

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.

- 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:

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 pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

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

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

THE

CHRISTIAN BANNER.

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

VOL. XI. COBOURG AND BRIGHTON, NOVEMBER, 1857. NO. 11.

SPURGEON.

Like every man, good or evil, who obtains renown, Mr. Spurgeon, the distinguished young Baptist preacher in London, has both friends and opposers. There are not wanting men who, after hearing him, most unqualifiedly denounce him; others know not what to think of him; and there are others who see and hear him as though he was an inspired messenger.

There are two ministers who have recently heard him who testify so oppositely, and, yet, we believe, so sincerely, that we incline to present their evidence as the best available means by which our readers may form an estimate of the far-famed 'modern Whitfield.' As both of these witnesses tell what they see and hear, let the impartial reader take the facts they bring forward, and make due allowance for the impressions and commentaries of each. The first gentleman speaks thus:

It is easy to see why Mr. Spurgeon, for a time, should be popular. First, he is, what I heard a woman call him, a "powerful preacher"—that is, as she went on to explain it, he can "make himself heard;" he possesses the valuable physical power of a great voice and clear intonation, together with a free use of plain English in the vulgar tongue. Then he was wit, often very poor, almost always very coarse, sometimes smart and taking. Add to this the ready effrontery with which he brow-beats and bullies his hearers. "I don't care a snap of the fingers for the whole lot of ye," "I like to make people savage," and the like—amusing them by its very impudence. Real eloquence he has none. Power of captivating the attention and mastering the feelings of the

heart he has none ; he shows no signs of being himself deeply impressed with the weight of his subject, and therefore must needs fail to impress others. He told us, indeed, not to criticise the man and his manner, but to listen to his message—and from some preachers the advice could be received and followed ; holy and humble men of heart, men who lose sight of themselves and are absorbed in their theme, who tell us “even weeping” that of which their own hearts are full ; such men constrain us to receive the Word from their lips as if it came from Heaven. But with Mr. Spurgeon this is impossible ; he is too much at his ease, too free and “rosy-lipped,” too flippant, too self-confident, to allow us for a moment to forget the man who is standing before us. With every desire to be charitable, one feels it very difficult to believe that he is in earnest. At the same time one must make allowance for his position and rather pity than condemn so young a man, carried away by the applause of the multitude, and continually tempted by the desire of praise.

But I fear there are graver counts than these to be laid to his charge. Mr. Spurgeon’s favourite way of handling his subjects, it is well known is the dramatic. He brings before you the persons of the sacred narrative, and you hear them, as it were, speaking by his mouth. And a very profitable way, no doubt it is when carefully and reverently employed ; but how when all care and all reverence are utterly discarded ? Can it profit any one, for instance, to carry away the idea of St. Paul, which many doubtless carried away the other night ; to imagine the Apostle a second rate debater, great in his own line, coarse and cunning and confident, grinning at the Corinthians, and exulting when he can catch them tripping ? Yet this is Mr. Spurgeon’s representation. “Yes,” says Paul, “you’re mighty clever in detecting my faults, suppose you look a little at your own—examine yourselves !” with a shout of defiance, and a shake of the fist in their imaginary faces.

If this is bad enough, how much worse is it when the person brought upon the stage is no less than the Holy One of God, and his words, spoken as man never spake before, are travestied and defiled by the preacher’s flippancy and irreverence !

Is it God’s work, or whose work is it, to call forth the laughter (!) of an assembly by an off-handed dialogue between Christ and Nicodemus—“Now, then, I’ll puzzle ye—read me my riddle if you can !” Poor Nicodemus scratches his head, and “I can’t make it out,” says he, &c. Or course the drama would not be complete without specimens of the Judge upon His throne, the cries of the damned, &c., and accordingly these were freely and broadly introduced.

As for the doctrinal views of this preacher, they are such as might be expected, and are only less dangerous than his profaneness of speech. “Are you at peace with God ? Do you feel that you are ? Can you say that you are ? Then you are all right—no fear of you !”

In accordance with this, a string of sarcasms is levelled at certain “gentlemen who preach what they call (!) *duty faith*” (probably, those who teach the necessity of a faith that worketh by love) and they are told that “they are quite welcome to their doctrine, Mr. Spurgeon would

not take it from them for the world—it's not worth the stealing," &c. Believe that you are in Christ, and you are in Christ; and once in Christ, in Christ forever, so never mind your duties. Such is the Spurgeonism of the day, very palatable, of course, to all those who prefer a fancy-religion to "patient continuance in well-doing."

The next gentleman who offers sincere testimony breaks silence upon the subject of Mr. Spurgeon's devotion, and proceeds as follows :

Is Mr. Spurgeon a devotedly pious man? He certainly bears every mark of true piety. His sermons, prayers, habits of life, and general bearing, unite to demonstrate this. But there is nothing like cant in all that he says, nothing like moroseness in all that he does. His moral convictions are strong, and hence his pity is not very emotional. It is rather the piety of principle, firm and unyielding, and earnest. It follows, therefore, as a consequence, that it is of a very cheerful character. He acts as if he feels that his religion is designed to elevate and develop his nature, and not to embitter and destroy it. Hence he constantly evinces a lively, and often a playful disposition. His anecdotal fund seems to be inexhaustible, and as he brings forth one story after another, to illustrate a point, to enforce a principle, or launch a sarcasm, he always discovers the same vein of humor. At times he deals considerably in sarcasm, but it is much more playful than bitter. There is none of that ironical gall about him which betrays a vitiated taste, a deeply venomous heart, and a hateful temper. On the contrary, he gives abundant evidence that he is very tender-hearted, quite child-like in his love, and kind in his spirit. Several times I observed that his eyes filled with tears, and his bosom heaved with tenderness, as we spoke to each other of the love of Christ, of the grace which had saved us and put us into the Gospel ministry, and of the various success which God had vouchsafed upon our labors in the cause of the Lamb of God. When he mentioned the fact that his labors in London had resulted in the salvation of at least one thousand souls, it was done in a manner which indicated a sense of personal unworthiness,—which gave all the glory to his Lord.

Perhaps no man in modern times has endured more abuse and more merciless treatment at the hands of the press, than has Mr. Spurgeon. The religious press has been as guilty in this matter as the secular, in many instances. Nay, even some of the pulpits of London has been used for violent detraction and denunciation of him, Sabbath after Sabbath. I was delighted however, to hear him speak of these attacks in very measured terms when he adverted to them at all. For the most part, he acts wisely in being entirely silent on the subject. Besides this a thousand stories have been set afloat as to an alleged lightness, an undue familiarity, and even a species of blasphemy observable in his public prayers. I do not believe there is the first word of truth in them. I heard him pray many times, in the open air, at the family altar, and in the pulpit, and certainly there was nothing approaching to

impropriety of thought, manner, or expression, in anything that I heard from his lips on those occasions. His prayers were singular, to be sure: but only in their sweetness, simplicity, and ardor. It is very rare that one finds such artless, unaffected, and humble utterances of spirit at the Throne of Grace. True, there was very little of the theological lecture, very little of the studied form and affectation of dignified solemnity which we are so apt to think essential to acceptable prayer. But there was much of self-abasement, much of contrite concession, much praise for the rich provisions of the Gospel, and much of that evangelical confidence which appropriates them as made for us. Really it would seem as if his devotional services cannot fail of edification to those who are of a devout spirit, and must be acceptable to God through our blessed Mediator. There can be no doubt of Mr. Spurgeon's personal piety if we look at him through these facts and not from some eminence of prejudice or bigotry.

UNION—AN INTERESTING DIALOGUE.

CHAPTER X.

