

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

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

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

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

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

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

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

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

Showthrough/
Transparence

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

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

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

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

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

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

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

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. VIII.

COBOURG, AUGUST, 1854.

NO. 8.

DEACONS—ELDERS—EVANGELISTS.

ARTICLE THIRD.

Before entering farther into the details of duty rightfully appertaining to the elders of Christian Churches, let us candidly hear brother Sillars again:—

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT:—I am glad that you admit (page 136, present volume) that my article published in November as a whole is most excellent. I see however from your remarks on my answers to your two queries, pages 133 and 139, that you are not quite satisfied. I think I understand you. But I could have wished that you had defined the difference between us more clearly, as I think some of the readers of the Christian Banner, especially those who may not have seen last year's volume, may be at a loss to know wherein we differ. My intention in taking up my pen at present, is not so much to oppose what you have said, for your remarks are very modest, as to show my views more clearly, as some of your remarks seem to be intended to prove what I never denied.

It has been said that the labors of a man wholly devoted to study and teaching is as necessary in every numerous church as the labors of a schoolmaster. See "The Christian," vol 4. No. 11:—I quote from memory. As no attempt was made to prove the above assertion from scripture, and, as my experience whilst among the Scotch Baptists seemed to contradict it, I was lead to suspect its accuracy. I examined the subject with some care, and the result of my inquiries was, that the above assertion required proof. We know that if a schoolmaster is not employed in a community, that at least most of the young generation will grow up in ignorance of the common branches of education. Now, if the above assertion be correct, all those who do not enjoy the labors of a man *wholly devoted to study and teaching*, will be as ignorant about religion as the children of a schoolmaster are of the common branches of education. (This is re-

preaching us also with ignorance, as we never had the benefit of a man wholly devoted to study and teaching.) Now, brother, O., I have been surrounded since ever I was born by people who attended the teaching of men who had no other employment (in appearance) but study and teaching. I have found the people who attend the teaching of such men, generally ignorant about religion,—while those who attended to teaching and exhorting one another, and who regularly labour for their daily bread, were well informed in the scriptures. I was ten years among the Scotch Baptists—I was acquainted with the circumstances of many of their churches. I knew by face and name all the teachers (and they were more than a few) of a church numbering at least 250 members: but I never knew any man amongst these people (if stationary in one place) but what labored regularly at some calling for his own support, unless disabled. Yet I never met with any people, any where, as well informed in scripture knowledge as the Scotch Baptists; and in confirmation of this I appeal to two respectable witnesses, Elder J. Stevenson, of Prince Edward Island, and Elder J. Murray, of Cambridge, Ohio—men who were well acquainted with the Scotch Baptists, and who are now preaching four score years of age and both readers of the Christian Banner. This however only by the way.

But the question is, What do the scriptures teach on this point? Do the scriptures teach that the labors of a man wholly devoted to study and teaching is as necessary in every numerous church as the labours of the schoolmaster in a community? If so, let the proof be produced that we may examine it. In my article of November I selected the church at Ephesus: I found it to be numerous; surrounded with enemies without and also enemies within, (this seemed to demand extra labor.) I said that I could find no proof of such a man being in the church at Ephesus when Paul took his farewell of them, Acts xx, neither any orders to provide such a person. From this I drew the conclusion that there was no such person at Ephesus at that time, otherwise Paul would have sent for him to give him a special charge; and as I could find no order or command to look out for such a person *under such circumstances*, I concluded that such a person was not necessary in every numerous church. I also said in that article that Paul committed the care of the church at Ephesus to the elders, both as regarded watching and teaching. I appealed for proof of this to Paul's farewell charge as recorded in Acts xx, to which I still refer the judicious reader.

But although the elders are by office constituted teachers and watchers over their respective flocks, the whole body of the members

of Christian churches are bound to watch over one another and teach, exhort, and edify one another as ability and opportunity may offer. We do not need now the apostle Paul *personally* to send for our elders to give them a charge, neither write a long letter to us, for we have the letter he sent to the church at Ephesus, and also the charge he gave to the elders of that church; moreover we have 20 other epistles sent to churches and individuals; we have also the sayings and doings as recorded by the four Evangelists; we have the book of the Acts, where we have recorded not only the manner the apostles fulfilled their commission, but also the formation of the first Christian churches, and the materials of which they were composed; we have the book of Revelation containing many solemn warnings and exhortations; we have Moses and the Prophets, all teaching us. Now my dear brother, we—Scotch Baptists—in all our meetings give a pre-eminence to these divine teachers by reading their writings (the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments,) in large portions, and we generally give these teachers an opportunity to speak even before elders and brethren; moreover we consider it a part of the duty of our elders to see that these divine teachers be permitted to speak in our churches, and also to call forth the talents of the brethren into exercise; and we believe these things to be in accordance with divine truth; and we think that even common sense might teach that a plurality of elders reading the scriptures in large portions, and calling into exercise the gifts of the brethren, must in the very nature of things be better calculated to instruct the people in religious knowledge than listening to one man engaged all the time in text preaching, although at study most of the time.

In my article of November, page 288, vol 7, I enumerated five evils naturally and necessarily produced by devoting a man wholly to study and teaching, while remaining in one locality. I now appeal again if these evils are not true; and I ask if each of them does not involve the laying aside of an important scripture principle. At the conclusion of my article of Nov. I remarked that what I said was intended for general cases and circumstances—that peculiar cases and circumstances might arise calling for a different treatment from what I had reasoned, but that a little common sense would generally be sufficient to govern in such cases.

I would not be understood to be opposed to talented men, mighty in the scriptures, while engaged in preaching the gospel, spending a portion of their time among the churches. Such visits are in my opinion calculated to help them much who have believed through

grace ; and such men being at least at sometimes without a certain place of abode, cannot, while moving about, labour for their own support, and it is the duty of the churches to do what they can for the support of such men ; co-operation among the churches seems to be a prudent and scriptural scheme for the support of such teachers.— Now if there be any farther controverting on this subject, let the ground of difference be clearly stated that we may understand one another. As I am now in the 70th year of my age I need a clear path before me, and if I still retain errors I want to get clear of them as soon as possible.

I remain your affectionate brother in the Lord,

JAMES SILLARS.

River John, N. S., June 9th, 1854.

We must allow the preceding—with all its good common sense and its good scriptural sense—to have its full weight without attempting to subtract one iota from it, until we pass into another chapter, wherein we shall treat of the position and obligations of evangelists ; and even then we shall gently touch only one item—more by way of inquiry than dogmatic tenacity.

There is no work in the world but what demands a workman adapted to it ; and so it comes to pass that the Lord has a work in every congregation which he requires to be done by workmen fitted to perform it. He has laid out the work and described the workmen. Those master builders, the apostles, who understood by inspiration every lesson that heaven designed men to learn, have shown the work and given us the spiritual likeness of those who are to do it.— The part to be performed by elders or overseers, and what these overseers shall or should be, are clearly and forcibly indicated by three simple words—Teach, Watch, Rule ; or, if any one prefer the terms, Feed, Guard, Guide. Teaching, watching, and ruling form the work that the congregation needs—hence he who can teach, watch, and rule well is able and fit to take part in this work.

