

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

CHRISTIAN BANNER.

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

VOL. IX.

COBOURG & BRIGHTON, AUGUST, 1855.

NO. 8.

JOHN BUNYAN--A SKETCH.

For the Christian Banner.

"To the names of Baxter and Howe must be added the name of a man far below them in station, and in acquired knowledge, but in virtue their equal, and in genius, their superior, John Bunyan."—*Macaulay*.

John Bunyan, the son of a poor tinker, in his boyhood was taught to read and write very imperfectly. In his youth a blasphemer, "cursing and swearing above his fellows," "taking pleasure in the vileness of his companions"—now and then checked and impressed by Providential occurrences—after long and intense struggles, became the most like an apostle in earnestness, in suffering, in self-devotedness; in faith, and in the joyful and ecstatic hope of heaven, of any who have lived on earth since the days of primitive christianity. By what power was this change wrought? Earth born philosophy cannot explain it. The wretched, conscience smitten Bunyan became—

"The man whose pilgrim marks the road,
And guides the progress of the soul to God."

And he who could say of himself at one time, "I found within me great desire to take my fill of sin, still studying what sin was yet to be committed, that I might taste the sweetness of it, lest I should die before I had my desires"—cheerfully suffered imprisonment for 12 long years, rather than yield to the law which forbade him to preach the gospel, and afterwards detailed the happy results of his conversion in "Grace abounding to the chief of sinners." It is remarkable,—the age of miracles having passed—that a man of so little education as Bunyan, could have composed the "Pilgrim's Progress," which the ablest authors of modern times have pronounced a masterpiece, and which has circulated more extensively than any other

book except the Bible. The developement of the "English Tinker's" intellectual powers is but little less surprising than his spiritual history; and it becomes us to consider whether the absolute reliance on the support and help of God which Bunyan throughout his religious life ever endeavored to feel, and manifest, was not the source, the sole source of that mighty power which it was given to him to exert amongst the masses of his fellow Britons in the advancement of God's truth.

We can read the recitals of Paul's inward experiences, his tossings, and his troubles, and can accept his history as "a pattern" for all believers of God's long-suffering and mercy. But the "honest tinker" comes home to the hearts of Britons more closely than does Paul's;—for Bunyan was a Briton, the facts of his early career, his preaching and imprisonment, his writings, his death and burial, are recorded in the annals of our country. 1800 years have rolled between us and Paul; not 200 have passed since Bunyan exchanged earth for heaven. The apostle as the special delegate of Christ might be supposed to have been sustained by the special aid of the "Holy Spirit," and we require to be told, and to make an effort to believe that he was "a man of like passions with ourselves;" but who is there amongst men that can hesitate for a moment to believe that the same power which converted John Bunyan can convert them—that the Spirit which comforted the unlettered author of the "Pilgrim's Progress" can comfort them—and that the path he trod to glory they can tread also?

But there is a truth beyond all this to be learned from the life of Bunyan—and it lies in this passage of his history (chap. 10 of his life by himself) "I will in this place thrust in a word or two concerning my preaching the word, and of God's dealings with me in that particular also. After I had been about five or six years awakened, and helped myself to see both the want and worth of Jesus Christ my Lord, and also enabled to venture my soul upon him, some of the most able among the saints, I say the most able for judgment, and holiness of life, did, as they conceived, perceive that God counted me worthy to understand something of his will in his holy and blessed word, and had given me utterance in some measure, to express what I said to others for edification; therefore *they desired me, and that with much earnestness, that I would be willing, at some times, to take in hand one of the meetings to speak a word of exhortation unto them* :—the which, though at first it did much

abash my spirit, yet being still by them desired and entreated. I consented to their requests, and did twice at two several assemblies, (but in private,) though with much weakness and infirmity, discover my gifts among them, at which they not only seemed to be, but did frequently protest as in the sight of the Great God, that they were both affected and comforted, and gave thanks to the Father of mercies for the grace of God bestowed upon me. After this, sometimes, when some of them did go into the country to preach, they would also that I should go with them, where though as yet, I did not and durst not make use of my gifts *in an open way*, yet more privately still, as I came amongst the good people in those places, I did sometimes speak a word of admonition unto them also—which they, as well as others received with rejoicing at the mercy of God to me-ward, professing their souls were edified thereby. Wherefore to be brief, at least being still desired by the church after solemn prayer to the Lord, with fasting, I was more particularly called forth and appointed to a more ordinary and public preaching of the word, not only amongst them, that believed, but also to offer the gospel to those who had not yet received the faith thereof; about which I did evidently find in my mind a secret “pricking” forward thereto, though I bless God not a desire for vain glory, for all that time. I was most sorely afflicted with the fiery darts of the devil concerning my eternal state. But yet I could not be contented unless I was found in the exercise of my gift, unto which also I was greatly animated, not only by the continual desires of my brethren, but also by that saying of Paul to the Corinthians, “I beseech you brethren (ye know the household of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints” (1 Cor. xvi. 15. 16.) By this text I was made to see that the Holy Ghost never intended that men who had gifts and abilities should bury them in the earth but rather did command and stir up such to the exercise of their gifts.”

