

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. VII.

COBOURG, AUGUST, 1853.

NO. 8.

INCONSISTENCY OF INFIDELS.

NUMBER ONE.

BROTHER OLIPHANT :—I propose to write a few brief essays for your valuable publication in answer to some very popular objections against christianity, which indeed have long been urged and often refuted, but which are still unblushingly presented anew by modern sceptics, with a view no doubt of affecting the young, unread and uneducated portions of community. Were I writing a book on the subject it would be necessary to premise several things as introductory, but as the remarks are intended for a monthly periodical, it is doubtless more apposite to come at once to the subject in hand.

And first, it is to be observed that most objections are founded in a supposed incongruity existing between the laws of Nature and those of the Bible—that the respective principles taught in these volumes do not harmonize. Whenever the objector thinks he perceives a disagreement here, he feels at perfect liberty to abandon the Bible and fly to Nature, *whose laws with him are always right*. And we feel very glad that they do acknowledge Nature's teachings to be true exponents of the character and will of God, for this is the fulcrum upon which to place our lever to raise their whole system of objections off its foundation. Thomas Paine calls Nature, "The true Word of God." We very cheerfully admit that whatever principles or laws are legitimately deducible from Nature are right, but we promptly deny that they in any case contravene those developed in the Holy Scriptures. There are mysteries, deep mysteries, doubtless, both in Nature and Revelation; and to our impotent minds, apparent contradictions;—and strange if they were not. We could not expect a caterpillar to comprehend Sir Isaac Newton's *Principia*, nor man to fathom the principles upon which God governs his moral and physical universe. But what we propose to show is this: That whatever *apparent* inconsistencies can be shown in the principles of the Bible, can also be shown in those of Nature; and therefore, that whoever abandons the Bible as his spiritual guide must also give up Nature as his guide.

To illustrate what we mean, let us take an example. How often do we hear men ask with a triumphant air, if God was really the Author of the Jewish wars? Did God command the indiscriminate

slaughter of the innocent and the guilty Canaanite? Would it not be unjust to order the massacre of sinless children and even infants, because their fathers had rebelled? Why did He not except these innocents out of the number of the devoted? These are plain questions and we will answer them by asking a few others equally as plain. All logicians admit this method of dispute to be fair, provided the questions be pertinent to the point in view. Is not God operating through natural agents, the Author of every volcanic eruption since time began? And do not these fiery floods often destroy the fairest portions of the earth, burying whole cities in ruin? And are no little innocents involved in the catastrophe? Does your "god of Nature" refrain from causing the earth to spew out the red hot deluge to save the children? Why does he not except them out of the number destroyed? Again, why does your "god" sometimes in his anger shake the earth so terribly as to tumble down every house in a populous city, or to cause the land to open wide its enormous jaws and to swallow down the innocent and the gentle all alike at a single effort? Whenever these interrogations are answered we stand pledged to explain all similar difficulties in the Bible. Why are the tenderest sympathies of our sceptical friends all aroused at the recital of the death of the guiltless in the Jewish wars when they can look with a cold hearted indifference or at least without a murmur upon all the sad havoc made by the operation of the laws of Nature, their acknowledged Deity? Here are difficulties of the same nature as those objected to. The intelligent christian finds, however, no great trouble in either case. What we claim for this argument is, that it blunts the edge of objection and goes far to show that the God who rules over the physical universe also controls the spiritual and moral—that He who made the world also made the Bible.

EVANGELICUS.

A NARRATIVE

OF THE ORIGIN OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.

No. VII.

The Parliament, desiring to comprehend the Independents within the new establishment recommended by the Assembly at Westminster, or to give them a full toleration, did, on the 13th of September, 1644, order a grand committee of accommodation to the points of difference. The Independents would have stated the points of difference and would have endeavored a compromise while the discipline of the church was pending in the Assembly; but, at that time, the Presbyterians insisted that the new form of government should first pass into a law as a standard, before the exceptions of the Independents should be considered. Upon which they were adjourned by the House of Commons till the affair should be determined in the Assembly; who agreed, April 4, 1645, "that the brethren who had entered their dissent against the Presbyterian government should be a committee to bring in the whole frame of their government in a body, with their grounds and reasons." The Independents desired liberty

to bring in their objections by parts as the Presbyterians had done their advices; but this not being admitted, they desired time to perfect their plan before any other scheme passed into a law, but the Presbyterians, without any regard to the compromise, by the assistance of their Scotch friends, pushed the affair to a conclusion in Parliament; upon which the Independents laid aside their own model, and published a remonstrance complaining of the artful conduct of the Assembly; and that the discipline of the church being fixed, it was too late to think of a comprehension. Thus the Presbyterians jockeyed the Independents, and intrigued their *jus divinum*.

The Parliament saw the mistake, and by their own hands resumed the affair, and revived the committee of accommodation; Nov. 6, 1645.

A committee of the most distinguished Independents, and also of the leading Presbyterians, met several times on the subject of accommodation and toleration. At their last meeting, March 9, the Presbyterian paper in answer to the overtures of the Independents, concluded with these remarkable words—"That whereas their (Independent) brethren say that uniformity ought to be urged no farther than is agreeable to all men's consciences, and to their edification, it seems to them as if their brethren (the Independents) not only desired liberty of conscience for themselves, but for all men, and would have us think that we are bound by our covenant to bring the churches in the three kingdoms to no nearer a conjunction and uniformity than is consistent with the liberty of all men's consciences; which, whether it be the sense of the covenant, we leave with the honorable committee." Hereupon "Jeremiah Burroughs, a divine of great candor and moderation, declared in the name of the Independents, that if their congregations might not be exempted from that coercive power of the classes—if they might not have liberty to govern themselves in their own way, as long as they behave peaceably to the civil magistrate, they were resolved to suffer or go to some other place of the world where they might enjoy their liberty. But while men think there is no way of peace but by forcing all to be of the same mind—while they think the civil sword is an ordinance of God to determine all controversies of divinity, and that it must needs be attended with fines and imprisonments to the disobedient; while they apprehend there is no medium between a strict uniformity and a general confusion of all things; while these sentiments prevail, there must be a base subjection of men's consciences to slavery, a suppression of much truth, and great disturbances in the christian world."

Thus ended the last committee of Lords and Commons and Assembly Divines for accommodation. Nothing was more detested and abhorred by the majority of the Presbyterians than toleration. The London divines, who often at this time held their meetings at Zion College, and had a synod every Monday to consult in order to aid the Westminster Assembly in carrying their points favorable to their own establishment, and in opposition to any toleration of other sectaries—besought, in a letter of January 15, 1645, the Assembly "to oppose with all their might the great Diana (toleration) of the Independents."

In this letter these words are to be found—"Not, say they, that we can harbor the least jealousy of your zeal, fidelity, or industry in the opposing and extirpating of such a root of gall and bitterness as toleration is, and will be both to the present and future ages." The city ministers, in a provincial assembly, Nov. 2, 1749, in a vindication of their beloved presbytery, "represent universal toleration as contrary to godliness, opening a door to libertinism and profaneness, and a tenet to be rejected as soul poison."

Such was the spirit of the Presbyterians both in and out of the creed-making assembly; and, as Mr. Neal justly observes this *no toleration* was turned upon themselves by the prelatists in twenty years; so that they who would, and who did shut the gates of toleration and of mercy upon others, had those very gates shut in their own face.

We shall notice but one other act of this assembly, and dismiss them from our view for a while. The Parliament requested them to recommend some other version of the Psalms of David than Sternhold's and Hopkins.' They read over Rouse's version, and, after several amendments, sent it up to the House, Nov. 14, 1645, with the following recommendation: "Whereas the honorable House of Commons, by an order bearing date Nov. 20, 1643, have recommended the Psalms published by Mr. Rouse to the consideration of the Assembly of Divines, the Assembly has caused them to be carefully perused; and as they are now altered and amended, do approve them; and humbly conceive they may be useful and profitable to the church if they be permitted to be publicly sung. Accordingly they were authorized by the two Houses."