But wherever we discover these combined gifts we likewise find an underlay of precious elements of character. A good teacher, a good watcher, a good ruler, in the Christian sense of these terms, has qualifications both mental and religious of a superior mould. An impatient man, for example, could not be a good teacher and ruler : for he would at any moment be liable to throw himself from the Christian stand-point by the sheer force of overboiling animalism. Thus he might teach himself to the congregation—not his Lord.—

Hence patience, that moral jewel, is one of the sweet and suitable qualities of a brother to be selected as an overseer.—Patience, let it be observed, is not the entire absence of the workings of anger, for anger has its place and may be usefully employed, to the honor of religion and the glory of religion's Lord; but Paul, who knew whereof he affirmed, happily describes the man of patience when he says that he is "Not soon angry." True, patience among elders is scarcely a modern virtue. With what telegraphic speed do some elders now-a-days become angry. Too smart to be patient, they frequently seize a logical or theological club and knock a brother down before either mercy or judgment has time to say a word or offer a reason! All such officials ought to be cashiered and sent to the feet of Jesus to learn lessons of meekness preparatory to learning patience.

And no one can respect a member of the church as an overseer who is greedy of gain—a small, penurious, nut-souled person who fears that his shadow is too large for him as he walks in broad daylight. We can never associate what is Saviour-like with such a man, and had the gospel creed said to us, 'Love your elders who are close-fisted, greedy, and meagre-souled,' an injunction would have been given which no man on earth could practically honor. The ambition and penuriousness which induce a man to love lucre, will operate in a multiplicity of ways to unfit him for the oversight of the Lord's people; for, in the first place, when any one loves riches, every other desire is subordinate to the desire to amass wealth—hence there will not be sufficient interest in the mind of such a man to attend to the things of the Great Master; but again, he will never afford the requisite time to gather up the rich treasures of the Bible to distribute among the flock; and, more than all, ten chances to one if he will not produce the impression throughout the community that he makes his profession and his office minister to his purse—thus bringing a fearful reproach upon the divine cause. Hence the Holy Spirit, speaking by Paul, has directed that one negative and one positive trait of character shall be found in the overseer, most effectually preventing the results above named. What say you Paul? The apostle replies, 'I direct that the brother chosen to be an overseer shall be known as a man "Not greedy of gain," and also known to be *hospitable*.'

But Paul—what do you mean?—do you mean that a man who is an overseer shall not be known to cheat or steal? 'I mean no such thing,' Paul responds; "you know the favor of our Lord, who, though rich, for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be

made rich;" and the overseer is to have this liberal and self-spend-ing spirit, so that the Chief Shepherd may be honored and somewhat represented by the shepherds he appoints over his flock.

But the portrait of an overseer or elder is drawn by Paul's own master hand; and he represents him in full—just as he ought to be—in the following manner:—

As it respects his position socially or in the domestic circle—he is to have, not a plurality of wives, but, like Adam in the garden, one wife; he is to be given to hospitality; and he is to rule well his own household. A brawling, untamed, rude family must always indicate that the father is an incompetent man for an elder, however pious and zealous he may be. In his commercial or business position, it is requisite that he show no tendency to covetousness, not even a marked desire for this world's gain. Concerning intellectual qualifications, he must have the mental eye that is vigilant; and he must likewise be apt to teach, which indicates both ability and readiness to teach. As relates to maturity of profession, he is to be of good behaviour, and not a recent convert. Respecting natural disposition and daily habit, he is to be a man of patience, and a temperance man both in eating and drinking; and so prudent and consistent that even his neighbours who are not brethren will speak of his character favorably. Such is the spiritual, moral, intellectual, and social likeness of a brother who may be lawfully nominated, elected, and ordained to work in that sphere we call the elder's office.

Among many prominent defects, one of the most prominent that we have noticed in relation to the office of overseer, is, the meagre portion of time allotted both to *learning* the duties of the office and *fulfilling* these duties. It indicates either a grand lack of the true knowledge of christianity, or an utter recklessness not to be accounted for, to see a man accept the office of overseer and then never do a thing except perhaps now and again say a few words at the close of a meeting on Lord's day. Is an overseer in some measure like a shepherd—like a father—like a loving ruler? And what would we give for a shepherd of our sheep, who, while wolves were prowling, and thieves increasing, and pasture not over plenty, would let the flock from day to day take care of itself, and he meantime away to "prove a yoke of oxen" or to examine "a piece of ground" that he had bought? Would we call or account him a shepherd? Would we pay him his wages if he asked them? And let a father pay as little attention in providing for and looking after his family as our elders their congregations, and what will be his worth in our esteem,

or how will he be estimated by the community ! And let a governor employ his time otherwise than among his subjects, and attend to his own interests and not to the interests of the people over whom he professedly has an overseeing care,—and what character do we give him ?

In our travels through some fifteen states, and in our intercourse with the churches in Western Canada, we have met with few, very few Christian elders ; measuring them by a standard not too high :—for we do not look for the same attainments in overseers of congregations not very old as in overseers of congregations more aged and established. It would not be fair to unchristianize an ordinary member because he had faults and blemishes, neither would it be consistent to affirm that a man is not an elder because he is not perfect. But with all due allowance for frailties and imperfections, we are constrained to assert that we have found few scriptural elders. And what shall be said of those called by this hallowed name, who, instead of growing riper, richer, and lovelier in the things of the Lord Jesus, actually advance backward, and become more worldly and less heavenly ?—more churlish, careless, and spiritless ?—more peevish, conceited, cold and formal ?—love the Lord's truth less and human honor and human policy more ? Yes, and if model men—teachers, watchers, guides—be of this stamp, what must be the character of the congregations ? But blessed be the Lord of favor, there were a few names even in Sardis, and there are a few elders in this nineteenth century who know and love, and faithfully perform their obligations before God and their brethren.

D. O.

DR. DUFF IN THE ASSEMBLY, EDINBURGH.

A copy of the New York Spectator is before us, containing a report of the speech of Doctor Duff before the Assembly at Edinburgh, Scotland, after his tour to America. His address was long and strong, and the report of it occupies over five closely printed columns of the Spectator. But we must honor the doctor and his speech by inscribing on the pages of the Christian Banner a few paragraphs. This we do the more cheerfully for the benefit of readers abroad, as there are most erroneous impressions relative to Canada West, of which the doctor speaks. Our country is very generally yet most unfairly associated in the minds of millions with Canada East—a country where snow abounds and popery prevails. There is as much difference between Canada East and Canada West as between Ireland and Scotland—in climate, language, nationality,

religion, social habits, enterprize, education, everything. Perhaps too we have a little prejudice in favor of the doctor's address, because delivered not far from our native town. He says—

[D. O.]

As regards the Eastern States, they are, I say, after all, a great branch of our Aglo-Saxon race,—not like the old stream, which, after ages of gathering and tossing, is now comparatively quiescent, and rolling on with a majestic sweep; but rather the same mighty stream in the rapids. And then, rushing with impetuosity. Westward, and reaching the summits of the Alleghany mountains, down it comes tumbling over into the valley of the Mississippi, like a mighty cataract, stirring humanities,—destined thus for some time to be tossed to and fro, amid reeking vapors and surging billows, till all that is foul and pernicious is precipitated to the bottom; and out it will flow in due time, a noble stream, diffusing the verdure and fertility of truth, and goodness, and righteousness, unto future ages of time. I must now, however, pass into Canada; and, late as is the hour, must say a word or two upon it, however brief. I confess, before going there, I did not adequately understand the nature of the country, though I had read a good deal about it.