The following is a report of the meeting of Preachers, in the town of Unity, to deliberate on the subject of Christian Union. There were present a Baptist, a Methodist, a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, a Lutheran, and a Christian—all preachers. Their ministerial support was suspended on the first day of January, 1857, by their respective congregations, until they shall agree upon the Scriptural basis of Christian Union. Brother Episcopalian being called to the chair, and Mr. Chronicle requested to report the proceedings, they advanced as follows:

Meth. This has been a sad year to me in a pecuniary sense. You know that Methodist preachers get but a scanty support, at best; but this year I have received nothing. Yet I trust it has been the most profitable year to me of my life. I confess that when my brethren suspended my support, I was a little warm, and felt some of the spirit of the old Adam remaining in me. But being thrown out of employment, and that by a most singular and unprecedented procedure, I determined to review the whole premises; not to uphold a party, especially one that had refused to support me, but to find the truth and the true basis of Christian Union. This, I am well satisfied, I have found. I can say now, with all my heart, in the language of Mr. Wesley, that I "would to God that all party names, and unscriptural phrases and

forms, which have divided the Christian world, were forgotten; and that we might all agree to sit down together as humble, loving disciples, at the feet of our common master, to hear his Word, to imbibe his spirit, and to transcribe his life on our own." Wesley's Notes, p. 5.

Bap. The remark made by the brother I adopt, with all my heart. I have never spent so profitable a year in my life. I have heretofore been content to study and defend *Baptist views*; but being cut loose by the action of my brethren, from their employment, and, feeling under no obligations to support *them* or *their views*, since they have refused to support me, I have tried to place the Lord before me, and solemnly to consider *his will*—his mind. And I have become well satisfied that we can never have his approbation, and keep up our former partisan peculiarities. Beside, I confess that I have found something so far above all these peculiarities, that I no longer feel any interest in them.

Pres. I presume, brethren, that no one among us felt more hostility to the movement of the private members of our churches, in withdrawing our support, than myself. I thought, too, that I would yield to no such dictation; but having the whole year for meditation, I have given the religious world a rigid examination, and have come solemnly to the determination never again to maintain sectarian partyism. Hence I accord with the remarks of the brethren just made. I am aware of the pride there is in our ministry, of a little learning, and the conceit that our preachers *never change*, but stick inflexibly to the traditions of the elders. But I have fully satisfied myself that all this feeling is of the flesh, and am determined no longer to adhere to it.

Lu. My views and feelings have been so fully expressed by those who have spoken, that I need say nothing more than I fully accord with every sentence, especially the quotation from Mr. Wesley.

Ep. I am free to admit that I am in the same mind, and my exercises have been much the same as other brethren have mentioned in reference to themselves. But still I am not clear as to what is to be done. Can we all agree? I can not sacrifice my conscience.

Chr. If we unite, it must be without any compromise of *conscience* or *principle*. No man should be required to violate his conscience, nor to yield any principle. But I hold that we can unite without this.—The reason that we are not now united is, that we have elevated opinions, and party peculiarities, to a prominence to which they are not entitled; thus making them bars of fellowship, and things that should be made prominent, or rather that are prominent in the kingdom of God,

are overlooked. Now, this state of things must cease, and that which cannot intercept between a man and his God, must not be made a bar of fellowship.

Bap. There are certain cardinal or catholic principles that are vital, but, happily for us, we are agreed upon these, we should not disagree and disfellowship each other about things that are not vital. In one single sentence, we must not spend our time about unimportant matters, and thus neglect the great vital matters of the kingdom of God.

Lu. I like that as a general remark, but it is not personal enough, or rather it is not practical enough for our situation. We have certain difficulties to surmount, and I am anxious to have them named out, and see if we can apply our philosophy to them. For instance, we are here under different religious names—Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Lutheran, and Christian. Now, what is to be done about these names? We can not be called by them all.

Chr. Brethren, I think this can be settled without any difficulty. Are you all willing to be call Baptists?

Pres. I, for one, am not, for the word Baptist means *baptizer*—the administrator of baptism—and I see no propriety in calling us all, men and women, *baptizers*. Beside, I am informed, the Bible Union is about to give us a version of the Bible, in which the word Baptist will be translated *immerser*. I see no use in calling all the members of the church *immersers*.

Chr. Shall we all, then, be called Presbyterians?

Eap. I am unwilling to be called Presbyterian. A *presbytry* is an assembly of elders. I see no sense in calling all the members of the church, both male and female, *seiniors*. Besides, I understand, the *eldership* to be an office in the church. Now, it borders on the ridiculous, to name the Church of God after an office in the church.

Pres. It would amount to what is no better to call them Baptists: because Baptist, or baptizer, or, that is more ridiculous, *immerser*, is an office, as much as *presbyter*, and frequently found in the same person. Therefore, in calling yourself Baptist, you take for your religious designation the name of an office in the church.

Chr. Are you, then, willing to all be called Methodists?

Ep. I am not willing to be called by any such inappropriate religious designation. This name came from a very rigid and methodical class of physicians, who, from their strict method of living, styled *Meth-*

odists. This name was applied to the followers of Mr. Wesley, out of derision first. and I can not but look upon it as exceedingly ridiculous to use it as a religious name. It can be applied to evil, as well as good, and is in the New Testament. The Greek *methodus*, translated "*wiles*," in one of Paul's epistles, means "the *methods* of the devil." A name that can be applied to evil as well as good, is certainly not fit for a religious designation.

Meth. I think the name *Episcopalian* equally inappropriate. I think it ridiculous to use a name derived from a peculiar form of church discipline. *Episcopalian* is really no church name, but simply significant of a certain form of church government. I am not willing to name the children of God after a peculiar form of church government.

Chr. Are you all willing to be call Lutherans ?

Bap. I am not, for I think Paul has virtually forbidden that we should be called after any man. He would not allow the Corinthians to say, they were of Paul, but asked them the questions: "Was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?" thus implying that in order to be of Paul, or a Paulite, they should have been baptised in his name.

Lu. Then, brother B. in order to be a Baptist, you should have been baptized in the name of John the Baptist.

Chr. Brethren, I think you must see that it is utterly useless to dispute about these names. You never can unite or agree upon any one of them. No one of them is held with any regard by any except the party adopting it. No one out of the Methodist church takes it as any offence to tell him that he is not a Methodist. No one out of the Baptist Church takes it as an offence to tell him that he is not a Baptist; nor is it any great offence to one in the Baptist Church, to tell him that he is no Baptist. But you tell any one, in *any church*; that he is *not a Christian!* here is a direct insult, not to be endured. Why? Because if a man is not a Christian, he will be lost; he is not in the favor of God. But it has no such an effect to tell him that he is not a Baptist, for the understanding is, that a man may be a Christian and not be a Baptist. It has no such effect to tell a man that he is not a Methodist, a Presbyterian, a Lutheran, or an *Episcopalian*, for it is admitted on all hands, that a man can be a Christian and not be any of these. Neither of these is identical with the name *Christian*. It contains all the good in all of them, and vastly more. When we come to the gates of death, the question will be, *are we Christians?* If we are, these

other names will dwindle into nothingness—into perfect nonentity.

Seeing, then, that you are all willing to be called Christians, and that you can not agree upon any of your former names, and seeing that the great matter in death and in the last judgment will be to be a *Christian*, why contend about these other names any longer? Why not solemnly covenant together, to be *Christians*, Disciples of Christ, and be called such, as the first Christians were? No man on this earth makes any sacrifice of anything good or divine, in doing this; nor does he give up anything that can be of any service to him in this world or the world to come. In this way we shall honor the Lord's name, exalt it above every name, even above all the hierarchies in the eternal state, and under his great and glorious name we shall be bound together in an eternal and an immutable covenant, as his people. It shall be our highest aim and greatest ambition to follow him. Shall we all commit ourselves to him and to *his name*?

Bap. I am satisfied, I confess, about the *name*. If other matters can be adjusted, I see no reason why we may not unite.

Pres., Meth., Ep., and Lu. We agree to the same.

Adjourned, by prayer, to this night one week, when we shall continue the subject.

THE DUNKERS OR GERMAN BAPTISTS.