Thus we have seen how the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, Solemn League and Covenant, Directory for Public Worship, Form of Discipline, Presbyterian Church Government, and Rouse's version of the Psalms of David, got to be canonical and of divine authority.— And with deep sorrow, too, we have seen that no toleration was the first sprout from this sweet or bitter root. The following items give the whole in miniature:—

1. When king Charles I sought the assistance of his Catholic subjects in carrying on a war for his own prerogative, the Parliament which opposed him sought the assistance of the Scots nation in resisting his claims.

2. The Scots, prejudiced in favor of Calvinism, through the preaching of Knox and others of the Geneva school, agreed to assist their English neighbors upon condition that they would assist them or unite with them in establishing one creed, one discipline, one ecclesiastical government in both nations.

3. In order to this, it was stipulated that an assembly of divines, be called as an ecclesiastical council, to aid the Parliament in settling a religious establishment that would meet the views of the Scots

4. That the assembly at Westminster was summoned, convened, sworn, instructed, paid, and controlled by this parliament.

5. That the solemn league and covenant was introduced, fashioned, matured, and established by the same divines and parliament

6. That Rouse's psalms were canonized and legitimized by the

same authority.

7. And that the whole ended in religious despotism, tyranny, and no toleration. That swords and constables, exiles, confiscation, and death, were the attendants and sanctions of this system.

It is to be hoped that many of the modern Presbyterians have seen the folly of their creed makers, and do lament that such should have been the circumstances which gave birth to their system.

MR. HOOPER TO D. OLIPHANT.

Halifax, 18th May, 1853.

MR. OLIPHANT:—Your answer to my letter of the 1st of February, bearing date March 7th. came to hand yesterday; and now after an interval of fifteen weeks, I sit down to write you another short epistle. I am tolerably well reconciled to the idea of your long silence however. From the fact that I have enough to do in my own legitimate field of labor, which I think will be more profitable, both to myself, and the cause of truth, which I am set to advocate, than I have reason to believe the present discussion will prove.

Be it understood, then, that unless you meet my arguments with a greater degree of ingenuousness, than you have done thus far, the discussion must end with your next letter; but if on the contrary you manifest a spirit of fair argumentation, and exhibit the candor which I acknowledge your first epistle contained, I care not how long the correspondence, (begun as it was without my knowledge, and against my expectation,) shall be prolonged, as in that case I trust it may be the means in the hands of God, of disseminating the truths of liberal Christianity, where otherwise they would not go at present. But to your letter.

1st. You say that I have virtually abandoned my strong pillar of Universalism, viz. 1 Tim. ii. 4, "God will have all men to be saved," &c. Because I demur at the position of one D. Oliphant, when he says "emphatically that God's will, which dates back centuries ago," has been all that while successively resisted by man, does it follow that I abandon that of Paul, when he says that God will have all men to be saved, and come unto a knowledge of the truth? No, I still contend that the passage is a "strong pillar of Universalism," and upon that pillar I continue to lean, and I trust that while I live, and when I come to die, it will yield me the same support that it has afforded me since the day when first I believed it.

Verily you must have been very anxious to meet an abandonment of evidence on my part, or you would not have endeavored to torture a sentiment "not within a thousand miles of the point" into such an abandonment. The remark which follows those "five words" of mine of which you make such a parade, renders it very clear what my meaning was, if (which I deny) there was any obscurity in the negation itself.

Is it limiting the Holy One, to believe that he will have all men to be saved, &c., and that in his own time, that will, will be accomplished? I think not; but to affirm emphatically, as Mr. Oliphant

has done, that God has a will, but cannot execute it, because it does not happen to be man's will also, this to me is limiting the Holy One; and it is this sentiment, and not Paul's affirmation that God will have all men to be saved, of which I said, "I affirm no such thing."

But you say I have given no argument in support of the truth that God will have all men to be saved. Assuming as you do, that I have abandoned my position, what ground had you to expect argument in its defence? But since I have not abandoned it, and you call for arguments, I will give you a few. I should be glad to fill my sheet with arguments of this kind were there not other matters to answer.

Be it known, then, that I believe all men will finally be saved, 1, because it is God's will, and that will cannot be resisted. Who will have all men to be saved, 1 Tim. ii. 4. "He doeth his will in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth; none can stay his hand, or say unto him what doest thou? Dan. iv. 35. 2. I believe it because God hath given all beings to Christ, and that Christ is a perfect, or if you please, an Universal Saviour. Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to *as many as thou hast given him*, John xvii. 2. 3. *All that the father hath given me shall come unto me, and he that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out*, John vi. 37. Surely not much logic is needed to make Universalism out of such passages as these. I think they must be plain enough to any mind that will take their meaning without prejudice, so I forbear comments.

2. You say, "A forthcoming dispensation, called the dispensation of the fulness of times, has, it appears, everything to do with the full developement of Universalism." In this you are right, and although I backed my assertion up in my former communications, "with proofs divine, and reasons strong," you are pleased to say still "that the proof is wanting, both as respects the dispensation to come, and the faith of all men when it does come." The phrase in question you will admit is a scriptural phrase, given originally by inspiration of the spirit of God, to the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and by him spoken to the church at Ephesus; but you contend that when Christ came, the dispensation of the fulness of times came also. Just brush up your chronology a little, and you will find that when the phrase in question was first used, by Paul to the Ephesians, Christ had been crucified twenty-seven years, and yet the Apostle spoke of a dispensation of the fulness of times as yet future, and assured his hearers that when it should arrive, God's will which he had purposed in himself, and which in all wisdom and prudence he had made known to the Apostles, should be accomplished, and all things in heaven and on earth shall be gathered together in Christ. If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature, old things are passed away behold all things are become new. And all things are of God who hath reconciled us to himself, by Jesus Christ, and hath given unto us the ministry of reconciliation, to wit, that *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself*, &c., 2 Cor. iii. 17. 18.

I have thus given you inspired proof that the dispensation in question was future, more than a quarter of a century after the cruci-

fixion of the Saviour, and upon this proof, taken in connection with the fact that the promises relating to it were universal in their application, and manifestly unaccomplished, I rest the argument that it is yet future. If this view of the subject be not the correct one, I am at a loss to know the apostle's meaning both in the language already quoted, and in that very significant passage from Hebrews quoted in my last, *We see not yet* all things put under him, but we see Jesus, &c., *i. e.* we see the evidence in the mission, life, death and resurrection of Christ, that when the dispensation of the fulness of times arrives, all men shall be made alive in him, and be children of God, being children of the resurrection.

3. With regard to the attributes of God, you say you do not know as much about them, as your universalist friends. A candid acknowledgement truly, to which I reply, just leave off chasing heathen phantoms, and study those attributes by what is revealed of them in the scriptures, using the same amount of rational and legitimate logic, that you use on some other points of study, and it is to be presumed you will learn in due time as much as we have learned.

What you say with regard to the phrases in the apostolic commission, he that believeth, and he that believeth not &c., and the saying of Paul, our God is a consuming fire, has been duly noted. Those passages are as familiar to all Universalists as household words; it is impossible however in this article to give them a passing notice without swelling it to an undue length.

You next proceed to say that "Mr. Hooper like other Universalist advocates, cannot see how mercy or love can inflict punishment." Now this saying is altogether gratuitous, and in point of fact decidedly wanting.

Universalists, strange as it may strike some ears, are the only denomination of Christians that preach the *certainly* of punishment! And every Universalist minister who acts up to the charge received at his ordination, makes it a prominent item in his ministry to "reprove, rebuke and exhort," declaring God's authority that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die," and that "He will by no means *clear the guilty.*" Do you preach thus? If not receive I beseech you the word from God's mouth, and warn the people from him, lest the blood of your charge be required at your hands, Ez. xxxiii.