At length the “honest tinker” after preaching several years, was apprehended on the 12th Nov. 1660, on a charge of “upholding unlawful assemblies, and not conforming to the worship of the church of England.”—“When the constable came in,” says our worthy in his “Relation” of his improvement, “he found us only with our Bibles in our hands, ready to speak and hear the word of God. We were just about to begin our exercise. When brought before the Justice he was asked, “How he could prove it lawful for him to

preach?" He cited to him that in Peter, which saith "As every man hath received the gift, even so let him minister the same."—"To whom is that spoken?" asked the Justice. "To every man," replied Bunyan "that hath received the gift from God." Every effort was made to persuade Bunyan to promise that he would leave off preaching. "I told him that I durst not leave off the work which God had called me to." Upon this, the Justice sent Bunyan to prison, and to prison he went.

The facts above narrated are very suggestive. Bunyan struggled against his temptations—feeling his weakness—is urged by the church to exhort the people; he reluctantly consents to do so—he gains confidence and strength every day, till at length he delights in the work, and is so supported in the work, and by it, that it is not too much to say, that his activity, zeal, and perseverance in preaching the gospel, were the means of his own greater establishment in the truth of the Gospel. If that church had not urged John Bunyan to speak to his brethren, his misgivings and self-condemnation would have kept him back. The souls which he led to the Saviour might have remained unconverted, and he himself left in the "Slough-of-despond." We can never know the amount of what was accomplished by one act of 'urging' John Bunyan to speak a word to the people. If official assumptions or "Reverend" exclusiveness had stood in the way of his exercising his gifts; had he concluded that he *could not* speak because he *did not*, that he was incapable of saying any thing, because he was *uneducated* and untrained, John Bunyan would probably have been lost to the church, and the world—he would never have preached: he would not have suffered imprisonment, except possibly for some other crime than preaching the gospel; and had he not been permitted to "ascend a pulpit" except with a certificate in his pocket that he had "studied divinity" under the guidance of some "Reverend" professor of divinity, his "Pilgrim's Progress" would ne'er have seen the light, or been the means of edifying thousands in many a land.

Speaking of Bunyan, the historian Macaulay, says, anent his Pilgrim—"It was, however, scarcely known to the learned and polite, and had been during near a century the delight of pious cottagers and artizans before it was publicly commended by any man of high literary eminence. At length critics condescended to enquire where the secret of so wide and so durable a popularity lay. They were compelled to own that the ignorant multitude had judg-

ed more correctly than the learned ; and that the despised little book was really a master-piece. Bunyan is indeed as decidedly the *first* of allegorists, as Demosthenes is the first of orators, or Shakespeare the first of dramatists. Other allegorists have shewn equal ingenuity ; but no other allegorist has ever been able to touch the heart, and to make abstractions objects of terror, of purity, and of love."

What need there is in the days in which we live, for such men as John Bunyan—men like-minded as he was. In an age as this, when we behold old Rome repluming her fallen crest, and repairing her shattered mitre—sending forth her bulls, her cardinals, and her Bishops with the design of making the nations bow down to her feet—when we see her pet Puseyism, spreading her doctrines in the cities, towns, and villages of Britain, Canada and the United States—see the spiritual death that has come over the earth, and the formalism that everywhere prevails—the effect of human forms connected with all the sects—and the increased manifestations among *priests of all denominations* for greater *power and domination* ;—what need there is for men like minded as "Bunyan the tinker." The age must come when christendom will stand aghast at the thought that the time ever was when sinful men dared to call themselves "Reverend," and assumed to be the *official teachers* of God's people at *FIXED* salaries, varying with the amounts drawn from the pockets of believers and unbelievers in lieu for Meeting-house accommodation. Oh ! for one day of Apostolic simplicity to scare away these disastrous anomalies ! When will the gospel, offered to all *without money* and without price, cease to be an *article of merchandize*, and the mystery of a *profession* ; a thing for Priests to "job" in ?

Had the method of procedure which was adopted in calling John Bunyan to the ministry been sustained and perpetuated by the churches, and Whitefields, Bunyans, and Haldanes multiplied by hundreds, how different might have been the aspect of Great Britain, and some other countries at the present day. A land of Bibles and gospel light for ages, with a divine commission in the churches, extending to every soul upon earth, contains myriads who have never heard the Gospel ! The churches have sent evangelists to the heathen, and they have done well ; but where are the evangelists for the heathens baptized in Britain and other countries called christian ? The

fact is, the churches have monopolized the paid ministry, instead of sending it forth like the church at Antioch ! (Acts xiii. 3.) Is it that these "men of God" of our day, have interpreted the commission,—“Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature,” to mean—“Go ye into the comfortable ecclesiastical buildings with cushion seated pulpits and preach the gospel to respectable congregations,” from whose Bibles has apparently dropped out the Divine precept, “Be not conformed to this world.” The world is quite at home in the worship of the *saints*, and the *saints* are equally at home amid the frivolities and puerile amusements of the world. Many ‘Reverends’ of our day would not own “honest” John Bunyan as a brother “clergyman”; for John’s education was that of a mechanic: he knew no language but English, and as it was spoken in the vulgar. He had studied no great model of composition with the exception of our noble translation of the Bible. He frequently transgressed the rules of syntax, yet his rude oratory roused and melted hearers who listened without interest to the labored discourses of logicians and Hebraists; the unlettered tinker being the most potent of the two, he being trained in the school of Christ, a better seminary than any earthly college.