When passing from Detroit, for instance, eastward to West Canada and coming suddenly upon a city called London. I thought I had certainly awoke from a dream? What! is this Canada West? It was associated far more in my mind with untilled forests, and all kinds of wild beasts. Passing along these, burst upon me one of those noble views which, in the course of the journey, are to be seen of this city. I said, What is this? London was the reply! It is certainly not so big as the old London; but really it is a striking and noble looking city, with 10,000 inhabitants. It is really most extraordinary to find such a city in the midst of what was the bush; and, what is better still, I subsequently found its inhabitants a noble Christian people; but this is not all, for there are others which come upon you. For example, Hamilton, on Lake Ontario, with a population equal to that of Perth, though only about twenty years ago it had only a few huts. It is as fine a looking city as the Fair city itself, and is surrounded with noble hills and lakes. Then you come to Toronto, Cobourg, Kingston, Montreal, and other cities—in short, you are completely taken by surprise by the magnificent succession of growing cities, with their fine public edifices, and bustling, commercial activities that burst upon the view on all hands.

After paying a high compliment to a work published by Mr. Lillie, on the growth and prosperity of Canada, as throwing more light upon Canada than a thousand other volumes which had been written on the subject, and earnestly recommending that it should be re-published here, for the instruction of our countrymen, the Doctor said, that there was not a nobler territory than this out of Great Britain and the United States, and that Canada West was one of the most promising parts of the British dominions in every respect, with reference to its capabilities and resources, as well as the social comforts, Chris-

tian character, and rapidly expanding intelligence and energies of its inhabitants. It is colonized mainly by British people, with free institutions, of which they have proved themselves in every way worthy. Its growth under every aspect, has been proportionally as rapid as that of the United States, and that is unprecedented in the previous history of the world. Education, as well as agriculture, commerce, and everything else bearing on the improvement of man, are making vast progress; and that being so, let us as a Church especially cherish it.

They have already, I understood when there, sent home money to get out three Presbyterian ministers. In many parts they have already enough of money, and soon will have in all; and their only want will be that of men although they will not long have even that want. Let us cherish that Knox's College of Toronto. It is destined to be a noble institution:—indeed it is so already. They have a fine set of students there under Dr. Willis and his colleagues, of admirable spirit; and they go out in the Summer months and act the part of missionaries amongst the settlers. One is delighted to meet with such fine young men. Let us, I repeat, cherish that college. It is worthy of being cherished, and in a few years you will find you will be saved all trouble in sending out men and money to Canada; nay, the probability is that you will find by and by that your favours and liberalities will be returned to you a hundred fold by a grateful people.

In East or Lower Canada, Popery, as is well known, prevails, though it abounds in Montreal, and elsewhere, with thousands of as noble Protestants as the world contains. Had there been time, I would have availed myself of this opportunity for making a reference to some of the Protestant missionary societies in that province. I meant to have said a word, for example, upon the French Canadian Society, a thoroughly evangelistic and Catholic institution, whose agents labored among the Roman Catholics, and whose constitution was of the most catholic character, so that all could unite in its labors. It was a society eminently worthy of being supported. On the south side of the town at Grand Ligne, there is another mission, which is under the influence of another denomination. Perhaps our Popish committees could not do better than put themselves in communication with the noble men and agents connected with these societies, and thus let us riddle ourselves into one another—and become an empire not only in name, but in action and in brotherly love.

The men who have gone from this country to Canada are noble-hearted men. What a fine specimen have we, for example, in Dr. Burns, of Toronto—a man who has more energy about him than many half-a-dozen young men. He is possessed of the utmost muscular energy and brain energy, and never seems exhausted; and proximity to him would put any hundred idlers quite in motion. His work yonder has been great. I lament that time and strength will not allow me to enlarge on this important theme, but others will, I trust, present themselves; and the republication of Mr. Lillie's work will accomplish much of what I had intended to have done. Only I cannot close without saying, that the cordiality with which my visit

was received by Christians of all evangelic denominations was only a second edition of that experienced in the United States; the enthusiasm of our public meetings the same; while there was a spontaneous manifestation of liberality toward our mission. The Lord has great things yet in store for Canada. Returning once more to the United States, there is one thing in connection with them, and with my visit to them, to which I would like to refer, as of exceeding importance to the cause of Christ.

On the occasion of my first meetings in Philadelphia and New York, the idea originated with some of the noble-minded men with whom I was brought into contact, of having a missionary convention, consisting of individuals interested in all enterprises for the advancement of the cause of Christ, for the purpose of discussing practically all missionary questions. Although the being present at the convention would prevent me from visiting Nova Scotia and New Brunswick,—places which I was most anxious to visit,—yet, as this proposed meeting was the first of the kind that had been held in the states, although it will not be the last, I felt that I could not be absent. Well, then, nearly 300 ministers from all the evangelical denominations were present. Two days, viz: 4th and 5th of May, with two sederunts each day, were spent in discussing the subject for which he had convened. I would to God we could transplant the spirit of that meeting into all meetings of Christians. All met at first in a spirit of trepidation and misgiving, as nobody expected full harmony.

But when these men of all ages and denominations came together and began to speak of Christ's work,—the work of the evangelization of the nations,—it was astonishing what a spirit of love, which really was latent all the while, sprang forward in vivid manifestation among all. One venerable man at the close of the last meeting said, "I never expected to see the like of this. To my mind it is a dawning of the Millennium. I am old, and tottering to the grave; but if such a meeting takes place next year, as I hope will be the case, I shall be there, suppose I should be carried." And so every one felt. Many of the questions we did not undertake, from want of time. All spoke freely as Christian freemen. Differences of judgment on various points there were: but these were expressed in such a tender, loving spirit, that many had their judgments rectified, or enlarged, or confirmed. Each topic being fully discussed, in the end there was a deliverance, upon which all the 300 unanimously concurred:

The meeting was so blessed, that every one said,—“We must have a meeting of the same kind next year—why should we not all be at one in facing a common enemy?” And so it was resolved that a similar meeting, with a similar object, should be held at New York in May next year. One other subject before I conclude. It was with something like fear and trembling that, at the outset of my visitation, allusion was made to the existing state of feeling between that country and our own. I know there had been sores and exasperations on both sides, and it is there as it is in this country. I hold

that the predominant element yonder is a noble Christian element and is every year becoming more so. And we know that it is the predominant element in Great Britain too. Surely should not "like draw like?"

The doctor's closing paragraph is too rich to be omitted :—

Let us then arise, with one heart and one soul, and in union with the whole Christian men in America, in Canada, in England, in Geneva and the Continent; let us pray that we may be melted and fused into one living, burning, glowing mass, and go forth as "Jehovah's sacramental host," carrying the standard of the Great Messiah from one battle-field to another, and unfurling his glorious banner in the assurance that the standard shall not be taken down again, nor the banner of victory furled, until it is found waving upon the citadel of the last of the rebel nations now prostrate at His feet. Ah, then, let us not only pray, but labor with intense, all-consuming devotedness for the speedy coming of the time when

One song employs all nations; and all cry,
Worthy the Lamb, for he was slain for us,
The dwellers in the vales and on the rocks
Shout to each other; and he mounts' tops,
From different mountains, catch the flying joys;
Fill nation after nation taught the strain.—
Earth rolls the rapturous hosanna round.

—Amen, Lord Jesus, come speedily, amen and amen.

SECTARIANISM AND THE WORLD'S CONVERSION.