A few weeks since we copied from a secular paper a paragraph, which was published there without credit, giving some account of the Dunkers or German Baptists. The members of this sect, it was said, are numerous in New England, and especially in Massachusetts. Some of our New England exchanges in copying the article, stated that they were ignorant of the existence of the sect in their vicinity, and as one of them has called upon us for information, we will give a fuller account of this singular people.

The Dunkers are a society of Seventh-day Baptists, founded in Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, some sixty miles from Philadelphia, in the year 1724, by CONRAD BEISSEL, an intelligent German minister who rebelled against some points of Calvinistic theology, and as a consequence was compelled to emigrate to America in order to enjoy his belief in peace. The little colony thus founded was called *Ephrata*, in allusion to the Hebrews who used to sing psalms on the borders of the Euphrates.

The Dunkers, or Tunkers, are remarkable for their rigid observance of the precepts and ordinances of the New Testament, even to the washing of the feet before administering the sacrament, and keeping the seventh day as a Sabbath. The brethren and sisters formerly resided in separate convents and wore the dress of the Franciscans or White Friars, a coarse woolen gown with a band around the waist, but now they are not distinguished by their dress from their neighbors. They baptize converts by plunging them forward, while on their knees in the water, and use trine immersion with laying on hands and prayer. From their mode of baptism, they sometimes go by the name of *Plungers*.

The Dunkers believe that, as Christ redeemed the human race by meritorious suffering, each individual is to work out his own salvation by penance and outward mortification. If his good deeds are more than is necessary to secure his own eternal felicity, the superabundance is applied to the salvation of others. They deny the eternity of future punishment, and hold that there are periods corresponding to the Jewish Sabbath at which those who in the meantime have been led to repentance in the other world are released from their torments. They believe also in a general jubilee, at which all the obstinately wicked will be added to the company of the blessed. The just, after death, they think, are preachers of righteousness to those who had no revelation in this life. The best speaker among them is chosen for a pastor. They are Baptists in their church government.

Marriage is practised, although they consider celibacy a virtue. Some writers assert that they live entirely on vegetables, and that they are non-resistants even under personal insults and injuries. These notions, we believe, are incorrect, although they are peaceful and their manner of living is temperate.

The Dunkers have increased slowly in some of the States, and in 1850 the society numbered 22,400 members.—N. Y. Chronicle.

☞ Too many, I fear, are mere Sunday christians. They fail to recognize the important principle that true religion is a life implanted in the heart, which grows daily, and which exerts a controlling influence over the whole man, *body, soul and spirit*. Too many, I fear, regard it rather as an outward covering that may be put on, thrown off, and resumed at pleasure. Christianity is an inward life, springing up in the human heart from the divine seed implanted therein, and it either grows into perfection, or is choked out by the cares and pleasures of the world.

B. F. M.

DO THE LORD'S PEOPLE NEED A MISSIONARY SOCIETY?

ARTICLE FIRST.

During the current year of grace the readers of the Christian Banner have enjoyed the privilege of hearing what Elder Franklin and Professor Pendleton have been pleased to affirm relative to the expediency of a missionary society. Not only have we listened to these brethren with the largest stock of candor that we could command, but we are prepared to hear two other estimable brethren; so that, while reviewing the missionary structure, we may respectfully bear in memory that at least four goodly pillars support this temple. Brethren Errett and Elley—the one in Michigan and the other in Maryland—are very acceptable and very successful workmen, worthy of a hearing on any religious topic, and we shall do ourselves the honor of attending to what they teach on the subject of co-operative action.

Friend Errett, treating of primitive liberality, and particularly the wholesale philanthropy of the disciples in the capital of Judea, affirms that—

The precise *form* of philanthropic action did not long continue. In a religion intended for all the world, there can be but few positive forms. While the *spirit* may remain the same, it will see development, under the law of liberty, in harmony with circumstances, times, and places. Thus in the church at Antioch, when Agabus signified by the prophetic spirit a coming dearth throughout the land of Judea, there was a special contribution made for the brethren in Judea, and sent to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. (Acts xi. 27-30) Again (Acts xv. 3) we find the funds of the same church expended in paying the traveling expenses of Paul and Barnabas. The churches of Macedonia and Achaia made special contributions for the poor in Judea. (2nd Cor. viii.) The most usual form of benevolent contribution in the primitive churches was that mentioned by Paul (1st Cor. xvi. 1-2), namely, a *weekly* contribution—placing in the treasury of the church what each could give, according as the Lord had prospered him.

There were several reasons for the peculiar form which the benevolence of the church in Jerusalem assumed.

1st. In so vast a multitude of converts, no doubt the large majority were poor. The "love of the brethren," which in passing from death unto life, they all felt kindling in their hearts, led the rich to share freely their abundance with their poor brethren. As among the tribes of Israel in the wilderness, they gathered of the manna, "some more some less," but putting it all together, "when they did mete it with an omer, he that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered

little had no lack;" so here, throwing all their means, great and small, together, and dividing to every man according to his need, there was a brotherly "fellowship," alike in giving and in receiving.

2nd Many of these converts were from distant places. It was important that they should be fully instructed in the "Apostles' doctrine" before they returned home, that they might carry back to their own lands the knowledge of this great salvation, and be missionaries in the cause of Christ. They were therefore supported by means of the "fellowship," until their missionary education was completed.

3rd. The Spirit foresaw the calamities that, in a few years, would overwhelm the church in Jerusalem. Persecution would scatter them abroad over the earth. It was evidently designed to prepare the whole host of converts to the word, every one in his own sphere, and it was wise, therefore, to spend for the common benefit the treasures which otherwise must shortly have fallen into the hands of their persecutors. We find, accordingly, that when they were scattered abroad, "they went everywhere preaching the word." (Acts viii. 4.) The church at Jerusalem, therefore, looms up before us as a *great missionary institution*, expending all her treasures in the education of preachers, to send them forth to other countries with the glad tidings of salvation.

But we are not so much concerned now with the peculiar form of this philanthropic offering, as with the fact itself, that the Jerusalem church, under the fresh inspirations of the gospel of love, freely poured forth her treasures to do good. The fruits of conversion were thus seen in the conquest of selfishness, and the joyful consecration of property, talents, and all else to God. The love of Christ constrained them.

So speaks brother Errett. Meantime, making no pause to offer comments, let us examine a portion of an article by the intelligent and zealous Elley, which will indicate the position that he has taken :

Let us admit that ten or one hundred congregations unite in an evangelical effort to send the gospel to the destitute, either at home or abroad, and for this purpose it is important that a conference be had upon all the premises. How then can such a conference be obtained? Must this be done by a general mass meeting of all the congregations, or by their messengers? Who shall collect the men and means necessary for such efforts, how shall the general objects of such an agreement be accomplished? It will not do to refer to Cor. viii. 15, for the details. There is not one case of church co-operation to be found in the New Testament for evangelizing as far as I can see. A divine model for such a co-operation appears to me to be wholly unnecessary. Neither the Council at Jerusalem, or the sending out of Paul and Barnabas by the Spirit and Prophets at Antioch, can be plead as a warrant. The love of God must ever be the moving cause of all such efforts, and the general tenor of the Spirit's teaching the foundation or guide in all such cases. The word of God must be translated, printed, bound, and circulated by the church, because she is the

ground and support of the truth. But how can this be done without a conventional arrangement? And who would ever think of asking for divine authority for so doing; and a model plan to work by? . . . What guarantee have they that the church will pursue the course most approved by them? Whatever the churches do advisedly by their messengers upon any subject, they will be held to do by their own act, and it is not in my power to see how such a co-operation can be judiciously gotten up, and controlled without such messengers.