E. G. B.

Grafton, 27th June.

UNION OF CHRISTIAN SECTS.

The following remarkable article appeared in the *Hamilton Gazette*, of yesterday—the highest of all High Church papers—under the title of “A Move in the Right Direction” :—

The *Daily Globe*, of the 21st ultimo, contains an account of the ordination of Mr. John Lees to the pastoral charge of the congregation of Ancaster, in communion with the United Presbyterian Church. With feelings of peculiar pleasure, we extract the following portion of our confrere’s report of the proceedings :—

“This settlement, in many respects, is to be contemplated with much satisfaction and hope. Mr. Lees, who was for some years a resident of the village, on receiving license, enjoyed the warm interest of the population, and especially the Presbyterians of all denominations : and a very harmonious opinion prevailed that, if he would become their minister, they would merge their differences. Consequently, the ministers both of the Free Church and Church of Scotland in Dundas, who had service in the village on each Sabbath, withdrew,

and the place of worship of the Free Church was offered and accepted for holding public worship, and that of the Church of Scotland was offered and accepted for holding the ordination services. It is very pleasing, also, to mention that the Rev. Mr. Burnet, of St. Andrew's Church, Hamilton, and the Rev. Mr. Irvine of Knox's Church, Hamilton, were present, and, on invitation, took part in the 'laying on of hands' in the ordination service. When we see the harmony of the people, and the ministers of the three Presbyterian Churches thus uniting as one, the absurdity of our Presbyterian divisions seems more apparent, and the wish for an incorporated union becomes more heartfelt."

Why should an "incorporated union" be confined to Presbyterian bodies? It would be well if earnest Christian men of all denominations often revolved this question in their minds. The matter, we are convinced appears impracticable, mainly because it is strange and unfamiliar. Let it once be fairly and honestly grappled, and what now seem mountains will dwindle down to the dwarfhood of mole hills! The vital importance of the unity for which we plead it is utterly impossible to over-estimate or exaggerate. Just meditate upon the following simple aspect of the case, derived from a recent English publication.—

"In the city of Madras, one of the strongest hold of Heathenism, ascend one of the high buildings and what do you behold? You can count up, scattered among the heathen temples and the Mohomedan Mosques, as many as NINE meeting houses of different sects professing the Christian religion; all of them calling upon the heathen to change their tenets and to come to them to be taught."

With cause do the heathen say that they are perplexed! Most reasonably do they ask the Christians to be united among themselves, before they call upon others to join them! The learned and astute Brahmins are greatly hindered by these divisions. When they behold NINE DIFFERENT BODIES, all worshipping God apart from one another, in separated and independent societies, well do they exclaim in their bewilderment: "Which one are we to believe?" Is not this enough to make us renounce the maxim—"agree to differ;" to think that the very heathen are hindered by our divisions? Was not one of the petitions of our Lord's last prayer, for *the visible unity of His Church*? "That we all might be one;" so that there might be "no divisions among us;" that we might be "perfectly joined together." Are we not all "called to the peace of God, in ONE

Body?" And for what end? Whence the necessity for this abnegation of denominationalism? Christ Himself shall answer the question: "THAT THE WORLD MAY BELIEVE THAT THOU HAST SENT ME!"

But now the world, seeing us *not one*, but divided into a multitude of hostile, jealous, discordant sects, are not able to believe that our Lord is the sent one of the Father. Thus is infidelity the sure and inevitable consequence of our miserable and sinful divisions!

THE BRANTFORD MESSENGER.

Our old friend T. L. Davidson is now an editor. He is an editorial youngster of some ten months, and is thriving as well as the sort of aliment he lives on will allow him. In his issue of last week, under the head of "Alexander Campbell in Canada," he contrives to signalize his paper, delivering himself as follows:

Just as we had finished writing another article, and were about to put it into the hands of the compositor, our coadjutor in the editorial work returned from the Post Office, bearing in his hand a letter from St. Catharines, informing us that the President of Bethany College, Virginia, the veritable Alexander Campbell *himself*, had, in his going to an fro in the earth visited Canada. The brother who wrote the letter from which the following extracts are taken, was present upon the occasion of Mr. Campbell's preaching, and was an eye and ear witness of the sayings of the great Reformer (?) Let us hear from him, what he heard.

St. Catharines, Aug. 6, 1855.