Sectarism prevents the world's conversion to christianity, by expending the means and labor which the church ought to employ for that purpose in spreading the non-essential theories of different sects. If all the people in the world were converted to the Presbyterian religion, the Methodist sect, to be consistent would be compelled to convert it over again to Wesleyanism, and the Baptist in turn to Baptistism, and so each sect must traverse the whole field of society, one after another, instead of having one Church to conquer for Christ only. To build parallel canals through the same valley, or parallel roads within a few feet of each other, or half a dozen parallel lines of fence, along one line of a man's farm, would be a foolish waste. Especially would this be true, if the canals or roads, or fences, differed in nothing essential, being varied in style only. But this is exactly analagous to what the sects are doing in religion. Four canals where one can do all the business, is not so foolish, as four meeting houses where one will hold all the people. Four school masters in a place where one could do all the work, would be not only useless, but a positive evil. And why are not four preachers, where one can reach much better all the people, a burden not to be borne. Men would not commit this great folly in reference to any thing else except religion.—The school masters cannot make the world believe that it is necessary to support four times as many of them as it needs. Preachers only are able thus to befool the world, and saddle themselves upon society. It would be impossible to make a sane man believe it best to hire four plow-men, to follow each other essentially the same

furrow over his whole farm, while one would do the plowing much better especially if the four quarrelled so much as not to do the work of one. But the difference between the furrow cut by the religious plow in the hands of the four sects, is no way essential, only for the support of the quarrelling plowmen. It is a very patient public which pays for all this folly.—*Christian and Citizen.*

REMARKS.

The above short and pithy article from the "Christian and Citizen," though somewhat unique in style and imagery, is, nevertheless, a well drawn picture of one particular aspect of sectarianism, a cogent argument against the foolish, and worse than useless expenditure of time, talent and money, for the support of party tenets; and one which, in my humble opinion, the advocates of sectarian theories will find difficult to answer.

The writer of this sketch calls the peculiarities which distinguish one sect from another "non-essential theories." This is right—right in reason—right in revelation, and right by universal concession; for there is not a sect in protestant Christendom but will acknowledge the Christianity of other sects. Indeed, so common is it for sectarians of every denomination to award to other protestant sects the same right to the epithet Christian which they claim for themselves, that the man or woman who presumes to call it in question is at once charged with being "uncharitable."

Thus we see that all the religious denominations are by sectarians regarded as Christians. This is a point universally acknowledged. But what does this universal concession amount to but a *bona fide* acknowledgment on the part of every sectarian that their denominational peculiarities—that is—the *things* in their respective system which distinguish them from each other, and which make parties of them, are non-essential?

Whether sectarian religionists make this concession intentionally, which, by the way, is so fatal to the consistency of their practice in keeping up these party walls, or whether they do it inadvertently, is a question not now to be answered, but certain it is that whenever they do admit that there are Christians in all parties, whether they intend it or not, they concede at once that the distinguishing peculiarities of any one sect are not essential to Christianity. For example:

When a Presbyterian admits that a Methodist is a Christian, he acknowledges that a man can be a Christian without being a Presbyterian, and hence, that the peculiarities of *Presbyterianism* are not essential to Christianity; and *vice versa*—When a Methodist admits that a Presbyterian is a Christian he acknowledges that a man can

be a Christian without being a Methodist, and per consequence, the distinguishing peculiarities of *Methodism* are not essential to Christianity. So with the Episcopalians and Congregationalists. Let an Episcopalian acknowledge the Christianity of a Congregationalist and he is logically compelled to acknowledge, also, non-essentiality of those peculiar tenets called *Episcopalianism*, forasmuch as man can be a Christian without them. On the other hand: Let the Congregationalist grant that his brother Episcopalian is a genuine Christian, and what argument has he left by which to support the essentiality of those peculiar and distinguishing tenets known as Congregationalism, which are not essential to Christianity, but, on the contrary, a positive evil, inasmuch as they erect a party wall between those who acknowledge each other as Christians.

Now, if these party walls which divide Christendom into several hundred conflicting sects, and which alienate the affections of those who profess to be followers of that Jesus who prayed that his people might be *one*, are built up of *non-essentials*, and we have shown by their own universal admission that they are, is it not the indispensable duty of every sect to break down these party walls as soon as possible? Does not the honor of that cause for which the Saviour spilt his blood demand it? Does not the present condition of the unconverted world call loudly for it?

Candid reader! Is it not a truth that these non-essential sectarian peculiarities constitute the most formidable barrier to the world's conversion? The world with eagle-eye is looking on, and scrutinizing the conduct of those who profess Christianity; and what, think you, will be their opinion of that religion, which, instead of uniting and cementing all of its professors in *one grand body*, animated by one spirit, having the one Lord, the one faith, and the one baptism, divides them into hundreds of sects and parties, which in many instances have no more affinity for each other than had the Jews and Samaritans in the time of Christ? Will they not say, we do not want such a religion as this? A religion which alienates men's affections from each other—which creates hostile parties that are constantly warring and contending—no—we do not want such a religion—if you have nothing better to offer us, we will stay where we are.

Do you not see, my honest sectarian friend, that this state of things has brought Christianity into disrepute—that it has dishonored and degraded that holy religion for which the Lord of Glory died, and oh!—shall I say it?—yes,—and say the truth too, it has render-

ed it *odious and contemptible* in the eyes of the unbelieving world—it has made infidels—yes,—as strange as this may appear to some *it has made infidels*; and whether you believe it or not the world never will be converted to Christianity till these sectarian peculiarities are thrown away, and all who profess the holy religion of Jesus are *one* as they were in primitive times. Then—and only then will the last yearning prayer of the Saviour be realized:

Neither pray I for these alone, but for all those who shall believe on me through their word. That they may be one, as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they may be one in us: That the world may believe that thou hast sent me. Jno. xvii. 20. 21.

W. W. C.

Auburn.

MR. WALKER AGAIN.

MR. D. OLIPHANT:—DEAR SIR:—I thank you kindly for the extra No. of the Christian Banner you sent me. In reading your reply to my letter I am sorry to find that we are rather diverging than converging. You charge me with making distinctions in the facts of divine truth; and I must charge you with confounding things which differ, and for narrowing the point of scripture vision—in order to build up your ecclesiastical distinction. You seem to be wise as a serpent. You know that as long as you can keep the facts of truth in one bundle that your wall is safe.—What are facts without the principles of love and charity? What are the fagots without the cord? What is form without power? “Now abideth faith, hope, charity; these three, but the greatest of these is charity.”

1. You charge me with separating the kingdom of Christ and the body of Christ, viewing his subjects and his members as two sorts of people. Jesus likens the kingdom of heaven to wheat and tares sowed in a field, Matt. xiii. 24—30. Again, to a net cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind. And answering that inquiry of Peter. How often shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him?—I say not till seven times but until seventy times seven. In these parables and others, our Lord uses the term kingdom of heaven. In his explanation of the first, we read, “The son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity;” and in those of the net and the ten virgins, we find different qualities. Where Christ makes distinctions so ought we. It is said of the Jews, they are not all Israel who are of Israel; yet Jehovah calls himself their God, King, Father, Saviour, Husband, Shepherd. The Bible declares that he created, begat, redeemed, saved, planted, preserved them—that they were his congregation, his church, his house, his inheritance. But as a whole they were only a symbol of that glorious church which those exalted terms indicated. Nor was the primitive christian

church but a nearer approximation toward it. That glorious church without spot or wrinkle is still in the future. When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. You quote Rom. xiv. 17, and desire me to settle it with Paul: The kingdom of God is righteousness, &c. The Pharisees asked Jesus when the kingdom of God should come? His answer was, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, lo here! or lo there! for behold the kingdom of God is within you." Here the Head of the Church tells us of an internal, an unobserved kingdom. Beware of what you are doing, Mr. O.