But the difference between Universalists and Partialists on the subject of punishment is this, (and a wide difference it is too,) that while we make all punishment disciplinary, and of course limited, you make it endless and consequently vindictive. With us all punishment is from the hands of a kind Father, who chastens us for our profit, that we may be partakers of his holiness, while with you it is from the hands of a cruel tyrant, administered with no good end in view, but on the principle of black and cruel revenge. With the apostle we believe that although no chastening for the present seemeth joyous but grievous, nevertheless *afterward* it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness, to them that are exercised thereby, Heb. xii. 10. 11. Endless punishment on the contrary can have no such effect, for the plain reason, that being *endless*, it can have *no after-*

ward. Your remarks with regard to the mercifulness of endless punishment, though entirely unsatisfactory and in my view highly absurd, afford however one consolation, and that is, that the orthodoxy of the present day is entirely a different thing from that of fifty, or even twenty years ago, then it was a *literal*, and a *local* hell of fire and brimstone, with

Eternal plagues, and heavy chains,
 Tormenting racks, and fiery coals ;
 And darts to inflict immortal pains
 Dip'd in the blood of damned souls.

Now is it a more *comfortable hell of conscience*, from which, even my friend Oliphant would not ask to be delivered. With regard to what you say of making your retreat from heaven, if Julius Caesar, Napoleon, and Pope Leo are there, I cannot do better than relate an anecdote of our late lamented Rev. Mr. Rodgers of Cincinnati, which I have lately read in some of our periodicals. Brother R. was once in conversation with a pious man of the partialist faith on religious subjects in general, and the evidence in favor of the doctrine of the restitution in particular, when a man who was known to both disputants, to be one of dissolute habits, chanced to pass ; upon which the partialist brother exclaimed (probably with as much of an air of victory as you advance the same idea.) There, Mr. Rodgers, if that man goes to heaven, I don't want to go there ; to which the other replied, My brother, if you ever get to heaven, do you not expect to find some holy angels there, as much better than yourself, as you are better than that man ? The reply was, Yes, but what has that to do with the matter ? O, said Mr. R., I was only thinking that if one of those holy angels should chance to possess the same spirit which you possess, and should say to our heavenly Father, " if you let that fellow stay here I don't want to stay," what sort of a place heaven would be.

With regard to your last paragraph where you ignore the use of carnal weapons, I would only say I am glad of it ; but I reiterate the sentiment contained in my last, that the man which would deny another the possession of the christian faith, because the views of the latter may not square in all points with his own, exhibits the same spirit that planted the stake, and reared the inquisition. I agree with you in your remark on the comparative fairness and liberality of different editors ; I have given my friend due credit heretofore, but I am fully aware, and I suppose you are, that there are exceptions, not only to all rules, but to the general character and practice of all men.

Your criticism upon the difference between *faith*, and *the faith*, is all a dead letter to me ; for after repeated efforts thus to do, I cannot comprehend your meaning, nor can my friends to whom I have shown your article, and applied for assistance, render me any ; we all pronounced it a sealed book, emphatically a darkening of counsel by words without knowledge ; perhaps we are all too young disciples in the use of language to see the point, but according to the principles of the grammar in which I was instructed, *the* is a definite article, and limits the noun to which it is prefixed. Now if I have no faith

in general, I cannot perceive how I can have "*the faith*" in particular.

In the bonds of the gospel,

I am yours,

W. HOOPER.

D. OLIPHANT'S RESPONSE TO MR. HOOPER.

Steamer Highlander, Ontario, 16th June, 1853.

MR. W. HOOPER. DEAR SIR.—On my arrival at home three days ago your last letter awaited me. I reply to it as I journey to the city of Hamilton per steamer on our beautiful Ontario.

You are pleased to call these letters passing between us a discussion. I cannot honor our performance with that name. When I enter upon a discussion I uniformly have definite rules and proportions by which the controversial investigation may be prosecuted in an orderly and systematic manner. Such a controversy has not been arranged between us. Accidentally or providentially I looked over your letter to a Provincial journal, published in a paper which comes regularly to my office. I copied it—offered a few thoughts on it—and you saw fit to respond. I am simply exchanging salutes with you until you judge that my logical salutations had better be directed somewhere else than toward the doctrine which Universalist friends aim to uphold.

From the letter now before me, and from hints and statements previously, if I apprehend you, the following affirmatives are regarded as necessary to maintain the system of Universalism:

1. God has a benevolent will.
2. His will cannot be resisted.
3. Sin must always be punished, but
4. All punishment is disciplinary, and, therefore,
5. Both punishment and sin must end—hence,
6. God will finally save all men.

Such, my friend, if I mistake not, is Universalism put into essence. Its whole volumes are mainly comprised in these six points. And at a distance, allow me to say, this sort of philosophy looks rosy and robust—as pretty as any beautiful sepulchre; but in order to admire it we must needs keep a far way off: for close inspection finds little to admire or applaud.

That this philosophy is not found in the Bible is evident from the fact that the Bible is never quoted as teaching it except as the pious Calvinist frames his theology and then picks up a word or a sentence of scripture that seems to suit him; or as the "Holy Mother Church" establishes the idea of a Pope and then manufactures Peter into a Pope to suit the occasion. And they all tell us, with my friend Hooper, of their proofs "divine." Universalism, while it has a good share of ridicule for the baseless conceits of traditionary Christendom, most faithfully follows the fashion of scrapifying the Divine volume and forcing the language of heaven into the veriest fancies. You, my dear sir, leaned up with your principal weight against a presumed bulwork of your doctrine said to be contained in the words "God will"

have all men to be saved;" but when the mere sound of these words was not accepted as proof of Universalism, and you were asked to consider the connexion in which the language stood,—who spoke, who was the party addressed, what was the work of preachers at that time,—yes, friend Hooper, when brought into close contact in this inductive style, you hastened off to some other stand-point and begged to be excused from considering the passage in its contextual bearings. Will my good friend even attempt to review and answer my statements in reference to 1 Tim. ii. 4, as presented in my letter in the January Number? Tell us, my friend, what Paul preached to men by authority of Jesus. Tell us what Timothy was doing in Ephesus. Tell us what salvation the Ephesians received, and how they received it. Then tell us what is to be understood by the language, "God will have all men to be saved." You have a nobler ambition I should judge than to earn the reputation of a scrap-doctor;—a counterfeiting pill peddler is a gentleman to him.

One instance may suffice as a specimen of how my friend gives the Bible a new tongue to speak Universalism. In asserting that God's will (*to save mankind from sin*) is not to be resisted, quoting 1 Tim. ii. 4, you confirm your statement by a reference to Dan. iv. 35, "he doeth his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth." Nothing apparently is here considered but the sound of words. For in the first place, the language is from the mouth of Babylon's king—Nebuchadnezzar—an idolatrous gentleman who had learned something of the living God. Secondly, the gospel as preached by Paul, and to which he had allusion when writing to Timothy, was not developed till more than five hundred years after the Chaldean monarch used the words you quote—so that the will of God as set forth in the gospel could not be alluded to by Nebuchadnezzar. Thirdly, the will of God as supreme Ruler over heaven and earth, exercising power as a Sovereign over all sovereigns, is a will as different from the will which he is pleased to exercise in the salvation of men from sin, as monarchial power is different from moral or spiritual power.—**A monarch's will is not persuasive. It commands—it appoints by authority—it enforces its designs whether the subject chooses or not.** But the gospel is a persuasive instrumentality. This you have conceded. It develops God, not as a monarch, but as a Beneficent Friend.