MY DEAR BROTHER.—

I take the liberty of writing you a hasty note in reference to Alexander Campbell of Bethany who preached yesterday afternoon *in the Baptist Chapel here.* So you see he is not dead as has been reported. The object I have in writing you this note is to request you to put the Baptists of Canada on their guard against the insidious way that great heretic is pursuing, in order to promote his tenets. He preached yesterday on the words "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." A great deal of his discourse was taken up in running down *Sects*. To be *consistent*, he ought to clear his own skirts of what he is laying to the charge of others.—Where is man who has done so much to *create*, what he was yesterday so strongly denouncing in others? I almost got out of patience in listening to his effusions, running down orthodoxy and *isms*. It had been well for him if he was *more orthodox*. In regard to the way in which he spoke of Missions, especially of Foreign Missions, it was calculated to lead people to discontinue their contributions towards those excellent Societies, that have been such honoured instruments in promoting the cause of our adorable Redeemer. He

referred to the Conversions taking place among the heathen as being generally occasioned by selfish motives, or some thing of that nature. What barefaced effrontery, and yet he had the boldness to say that he had his information from different missionary reports, received from different parts of the world.

Of course he did not bring out his distinctive tenents yesterday. He had too much of the Jesuit about him to do so at the first time. I think it would be very advisable for you to make some remarks upon the importance there is, that the Baptists of this Province should be on their guard against such heresies as he has been propagating, and I am sure you will use your best efforts to that end."

We knew that Alexander Campbell had stated in his *Harbinger* that he should probably visit Canada at this time, as we saw it announced in the *Christian Banner*, a monthly Magazine published in the interest of the Sect called Reformers, who refuse to be called a Sect; and also perceived the joy of the Editor sparkling through the words—"Glad to hear it," which followed the extract from the *Harbinger*; but we did not know ought of his advent among us, till we received the letter from St. Kitts, for which our correspondent will please accept our thanks. It is timely and valuable. The contents however, astound us. What! the Baptist Chapel in St. Catharines thrown open to Alexander Campbell!! What next? How it may have been granted for his use we trow not, but would beg our readers to regard our beloved Bro. Ryerson as free of all blame in the matter, as he was unable on the Sabbath in question to leave his bed on account of severe bodily ailment.

Some of our readers may regard the language of our correspondent as too strong in calling Alex. Campbell a "great heretic," yet if no other proofs of his great—should we not rather say "damnable heresies?" could be produced than those given by bro. Frazer in his valuable letter published elsewhere in to-day's issue; these are sufficient to settle the matter forever. There are his own words deliberately written and publish to the world, and we are not aware that he has ever eaten them up. If any one says he has done so, we demand of him to table the proof, and we have abundance of the same kind of thing in our editorial drawer.

Talk about the evils of schism and sectarianism! Who in the name of truth, has done more to create schism in Evangelical bodies and add to the number of the sects than Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Virginia? Who among the Baptist body? As regards the imperative duty of the Regular Baptists of Canada to refuse to open their Chapel doors to him or any of his sect, whether they belong to the Benedictine order of Evangelists, or not; we have only to say, that, we should just as soon think of opening our chapels to Theodore Parker, James J. Strang, or Brigham Young—to Andrew Jackson Davis, or Elders Hall and Hickley, who visited us last winter; as we would think of opening them to any man, no matter who he was, or where he hailed from, who taught the monstrous errors which are taught by the teachers of the current Refor-

mation. The legitimate influence of not doing so, is well seen in the case of the Baptist Church in Carthage, N. Y.,—who kindly opened their Chapel to Elder Benedict, who brought matters round with so much adroitness that after the third Lord's day in June the "brotherhood got possession of it for all time."

Let no one imagine that we write rashly or unadvisedly. We do not so. Greater and better, men, and Baptist Ministers than we, have seen the need of sounding out the alarm, when their borders were invaded, and the peace of Zion was menaced, as is now the case with us in Canada. The danger is not in the distance, it is at the door. On this subject we have heretofore said but little, but the time has come for us to speak out and we shall do so. We shall do as we deem it incumbent on us to do, impugn our motives, who so listeth. Brethren, we would say to you each, and all, *earnestly* and *affectionately*, ~~It~~ safety lies in *non-intercourse* and *non-fellowship* with Campbell and C——ism. ~~It~~ "Be ye therefore wise as serpents."

Precisely such a display of weakness, rashness, prejudice, impudence, and narrowness might be expected from friend Davidson.—As an apology to our readers for the Baptists in Canada, it is proper to observe that Mr. Davidson is not a wholesome sample of the Baptist brethren. The simple fact that the chapels used for public worship by this denomination both in St. Catherines and in Toronto, were opened for Mr. C., very decidedly indicates that our juvenile contemporary is an extra if not an eccentric Baptist in these regions.

We have only two remarks to offer on the preceding at this sitting. In the first place, we are not specially gratified to learn that our new Baptist scribe and his friends have as much sympathy with Young the Mormon or with the fanciful sceptic Davis as with any teacher or preacher who accepts the platform, doctrine, and manners of the primitive friends of Jesus our Lord and king. This is a startling confession not at all flattering either to the intelligence or the piety of Mr. Davidson and those who stand in rank and file with him. Again, the urgent appeal and the anxious plea to close Baptist chapels and Baptist ears against those who plead reformation, is indicative of most mortifying imbecility on the part of these brethren; for if Baptist principles are New Testament principles, why fear to hear any man who appeals solely to this inspired Record as the Lord's Confession of Faith?