The State meeting of Kentucky claims no authority over any congregation, nor do they exercise any control over any evangelist farther than to direct him to the proper field of labor, connected with such other objects as belong exclusively to the work of their voluntary agents. No church is bound either to send money or messengers, and consequently it can have no existence or executive rule only as they are pleased to give it. It is, therefore, purely a creature of their making; and I give it as my deliberate judgment, that without co-operative efforts our progress must continue comparatively small. Since the organization of the Kentucky State Co-operation a great improvement has been manifesting itself among the brethren. They are learning the spirit of general benevolence, and not to look altogether upon their own things but upon things or interests of others.

A missionary spirit is essential to the vitality of any congregation. "The Spirit and the Bride say come; and let him that heareth say come; and let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will let him take of the water of life freely." This principle must pervade the whole body of Christ. It is in fact the test of its fellowship with Christ the Head of the body. We want no *ritual* or special form for such a work.

In this calm and dignified manner our brother employs his pen. There are choice sentiments in the utterances of brothers Errett and Elley. Let us all peruse and examine and re-examine with care these devotional and sincere statements, and if any of us differ 'in any wise,' may we possess and express love enough to 'let brotherly love continue.'

D. O.

EVANGELISTS—THEIR WORK.

For the Christian Banner.

DEAR BROTHER:—In the January Number of the Banner, an article appeared headed, "The Work of an Evangelist," and signed by Isaac Errett. This article follows pretty much in the path of Dr. Shepard. Brother Errett exhibits a much more christian spirit than Dr. S.; he is entitled to a patient hearing. What I have said in former articles in

reference to Dr. S. must suffer at present so far as the two are on the same path. But there are several things in brother E.'s article that seem to demand a separate notice. On page 19 he speaks of churches getting into disorder and beyond the control of the Elders; and the remedy he seems to provide for such disorders is the authority of the evangelists. This seems to me to be a very silly remedy, (what a pity that Paul forget to tell the Elders of Ephesus to call evangelists to their aid when the grievous wolves would enter in among them.) If Elders cannot preserve churches from disorder with argument, persuasion, and reproof, I ask, what other means can evangelists bring to bear upon the disorderly church? Can they coerce the church? Admitting that evangelists had a right to all the authority claimed by the Roman Pontiffs (and this seems to be what brethren Shepard and Errett are contending for,) how can they enforce their authority?

While an evangelist might be in the very act of reproving the refractory church, any one of its members might stand up, and proclaim, 'To your tents, O Israel,' and every member might scatter to their homes and leave the evangelist alone in his glory, and how could he hinder them. Churches are voluntary associations; people cannot be forced into, neither compelled to remain in churches against their own will. So that whatever way we turn, we are practically taught that the power is in the church. It cannot be placed anywhere else without depriving the christian people of liberty of conscience.

On page 20 brother Errett speaks of wicked Elders; and it seems to me that he thinks no one has authority to reprove wicked Elders but evangelists. Upon this I remark, that after my long experience I never saw the Elder that I could call wicked; but I have seen Elders who erred and deserved reproof, and were reproofed by common brethren. The constitution of the kingdom provides that an Elder should possess seven positive and as many negative qualifications; the first of all these is to be blameless, the last to be of good report of them that are without, 1 Tim. 3. 1-8. A wicked Elder cannot possess any of these. The first thing to be done to him, is to depose him from an office of which he is unworthy. He then stands in the same situation as any other member, and may be dealt with accordingly. He must be reproofed, and if he fail to repent, he must be excluded. But it will be asked who is to do all this (aye, that is the rub.) I answer, the church: the only power on earth, in my opinion, that has authority to

take cognizance of such matters. The constitution of the kingdom provides that there should be a plurality of Elders in every church, Acts, 14. 23. No doubt one reason for this, is, that if an Elder neglect or refuse to do his duty, the church may have one or more to lead and guide. The presiding Elder for the time being, is the mouth of the church; he is clothed with the authority of the church, and it is part of his duty to reprove all persons deserving reproof, whatever their station in the church and the church is in duty bound to support him in the discharge of his duty. In this way the church is perfectly independent of evangelists for reprovng or excluding any person whomsoever.

Brother Errett says, page 22, 'We need to be saved from *anarchy* quite as much as from *tyranny*.' To this I say no. In my opinion anarchy is generally the offspring of tyranny—do away with the latter and we shall be in less danger from the former. Let the churches bear in mind Paul's exhortation, 'stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free;' and be not entangled with Dr. Shepard's yoke of bondage. Ecclesiastical tyranny, the tyranny of the priests, is the worst of all tyranny. May we, and our children, and children's children, to the last generation, be delivered from the dominion of the priests.

JAMES SILLARS.

River John, N. S., Sept., 1857.

[Not to assist one brother nor to resist another, but to leave the subject open for further study, we would merely observe that the same degree of spirituality which would induce the members of a church to scatter to their homes and leave the evangelist alone in his glory, as set forth above, would inspel them to visit their own places of abode and allow the elder the same glory. Should not the authority of heaven, and not men's disposition, weigh with us in this as in every other matter?—D. O.]

A PHILOSOPHER'S AND CHRISTIAN'S FAITH.

Some believe the Gospel in a patrenizing way, as if they were complimenting its teaching by giving it the sanction of their superior intellects. All such faith involves the very essence of unbelief. "Except a man be converted and become as a little child, he can in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." The Roman Emperor who placed the statue of Jesus among his gods, on account of some sentiment in the

Gospel which he approved, supposed, no doubt, that Christianity was greatly indebted to him. Whereas the humblest Christian who embraced it to the saving his soul, is a far more brilliant monument to its power and glory.

Thomas Jefferson, on being asked whether he was a Christian, made this reply, "I have procured a copy of the Bible; I have cut out all the passages that belong to the same branch of its moral precepts, and have pasted them together, in order that I might have, at one glance, a view of its entire code on the various points that it embraces. I approve and admire them, and if, to adopt Him as my example on these points, and them as my rule of action, is to be a Christian, then I am one." From such *data* even a babe in Christ could answer the question. Mr. Jefferson was not a Christian at all. He, and any number of like-minded persons, might have lived in Antioch years together, and though the Gentiles might, and doubtless would have found some convenient name for them, they never would have called them Christians.

On his own showing, Mr. Jefferson was simply a Jeffersonian. He selected, copied, and praised certain extracts from Christ's sayings, but why? Because Christ said them! Not at all, but because Mr. Jefferson approved them. The authority of the Master had no weight in the matter. The philosophic statesman treated the Gospels just as he would have done the writings of Confucius, or of Seneca. What he thought good he accepted, what he thought otherwise he rejected. To do this is not to be a Christian. It rather serves to show that a man is not a Christian. He rejects the authority of Christ, sits in judgment upon His words, and impliedly but plainly, repudiates all reliance upon Him as an atoning Saviour. Yet this is the chief light in which the Lord Jesus is presented in His own Word.

THE ZEAL AND THE SPIRIT OF PARTIZANS.

Rainham Centre, Oct. 24th, 1857.

MR. EDITOR:—I saw Mr. Oliphant's excellent religious magazine on the table of the house where I lodged last night, and if it were on every man's table I presume none would be offended except BIGOTRY, SECTARIANISM & Co., a rather formidable and hateful and numerous crowd I find in many places. For instance I am a Wesleyan Methodist, and because I am a Wesleyan Methodist, the honest *New Connexion* brother

in Christ who should rejoice with me in the common Saviour of all men "wont have nothing to say to me on no kind of consideration." Which does grieve me awfully, brother Oliphant, I do assure you. And because I am a WESLEYAN sometimes I find another Methodist and a Baptist, generally a *hardshell one*, and a church of Rome, and a church of England, and a church of Scotland, and an Independent, who thinks it best to keep me at a respectful distance, lest I should bite 'em perhaps. Brother Oliphant, strange that you was not alarmed at the idea of taking me into your happy home when I was in Brighton! Was'nt you a good deal afraid that I would eat your happy children! Joking aside, it is most abominable to see the amount of nasty, narrow, mean, soullessness that is abroad in this Canada under the cloak of the Religion of JESUS CHRIST!

