allotted to the tribe of her father, no matter how small it was; whereas a Jewess might through her father, inherit a million of pounds of money, but that would not constitute her an heiress in the scriptural sense of the word. And from the time that God dispersed the Jews amongst the nations, there has not been an heiress in Israel, so that the exception upon which you build so much, is a nullity, and will continue to be so, until it please God again to establish the Jews in Canaan upon the same footing as when he first brought them across the Jordan.

"I am tired of the pertness and confidence, with which some in this style speak." Brother, I am afraid that I might misunderstand you here, so I will let you explain yourself at your convenience; but as we are both old men, and if I do not mistake I am the oldest of the two, I would offer a few words of advice. They are of general application, and I have as much need to be admonished as any—Never lose your temper in argument, to attempt to frown an opponent down, for it is always considered a weak argument.

As to your excellent advice to unmarried members, I most heartily agree with it all, as it is in accordance with my article in the May number of the *Christian Banner*.

"I am of opinion that if Christians marry those whose characters have been formed under the influence of the gospel, though they may not be church members, they sin not." Now brother, the proposition is this, "Are members of the church bound by the law to marry only members?" and your opinion is that under certain circumstances the members are not bound by any law to marry only members.—Here again your opinion and mine are in exact accordance.

I have endeavoured as much as circumstances would permit to avoid that pertness you complain of, hoping that this will be acceptable I leave it for consideration, and it gives me very much pleasure to bid you adieu in the bonds of Christian love.

THE FIRST SENEX.

LABOURS OF EVANGELISTS.

REPORT NO. IX.

After leaving Rainham, we directed our course Westward and arrived at South Dorchester, where meetings were held until Monday, August 3rd. The attendance for the season of the year, was large, especially on Lord's Days. The church here now numbers forty members; and the prospects for its increase are very good. Much attention is paid to the truth by those who come, and prejudices are fast giving way. The meetings were not held all in one place; but in five different places. In Yarmouth the people were addressed in Gaelic. Peace and joy and rejoicing are amongst the Lord's people in Dorchester.

On the above-mentioned day, we left for Lobo, where meetings were held on Monday and Tuesday evenings, in the neighbourhood of Elder Sinclair, who had previously made the appointments. On both evenings the attendance was large. We could say much about the kindness and christian love manifested towards us by brother Sinclair and his family. We feel more than we can express, or than he would like to see expressed. No one can be in the company of this venerable servant of Christ without being benefitted.

On Wednesday we parted from him and from each other, and journeyed to our respective homes. May God's blessing rest upon our labors, and he shall have all the glory forever. Amen.

JAMES BLACK.

EDMUND SHEPPARD.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

BROTHER DOUGALD CRAWFORD, writes under date of August 13th, that he had immersed four believers at Weymouth, N. S. He has, for some time been laboring at "Digby Neck" and in the region of St. Mary's Bay,—a district of country where the people have not, before, heard the Apostolic gospel in all its native simplicity and purity. These are the first fruits of his labors. From other sources I learn that those who listen to his teaching and preaching are giving more attention to the study of the scriptures than ever before. We hope and pray that he may witness an abundant harvest of precious souls.

BROTHER JOHN McDONALD, writes that he has immersed several during the summer in Newport and Douglas. A few interesting particulars are given by

BROTHER MICHAEL WALLACE in a letter just now received, from which I make the following extracts: "Since I wrote we have had some additions to the church. Two promising young men when I last wrote had come forward, whom by necessity I baptized. Two weeks after one young man and two females were baptized by brother McDonald; and in one week after that time I led three young men into the hallowed figure of Jesus' tomb, and I trust to rise in newness of life. Making in all, in Douglas, eight persons in their youthful bloom—in age none above twenty two nor under fifteen. Oh, brother Eaton, this is good tidings that will fill your drooping heart with heavenly joys, and tune your lips to the lines: "God on his thirsty Zion hill, some mercy drops has thrown." Brother McDonald baptized two at Newport two weeks since, and expects others. Our reformation here is somewhat strange to many, and very unlike the common excitements of the age; they frequently leaving their common occupations, come to me and mention their intentions, and thus break their long silence by premeditated resolution, with calmness and evident decision. O my brother, the Lord has been gracious to me in applying to my troubled heart [I ought before to have stated that our dear brother Wallace had very recently lost a beloved son, W. W. E.] a balm so heavenly. Tears of grief have often been suspended by the tears of gratitude for unexpected blessings on Zion for which we, according to the deserts of our labours, have not been worthy." * * *

Brother Wallace concludes his interesting letter of the 16th inst. as follows: "Brother Crawford has been with us for a week. He is improving much—is fervent, faithful, and diligent. Had we enough of such brethren we might thank God and take courage in the cause of gospel truth.

"Two of brother Vaughn's family made the good confession in Newport last Lord's day, and yesterday in Douglas three more, making eleven here,—venturing their eternal all upon the well-tried foundation which God hath laid in Zion."

There have been accessions at other points, but I have not the reports in such a form as to give them at present. May the Lord bless and prosper the lambs of the flock and enable all of us to be more grateful, zealous, and devoted. W. W. E.

☞ We should previously have stated that our June meeting was enlivened and made additionally interesting by some four or five who came forward to confess and put on the Lord Jesus by baptism. It was a season of happiness to the young converts and to the saints generally. D. O.

PROGRESS.—Our friends will see that our exertions are being successful in regulating the issues of this paper according to a healthier rule than in months past. It is our desire to be punctual. D. O.