2. You assert that baptism is spiritual. True, Paul says to the Corinthians "I would not have you ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink,—for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." But we must attend to the acknowledged laws of interpretation and not confound the truth with the truth symbolized. "In all symbolical propositions, the persons of the substantive verb, as 'I am, thou art, is, are,' whether expressed or understood, are the copulation shewing the relations between the type and antitype. Thus in Gen. xv. 12, 'the three branches are three days,' instead of the three branches *signify* three days." In Luke viii. 11; the seed is the word of God, instead of, by the seed is meant the word of God. "In symbolical rites it is usual to ascribe an effect to the symbolical rites it is usual to ascribe an effect to the symbol or type, by which the antitype was represented, as if the symbol or type were the efficient cause." "Thus Moses smote the waters of the Egyptian river, as if he gave a wound, to turn them to blood." In looking for the cause of this wonderful result, the mind is not satisfied with the potent rod and stroke of Moses; it seeks the energy of a present God. So in baptism. Paul says, Rom. vi. 3-5, "know ye not, that so many of us, (Note this, Mr. Oliphant, he does not say *all*.) as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death; therefore we are buried with him in baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." What is the great spiritual truth the apostle is here teaching? Is it not sanctification? And are we not taught here to look through the symbol, baptism, to that divine energy which raised our Lord from the dead? Paul makes use of another figure to illustrate this truth. "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed; that henceforth we should not serve sin."

The apostle Peter distinguishes between the type and antitype baptism: "The ark, wherein few (that is, eight souls) were saved by water—the antitype baptism does also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Here the apos-

he teaches that the baptism that saves, is the antitype. "A quoi aussi répond maintenant, comme à une figure, le butème quoi nous sauve ; non pas celui qui nettoie les ordures du corps." The word antitype is Greek ; Dr. McKnight renders the passage thus : " By which (water) the antitype baptism (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) now saves us also, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." He remarks that the Greek relative which is translated *wherein*, is in the neuter gender, and as the Greek word which is rendered *Ark*, is not neuter, but the word which answers to water is neuter, therefore water is the type of baptism. But that would destroy the antithesis of the whole passage ; and that rule has an exception, viz : "A relative between two antecedents of different genders, may agree with either, as, 'to thy seed, which is Christ.'"

In following Paul through all his circuit, Luke does not inform me, of his converts being baptized, but at Philippi, Corinth, and Ephesus. True, I find Paul labouring "at Antioch, at Salamis, at Paphos, at Perga, at Lystra, at Derbe, at Athens," but not baptizing, nor commanding to baptize. So I believe Paul told the truth when he said he was not sent to baptize. The passage you quoted to weaken the force of the negative side of Paul's commission, is not a parallel case : for I do not find, in the divine book, one affirmative or imperative sentence respecting baptism from the lips of our apostle. Take care, Mr. O.—what can be your object in referring to those eight places, as proof of Paul's baptizing, when the subject is only mentioned at one of them ? Are you turned ventriloquist ? You tell me to "keep perfectly cool" and to "take better aim." The former I heartily cede to—the latter is difficult. The one time you are all fact, all flesh, blood, and bones.—the next you are all spirit. You assert that any one may baptize, if not lame or physically weak. But can you prove from the divine word by precept or example, that any one baptized but an evangelist.

I proved by three divine witnesses that the gospel of the circumcision was fulfilled, in as far as it was peculiar to the Jews, within sixty years from the time it was given. You call this "a magic wand." This will not do, Mr. Oliphant. Mere assertions wont pass at par, unless with your admirers. Man wont tolerate such logic any longer. What Mr. O. says is truth Mr. O. says so and so, therefore it is so. "But we must not forget the starting point."

3. "Our plea is beyond all contradiction, the only one that will ever prove successful in effecting a universal Christian union, because we are endeavoring to recover the ancient, the original order of faith and practice, as taught by Christ and the apostles, and practised by the first Christians." 1. It is not so.—because it differs from Paul's plea : The foundation of the apostles and prophets. The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. 2. It is not so—because it excludes all the rich unfulfilled prophecies and promises of the Old, and all the subsequent promises of God through the apostles and prophets which are ready to burst on our globe in glorious development. 3. It is not so—because the apostles and primitive evangelists proved and illustrated their doctrines from the old Testament, which, as

I understand, you do not admit either *pro* or *con*. "Think not," says our Saviour, that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." And when he taught his disciples the things pertaining to his kingdom, he opened to them the scriptures: "and beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." Thus he taught the apostles the things pertaining to the gospel dispensation. In their proclamations of the gospel, as recorded in the Acts, we find them confirming or proving their doctrine from the prophets. We find the same practice in their letters, in which they expressly declare that those scriptures were written for the benefit of the Christian as well as that of the Jew. Paul, after quoting a passage from the Old Testament, adds, "For whatsoever things were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." 4 It is not so—because it differs from our apostle on justification by faith. He teaches that we are justified by faith, simply by believing in Christ, and not by obedience of any law. "If there had been a law given that could have given life, verily righteousness would have been by the law."

Now, Mr. Oliphant, I understand you to say that baptism is such a law, that disciples are saved or justified by obedience to that law. Paul argues that the law demands perfect obedience, and as all men have sinned, therefore no man can be justified by the law.—He proves this by selecting those passages from the Old Testament which prove the general sinfulness of man. "There is none righteous &c." Our apostle considers that as the Bible asserts man to be a sinner—that proves that he can never be justified by obedience to that law which demands perfection. Your contrast between baptism and the forbidden fruit, is proved to be unsound, unscriptural. Man cannot be saved by obedience,—he must be saved first—then raised up to obedience. Paul also selects those passages from the Bible which affirm that man's acceptance with God is by grace,—as what they do not deserve, a free gift, a free favor. Hence, he refers to the language of David, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered." He further teaches that the way of justification without works, was witnessed by the law and the prophets. The two ways of justification or acceptance with God, the one by works, the other by a propitiation for sin, are inconsistent. And as the Bible teaches the latter way, it denies the former. But it expressly asserts that the just shall live by faith. The law spurns at faith, and says, The man that does its demands shall live by it: it refuses everything but perfect obedience as the ground of acceptance. If the Bible says we are accepted through faith, it says we are not accepted on the ground of obedience. To illustrate the point Paul refers to the case of Abraham, and asks, Was he justified by Works? He answers no. The Bible clearly asserts that Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for ours also, to whom it shall be imputed if we believe on him that raised up our Lord Jesus from the dead, who was delivered for our offences and was raised again

for our justification. 5. It is not so—because it is predicated upon the assumption that all prophecies have been fulfilled, and that nothing subsequent has been revealed; and until these propositions can be proved, the propagators of your theory occupy the position of those in the beginning of the gospel dispensation who maintained that the believing Gentiles should be circumcised and obey the facts of the Jewish dispensation. 6. It is not so—because such a retrogression is an anomaly on the history of the past, first, as it respects God whose perfect conceptions prevent the necessity of his works being done over again: and is it so that the Anglo Saxon race is inferior to every other? When Jesus appeared to fulfil the promise to Jerusalem, did he proceed to re-organize the carnal economy or infuse new life into its crumbling ecclesiasticism? Did he not rather endeavor to turn the attention of his followers to a new and spiritual church? Mr. Oliphant once said he had only one life to live—did he not mean that he would have but one physical organization here? Does he not believe there is another new-born man within him, destined to grow up within him which shall develop the divine nature until he arrive at the perfect stature of his Master or pattern, who is Christ? Does he not hope to rise again and have a new organization, a spiritual body, not like the old, but like Christ glorious body? The Prince of Peace ever opposed himself to a spirit of ecclesiastical elevation. It is a smoke in his nostrils, a continual burning. I am left alone," says one, "and they seek my life." To which God answers, "I have reserved to myself seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to Baal's image." He approved of the good Samaritan and justified the humble publican, in preference to the priest, the Levite, and the Pharisee.