And here, my good sir, you have not only given us a sample of how you scrapify the living oracles, but you have put your foot in a place where you cannot easily raise it again. Did you not concede to me, when I was at pains to show the principle on which the Divine will operated in saving men, that God according to his benevolent will saves men by gospel instrumentality?—and that the will of God, as developed in the gospel, addresses and draws men by moral suasion? Why, then, do you now commit logical suicide by bringing up the will of God as a monarch to prove the salvation of *any man* much less *all men*? After agreeing with me that spiritual suasive power is the power that saves men, why do you affirm that monarchial power saves men from sin? I see not how you can honorably escape from the

discharge of this destructive gun which I have thus made you touch off upon yourself.

Still farther. You put yourself in company with Nebuchadnezzar, saying, God does his will in heaven and on earth; then affirm as a devout Universalist, that God's will, thus done, is his irresistible will to save every man from sin. Yet the apostles, in their Jewish mission, are taught by their Lord to pray, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." Thus, according to Universalist theology, we have the apostles praying for what had been done in the world ever since it was a world!

But I must pay my respects to the six points of your philosophy. My pen must sketch rapidly; for, as with yourself, so with me, other engagements call for attention.

First. Your first affirmation is admitted. The will of God is supremely and comprehensively benevolent. Would that all men knew and realized it!

Second. The inference that your philosophy draws from the character of God, namely, that his will cannot be resisted, is a sophism of capital magnitude. "You do always resist the Holy Spirit" was said to the stiff-necked Jews by God's authority; and in resisting the Holy Spirit they resisted God. It is most popular at Halifax and at Cobourg to resist the will of God; for "he will have all men to be saved," but many choose darkness rather than light, the spirit of sin to the spirit of holiness, the love of the world to the love of God's dear Son. If not in Nova Scotia, at least in Canada, there are those who are in the "snare of the devil, taken captive by him at his will;" and if these do not resist God's will while captivated and held by satan's will, be kind enough to explain what you mean by the term resist.

Every man resists the will of God who is unhappy. Deny this or affirm it, just as you please, and in either case your system is shaken as with the palsy. The gospel, according to the first intimation of it, is God's "good will to men;" and this good will is graciously offered to men, not forced on them, as my friend has long ago acknowledged: and when thus presented in the form of an appeal, the word of exhortation accompanies the gospel voice, "See that you refuse [resist] not him that speaketh." In speaking of the gospel, therefore, and the salvation it proposes, it is as palpable a fallacy and as unscriptural a notion as can well be conceived, to say that God's will cannot be resisted.

Third and Fourth. Sin, you assert, must always be punished, and the punishment work reformation. Neither Moses nor the apostles will help you here. Sin, where the mercy of God is *not resisted*, can be forgiven, yes, is forgiven. In this the love of God is manifested. Remission of sins is the charm of the gospel. True, the sinner when he resists the offer of forgiveness, must be punished. But punishment is not always reformatory. Where do you read of Pharaoh's reformation after his destruction in the Red Sea?—or does your philosophy testify and say that the hard hearted king, after all his exploits, all his rejection of mercy, will appear at length, saying, 'O Lord, I

hardened myself against your mercy—you gave me up to destruction in the same waters through which Israel passed—now my heart is thine—those waves have purified my soul—the sea has washed me clean from my iniquity?

What reformation was wrought in the case of Korah and his company when the earth swallowed them in a moment, and fire from heaven consumed two hundred and fifty princes who took part with him, will be a test to your philosophy. Of the one and a half millions of Jews who were slain and taken captive when Jerusalem was given into the hands of the Romans, how many of them were disciplined your philosophy answers not. Concerning “the angels who kept not their first estate, but left their habitation, reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, to the judgment of the great day;” how far they are yet partakers of the benefit of your discipline and made morally better, and how great will be their progress in reformation after the “judgement of the great day;” are questions which must, I conclude, be laid over to your future dispensation.

But you must be pressed still closer on this point. It is of grand importance. Men live in sin—love sin all their life—die in sin—appear before God in sin, all his mercy having been refused; and a gentleman in Halifax city, Nova Scotia, says that punishment shall discipline them and make them holy and thence happy; affirming that it is God’s will that they should sin during their lives, reject the gospel, sink down in death with all their sins upon them, and then by his wrathful love scourge their sins from them. This, my kind sir, is a species of philosophy certainly bold enough, but where, Mr. Hooper, did you get your philosophy? Did Hosea Balou leave it as a legacy to his successors? A word of proof on reliable authority, if you please. A passage of scripture in its true context will answer. The following passage is not at par in Cobourg:—“Go, my apostles, and preach repentance and remission of sins to all the world, beginning at Boston: he that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall likewise be saved after he is damned.”

Fifth—Sixth. Punishment you say will cure sin, God will cease punishing, and universal happiness be the issue. Not only will the devil be without a friend, but the old enemy himself will reform and love God. Your disciplinary punishment is therefore the most effective commodity in the universe for the purgation of sin and the diffusion of bliss. But please give us one instance of a sinner being turned to a saint by punishment, or, with the scriptures before you tell us of one that will be. I put you to the proof. Philosophy is not testimony. Whenever, Mr. Hooper, you give us one such case, I will assist you in glorifying punishment as the capital instrument of turning the hearts of wicked men to God. Till then, excuse me for agreeing with the apostle John when he says—“we (who know God) love him BECAUSE he first loved us.” This single expression kills the exotic idea that punishment produces love to God, or which is the same thing, destroys sin. And can you not see that if one sinner could be punished into holiness and thence to heaven, he would be compelled to raise a different song of praise from John and all

saints saved by Jesus' love, as his strain would be—'I love him because he punished me.'

You quote Heb. xii. 10, 11, as proof that punishment is disciplinary. The apostle speaks of chastisement—the chastisement of sons: not the punishment of sinners. This is another example of the unceremonious havoc which is made of the divine scriptures. What Paul applies to the Lord's children on earth, who are in the congregation of the saved, friend Hooper carries away to the other side of pandemonium and makes it applicable to sinners in another world, and while on the way Paul's chastisement is transformed into punishment!! No wonder you call D. Oliphant such hard names when you can thus treat the apostle Paul.

In your remarks upon the views I offered touching the state of the wicked, you speak of a "comfortable hell." By this I perceive you are not well posted up in respect to what constitutes punishment.—And with all your philosophy, you seem very imperfectly acquainted with mental philosophy. The agony of mind or spirit is an agony as far transcending physical pain as mind is superior to body. Should the Legislature of Nova Scotia pass an Act that Mr. Hooper should never leave his lodging in Halifax city, never see the face nor hear the voice of one friend during life, never again hold communion with the social compact in any form, I cannot doubt but the physical suffering of the martyr at the stake would be envied and freely preferred. Talk of comfortable punishment when referring to the exquisite pangs of a spirit without hope and the untold woe of a mind groaning under moral despair! O, sir, what next?

An anecdote is introduced to rebuff one of my positions, and I presume you will have no objections to hear another—also concerning a Universalist preacher. I offer it not as argument, for anecdotes are generally quite harmless as to logic. A Universalist preacher once visited a community "out west," and gave an animated discourse on all men's salvation, to the great comfort of the chief villians of the neighborhood. After sermon, the speaker announced a collection. He sent round his hat to gather the coin. The collection commenced. One put in a piece of tobacco, another a dirty pipe, a third a broken button, then another a worn out snuff-box, and another a rusty nail. The hat with its load of contents in due time came back to the preacher. He looked at it and with a smile of chagrin exclaimed—'Well: I've been preaching there's no hell, but from this specimen I think there ought to be one.' My story is not so long as yours, but it is as broad and perhaps as deep.