As may be gathered from the foregoing, brother A. Campbell has called over into Canada according to promise. His rapid and short tour, has, we are assured by many evidences, been eminently beneficial. The brethren wherever he visited them have been much

cheered and refreshed—stout opponents have in some instances been made friends—and not a few hard-shell prejudices have been set agog and removed. Some, too, who were previously among the unreconciled have bowed to the gospel and put on Christ. All these are good fruits for which we cannot be too grateful to the Giver of all Good.

The beloved Campbell and lady and youngest daughter arrived in St. Catherines among the first days of August, or rather the last days of July. Being enfeebled by various labors previously, and needing repose, brother Campbell did not immediately commence his labors in this our country, but for some days tried the virtues of the St. Catherines Springs. Having been invigorated either by the mineral waters or other agencies, he addressed the brethren and friends in the village of Jordan, Saturday evening, August 4th. On Lord's day 5th. brother Campbell delivered an address at St. Catherines, the Baptist chapel having been granted for the occasion. Monday evening he arrived in the township of Ermosa, and on Tuesday and Wednesday mornings spoke to large assemblies convened at one of the largest barns in the vicinity. Here five or six were immersed in accordance with apostolic fashion. Wednesday evening brother C. was at Norval, and on Thursday afternoon halted at Toronto, where he addressed a fair audience the same evening in the Meeting House owned by the Baptists. He also preached there on Friday evening, much to the satisfaction of many. From all that we could learn, it is believed that an unequivocal wholesome impression was made by these discourses in the city. Lord's day an appointment was filled in Bowmanville, and again on Monday morning, Aug. 13th. And on Thursday, 16th, brother Campbell delivered his last address in Canada at London, the chapel of the New Connexion Methodists being opened for the meeting.

The devout friends who worship in the Baptist chapel in London, not having become so candid as their brethren in St. Catherines and Toronto, could not regard it as either duty or honor to allow their chapel to be occupied by an auditory of neighbors who sought to listen to an hour's discourse from a Christian gentleman who, in his ministrations, begins with Paul, Peter, and John instead of with Knox, Fuller, or Wesley. It is presumable that these friends in London are the most competent judges of their own cause and how it ought to be guarded, fended, and defended; and hence, as the delicate chicken not yet fully out of the shell, should not be ex-

posed to the natural air, so some of our devout but delicate Baptist brethren should not be allowed to hear for themselves the rude heresy of bibleodoxy.

Brother and sister Campbell start to-day, Aug. 17th, for Detroit—to which point we shall accompany them, the Lord so permitting.

D. O.

London, Aug, 1855.

KINGS AND CLERGY.

From the Christian Baptist.

There is a much greater resemblance between the holy alliance of kings and the holy alliance of clergy than at first thought would appear. In the first place, kings and clergymen of this day find themselves pretty much alike. They have both got upon thrones by the common consent of the people. The king upon a golden throne, or a gilded one—the priest upon a wooden one, sometimes gilded, and sometimes crimson-cushioned too. The king wears a crown, and the priest a mitre. The king from his throne publishes his speeches and proclaims the laws of the state—the priest from his pulpit, or wooden throne, publishes his sermons and proclaims the canons of the church. The king is high in honor and lives upon the toils of his people—the priest is high in honor too, and lives upon the sweat and sacrifices of his people. The king pleads his divine right to rule, to be supported, and to be honored by the people of his realm—the priest pleads his divine right to instruct his people into the meaning of the bible, and to support and honor by the people over whom he reigns. The king pleads the antiquity of his order, and goes back to Genesis to show that his order is there mentioned and dignified in the person of Nimrod, Amraphel, Tidal, and Chedorlaomer. The priest is equally fond of antiquity, and turns over to Genesis in support of his order, and pleads that his order is found in the person of Melchisedec and the priests of Egypt. The king pleads his right to peculiar immunities from immemorial usage—the priest pleads the same right from usage as ancient; he quotes *Genesis* xlvii. 22. “The land of the priests Joseph would not buy, for the priests had a portion assigned them by Pharaoh, and did eat the portion which Pharaoh gave them.” The kings of ancient and modern times united in leagues offensive and defensive for the better management of their affairs, the securing of

their interests, dominion, and rule. Of this sort was the confederation of the vale of Siddim nearly four thousand years ago. The priests of ancient and modern times have united in synods and councils, "ministerially to determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience, to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship and government of the church." Of this sort was the confederation of priests in all ancient nations, in Egypt, in Chaldea, in Greece and Rome. The Jewish sanhedrin, that condemned the Son of God to death, and that excommunicated the apostles, and would have silenced them, was of this complexion. In all these items we discover remarkable coincidences between the kings and the priest of ancient and modern times.

But in the nature and object of their alliances or consociations there are the most remarkable analogies. We shall take the existing alliance of kings in Europe and the existing holy alliance of American clergy, and examine their respective aspects. The holy alliance of monarchs have sworn and subscribed to certain articles of common faith, necessary, essentially necessary, to their salvation. They have pledged themselves to inculcate and support the same by all means and at every risk. Have not the confederated clergy of America done the same! Have not the respective ecclesiastical councils solemnly vowed and subscribed to certain articles of faith deemed essential to salvation? Have not they pledged themselves to inculcate the same at the risk of their livings and sacred honor?