Yours respectfully,

Cayuga, May 27th.

CHAS. WALKER.

A FEW WORDS TO FRIEND WALKER.

MY CHRISTIAN FRIEND:—A preacher once chose for his text the words in Genesis, "Adam, where art thou?"—and his first head in dealing with the text, was, "All men are somewhere." Agreeably to this sound theology, it is taken for granted that you are religiously somewhere, although your exact latitude and longitude has not been discovered in this meridian.

Friend Walker, you did not perceive, that in offering six reasons against our plea of union, your artillery pointed as much at the apostles as at "Mr. Oliphant" and his brethren teachers. For we first carefully inquire and faithfully ascertain how they united Jew and Gentile, bond and free, upon the "rock of our salvation," and then take our lessons from them; working by the pattern they have left us. This, at least, is our design.

We have no plea of our own. Too many make a plea—a creed

—a new foundation—and form a party thereon. And even my excellent friend Walker, while earnestly maintaining a purely spiritual gospel *through one apostle*, appears happy in attempting to splice something to it as old as Moses, Elijah, or Jeremiah! And while finding the whole gospel through *one apostle*, it is somewhat amusing to find the grave and good Mr. Walker rapping me over the knuckles for not including the old law, the old prophets, and the unfulfilled prophecies as a *basis* of gospel union! It strikes me that there must either be two Mr. Charles Walkers in Cayuga, or else Mr. Walker is here fighting Mr. Walker; and if it be the latter, it may be courteous in me meanwhile to halt a little and see how friend Walker will treat himself.

I will however pay my respects to two or three of your six reasons against what we understand to be the faith and practice which saved and united all the followers of the Lord Jesus originally or primitively:—

Your first objection is that our plea differs from Paul's plea. As this is simply an assertion, unaccompanied with an attempt at proof it will be genteel to let it pass as such. I am pleased however that you make Paul's plea, not only his own, but that of the apostles and prophets. Do I understand you therefore to give up the imaginary commission you have given *one* apostle? Keep Christ the Head, and his apostles and prophets together, and Mr. Walker and Mr. Oliphant will walk arm and arm with them.

The second objection you urge, is, that in offering what we regard the apostolic basis of union, we exclude the prophecies of the old dispensation, and the prophecies and promises uttered by apostles and christian prophets. Brother Walker, you have sharp glasses to make such a discovery. I have always believed that the divine temple, resting upon its own basis, contained everything that belonged to it; and certainly all the promises as well as all the prophecies "are yea and amen in Christ Jesus."

Your next objection starts out with this language,—“the apostles and primitive evangelists proved and illustrated their doctrines from the Old Testament.”

Agreed: and if so, we have all the Old Testament proofs and illustrations connected with the divine basis in the labours of these apostles and evangelists!! Do you not see, my friend, that if the primitive workman summoned Moses, Isaiah, David and Daniel as prophetic witnesses for Jesus, that in accepting of the labours of these inspired proclaimers we have *all* the old documentary evidence

on which they relied ? Why object to making them the judges and the measure of what should be taken from the old dispensation to prove the better things of the new ? Thus, too, we will not confound, mix up, and jumble into perpetual confusion what is abrogated and what is now in force.

I will close with your fourth objection—justification by faith, or “ simply believing in Christ, and not by obedience of any law.” Justification by faith is a very healthy and charming doctrine ; but neither the self-righteous Jews, nor the students under the Pope, nor many of our proud and self-glorifying Protestants understand it. No one is justified by works. No man is justified by “ the law.” Gospel baptism is not a law. The supper of the Lord is not a law. Prayer is not a law. Repentance is not a law. The ordinance of baptism is as much the object of faith as the author of it.” Faith in Christ is not only a reliance that there was and is such a person, but faith in him is full reliance in all that he did and said—in all that he uttered and enjoined. If any one will prove his faith in Christ by neglecting his authority, or by disobeying him, he only proves that he is not possessed of the faith of the gospel. Noah was saved by faith ; but by faith he *built* an ark—by faith he *entered* it—by faith he *rode upon* the raging waters—and by faith he *remained* in the ark until the destruction of the old world was complete. Thus was he saved by faith—not by faith alone ; for the ark was exceedingly useful to him ; and the faithful patriarch built it. Or if you please God built it by employing Noah to build it ! Adam fell by unbelief which practically opposed God’s authority. Man is raised again by faith which takes hold and keeps hold of God’s authority. This is not making obedience a mere affair of law, but it is making the grace of God quite sufficient for us in all the appointments ordained of God.

Even friend Walker is against friend Walker on the question of faith alone : for you speak of justification by the great propitiation ; and hence while arguing justification by faith you think it not inconsistent to maintain justification by grace and by the great sacrifice ! Whenever you reconcile yourself to yourself in holding that these three issue in the one salvation or justification, I will be ready to show, by the Divine Book, that we are saved by his blood, saved by the gospel, saved by preaching, saved by believing, saved by repentance, saved by baptism, saved by hope, saved by observing all things enjoined by Jesus the Saviour.

Do I understand you to put the kingdom of heaven within every spiritual man, and then the angels to be sent forth to enter every

believer, to gather out of him all things that offend? And I do apprehend you as teaching that only a portion of the believers at Rome in Paul's time were buried with Christ into his death and planted together in the likeness of his death and raised to the new life?

Facts, you intimate, are worthless without love. Quite true. Now, if you will point to a divine fact that is not full of divine love—or if you will point me to one iota of God's love that is not developed by fact—I will send you a box of new pens with which to write a volume on the discovery.

Brother! it is a waste of ammunition to scatter our shot over all creation,—here are a few queries which will, if you please, bring us into close quarters at once:

1. Do you gather from the scriptures that in the primitive age the believers in Christ were all united?

2. If they were not united, in what consisted the disagreement?

3. If united, what were they united upon?

Believing you to be an honest and a good man.

I am Yours,

D. OLIPHANT.

July, 1854.

A CRITICISM ON BAPTIZO.

May 24th, 1854

BROTHER OLIPHANT:—I was called upon a short time ago to respond to a discourse on the action of baptism delivered by a Presbyterian preacher to which response he was honest enough to give a hearing. I gave him the privilege of defending himself and his doctrine in several short speeches alternately with myself. I do not write on account of any intrinsic importance attaching to this but for the sake of a philo-logical principle which I think was settled to the satisfaction of the audience if not of the gentleman himself.

When I confronted him and the people with a number of open Greek Dictionaries all proving that *baptizo* means *primarily* "to dip, plunge, immerse, overwhelm," he fairly confessed that I was right in saying this was its *primary* meaning but sheltered himself under cover of its other, and secondary significations and stoutly proclaimed me to be in error when I contended for an *exclusive* use of the *primary* meaning in administering the ordinance. The word *had secondary* meanings by my own concession and why wholly disregard them in baptizing? Here was the tug and to me rather a new shift in defense of washing, tinging, wetting, soaking &c. But it was very plain that upon the decision of this point turned the whole argument.

Must a positive ordinance be obeyed *always* in the primary signification of the term? I affirmed it. In illustration we referred to one or two other words containing commands. When the Saviour insti-

tuted the Supper he said "Eat ye all of it;" and "Drink ye all of it." The words *eat* and *drink* like all others have their *primary* and *secondary* meanings. To eat is not only to *masticate*, but also to *corrode*. "Their word will eat as doth a canker," that is their words are corroding words, this is its secondary sense. Look at *esthia* in any Greek Dictionary and you will find it means both "to eat" and "to corrode."