I am sorry that the benevolently disposed men who embrace Universalism presume so much upon their own reason, and rely so little upon the Divine word. The short metre of every Universalist, is, 'I can see no reason why God should arrange the universe to permit sin and punishment to exist perpetually; the goodness of God would never allow it; I must think that sin shall end and punishment cease.' Coming to the Bible with the mind pitched upon this key, the Universalian Rationalist seizes the syllables and sentences that seem to sound well on his patent doctrinal instrument, and makes slurs and

demi-semi-quavers of all passages where his particular metre needs them. It were far wiser to follow Peter and Paul. They never said one word to encourage a wicked man to think he should be saved *finally* though he persisted in a life of sin. Not a word had they to say about punishment curing sin. The philosophy of sin being purged out of the universe by punishment, like the Pope scourging heresy out of his dominions by fire and sword, was never thought of by the simple Galileans nor by the apostle to the Gentiles. But this is an age of progress. Great discoveries are made. Spiritual explorers must have scope to develop their powers, and the Bible is their territory. Reason must be enthroned, and philosophy applauded. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved"..... "beware lest that come upon you, predicted by prophets, Behold you despisers, and wonder, and perish"—these sayings in the plain blunt style of the inspired heralds of Jesus are too impolite and harsh for the superfine and extra-capped benevolence of some modern philosophers.

The proof you furnish in attempting to confirm what you formerly averred respecting a Universalian dispensation is a literary curiosity. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself" refers to a dispensation *to come*!! "He has reconciled us" signifies that he *will* reconcile us when the new dispensation comes!!! Be patient, and try it again Mr. Hooper.

But I must bid you adieu, for my paper admonishes me that my epistle is already sufficiently lengthy. I opine you are a gentlemanly Universalist, and believe me that I sympathize with you in your troubles to match your system with the gospel. I could almost wish that your views of punishment were correct in your own case at least, and that the punishment my letters administer to you might prove disciplinary.

Yours honestly and plain-heartedly,

D. OLIPHANT.

THE BAPTISTS--THEIR DOCTRINES AND POLICY, NO. III.

The reader may be assured that no duty is more painful to the writer than the necessity of exposing the faults and follies—the sins and duplicity of men professing to be ministers of Jesus Christ; and more especially is this the case when not only their "own people," but many others, cherish for them a high esteem, and honor them as self-sacrificing, devoted servants of the Most High God. But "all is not gold that shines." Few men are always—in all circumstances—what they profess to be. Within my limited experience I have found more *bad* men among the [professedly] *good*, and more *good* among the [esteemed] *bad*, than I—in my juvenile and unsuspecting days—even fancied, not to say anticipated. I have greatly changed my opinions in relation to poor "human nature!" Not so much however in relation to its native as to its cultivated condition. Some men

whom I have most highly honored and most devotedly loved, especially among denominations for whom I have the highest regard, have proved themselves to be but poor, weak, sinful men. The proportion of the clergy who demonstrate to the world the lack of real christian integrity is fully as large as of any business or profession called secular. Indeed, when men profess to "stand between the living and the dead"—as priests of Jehovah—as mediators between God and man, their arrogance, and their ignorance of the true position of a minister of the gospel of Jesus, place them in a most critical position. A "haughty spirit before a fall" obtained even in the days of Solomon. In these days few fall in the estimation of their blind devotees, in comparison to the multitudes who fall from the spirit of love, humility, truth and the fear of the Lord. The reader must not suppose, because we exposed Mr. Robinson's perversions of the writings of another to carry a point, that even in this particular, he has sinned more than all others. We have apologized all in our power for him. The textuary system under which he was reared—under which he has always lived, and which he has for a quarter of a century taught, leads directly to this. As remarked in a former article, when men make up their minds on a certain doctrine *before* thoroughly studying the holy oracles, and then seek in them to find proofs, they must in a majority of instances, pervert, misquote, and garble God's word to support their assumed hypothesis. *When men embrace a lying system they must lie to support it!*

Few men in the Baptist denomination have ever had so large a place in my heart as Rufus Babcock, D. D., now Secretary of the American and Foreign Bible Society. He used to pray with great unction. And I have heard his parishioners say that, when trouble, darkness, or seasons of peculiar interest occurred in connection with his congregation, he would spend whole nights in prayer. I could not but love such a man, however different our sentiments. But alas! how my heart sunk within me to learn—as I did by a document placed in my hands by the venerable Dr. Maclay—that to carry a point—having a position—an untenable position which he was induced to support—he resorted to the practice which we would now hold up to the condemnation of the world, in order to sustain himself. The facts in the case are interesting, and important on many accounts, and we therefore submit them to our readers as beacons to future voyagers.

In 1850 the American and Foreign Bible Society determined, by a decided majority, not to carry out a measure dear to the hearts of

many Christians. For which many pious Baptists and others had poured into its coffers hundreds and thousands of dollars. This measure was a corrected English version of the oracles of God. The A. and F. B. Society was urged into existence to supply the myriads of India, Burmah and the East with versions made by Carey, Judson and others, devoted Baptist missionaries—which versions pedo-baptists refused to circulate, because these men of God would have their versions correspond to the original. They refused—as they ought—to make King James's English version the standard. This society, then, was created to supply the world with a faithful transcript of the mind and will of God. When the time came—when they had the means and the men to publish a correct version in English, the majority refused even to encourage such a work. They would become unpopular with the whole of pedo-baptist christendom, were they to change baptize to immerse, and they drew back! They did more, they opposed the measure! 'Tis true, said they practically, Siamese, Burmese, and Hindoos must have a version clearly expressing the mind of the Spirit, but we can do with a defective one—defective and obscure in doctrine, obsolete in style, incorrect in grammatical construction! But men like Drs. Cone and Maclay, Messrs. Wyckoff and Colgate of New York, and others in various parts of the east, west, north and south, said, No; hundreds read the Bible in English to one in another language, and we ought to have as correct a version as any people living; and by God's help and blessing we will have it!

The Bible Union then came into existence. W. H. Wyckoff became its Secretary. A Missionary brother, J. H. Chandler, returned from Siam where he had been for many years. In an interview with the secretary of the Bible Union, in a "solemn and deliberate manner," he said, "Brother Wyckoff, we need a corrected English version for the heathen." The present king of Siam is a man of great intelligence, acquainted with several languages and skilled in arts and sciences. Before he ascended the throne he occupied a conspicuous position as brother of the reigning monarch, and was very intimate with the missionaries. When the Siamese Testament was translated, brother Chandler presented to him a copy which he read with interest. Subsequently he received, also, as a present, a copy of the common English version. He examined it and found numerous discrepancies between it and the Siamese. He took them to his English teacher, (a Presbyterian missionary) and called his attention to the discrepancies, telling him that the Missionaries had made mistakes,

the Siamese version was wrong, &c. He was referred by his teacher to the donor of the Testament, and by him to Dr. Jones, the Baptist missionary who had made the Siamese version. He examined every place referred to and then had to assure him that in every instance where the Siamese version differed from the English version the English, and not the Siamese, was *wrong*.

These facts being used by the advocates of a revised version of the English scriptures, Dr. Babcock sought to invalidate this testimony. He wished to make it appear that this missionary was more favorable to the American and Foreign Bible Society than to the Bible Union. To do this he gives publicity to a letter written by Mr. Chandler. And here is the fact which we referred to in proof of the unholy influence of a desire to sustain a favorite hypothesis at all hazards—to show what an influence this disposition has upon otherwise good and great men. In reference to the position of Mr. Chandler to the A. & F. Bible Society Dr. Babcock writes as follows:

“TESTIMONY OF RETURNED MISSIONARIES.—It is a gratifying circumstance in the midst of some trials and perplexities, and the opposition of some of our early coadjutors, that the returned missionaries, without exception, so far as we have been able to learn, are the steadfast friends of the American and Foreign Bible Society. They do not wish, and certainly it is no part of our plan or purpose, to draw them into any controversy. When, however, their casual remarks have been used for a purpose they had not intended, it seems but simple justice to themselves, that they should be allowed to define their own position in self-defence. For this purpose, we insert the following extracts of a letter from our brother Chandler, printer to the Siam Mission, giving the whole of his testimony, voluntarily proffered, in regard to our institution:

DR. BABCOCK'S VERSION—
declared by him to be “WHOLE testimony!”