Again, the object of the holy alliance and that of the allied priests is one and the same, ostensibly and really. The ostensible object of the allied monarchs is the peace and prosperity of Europe; the ostensible object of the allied priests is the peace and prosperity of Zion. But the *real* object of most of the allied monarchs is their crowns, their thrones, and their revenues: and the *real* object of most of the allied priests is their mitres, their pulpits, and their stipends. The allied monarchs call those who write or speak against their schemes, "traitors, rebels, or enthusiastic demagogues," whose object it is to sow discord, and to revolutionize that they may reign; the allied clergy represent those who speak or write against them as infidels, schismatics, heretics, or bewildered enthusiasts, who oppose them from some sinister motives. The allied monarchs have amongst their subjects such as they have honored with more than usual respect, and these plead their cause, defend their measures, and denounce those who plead for reform; these kiss the tyrant's

rod, and lick the dust on which he walks—just so, the allied priests have amongst those over whom they reign, certain ones whom they honor with more than ordinary respect; these plead the cause of the priests, defend their proceedings, and denounce those who plead for reform; these kiss the priest's toe and hold his stirrup; these are the veriest bigots; these are the ass on which Balaam rides. When one of the allied monarchs is likely to become too powerful, or to be too strong for the others, the other sovereigns become jealous, begin to explain away the obligation of the alliance, and prepare themselves for his exclusion; when one of the allied priests becomes too popular or too powerful in the diocess, the others say it is better that one man perish, or be destroyed, than that the whole priesthood suffer. But in fact the analogy appears perfect in every instance; the allied clergy resemble a monstrous production of nature which we once saw, two bodies united, and but one soul. Thus, though the allied clergy are two apparently distinct bodies, they possess but one and the same soul and spirit.

THE HISTORICAL ARGUMENT FOR UNIVERSALISM.

Plains, near Cobourg, 3rd June, 1855.

To the Editor of the Christian Banner:

MR. EDITOR:—One of these days the August Number of your periodical for 1853, came into my hands, in which I found a reply of yours to the Rev. W. Hooper, Universalist, Halifax, Nova Scotia. In said article of yours, you assert, "Universalism, while it has a good share of ridicule for the baseless conceits of traditionary christianity, most faithfully follows the fashion of scrapifying the divine volume, and forcing the language of heaven into the veriest fancies."

Now, sir, people whose dispositions of mind are naturally vindictive, may "ridicule" the doctrine which Universalists advocate, but I do not see how any benevolent mind can for a moment believe the horrid doctrine of eternal burnings: and as regards that part of your assertion in which you speak of "scrapifying" the Bible, &c., let me state in reply, Mr. Editor, that in my opinion, Universalians are no more guilty of "scrapifying" as you term it, than is Mr. D. Oliphant of the "Banner," in his controversies with those who differ from him in his interpretation of "Baptism," &c., &c.

But, sir, in his discussion with you, Mr. Hooper omitted the his-

torical argument for Universalism. This, then, I will supply: and before I am done, will prove to the veriest sceptic that the "traditions" of history are not "baseless" as asserted by you. Do treat Universalists with candor, Mr. O. Hear me thus and then reply.

1st. Nearly all the orthodox writers of the two first centuries allude to, or expressly assert a future judgement. Seven call it the everlasting, the eternal fire, or torment; but out of these, there are three, who certainly did not think it endless, as two of them—Justin Martyr, who died A. D. 162, and Irenæus, who died A. D. 190—believed the damned would be annihilated: and the other, Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 300, asserted their restoration to eternal bliss. Clement, then, is the first writer of eminence and respectability who can fairly be claimed as a Universalian; while Tertullian of 2nd century is understood to be the first christian writer, who expressly asserted that the torments of the wicked will be of equal duration with the happiness of the good; and it is painful to notice the ferocious exultation with which his imagination dwells on the gloomy prospect. These Christians of the primitive age (who are called heretics by some ecclesiastical writers) appear to have generally believed in a final restoration; but this opinion of theirs does not appear to have met with condemnation.

2nd. Universalism was first publicly condemned, as stated in the works of Oregin (born 185, A. D) and that *not* until nearly 150 years after his death, and *not* until his name had become peculiarly odious on account of *other* imputed "heresies;" and down so low as 400 years after the death of Christ. The "heresy" of Universalism was held and avowed by many of the most eminent fathers of Orthodoxy, in the east: among whom I may name Titus, Bishop of Boshâ—Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa. Universalism had among the Latins for the most part long before the 4th century, shrunk up, and disappeared in *then* accounted orthodox doctrine of purgatory. Mr. Oliphant, these are only a few of the proofs that could be brought in, to prove that the Universalian "heresy" is not what you are pleased to term "baseless," as regards its "historical proofs." When I call to mind the numerous individuals in ancient and modern times, celebrated for their genius, their wisdom, and their virtues who have embraced and advocated Universalism; and whose very names are a "tower of strength," I and every true Universalist can afford to suffer reproach and persecution; for we are in good company, many of them were giants; and their foes were pigmies, limitarians being judges.