If JESUS CHRIST were to come and wear clothes as plain as I do, and tell the truth as plainly as I do, he would stand a good chance too of being mangled and crucified again by the *Wesleyans* themselves! For I was in a town recently not a thousand miles from Dunnville, on the Grand River, where a brother Wesleyan sells Wine, Brandy, Gin, Peppermint and Whiskey by the quart, gallon, and every way, and does it openly and above board, which is the only redeeming feature in the case. If he did it on the sly, it would show he was a coward! And it does take considerable pluck for a man now-a-days to sell alcohol! After what I have told the world it did for the family of which I am the only survivor,—a family that were once happy Wesleyans too, it takes *some brass* to enable a man to face public opinion! Will *brass* do in the Day of Judgment, brother Oliphant?

Will the profit made on the poison ransom my *Wesleyan* brother in the Day of Judgment? And with what Isaiah 5th chapter, Habakkuk 2nd chapter, and Romans 14th chapter say to them, how can so many of my Church of England, Presbyterian, Baptist and other christian friends and brethren in Canada continue to make, buy, sell and use as a beverage Intoxicating Liquor?

Yours truly,
A WESLEYAN.

THE CLERGYMEN of Kansas have an association called the Kansas Ministerial Alliance, organized upon truly Catholic principles. It includes all denominations, united by the single tie of Christian brotherhood.

'CAMP MEETINGS' AND 'REVIVALS'—AGAIN.

It is not doubted that Mr. Carroll is most sincere in stating that the success at late meetings, camp and protracted, is the result of 'honoring the Holy Spirit.' Let no one suppose that we question the gentleman's sincerity. In this essay we propose to examine, not Mr. Carroll's sincerity, but his teaching. For aught we know to the contrary the gentleman may be, speaking after the manner of men, one of the most amiable citizens in Canada West. Against him, as a man or as a fellow citizen, we have not one word to offer. It is his public teaching—his theology—his method of conversion—his avowal that he and his religious relatives 'honor the Holy Spirit'—it is with this chapter of general particulars that we have to do, and we proceed at once to the work.

The oracles of heaven—the Divine Scriptures—speak of the Holy Spirit in the following connexions and relations:

1. The power of the Spirit in creation. When the present earth was formed, the Spirit of God did move upon what was without form and void; and by the Spirit in creative power the existing world was produced.

2. The Spirit did, according to the pledge of the Lord Jesus, become BAPTIST; in other words, the Spirit did in the beginning of the new creation baptize men. And let it be religiously observed, the Holy Spirit baptized those who were already disciples of Christ. NOT ONE UNCONVERTED MAN EVER RECEIVED THE BAPTISM OF THE SPIRIT.

3. The Holy Spirit was dispensed or bestowed in the form of special spiritual gifts. The apostles were the only servants of the Lord who could impart or confer this miraculous power.

4. The Holy Spirit did dwell and does now dwell WITH and IN both individual and congregated believers. Primitive disciples were taught individually and collectively that they were to enjoy the presence and power of the Spirit, since they were the temple of the Lord. The same promise, in all ages and countries, has been enjoyed by all believers. That man who does not partake of the joy, strength, and comfort of the Spirit, is not a member of the saved family.

Let us reverently and with godly honesty ponder these specifications more fully. No true man desires to retain a single error, particularly in reference to a subject so thrillingly grand and vital. An error relative to one of the manifestations of Deity—and the Holy Spirit is

such—usually carries with it or includes in it an army of errors. A mistake concerning the Spirit, or concerning the Lord Jesus, or concerning the Father, especially a mistake on the part of teachers, whereby diverse teachings separate honest worshipers, instead of the divine ‘unity of the Spirit,’ is such a mistake as must be conscientiously deplored by every man who has one spark of attachment to Jesus the Redeemer. We have a long-standing vow which steadily impels us, in the great name of the Divine Saviour, to give and to receive light on themes so momentous and engrossing.

The motion and agency of the Spirit in the physical or material creation we may pass over, with this remark,—that the power exhibited leads us to admire and adore. Nay, we may affirm in the assurance of joyful hope, that the majestic agency which produced the present heavens and earth is capable of saving us, if indeed we are to be saved in the same manner as the physical earth was created.

Concerning the baptismal grace of the Spirit, our Divine Lord and Divine Teacher says, not to all the world, but to his disciples who are to be his select witnesses, ‘You shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence,’ Acts, 1st chap. Accordingly, a few days after these words of prophesy and of promise were spoken, the disciples of the Author of Life were so baptized. The promise uttered by the Lord could not possibly refer to a period far off, nor to persons at a distance; for the baptism is to take place, he says, NOT MANY DAYS from the time he gives the promise, and speaking to those who were present before him he informs them that they are to be the subjects of this baptism.

A new work is to be performed. New agents and agencies are therefore needed. Spiritual news, fresh from the presence of the Lord, full of the life of the Spirit, is to be borne to the nations in the name of Jesus; the messengers are the Lord’s educated disciples, the Saviour is the Source and the Author, the Holy Spirit is the intermediate quickening instrument between the Saviour and the ordained disciples, and hence the Spirit declares and illustrates the whole truth in its power, love, joy, peace, hope, grandeur, and blessedness through the preachers it baptizes and inspires.

The baptism of the Spirit therefore is a phrase full of spiritual sublimity and majesty, and the subjects of it were endowed and empowered as follows:

1. Those whom the Spirit baptized were put in remembrance of every truth that Jesus in person had taught them.

2. They had new truths revealed to them—things that they never heard or saw or knew before.

3. They were at once educated and enabled to speak in every language and dialect spoken by man.

4. They were emboldened and encouraged to declare the news of heaven's favor in the face of opposition which took their Master's life and threatened to take theirs.

5. They were qualified to show signs, perform wonders, and work miracles.

6. They received power to establish the doctrine and government of the Lord Jesus as his infallible ministers: power to forgive sins in the new name.—Jesus.

This miraculous education and endowment, embraced in these six qualifications, enabled the preachers to deliver the message of remission, otherwise called the joyful tidings of salvation. Forthwith the power of Christ to forgive sins was preached and illustrated. The Spirit of Truth descended from the throne of the glorified Jesus, imparting the whole truth; it was the quickening Advocate, pleading or advocating Christ as the only Saviour; it was the Spirit of Life, ministering the things of life by uttering and developing the gospel as the means of pardon and peace.

So important was the baptism of the Spirit, that Christ's death, without it, would have been vain. His revival after entering the grave, and his glorification in the heavens, could not have been demonstrated and appreciated without the revelations and power of the Spirit. While therefore Christ brought to us salvation by his mission among men, his offering on calvary, his resurrection from the gloomy tomb, and his ascension to the throne where he wields the sceptre over realms celestial and terrestrial, the Holy Spirit brought salvation by descending and baptizing the apostles, showing them all things pertaining to Jesus in a true and divine light, and giving them utterance and living energy to communicate these things of Christ to the world. The Lord had previously proposed and promised to these select witnesses, saying, 'the Spirit shall receive of mine, and show unto you': 'the Spirit shall testify of me.' 'the Spirit shall glorify me.' Jno 15. 26; and 16. 13, 14.

Hence, then, the testimony or preaching of the apostles was the

living witnessings or pleadings of the Holy Spirit, which thus developed through the apostles the divinity, authority and glory of the Lord Jesus. It was no part of the Spirit's office to speak of itself—it spoke of JESUS, and by its utterance glorified HIM. The Spirit qualified the preachers to prove and enforce the capital proposition that JESUS IS THE SON OF THE HIGHEST, THE SAVIOUR OF MEN. Hence they spoke as the Spirit gave them speech, or as the Spirit testified to them and by them. Their gospel therefore is the gospel of Christ as uttered and developed by the Holy Spirit. And hence the authority of Christ, the power of the Spirit, and the official testimony of the apostles are united and embraced in the gospel: or, to make it still stronger and richer, we have the love of the Father, the grace of the Son, the life of the Spirit, and the word of the inspired preachers charmingly blended and inseparable; for the Lord and Master, after saying to his ambassadors 'the Spirit shall teach you all things,' also says 'Receive you the Holy Spirit,' and then adds, 'Whosoever sins you remit, they are remitted to them.'