“I have ever regarded the A. & F. Bible Society as one of the most important societies connected with our denomination. I was present at the annual meeting of the Board of Missions in Hartford, Conn., (in 1836) when its formation was first advocated; and from what was then said of the importance of having a Bible Society of our own, and from the great good

EXTRACTS FROM THE ORIGINAL LETTER, written by J. H. Chandler to Dr. Babcock.

* * * * *

I will now define my position in relation to the Bible Societies. I have regarded the American & Foreign Bible Society as one of the most important societies connected with our denomination. I was present at the annual meeting of the Board of Missions in Hartford, when its formation was first advocated, and from what was

Dr. Babcock's extracts continued.

it has done since its formation, has ever led me to regard it with deep and lively interest. When the act of incorporation was obtained, I understood the Society was virtually pledged to confine itself to the common English Bible, in the English department, and the best translations in the foreign. And so long as the Society holds its present act of incorporation, I should deeply regret any deviation from this course.

Soon after my return to the United States, I called at the Bible rooms, and remarked to brother Ward that I looked to the A. & F. Bible Society for funds to aid us in translating, printing, and circulating the Scriptures in Siam. I still continue to look for aid to your society, and was pleased to learn from brother Osgood, when in New York, that you would be able to appropriate to foreign fields the usual amount of funds. This is my position in relation to the Am. and Foreign Bible Society.

Mr. Chandler's letter continued.

then said of the importance of having a Bible Society of our own, and from the great good which it has done since its formation, has ever led me to regard it with deep and lively interest.—When the act of incorporation was obtained *from the New York Legislature*, I understood that the Society was virtually pledged to confine itself to the common English Bible, in the English department, and the best translations in the foreign. And so long as the Society holds the present act of incorporation, I should deeply regret any deviation from this course.

Soon after my return to the United States, I called at the Bible Rooms, and remarked to brother Ward, that I looked to the A. & F. Bible Society for funds to aid us in translating, printing and circulating the Scriptures in Siam. I still continue to look for aid to your society, and was pleased to learn from brother Osgood, when in New York, that you would be able to appropriate to foreign fields the usual amount of funds. This is my position to the American and Foreign Bible Society.

I will now say a few words in regard to my views of the Bible Union, and its efforts to procure a better or improved translation of the Scriptures into English. My mind was first directed to the subject of emendations of the English Bible about seventeen years ago. The more I have investigated the subject, the more I am inclined to think it a worthy object, and worth the attention and united efforts of every evangelical denomination. But I do not suppose it possible to unite every evangelical denomination

Dr. Babcock's extracts continued.

Should an agent of the society be present, and ask aid of the church where I should be present next sabbath, I should contribute to aid that society; for to separate from it after it has done so much to aid in giving the word of God to the dark, benighted and perishing heathen, would indeed cost a struggle."

[So far Dr. Babcock. The reader will remember that this extract was prefaced by the remark that he was giving the "whole of his testimony." After the extract he adds the following remarks to confirm his statements:]

"Whatever may be our respected brother's opinion in regard to another organization; which

Mr. Chandler's letter continued.

in such a work, and some must take the lead if it is done at all.

With these views I could but feel an interest in the formation and objects of the Bible Union. I do not see that there are any occasions for jealousies or unkind feelings between the two societies or their friends. There is a wide and open field for both. A part of our denomination wish to hold on to the common English Bible. Let them do so. This version has been blessed to the conversion of tens of thousands of souls.— I believe God will continue to bless it to the conversion of multitudes more. Another part of our denomination desire an improved or emended edition of the English Bible. Let them make every suitable effort to accomplish their object, and if entered upon with right feelings, it will do great good, and who can tell but what it may result in the conversion of as many or more souls than the common one.

Should an agent of the American and Foreign Bible Society be present and ask aid of a church where I should attend next Sabbath, I should contribute to aid the Society. *Should an agent of the Bible Union be present the succeeding Sabbath, and solicit aid for that Society, I should do the same. But whether I should continue to aid both Societies after the publication of the revised English Bible or not, is more than I can say. But this I can say, to separate from the A. & F. Bible Society after it has done so much good to aid in giving the word of God to the dark, benighted, and perishing heathen, would cost a struggle.*

Brother Wyckoff forwarded a

we know is seeking to put itself in opposition to us and to hinder our work, we have never felt at liberty to ask, nor is this the proper place to show."

copy of the communications sent to the New York Baptist Register, in regard to the conversation I had with him last November.— He has reported it substantially correct. The English language is spreading fast in India, and there is no book from which the natives can get hold of our language so readily as the Bible.— They take our translations into the native languages, and compare them with it, and are quick to perceive any discrepancies.

* * * * *

The foregoing extracts are made for several reasons: 1. We are desirous that our readers should understand that efforts are being made by a large proportion of the Baptist denomination—aided by many of the disciples, to give the world a revised version of the Living Oracles. All lovers of God's word should feel and take an interest in this good work. It is to be *the* grand event of the latter half of the nineteenth century.

2. The facts before the reader are but a tithe of similar ones enacted by the other moiety of the Denomination to oppose and hinder the good work of making the world more familiar with the scriptures of truth. We do not say that this is their intention. By no means.— But the opposers of a corrected English version of the oracles of God seem to associate, as inseparable, the popularity of the ministers of Jesus, in the estimation of various classes called evangelical, and success in the advocacy of the truth. Rather, therefore, than breast the current of popular sects against what every intelligent Baptist knows to be a desideratum for the Anglo-Saxon race, they join the advocates of infant sprinkling to decry and oppose some of their best and most honored veteran ministers of the denomination in their "work of faith and labor of love, and patience of hope" in giving to the world a pure version of Heaven's last will to man.

3. These statements are re-published to illustrate the unholy policy of some men—of leading influential men even among the Baptists—when an opponent is to be silenced, an unpopular doctrine is to be caricatured, or a favorite point to be carried. 4. Lastly, my thoughts have taken this turn to be as easy with my old friend Robinson as possible. The task which he has compelled me to take in hand has been most painfully unwelcome. I would not chastise him too severely for his obvious misrepresentations of the statements of others. But

the manner in which he has garbled the "Christian System," scarcely admits of any apology. I have made as good a one for him as I could. The self-contradictory system under which he has been reared, and the examples set him by the great Dr. Babcock and others of the same school, are the only apologies I can make for him. May the erring learn wisdom by the things they suffer; and may these faithful chastenings—though painful to the administrator and recipient eventuate in "godly sorrow which works reformation to salvation, not to be repented of."

W. W. E.

New London, Pennsylvania, 2nd July, 1853.

YEARLY MEETING.

The annual meeting in behalf of co-operating churches of Disciples of Christ in Canada was held this year in Williamsville, Saturday afternoon, June 18th. Brother J. Kilgour was called to preside, D. Oliphant appointed secretary. After devotional exercises, the following brethren were ascertained to be present to take part in the meeting:

C. McMillen, Erin; A. Anderson and J. Kilgour, Eramosa Centre; T. Bradt and G. Tompson, Wainfleet; R. Bently and J. Buehart jr, Dorchester; D. Oliphant, Cobourg; T. C. Scott, Toronto; J. Ross, King; J. Ash and A. Burke, Oshawa. A letter instead of a messenger from Eramosa East.

The Report of the secretary of the co-operating churches was read and received.

ANNUAL REPORT.

To the Churches of Christ composing the Provincial Co-operation for the support of Evangelists in Canada West, the Committee of management wish grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour:

BELOVED,—In presenting a report of their proceedings during the year now closed, your committee desire to direct special attention to the fact that they have experienced much difficulty in procuring suitable laborers to send forth to the work of the Lord. This difficulty has existed since the formation of the Co-operation, but probably it has, in no former period been felt to a greater extent than by your committee in the past year.

Time after time, and at considerable personal inconvenience to several of its members, have your committee met in earnest consultation on the question "Whom shall we send, and who shall go for us?" but seldom have they been cheered by the ready response "here am I send me."