No trace of the prevalence of the Universalist "heresy" can be found, during the long night which gathered over the christian world after Rome had gained an entire and undisputed ascendancy. Universalism re-appeared, however, at the first dawn of the Reformation. In England in 1368, Langham, Archbishop of Canterbury, convened a council to condemn, among other truths, the position, that "a^l the damned, even the devils, should be restored and become happy." Among the Reformers from popery, Zuingle has been charged with Universalism and not without proof, by Catholics; and it is also certain, Mr. Editor, that the same doctrine although it be detested by many Baptists, and by you Mr. Oliphant, among the number, was professed and advocated by many of your brethren the Baptists of Germany in the days of Luther.

4th. In late times we find the name of Archbishop Tillotson, advocating the same benevolent doctrine. The name Tillotson, is one who would do honor to any cause. He indeed admitted that endless punishment is threatened against transgressors, but thought that the execution of the threat might and would be remitted by reason of the views which christianity gives us of the character of God, and the nature of his dealings with men. Bishop Newton also asserted positively the doctrine of Universalism, in a dissertation published after his death, on the final state and condition of mankind. Dr. Watts and Dr. Macnighit towards the close of their lives were favorable to the doctrine you consider "heresy:" and William Whiston, the learned and the amiable philosopher, (who rejected in toto the doctrine of endless misery, justly considering the same as a stigma on the moral character of God,) assures us that Sir Isaac Newton, and Dr. Samuel Clark, agreed with him on this subject. Now, what say you to this, Mr. Editor? whether shall we consider such a mind as Newton's or that of others less gifted the most capable of giving a correct answer on the question? I pause for a reply. Ramsay and the mental philosopher Hartly, were Universalists, and a host of other great men. In reading your reply to Mr. Hooper, it was forcibly impressed on my mind that *fear* was substituted for argument by you as it commonly is by the so called orthodox in their discussions with Christian Universalists—and the manner in which you asserted your "scraps" of Bible texts, often wrested altogether from their connection with other verses in the chapter quoted, reminded one of an anecdote told concerning Bishop Smallbridges' saying to the philosopher, Whiston,

Whiston once urged the Bishop to write a work in recommendation of a fair and impartial examination of the state of opinion, in the early ages of the Christian Church. On this Smallbridge exclaimed with great emotion, "Mr. Whiston, *I dare not examine, I dare not examine!* for if I should examine and find that you are in the right, *then* the church has been in error so many years"—you being another Smallbridge, afraid like him to examine. Now Mr. Editor, the question is not how long the doctrine of endless misery has existed, nor how many "sinners" has fled by the means of its advocacy from the "wrath to come;" but is it, or not, true?—is it, or not, founded on scripture?—what are the evidences in its favor?—and what are those against it? To weigh these in a fair balance—to notice the preponderance, and to side with that system which has the greater weight of evidence, and in searching for proofs use every text in its proper connexion, and in connexion with proofs from the Bible, prove also that the early christian were *not* Universalists, taking for your historical authorities, writers of approved reputation, while it will be mine on the other side to prove the contrary, making reason as well as scripture my guides.

I hope you will give a place to this letter in the pages of your magazine, for who ever knew of truth being beaten when placed on a fair field with error?

I am, sir,

Yours in behalf of injured truth,

JABEZ WILLIAMS, JR.

While giving your letter to the public, Mr Williams, it does not seem to me to be necessary to accompany it with a formal response. If you desire to lay the claims of Universalism before the readers of this work, I will give you space for three letters, of from three to four pages each, provided you prepare them for insertion in consecutive Numbers. After you have formed, fashioned, and finished these letters, I may briefly review them—which review you will have the liberty of replying to, if you should discover anything in it uncandid or unfair toward yourself or your system.

The inspired Book, I am thoroughly assured, gives not the least countenance to any *ism*, and just as little as to any other the new-coined and eccentric "ism" with the word universal before it. Still, as this Banner is unfurled in the name of truth and the author of truth to do battle as occasion may demand against all the *isms* that either build citadels or go out upon the open field, and as you

appear to think that Mr. Hooper ought to be assisted, you shall have fair play to come forth and arrange your forces. To work, then, Mr. Williams, and point your pen. But while treating of salvation for all, please *save* yourself the toilsome and profitless task of using spy-glasses to read isolated texts from uninspired men, eminent or not eminent, in the early ages or in latter ages, to prove universal salvation; for who cares a dried fig-leaf for the supposed leanings of the old fathers, the middle aged fathers, or the young fathers toward Romanism, Churchism, Presbyterianism, Universalism or any other ism in the current party calendar? Do you not know, my friend, that the Romanist, the English Churchman, the Presbyterian, the Congregationalist, each in his turn, after his system is shaped and matured, appeals to the fathers for the "historical argument" of the polity and doctrine he favors, and, wonderful to tell, the good-natured and accommodating fathers, give a nod of assent and a gracious smile to each and to every ism-doctrine, from Romanism to Universalism!!