Again look at *pino*, to drink, primarily, but secondary it means "to soak." The earth *drinketh* in the rain" that is soaks it in. Now are we at liberty to abandon the literal sense of the terms *eat* and *drink* for the figurative? They certainly may with equal propriety. If they wish sometimes to immerse and sometimes to wet or tinge because baptizo means all these, why not sometimes eat the bread and drink the wine as others do, and at other times corrode the bread somehow and soak in the wine? But no they invariably eat and drink in the plain literal sense of these words. Why not permit some of our members to eat the bread and some to corrode it according as each one thinks right, for why be so uncharitable and exclusive as to deny that a man commemorates the Lord's death by corroding the bread just as well as by eating it if the heart is only right. What is the difference about the form? Surely the Saviour cared but little how we use the wine, whether we drink or soak it. If brother A likes best drink it it is all right for him, but if brother B prefers soaking we will so administer it to him and all will be suited.

I am not aiming at a mere caricature of sprinkling, but aver in solemn earnestness that this is the ridiculous position occupied by able rantists in taking the secondary meaning of baptizo instead of adhering immovably to its primary sense. Nor is it possible to dodge the blow by saying that common sense would teach us that we cannot take the supper in the secondary sense of the words eat and drink, for common sense (a very uncommon thing) ought also to teach us that we could never be buried by sprinkling, nor be born of the few rinsing drops just fallen from the preacher's hand.

I have not had leisure for examining the subject thoroughly but I am almost moved to affirm that every positive ordinance, Jewish and Christian, must be invariably obeyed in the *primary* meaning of the terms expressing such ordinance, and that to obey in the secondary sense will always be prolific of absurdity. What says Brother Oliphant?

EVANGELICUS.

A BUDGET FROM OKOLONA, MISSISSIPPI.

DEAR BROTHER:—The truth is Omnipotent, and will prevail.

I am very desirous that your Periodical should circulate extensively through the floral South. It has nerve pith and lucidity.

Through it I want to extend the right ~~ES~~ of fellowship to its Editor, and brother Sillars. God loves the brave and daring champion of truth. The dastardly paltroon he hates.

Too many of our public teachers are carried away by the thrilling gratifications of large accessions during great excitements; the settling the churches in order, admonishing the short comings of half converted brethren, and building up the sincere in Zion, is a business too dampning to the ardor of these Fisherites, or Boanerges. They loath the discipline of the Church, as a work too cold, too formal, too plodding for their Vesuvius spirits,

Dear brother Oliphant, speak kindly, boldly, truthfully to the brother-hood. Do compose one discourse, on some vital topic in the Science of Heaven for the pages of each number of the Banner. There are thousands who are mere Catechumens in first principles—desirous to learn, but their teachers have become abashed at teaching the incipient lessons—and have dashed off into the higher branches.

This rushing pupils, too rapidly, through their primary books is not the best mode of making scholars.

[We sent vol. 7 to our friend and brother Butler, and he remarks, after various introductory sentences—as follows :—D. O.]

Your Essays on Universalism (that fungus production of the enthused brain of Hosea Balon) should be gathered up, that “nothing be lost,” and sent abroad to the four Cardinal points, in pamphlet. The work throughout is stamped with the urbanity, scholarship, and logical acumen, of its Editors. And each essay is odoriferous of the midnight lamp.

Brother Oliphant asked concerning the Church statistics in the floral South.

In 1834, I opened as the first, and for the first time, the Bible in in defense of the Old Jerusalem doctrine.

In, 1843, I left Alabama for Mississippi, leaving in Alabama, about 2500 brethren. My co-labourers, mainly were the lamented A. Graham—the beloved E. A. Smith—the logical and cogent Jas. C. Anderson &c. At this time the State numbers about 5000.

P. B. Lawson, and Pinkerton are prominent labourers. The cause is onward in Alabama.

Mississippi numbers 7,000 brethren. The prominent labourers are W. M. Brown, of Illinois; B. F. Manier, of Tenesee; W. Baxter, of Pennsylvania. The urbane, grave, and learned William Clark, of Jackson, has stereotyped his name upon the age. And many other active men are employed in planting the flagstaff of eternal life, on the soil dedicated to cotton-growing.

We have many substantial Church buildings throughout the South, ranging in cost from \$800 to 7,000.

Touching periodicals of the Reformation—South Carolina: Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tenesee call loudly and aloud for a well edited vehicle. O brother Oliphant, come to Aberdeen, the chances to do good are world-wide.

We had a periodical in Nashville, Tenesee. It became *elated, inflated* and exploded: conferring its fumigations and smoke pretty much to the city! Did you read of the Methodist preacher's bad philology? He prayed fervently to the Lord to dispense with the gospel

throughout the whole world. We dispensed with the Nashville medium;—The "Magazine" throughout the South.

We could sustain an able paper in Aberdeen.

There is no point more inviting upon this green globe. Who will come? The brethren generally are wealthy, and have untied their purse-strings freely to support evangelists, and surely they would not refuse to patronize talent and solid literature. We need a paper. How is it with brother Oliphant? Is he rived to the ice begirded land? Or could he be induced to come to our sunny land.

"Soil of the South! with may born flowers,
Thy glowing breast is decked—
While branching trees and wreathing bowers,
Their vernal bloom protect.

Soil of the South! to thee is given
Fruitage and florige fair—
To thee the Sun and dew of Heaven,
Their kindest offerings bear.

Soil of the South! in glory bloom,
Green be thy fields and bowers—
And each returning May illumine
Still fairer fruits and flowers"

In hope of eternal life,

JAS. A. BUTLER.

1st, June, 1854.

MEETING IN JUNE AND VARIOUS REPORTS.

Everton, 4th July, 1854.

MR. EDITOR—DEAR BROTHER—I am requested by the co-operation to forward to you the following documents for publication in the Christian Banner:—

Jordan, 16th June, 1854,—The delegates from the different churches forming the provincial co-operation having met, brother John Doyle was called to the chair and brother Jas. Mitchell was appointed secretary. After prayer the committee of management presented their report which was read, and after some conversation relative to its contents it was resolved, 1st, That the report of the committee be received; 2nd, That the report of the treasurer be read; report read, and resolved 3d. That the report now read be adopted; 4th, That the present provincial co-operation be continued; 5th, That the committee of management be continued as last year, substituting the name of brother J. Black in place of brother Alexander Adams.—Several of the churches through their delegates presented reports, showing the state of said churches. Resolved 6th, That the reports of the Board, of the treasurer, and the different churches, be forwarded to the Banner for publication. 7th, Resolved that the next annual meeting be held in Wainfleet, commencing on the 3d Friday in June.

REPORTS FROM THE CHURCHES.

South Dorchester:—present number 49; added during the year

4; removed 3; died 2; expelled none. R. Bentley and P. Mc Neil, Elders; John Lutton and John McLaughlin, Deacons; E. Sheppard Evangelist.

Rainham:—present number 39; by baptism 2; withdrawn 3. A. Overholt and L. Yager, Elders; A. Holmes and B. Culp, Deacons.

Jordan:—present number 67; added 1; excluded 2; W. Bradt and J. Simmons, Elders—the former migrated recently; D. Crow and J. Snure, Deacons.

Eramasa Centre:—present number 70; removed 2; excluded 1; died 1. J. Kilgour, A. Anderson, and David Stewart, Presidents; J. Morton, W. Abbott, and J. Mitchell, Deacons.

Eramosa West:—present number 24. L. Parkinson, and R. Koyce, Presidents; H. Tolton, Deacon.