Brethren who have labored acceptably and successfully were de-

sired and urgently requested to put on the armor of righteousness, and again go forth to the help of the Lord against the mighty—to assist in that hallowed revolution by which the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. But the result has not been particularly encouraging. Your committee would therefore again respectfully invite attention to the question—By what means can the church in Canada be supplied with Evangelists, who will give themselves wholly to the work of the Lord?

This subject was introduced at the last annual meeting, and since then, the attention of the brethren has been directed to it by the "Banner." In the judgement of your committee this is a point which merits the earnest and prayerful consideration of every one in the Province, who desires the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom. If the system of operation now in force, is impracticable, those who have experienced its practical workings, are perhaps prepared to point out its defects and to propose a remedy. Meantime let all seriously ponder the question—By what means can the church in Canada secure the services of Evangelists, who will give themselves wholly to the work?

But although your committee have been somewhat cast down, they have not despaired. They have seen sufficient to induce them to thank God and take courage;—and have realized in some degree that the cause in which they have been engaged is the Lord's and that it will assuredly prevail. They have been cheered by the report of brother Anderson with reference to the cordial manner in which he, as the messenger of your committee, was received by the churches visited; and the liberal manner in which the churches responded to his appeal on behalf of the cause of Christ. They do not intend by this to convey the impression, that the churches came fully up to the standard of duty in regard to contributing to the Lord's cause; but that the measure of their liberality was encouraging. Your committee feel assured that the churches will furnish the necessary means for the maintenance of Evangelists, provided a way be found in which such means can be appropriated.

Upon the whole, there has no difficulty occurred but such as is common to every good cause, and by the blessing of our Heavenly Father on our patient continuance in well-doing we trust we shall be made more than conquerors through him who is able to subdue all things to himself.

Finally, brethren, farewell. Let us watch and be sober, having our loins girt about with truth, and lamps burning; and when Christ who is our life shall appear we also shall appear with him in glory.

On behalf of the committee of the Provincial co-operation.

J. KILGOUR, *President.*

WILLIAM OLIPHANT, *Secretary.*

Eramosa, June, 1853.

A sentence in this Report, namely, "By what means can the church in Canada secure the services of Evangelists who will give themselves wholly up to the work?"—was considered and pleasantly discussed.

Moved and resolved that the existing system of co-operation for the proclamation of the word be continued for the present : also, that the co-operation committee (in conjunction with the Evangelists,) be allowed to direct labor in those places thought most preferable.

Resolved that the committee of the co-operation be appointed from among the churches of Eramosa and Erin—resolved also that the same brethren who were selected as said committee, June. 1852, be re appointed. Their names are : L. Parkinson, W. Oliphant, J. Kilgour, Alex. Anderson, R. Royce, James Mitchell, Hugh McMillen, Charles McMillen, and Alexander Adams.

It was resolved that a messenger should be appointed to visit the churches to obtain funds for the support of Evangelists, and to exhort the churches to liberality in all suitable ways.

Resolved that the propriety of petitioning Parliament to secure the passing of a Bill by which the Disciplos may be exempt from military duty be considered, and that the wisdom of this step be examined and considered in the *Christian Banner*.

That the next general meeting, June. 1854, be held in the village of Jordan, on the third Friday of the month.

Resolved that the Reports of the Secretary and Treasurer of the co-operation be published in the *Christian Banner*. [It was explained that the Treasurer's Report was not forwarded to the meeting, but that it would be forthcoming and be laid before the brethren in due form, that all might see what was done with the funds of the churches.]

The blessing of the Lord being again sought, the meeting came to a close.

J. KILGOUR, *Chairman*.

D. OLIPHANT, *Secretary*.

The preceding minutes could not appear in our July Number, as the matter of said No. was in the printer's hands before the meeting took place. But the above is not an account of the general meeting which commenced on Friday and terminated on Monday. There were saints and sinners then and there in attendance who will never forget those days. The influence of the assembly and the speaking, will doubtless be felt in the Williamsville community for years, and not a few who were strangers to the Disciples, coming from a distance, will tell with earnestness and interest the things they saw and heard at the June meeting of 1853.

We thank brother Clendenan for the following communication, which sets before us briefly the generals and the interesting particulars of the meeting :

Wainfleet, June 24th, 1853.

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT:—Being earnestly solicited by some who possess my warmest christian affection to write a narrative of the Rainham meeting—I consent to forward a communication relative to this matter for the pages of the *Christian Banner*. The Wainfleet church was duly prepared for this joyful occasion, having been cheered by the labors of the evangelists a short time anterior to the annual meeting. You were not present I believe at its commencement but you may rest assured that it had a most happy beginning.

Brothers Anderson and Kilgour presiding, the holy exercise was opened by brother J. Stevens of N. Y., who was followed by a goodly number imparting exhortation and comfort to the brethren. We were much edified by the remarks of brothers Taylor and Vinekie of N. Y. The scene was gladdened by the arrival of many Disciples from Dorchester and a few from Wainfleet.

Saturday morning brought many cheerful countenances from Wainfleet, Eramosa, Jordan, Toronto, and various other places near and remote. It was plainly discernible that a *good* meeting must be the result. By simply naming the public brethren in attendance on this occasion your distant readers will readily perceive that the meeting could be no other than one of the happiest description:—they were the following: D Oliphant, J. Stevens, A. Anderson, J. Kilgour, T. C. Scott, J. Mitchell, and E. Sheppard. No effort possessing such an amount of talent and piety could be otherwise than a successful one. At the close of this day, three came forward for baptism. How happy we were.

On Saturday morning a very great multitude were assembled there—the opening address was given by brother Sheppard, followed by others who occupied the day in a profitable manner. You know I love sacred music. The singing—yes, the *singing*—warmed my heart and brought to my remembrance the holy songs of Zion sung by sweet celestial voices, replete with harmony and melody. What more delightful—what more heart-stirring—than to hear sister voices properly trained, singing in sweet and melting strains the love of our dear Redeemer! Ye highly favored ones, cease not to touch the hearts of sinners by your subduing strains and entice them to the gospel of the glorious Saviour. “Jesus loved Martha and her sister Mary,” and certainly he loves you also, for the rich service performed by you in his kingdom. Brethren and sisters, everywhere, if you desire sacred music, acceptable, cheering, and captivating, please have recourse to A. S. Hayden’s *Sacred Melodeon*, and your wish will be gratified. At the close of this day attending Angels swiftly bore the happy news causing the heavenly hosts to burst forth in simultaneous rejoicing, that four precious souls were persuaded to leave the dominion of Satan with all its enchantments, and enter the kingdom of their Saviour. Could language express our delight at that moment?

Monday morning, the last day of the rich heavenly feast, found us once more together. I need not affirm that our happiness was greatly augmented by the antecedent proceedings and enjoyments. Exhortations, rich, soul-stirring, and subduing, were presented to the solemn

audience. Our hearts were filled with joy. The effort against the Enemy of souls was a most successful one—to God be all the praise. We felt resolved, the Lord helping us, to be more faithful—more devoted to the Redeemer's cause in future-time. We evidently saw what mighty results could be achieved were we sufficiently liberal in sustaining faithful and pious evangelists to proclaim the word to a dying world. Twelve o'clock closed the scene, when "the general assembly and church of the first born who are written in heaven" beheld the salvation from sin of three mortal souls who resolved to go to the Saviour for pardon and protection. I may not say that the obedience of one of the three affords delight to the good people here, but causes deep and pungent wailing among Satan's generals stationed in Wainfleet. Thus it will be seen that ten were immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of sins.

Permit me in conclusion to say that the highest credit is due to the friends in Rainham for their good order and amiable behavior manifested by them throughout the meeting. ↴

A. CLENDENAN.

MR. McALEESE.