This is enough. The forgiveness of sins is with the apostles. The Spirit guides them. Christ authorizes them. The Father sanctions them. The Father sends the Son; both Father and Son send the Spirit; the apostles therefore are sent by Father, Son, and Spirit. Therefore they speak the mind and carry with them the authority of the Godhead. Their gospel is the gospel of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. What a mighty instrument!—what a weighty message! The whole favor of heaven to sinful men is unfolded in the utterances of the apostles.

How, then, with such powers, did these inspired workmen convert sinners?

Let us answer this query in brief. All will agree that they did not make sectarian converts. All will agree that their converts were evangelical.

1. They proved by divine facts and incontestable testimonies that Jesus who appeared in Judea and was nailed on a cross on calvary, was the Lord from heaven, the Redeemer of men.

2. When those who heard their gospel, believed in Jesus, and asked how they should act in order to receive the favor and enjoy the government of Jesus, the infallible preachers urged, in the name of the Lord, repentance and baptism as the necessary obedience consequent upon faith in the Lord Jesus.

3. The divinely empowered proclaimers promised to these believing

and obedient men the forgiveness of their sins and the Holy Spirit.

4. They then began teaching these converts all their duty to one another, to all men, and to their Master and Lawgiver in heaven.

This labor in the gospel, which proved so effectual in making converts to the Lord, was in deed and in truth "honoring the Holy Spirit." And here, in the love of God and by the grace of the gospel, we turn o. Mr. Carroll, chairman of the Belleville District, and avow in solemn English that his preaching and mode of making converts dishonor the Holy Spirit, because he does not preach and make converts as the Spirit directed the holy apostles. We have great charity for Mr. Carroll and his ministering brethren, but we have much greater charity [or love] for the inspired ministers, the apostles of Christ. We thank the Lord Jesus, the Author of Salvation, that the Holy Spirit not only gave power to living apostles to declare and develop the whole gospel, but that the same Spirit by these divinely ordained workmen has given us the New Oracles, called the Christian Scriptures, in which there is a sure record of the apostolic preaching and the inspired manner of turning men from sin to the service of the Saviour.

Not to be tedious, we must pause a moment and commence again.

D. O.

'HONORING THE SPIRIT.'

There is not a more effectual mode of dishonoring a king than to reject his voice or official word. The man who despises his word of command, practically despises and spurns his whole kingly authority.

And is it not equally correct to affirm that those who reject the TESTIMONY of the Spirit, as delivered by the persons who spoke as they were moved and guided by it, are virtually chargeable with dishonoring the Holy Spirit? We speak not of intention, for it may in courtesy be taken for granted that no man living would intentionally disown and deny the Spirit. Even the hardened Scribes while Jesus ministered on earth did not intend by their traditions to nullify the word of God. At least we have no ground to assert that they did this designedly. But they did it effectually. They dishonored God by making void God's word through their traditionary orthodoxy.

Men who are incessantly talking, preaching, and praying concerning the Spirit will not feel that it is a compliment to be mildly or in any

way told that they disown, deny, and dishonor the Spirit. Neither do we feel that it is, on our part, in the sight of our cotemporaries, a complimentary work. But apart from all feelings, whether theirs or ours, is the charge true? This is the question.

It will not do to assert that because our neighbors speak so much about the Spirit that therefore they possess and are directed by it. Many a talker entertains his friends by a continual chatter about wealth and the way to wealth, who lives in blissful poverty all his days. Many a speech-maker treats of the happy effects of kindness, who never had one kindly generous throb in his heart. Many an orator gives glowing lectures in reference to good government, who never for one whole hour properly governed himself. In these instances, talking and theorizing are not possessing. So also as it relates to the things of the Spirit. Indeed it sometimes happens that in these degenerate days the more that some pious people say about the Spirit the less they are 'led by the Spirit.' While therefore it is certain that an orator could preach every day for forty years concerning a pet theory of what is termed spiritual influence, and yet be as destitute of the Holy Spirit as though he was an Indian chief following the trade of war and paying homage to the sun, we cannot and dare not accept of a great stock of talk about the Spirit as proof that it is possessed.

Nay, the very opposite ground may be safely taken. For it is undeniable that in all the recorded sermons of the apostles to sinners, there is no theory of the Spirit presented. The model preachers to whom Jesus said, 'Go—preach to every person in the world,' executed their work without preaching the Spirit. They preached Jesus. They could, it appears, be full of the Spirit, and show signs as extraordinary ministers of Christ by the Spirit, and yet never even once while announcing the gospel to men speak a syllable about the 'influence of the Spirit' or the 'work of the Spirit.'

The phrase, 'the work of the Spirit,' so frequently employed by modern preachers, and not unfrequently found in the preaching and writings of the Disciples,—this phrase, we say, is not once found in the Sacred Oracles, Old Testament or New. We therefore most heartily desire that teachers were so fully possessed of the Spirit that they would cease to use non-spiritual language. It is not however the mere expression to which we object. The meaning or idea conveyed by it is radically unscriptural and subversive of the teaching of the Spirit.

To illustrate this let us first hear a revivalist preacher of the most approved stamp. He says—

“A revival of religion is simply an increase of the best desires, affections, and exertions of persons who are already pious . . . and by fervent and united prayer prevail with God to send down that effectual influence of his Spirit by which sinners are converted.”

This is from the pen of one of the most popular living ministers. Let us consider it. Passing over the expression relative to ‘a revival of religion’ (which, taken as it reads, clearly means that religion has been dead! and has been brought to life again!) behold what is said concerning the ‘work of the Spirit.’ First of all, it is distressing to hear a talented and eloquent teacher, and an able writer, tell us that God requires to be prevailed upon either by prayer or other agency to do something special for the unconverted, without which special working they must be lost; while prophets, apostles, evangelists, and teachers ordained of heaven have stated, proved, and illustrated the superabounding affection of God for the family of man; always willing and ever ready to bless those who will hearken to him, and receive what he has already done. Again, this fervent and united supplication is for the purpose of moving God to send down, not his Spirit, but the *influence* of his Spirit—a gift that is only spoken of in latter-day theology. But mark what this influence is to do: ‘by which,’ says the preacher, ‘sinners are converted.’

Not further to criticise the phrase ‘*influence* of the Spirit,’ but taking for granted that the preacher means the Spirit in its own living power, let us propose two queries just here, after stating two cardinal facts. It is a fact that Jesus, while personally on earth, promised to send the Holy Spirit. It is also a fact that the Holy Spirit, agreeably to promise, did descend from heaven. Now it is in place to ask, Did Jesus promise that the Spirit should descend upon sinners? Or, when the Spirit actually came, did it rest upon and enter sinners in order to their conversion? Or we may earnestly ask, Have we a single example registered in the Christian oracles of the Holy Spirit being sent by God to an unbeliever to convert him? And if we cannot find even one such instance in the days of inspired preachers and superhuman signs and wonders, it is not only fallacious but it is a virtual rejection of the testimony of the Spirit to expect or teach anything of the kind in this our day. Thus the so-called work or influence of the Spirit is put for-

ward as the grand converting power, in place of the gospel of Christ, which develops and embraces the love of the Father, the favor and divinity of the Son, and the living power of the Spirit.

We have, then, two distinct and diverse gospels—thus :

1. The gospel of the apostles—a divine message setting forth in heaven's own language the affection, grace, and power of the Godhead, —which gospel, carrying in it and opening up the things already executed for the sinner's salvation, is pressed upon him for acceptance. Such is the apostolic or primitive gospel.