Eramosa East:—present number 47; Jas. Black, Elder; J. Stewart, Deacon.

Erin:—present number 139; by baptism 8; removed 9; excluded 1. H. McMillen, C. McMillen, A. McMillen, and D. Thompson, Presidents; P. Thompson, L. McKinnon, and Collin McMillen Deacons.

Esquesing:—present number 24; added by baptism 4; by letter 1; gone back into the world 2. J. Menzies, Elder; Jas. Menzies and Peter Laird, Deacons.

Oshawa:—present number 60; by baptism 3: W. McGill and J. Ash, Elders; M. Luke and A. Burke, Deacons.

Bowmanville:—present number 45;—Ira Van Camp, W. H. Gaud, and C. J. Lister, Elders; Samuel McMurtry and D. D. Williams, Deacons,

JAMES MITCHEL.

Secretary.

N B—The year is reckoned from June to June. The reports from the churches are very different, as some did not present any, and others were handed in after the meeting and have got mislaid. But we trust that we will all be better prepared in this interesting part of the business by next year, the Lord willing.

J. M.

To the Churches of Jesus Christ, co-operating in Proclaiming the Gospel throughout Canada West;

The committee of management would beg leave to present their annual Report:

BELOVED BRETHREN:—In presenting an account of their proceedings during the year now past, your committee have, as on previous similar occasions, to express deep regret that so little has been done. But while they freely confess that little or nothing has been done, they cannot feel condemned for excessive indifference to the trust committed by the brethren to their care. They have felt that the eyes of the brethren were upon them or rather that the eyes of the Lord were upon them; that the Churches were willing and able to sustain those who would devote themselves to the ministry of the word under the present system of co-operation, and that the necessity for

the labours of faithful ministers was great; therefore their efforts to realize the reasonable expectations of the brethren have been unremitted.

Meeting after meeting of your committee has been held, to ascertain if any means of forwarding the object of the co-operation had been discovered, and still the question "what can be done" has been left unsolved, your committee still continuing to hope that at their next meeting something more encouraging would be developed. So earnest was the desire that the contributions of the brethren should be profitably employed, that it was considered expedient to appropriate them in aid of the Grande Ligne Mission or "the Bible union," rather than allow them to remain idle in the Treasury, but all such suggestions were overruled, on the ground that the funds of the Churches should be held sacred to the special object for which they were contributed.

Realizing in years past, the difficulty of procuring acceptable ministers to travel and labor as desired by the churches, your committee in their last annual report, suggested to the brethren the propriety of revising the present system of employing Evangelists, with the view to ascertain whether or not it was practicable to adopt a more efficient and scriptural method. The subject was too large and important to be disposed of by the brethren in the few hours at their command at the annual meeting, and was therefore postponed to a more CONVENIENT SEASON. Again the subject was brought to notice in the pages of the "Christian Banner" and again left untouched.

In the absence therefore of further instructions, your committee realized it to be their duty to execute to the extent of their ability, the previously understood wishes of the brotherhood. After an earnest and faithful endeavour for a period of three years to carry into successful practice the views of the co-operation, your committee conclude that it is now due to themselves, and to the cause of Christ to state, that they find those views to be impracticable to secure the many and great advantages which a general co-operation of the Churches seemed to promise, your committee having perseveringly struggled to overcome the obstacles with which they have been beset. But experience has fully satisfied them that a farther attempt on their part to carry out the system hitherto pursued might only as heretofore prove unsuccessful. Already the feeling is gaining ground, that it is better for each brother to appropriate his contributions to the Lord's cause with his own hands, than to forward them to those who cannot employ them, and it is reasonable to conclude that unless some more practicable and acceptable system of expending the collected funds of brethren be adopted, this feeling will increase until union or co-operation be esteemed of little value.

Under these circumstances your committee would briefly refer to the principal difficulties, which have prevented them from accomplishing that amount of good they desired, viz: 1st, The extent and diversity of labor rendered it difficult to obtain laborers that would be useful and acceptable in all places. 2nd, The system of employing laborers for a limited time and then leaving them to resume their secular callings. 3rd, The extent of country to be hastily travelled

by the Evangelists, and the length of time they require to be absent from their families. These produced a 4th and standing difficulty, viz: an impossibility to procure under such circumstances suitable laborers.

Brethren, "let us not however be weary in well-doing; for in due time we shall reap if we faint not." Most assuredly the kingdom of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and unless we be diligent in holding forth the word of life, he will accomplish his purposes by others, and shame and confusion will be ours.

All which is respectfully submitted.

L. PARKINSON,
Chairman.

Eramosa, June 11th, 1854.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

New Albany, June 20th, 1854.

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT:—May grace, mercy, and peace be multiplied unto you. The Christian Banner continued a regular and welcome visitor in our family; and enclosed you will find which you will please to place to my credit to aid in keeping it waving on the breeze. We are all in usual health at present and hope you and yours are in possession of the same blessing. Brother Lamphear was with us last Lord's day week; he preaches the fourth of his time for us; and your humble servant the balance—How are matters moving off in Canada West? Having but little time to write I must conclude by subscribing myself your brother in the hope of immortality.

GEORGE POW.

Gratified to hear from brethren Pow and Lamphear.—The principal news of what we are doing in this territory, brother Pow, you have forwarded to you from month to month in the Banner. Christian love to the brethren in Albany, not forgetting friend Lamphear.

D. O.

EVANGELISTS' FUND—THE TREASURY.

Eramosa, 20th July, 1854.

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT:—For the information of the brethren I transmit for publication in the "Banner" and account of the receipts and disbursements of the provincial Board of the churches of Christian Disciples, forming the co-operation for the spread of the gospel in Canada West, from June 1853 to June 1854 inclusive.

THE TREASURER IN ACCOUNT:

June 15th, 1853, cash in hand at date	822. 5
Received from church in Rainham	44. 50
" " Dorchester	10.
" " Wainfleet	38. 50
" " Esquesing	26.

"	"	Toronto city	\$80.
"	"	King	10.
"	"	Packering	23.
"	"	Oshawa	20.
"	"	Bowmanville	13.
"	"	Darlington	11.
"	"	Owen Sound	24.
"	"	Eramosa West	27.
"	"	Cramosa Centre	50. 50
"	"	Eramosa East	24.
"	"	Erin	108.
"	"	a friend per J. Mitchell	5.
"	"	"	3. 20
			\$539. 75

MONIES PAID

By order of the Board from June 1853 to June 1854.

Paid to brother James Black	\$12.
" " E Sheppard	79.
" " D. Oliphant	5.
" " Sullius Stevens	5.
" " A. Anderson	40
" " T. J. Crow	30.
" " J. Mitchell	15.
" " J. Kilgour	79. 35
" " Balance in hand	273. 40

Total.....\$539. 75

Since the accounts have been added up, I have received monies from Jordan and Pickering through brethren Snure and Black, which amounts have been placed to their credit and will appear in the published accounts in their proper place.

Beloved friends, the cause we are engaged in, is worthy of our noblest efforts. Let us work while it is called to-day.

All of which is respectfully submitted by your brother in the hope that maketh not ashamed.

R. ROYCE,
Treasurer.

STRINGENT CHARITY—It is the common boast of our Wesleyan friends that they never interfere with other denominations. Here is a sentence as an illustration of how the boast agrees with facts.—“It is surpassingly strange and unaccountable how reluctant some of our Protestant brethren are to believe that Popery is in reality what it professes to be—the enemy of religion and morality, humanity and justice.” And this writer, who is giving the public a series of letters through the *Guardian*, tells us every time he writes that “the more priests the more crime.”

D O.