In our No. 2, current volume, we announced a species of preaching discussion to take place in March, at or near the village of Warsaw, township of Dummer. Mr. McAleese, Free Church minister stationed at Norwood, officiating occasionally at Warsaw, is the gentleman who was to have been our opponent. The discussion has not taken place as contemplated, for what reason every reader may become his own judge when we offer a brief summary of facts.

About the first of January, as our readers will remember, a visit was made to Dummer, and an acquaintance formed with the Baptist brethren of that locality. While at the residence of brother William Kidd, information was received in relation to the valorous zeal of Mr. McAleese—a zeal towering several degrees above the common level, which showed itself in giving what some linguists would call a challenge on the subject of baptism. The gentleman, on the occasion of introducing an infant into the church at Warsaw in the customary way, took the opportunity of announcing to the community that he was ready to meet any one in vindication of the practice then and there publicly approved by him. On first receiving this intelligence, it appeared to us as though there had been some mistake made, since it is patent to the world that Pædo-baptists, especially if they have a fair share of learning, are particularly careful to say little about baptism by way of public investigation; but on having the statement confirmed by those who were present at the "christening," we necessarily put confidence in what was currently affirmed. After counselling with

one or two Christian friends, a concise note, unsealed, was sent to the gentleman, he being at that time in the vicinity on ministerial duty. The following is a copy of the few lines thus forwarded :

Dummer, 15th Jan., 1853.

TO MR. McALEESE, MINISTER : DEAR SIR :—Several of your hearers at a late meeting (where you “administered baptism” to young children) report that you publicly intimated your readiness to discuss the question and prove the validity of infant baptism with any one. As a ‘defender of the faith,’ though in another form than that of king Henry VIII, I am induced to inform you that I accept the challenge.

You will be pleased therefore to let me know at what time it may suit your convenience to engage in the proposed discussion. Also it will be in good order to say something relative to the proposition to be debated, the length of time the debate is to occupy, the place where it is to be held, the means for observing order, &c. These of course must be mutually determined on.

Suppose we discuss the following proposition :—*The infant of a Christian parent is a proper subject of Christian baptism* : you taking the affirmative and I the negative. Or if this phraseology is not such as you can approve let language be chosen to represent your view of the question as shall be agreed upon.

I could be in this neighborhood to attend to said debate any time after six weeks from this date ; or if it would incommode you to engage in it either at or after that time, I would endeavor to make arrangements to be on the ground earlier.

I thus write on the assurance that you are a minister in good standing with the Free Church of Scotland ; for I would not be willing to join issue with any one before the public who is of doubtful character or standing. The friends of immersion in this vicinity will, I presume, satisfy you in respect to my religious standing and public position.

A brief reply in writing by the bearer will probably facilitate matters. My residence and post address you will doubtless have learned, which you will please avail yourself of in the direction of letters. It will perhaps be necessary to pass several letters to each other while arranging the requisite preliminaries of a discussion of a topic intimately connected with the peace, prosperity, and purity of the church of the Lord Jesus.

With due respect,

D. OLIPHANT.

Twenty-four hours after the preceding note was written, there was a face to face interview between Mr. McAleese and the writer. After revealing to us how greatly we had sinned in sending him a note unsealed,—after expressing doubts relative to our being a clergyman (!)—after figuring some time upon sundry Greek terms such as *metame-lomai, louo, baptio, baptizo*—after explaining that he must receive an expected supply of books from Kingston before he could enter upon

the controversy, after stating that he desired not a formal discussion, having moderators appointed, and so many set speeches per day—it was finally arranged by mutual consent that he should preach two discourses immediately following each other treating upon the subjects of baptism, to be responded to by two discourses from us; and then two discourses from him on what he called the mode of baptism, followed likewise by two responses on our part. March was the month appointed for the “sermons” to be delivered, and Warsaw or vicinity the place for their delivery. The gentleman was to communicate definitely in respect to the day he would be prepared to begin. Desiring an assurance that the arrangement was not a mere feint, he affirmed to us in the presence of some two or three others, “You may depend upon it:” that is, we might depend upon him honoring and standing up to the arrangement.

The gentleman, for a stranger, was very generous with his knowledge of Greek at the commencement of the short interview to which we have now referred. He alleged that while discoursing that evening, in reading or repeating Matt. iv. 17, we had used Reform for Repent; and he gave us a specimen of his critical acquaintance with the language of the venerable Greeks. Whether indeed we employed the word as he asserted, we could not dogmatically affirm; but certainly the learned criticism he offered upon *metamelomai* would naturally have led to the suspicion that the gentleman had too small a capital from the Greek tongue to deal much in the article. We permitted him to deliver himself and exhibit his philological depth, simply putting in the plea, for the time being, that no doubt Doctor George Campbell, the translator and orthodox Presbyterian, was as fully versed in Greek as either of us, and that in the passage in question he had given us Reform instead of Repent. Mr. McAleese seemed just then not to have known the distinction between *metamelomai* and *metanoco*; neither did he appear to be aware that *metamelomai* is not in the Greek text in Matt. iv. 17 at all! *Apo tote erxeto ho Iesous kerussien, kai legin, Metanocite, engike gao he basileia ton ouranon.* So reads Matt. iv. 17 in the Greek text that we look into occasionally; does it read differently at Norwood in the KAINÉ DIATHEKÉ of Mr. McAleese?

But to the point. The month of March came, and no letter from Mr. McAleese. April passed, and no letter from Mr. McAleese. May and June gave us their complement of days, and no letter from Mr. McAleese. The most of July has come and gone at the date we write, and no letter from Mr. McAleese. Unwilling without evidence even

to hint anything against the gentleman, lest we might unconsciously do him injustice, not knowing but what he had reasons good and valid for omitting to do as he had covenanted, we refrained from presenting our readers with a single syllable in reference to the non-fulfilment of his solemn word of promise. But, courteous reader, what think you? The evidence comes to us that Mr. McAleese has delivered his discourses on baptism both at Warsaw and at Norwood! Yes, verily, if there be dependence upon good testimony, our friend the minister has been so fond of good company in this campaign that he himself has been the sole combatant! Why should we object? The gentleman after the sober second thought is to be considered the best judge of his own powers and prowess. Or is he yet to be forthcoming, appointing the March of next year instead of the current year, meantime practising a little to see how he can load and fire in order to make sure work of it when the controversy commences in earnest?

We would take much pleasure in offering an apology for our friend the minister; but with the premises now in our horizon, any apology we might make would be at best a left-handed compliment. In view of these facts, let every reader think as favorably as possible of Mr. McAleese, minister at Norwood.

D. OLIPHANT.

THE ITALIAN LECTURER GAVAZZI.—On the night of the 6th June, in the city of Quebec, while Gavazzi was delivering a lecture upon Romanism, a number of Romanists after raising a riot attempted to lay hold of him, with the intent, it is thought, of taking his life. He escaped injury with the exception of a slight wound on the face. Three evenings afterwards, while lecturing in Montreal, a host of Catholics lawlessly rushed to the chapel where the above gentleman was speaking, but were prevented from entering the building by the joint efforts of the stationed police and various auditors of the chapel, who, it seems, went prepared to give a matter-of-fact reception to the rioters. The military were subsequently called to take part in the uproar, and several lives were lost. Gavazzi was to deliver a second lecture in Montreal, but after being refused protection in the city while he lectured, on the ground that the authorities were not certain of success in attempting to put down the excited Romanists, the lecturer took his leave of Montreal and proceeded to New York. Thus has freedom of speech in at least one case been prevented within Queen Victoria's dominions, and a world-wide reputation gained for Canada East which is anything but complimentary. It is possible however that just such a demonstration of the spirit of Romanism is necessary at this crisis, in order to clarify the vision of certain otherwise enlightened men, who have allowed themselves to be persuaded that the adherents of the Romish Church are advancing in the direction of reformation. We intend giving in our next Gavazzi's first speech on his arrival in America.

D. O.