2. Then there is the modern gospel, which sets forth to the sinner that he cannot be converted till God send to him a special influence from heaven, called the influence of the Spirit: this too in the face of the fact that the Holy Spirit speaking by heaven-ordained apostles urges the sinner to turn from his sins and live. This latter-day gospel, we are bold to say, does practically deny the Spirit that spake to the unconverted by the inspired preachers. It is not the gospel that was delivered to the world by the apostles in the name of Christ, approved and sanctioned by the Father, and immediately dictated and uttered by the Holy Spirit.

Seeing therefore that we have to choose between two gospels, two classes of preachers, and two ways of making converts, we halt not in a neutral attitude—we dare not sanction the modern gospel, but must in the name of heaven accept and teach with our whole heart, mind, and strength the gospel announced by the ambassadors of Jesus.

In so doing who can call our charity anything but genuine?

But there is a class of persons to which the Holy Spirit is promised. Yes, and the promise is made good in every instance upon the conditions divinely proposed. Praise the Lord for his proposals and promises! Those who obediently acknowledge the Lord Jesus, ACCORDING TO WHAT THE SPIRIT HAS ALREADY TESTIFIED OF HIM, are assured of the forgiveness of sins, and, thanks to Jesus, they are assured of the Holy Spirit. The whole college of apostles, in reply to the opponents and opposers of Jesus in the city of Jerusalem, say, "We are his witnesses of these things, [the things of Jesus the Lord], and so also is the Holy Spirit, whom God has given to them that obey him." Acts 5. 32. Again, speaking of the Lord's followers in a certain place, evangelist Luke testifies, 'the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit,' Acts 13. 52. Paul observes to his brethren in the city of Ephesus, speaking of the past, 'you were, after you believed, sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.' Ep. 1. 13.

Our prayer is that every avowed and faithful worshiper of Jesus the Divine Prince and Redeemer may be so largely and richly filled with the Spirit that he will feel, and teach, and live according to the 'mind of the Spirit,' expressed and revealed in the Sacred Writings.

D. O.

DIVISIONS AND OFFENCES.

From the Christian Union.

In the sixteenth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, the Apostle says, "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them; for they that are such serve not the Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." When, therefore, a church is corrupt, as was the Romish church in the days of Luther, it is not wrong to make a division in it if it tend to bring men back to the purity of the Scripture, the vile of division lies in the fact that they are commonly made "contrary to the doctrine learned" of the Apostles. This must have been true of all divisions originally made, because if men had adhered to, and been content with, the doctrine of Scripture, there could not have been any division. We have repeatedly called attention to the fact that, the union of Christians is not merely a matter of expediency, though certainly it is expedient, but one of religious obligation. We have quoted from the apostles such scriptures as the following: Stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel (Phil. 1: 27.) Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment, (1 Cor. 1: 10).

And we have contended that these and other like passages showed divisions to be wrong and union to be obligatory. It is regarded by us as an established truth which can not be gainsayed, that partyism in Christianity is not only impolitic, enfeebling the powers of those actively engaged in propagating the truth, but *morally wrong*; and consequently, that, for the formation and perpetuation of which, men will be required to give an account to God.

How strongly contrasted with this teaching of inspiration, is the lan-

guage of many professors of religion. They would teach us that divisions are beneficial; they tell us that they afford every one an opportunity of selecting the church he likes best, and that they do not wish to see them done away. But what is the duty of Christians with respect to the world? To so modify and change the inflexible requirements of Christianity, as that the tastes and preferences of men of the world may be suited; or to present it *as it is*, and to insist that *men* must be changed to suit it? Every one must admit the latter course to be the true one. And every one would say, theoretically, that if men will not accept of the Christian religion as Christ gave it, they must either change their minds and hearts until they are reconciled to God and his institutions, or they must expect no benefit from them. But practically it is not so. When will men learn that the church they build for themselves, is not *Christ's church*? They may rob his temple of its gold and jewels, and place these precious things conspicuously in their building, and then call upon the world to observe the *divine materials* of which it is constructed, and so far they will be successful. Men see these things; they are not disposed to make nice distinctions; they recognize many of the materials as scriptural, and they look on in admiration, believing it to be the identical temple of God! But what is the true state of the case? The builders have carried away the vessels of silver and the vessels of gold from the sanctuary of the Lord; they exhibit them to the people as an evidence that *theirs* is His sanctuary, and thus "with good words and fair speeches they deceive the hearts of the simple."

Every division sustains itself before the public by a profession of scripture quotations and references. Taking the word of God from its proper place and connections, they manage to make it prove anything; and hence it comes to pass, that all divisions, however antagonistic to each other, or however opposed to the uniform and harmonious voice of Scripture, are apparently sustained by the word of truth. The effect of this upon the minds of men is, a feeling of anxiety and uncertainty. If they propose to join one of these divisions, the voice of all the others is virtually sounding in their ears, telling them that they are going wrong. If they pause and turn their thoughts to some other party, there is an equal number testifying that their course is unscriptural and unsafe. Or, if they venture to go to the scriptures and read for themselves, here are a thousand doctors of divinity, and numerous councils and assemblies,

deriding and taunting them for presuming to understand the scriptures better than they who have so much learning, and who have made them the special study of their lives! And thus it is that these "divisions contrary to the doctrine" of Christ, become *offences* (stumbling blocks) to the world. May we not say, in the language of the Great Teacher, "Wo unto him by whom the offence cometh?"

The only remedy for this unfortunate state of things, and it is a perfect one, is for us to remember that Jesus Christ founded his own church; that he established *but one*; that he sent forth his Apostles, as ambassadors, to make known the terms of admission into it, and to teach those who were admitted, the doctrine necessary for their happiness and salvation, here and hereafter; and that now, instead of making churches or systems to suit ourselves, or selecting one of those already made which suits us, we are meekly and reverently, without bias or prejudice, to study the scriptures in order to find His church, to learn the terms of admission into it, and the doctrine which we are to receive and practice as members of it; and then we obey these terms, because members of this church, and receive and practice this doctrine, or else make up our minds to forego the blessings, privileges, and honors which are vouchsafed to those only who do thus act.

In this way, laying aside all our preconceived opinions, disregarding, for the time, the peculiar mode of faith and worship adopted by our parents or our reverend ministers, and loving Christ and his word more than father or mother, or minister or friend, let us go back to the "beginning at Jerusalem;" let us listen to the first discourse preached by Peter; let us follow the apostles in all their journeyings, and hear with a sincere desire to learn the truth, all their proclamations and instructions; and in this way, we must necessarily receive the very same ideas, the precise instructions, and the identical information concerning the church of Christ and the way of salvation, that were received by those originally addressed. This course will lead us to a knowledge of the *Church of Christ*. If, when we have found it, we are satisfied with it and its institutions, and are willing to sacrifice our party preferences, and to disregard ancestral and ministerial influences for the sake of truth and safety, the way is open to us. All can unite in Christ's church, and as Christ's people, with his laws and ordinances to govern them.

But if when we have found this "good old way," we begin to raise objections, and to say, this does not suit me; I do not believe this is

essential ; my father has gone to heaven, and he did not believe in this ; I do not like the order in which these items are placed, and therefore will change them ; I do not believe this institution sufficient to attain the end proposed, and therefore, I will add something to it ; I believe the entire arrangement of things is too simple to suit the present age, and therefore I will re-model it, and gracefully interweave the splendid and costly furniture of the Jews' religion ; it will be just as well—this is the same church any how, besides, the last and best exhibition of the church should certainly be grander and more splendid than the mere shadow ; I will be careful to retain all that is *essential* in the new dispensation.

If any one argue and act thus, let him do so ; our country accords to every man the right to think and act as he pleases in matters of this sort,—but let him not suppose, when he has added, and subtracted, and changed, until he has made a church to suit himself, that this is the church of Christ, or that he can legitimately claim for it the promises which the Lord made to his own church alone. Let him know that, in the light of the Bible, he is a schismatic, exerting all his influence “contrary to the doctrine” of the Lord. Appealing as he does to the carnal mind, he may become popular in the community, and far outnumber the devoted few, who would not for the world, change one iota of God's truth ; he may, in course of time, by an overwhelming majority, vote himself and his party, *orthodox* ; he may deride those who are faithful to the Lord, as heretics, and he may flourish in the high places of the earth—his party be favored by the State—his votaries be honored by the wise and learned of the world—while thousands and tens of thousands of the “simple hearted” will believe that his is the veritable church of God. But in the eyes of Him who searcheth the hearts and trieth the reins of men, how different is the man and his system ! With all his “good words and fair speeches,” with all his seeming piety and fervent prayers, the inspired apostle places his finger upon him, and says, “*mark him and avoid him ; he is a dangerous man, he has produced a division and an offence contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and, notwithstanding his good words and fair speeches, he does not serve our Lord Jesus Christ, but his own belly ; he is a sensualist, he is selfish, he has presumed to touch the church of God with his corrupting hand to improve it—I beseech you, brethren, (O how earnestly does he speak) to mark him and avoid him.*”

Tried by the same standard, and viewed in the same light, how much better are they who knowingly give all their influence to perpetuate such divisions! Let us think upon these things, and let us not wait till others act; we are individually responsible for our conduct. Let others remain where they will, "what is that to thee? follow thou the Lord."

J. S. I.

THY HEART IS NOT RIGHT.

It is the prerogative of the Almighty to know infallibly the state of the heart. When it is said, 'The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?' it is added, 'I, the Lord, search the heart.' The only means which we possess of judging of the heart is the conduct. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.'

Judging by the conduct of professors, we are constrained to believe that their heart is not right. This is evident:

1. When they show that they are supremely selfish. If they are unwilling to aid in sustaining religious institutions for the benefit of mankind; if they are tight and niggardly in their dealings with others; if they take advantage of the ignorance or inexperience of their fellow-men; if they are *covetous*; they show that their hearts are not right.

2. When they manifest that their minds are earthly and sensual. If they are *too proud* to hold intercourse with men of low estate; or cherish hatred towards some of their fellow-creatures; or manifest a spirit of malignity towards those who have, as they supposed, injured them; or are contentious and unreasonable in their intercourse with others, their heart is not right.

3. When they engage in business, the direct and evident tendency of which is to injure their fellow-men for this world and the world to come. The christian may engage in business (whose fruits are hurtful) through thoughtlessness, but then he will abandon it at once when he perceives its tendency. But when men engage in a business against which all the virtuous and enlightened portion of mankind enter their protest, they show that their hearts are radically defective.

4. When they habitually *neglect* any plain and admitted duty. A christian may sometimes, through force of temptation, neglect many duties for a season. But this is an exception to the *habitual* conduct.

When persons are found habitually neglecting public worship, or family prayer meeting, or religious conversation, it is evident that their hearts are not as they should be.

5. When their religion is almost wholly *spasmodic*. If you find a man who manifests little or no interest in religious matters except in time of revival or in prospect of death, you may fairly infer that his religion is good for nothing—that his heart is not right.

6. When they show that they prefer the company and conversation of the giddy and thoughtless, to that of serious and consistent christians. The conduct of such persons shows that they are in their natural and worldly state—that their hearts have never been changed.

7. When it is evident that they are unwilling to *deny themselves*, and take up their cross and follow Christ. When you see a person who cares more for gratifying his appetite, for intoxicating drinks, or for tobacco, than he does for having something to give for the souls of his fellow men, you may conclude, without much danger of mistake, that his heart is not right.

8. When they show that their religion is *local*. If you find professors of religion, when among strangers, living after the course of this world, showing no christian firmness, but “mixing themselves with the people” of the world, attending the theatre, visiting gambling establishments, neglecting public worship, or using profane language, you will not fail to form the opinion that their hearts are not right. Their religion is local, and will not bear transporting.

9. When they show that their *treasure*—what they think most of and care most for—is on earth, and not in heaven. When we see persons wholly absorbed in worldly cares, property, honors, appearance, gratifications, company, we cannot help concluding that their hearts are not right.

A MEETING HOUSE IN THE UNITED STATES CAPITAL.

DEAR BROTHER:—Please allow the following space in the Banner a few times.

To the brethren in the United States, “greeting.” You are hereby advised that Brother John O’Kane, of Indianapolis, Indiana, has entered into an arrangement with the brethren of the city of Washington D. C. U. S., to devote his time and energies among the brethren and friends throughout these United States for the purpose of soliciting funds t

purchase a site and erect a church edifice thereon in this city for the use and benefit of the disciples, local and transient.

By request of the elders and brethren,

Yours Truly,

B. N. S. M. W.

ENGLISH CHURCH MISSIONARY IN JERUSALEM.

We copy the subjoined from an Episcopal journal.—D. O.

Bishop Gobat, long a devoted Missionary of the Church Missionary Society, and afterwards vice-principal of the Malta Protestant College, arrived at Jerusalem December 30th, 1846, and through his agency schools have been erected, a house of refuge for Jewish converts established, and an influence circulated promotive of great spiritual good, and holding out the prospect of yet richer blessings not only for the Jews, but those Christian churches so low in the Christian character. Thus our Reformed and Protestant Church and worship are now established on Mount Zion in Jerusalem, under the Episcopal superintendence of a Christian Bishop, and in the full order in which it has descended to us through our Protestant forefathers from the Apostles.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Brother A. McArthur, of Nottawasaga, informs us that six persons have confessed the Lord in that vicinity since the last report. This is cheering news. May all who love and obey Jesus the Redeemer be increasingly strengthened to serve him in newness of spirit.

Glancing over the new columns of the 'Christian Age' and 'Christian Intelligencer,' we find that accessions, at recent dates are given, without reckoning those we have already reported from other periodicals, summing up to over two thousand.

D. O.

☞ The "Register" of the Grande Ligne Evangelical Society, for October, is at hand. Pleased to greet it.

D. O.

FINANCES—OUR RELIGIOUS PAPERS.

The organ of Episcopacy in Canada, "The Echo," after a number of successful appeals for extra pecuniary aid, is now in debt over twelve hundred dollars. It is affirmed that the proprietor of the "Montreal Witness," within the past year, has paid for publishing his paper between two and three thousand dollars more than the amount of his receipts. Our monthly paper has been issued from the beginning with special economy, else it would not now be among the living. The present time is peculiarly depressing, and publishers, to say the least, realize the pressure *as much* as any other class. We intend to weather the storm, the Lord assisting. And will some eight hundred or a thousand friends, in whose hands there is at this moment the sum of full two thousand five hundred dollars honorably due us, stir up their religious activity and christian honesty to render their share of aid? All friends know that we do not often allude to these temporals. If publishing could be done without funds, gladly would we do so! Manna such as fell in the wilderness, has never fallen upon any portion of Canada; and besides, we doubt if paper-makers, printers, and type-sellers could live on it or would accept of it as a legal tender for their respective kinds of labor.

D. O.

THE EXPOSITOR'S RESPONSE.

The 'Expositor,' of Rochester City, N. Y., has been liberal enough to copy a large portion of our article in the August Number pertaining to the Gospel and Kingdom of Christ. The 'Expositor's' preface to what he quotes from us, is in these words:

In a previous number of the *Expositor*, we took some exception to a statement which appeared in the *Christian Banner*, the purport of which statement was that believers are baptized into the kingdom. To these remarks the *Banner* for August, replies. We give the following extract, and would say that the spirit of christian courtesy in it, is highly commendable. We wish success to the *Banner*, so far as it engages in the proclamation of the fundamental truths of the Gospel.

☞ The "Evangelist," of Fort Madison, Iowa, has made us a November visit, the issues for September and October not having been seen at this office.

D. O.