D. O.

CHRISTIANITY--NOT THE RELIGION OF ANY SECT IN CHRISTENDOM.

COURTEOUS READER, be not startled at the position we have taken, when we assert that Christianity is not the religion of any sect in Christendom. It is not, we assure you, a mere assumption incapable of proof; nor does such an assumption betray in us an uncharitable or liberal spirit towards those who may differ from us.

If one's creed be a fair exponent of one's principles, ours must be of the most liberal kind, seeing our creed is acknowledged by all parties to be itself the message of good will towards men. It would, therefore, ill befit the professor of it to indulge in uncharitable temper towards those who may labor under involuntary errors of any kind. We trust, then, that while we attempt the proof of our proposition, we shall do it in the spirit of that religion which we now proposed to define.

What, then, is Christianity? It is, says one, the religion of our party. Says another, Ours is the religion of Christ. Answers tantamount to the above would be, we presume, given, if required, by any of the numerous religious parties. Now consistency requires that every true partizan shall deny the above definition to be true of any religion but that of his own party or church; or in other words, that

he shall deny to every other sect what he claims for his own—that is, that his church alone possesses the religion of Christianity.

Now what we propose in this essay, is to determine, if possible, what is the religion of Christianity. This we shall attempt by giving a definition somewhat more particular than either of the above.

A more precise, as well as a more satisfactory definition would be, we conceive, something like the following—Christianity is that religion whose faith, doctrine, and discipline, both in matter and form, are contained entirely and exclusively within the New Testament; and of which Jesus Christ alone is the author and finisher. Now the important question is, Is Christianity, as above defined, the religion of any sect in Christendom? Will the Roman Catholic, with his traditions, hold to be equal authority with the inspired word, his image worship—his passion for the relics of saints, his monastic orders, his doctrine of purgatory, his seven sacraments, and his decretals of the Popes? or the Episcopalian, with his code of faith and discipline of thirty-nine articles, and liturgy or book of church service, established by royal edict? or the Presbyterian, with his Confession of Faith, made by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, convened by act of Parliament, and established by the same, in 1644, as a directory of public worship; or the modern Presbyterian of this country, with his Westminster Confession of Faith, adopted in the year 1729, as the standard of his church? or the Congregationalist, with his Saybrook Platform? or the Wesleyan Methodist, with his Book of Discipline, ordaining and regulating class-meetings, love-feasts, quarterly meetings for communion, camp-meetings, and yearly conferences? or the Lutheran, with his Augsburg Confession of twenty-one articles? or the Baptist, with his Philadelphia Confession of Faith and his monthly or quarterly communion? or the Quaker, with his light within independent of the Bible—teaching him to reject a Christian eldership, the Lord's day, the Lord's supper, and baptism? or the Socinian, with his creed, disproving the divinity of Christ, original sin, predestination, propitiation for sin by the death of Christ, and the plenary inspiration of the scriptures? or the Universalist, with his creed?—that all mankind are already perfectly restored to the divine favor—and that, receiving the correction due to them in the present world, they are at death admitted to the felicities of the heavenly world or if punishment be extended to another world, it is merely corrective and disciplinary, and will ultimately prepare the soul for the enjoyment of heaven? or

the Swedenborgian, with his Book of Exposition, showing that the sense of scripture is threefold, corresponding to things celestial, and natural; and that the resurrection and general judgment are already past?

But here, for the present, we must stop, as our space, if not time, would fail us to particularize farther in illustration of our position. Now we ask, Will any of the above partizans affirm our definition as true of the religion of his party? or that his religion is contained entirely and exclusively within the New Testament? Will he claim for those traditions, creeds, confessions, liturgies, disciplines, ordinances, and expositions, so conflicting and discordant, the sanction of the divine word? Not one of the above Protestant sects can claim for itself the antiquity of the religion of the New Testament. In vain would the ecclesiastical historian attempt to trace their history beyond the last three hundred years. But within this period every fact connected with their origin and progress can be found faithfully and particularly details on the page of church history. Not only, then, does our definition of the religion of Christianity disprove all the claims to the divine authenticity of the above named systems of religion; but likewise does the single fact of the greater antiquity of the New Testament religion, compared with the state or age of any of the above systems, demonstrably prove that they are not to be found upon the page of Inspiration.

We leave it now for the intelligent and candid reader to say whether we have proved and sustained the proposition with which we set out—that the religion of Christianity is not the religion of any sect in Christendom. If we have proved this, then does it not follow that the religion of the New Testament can alone save men and unite them into one visible body or church? If, then, that form of divine truth which we call the Christian religion, and which we affirm is only set forth to us in the New Testament, and no where else is to be found;—if this form, we say, cannot save men and unite them in bonds of Christian love and church fellowship, who shall hazard the consequence of attempting to improve either in matter or form that religion of which Jesus Christ is the author and finisher?

Now as every thing must have form, and as the wisdom of the Maker is as much seen in the form, as in the material composing it, he who changes the form unfits for the use intended by its Maker, and may indeed by so doing, convert its materials into an engine of evil.

Such, then, we conceive to have been the capital error of all creed-makers. They have marred the symmetry of that divine form of sound words given it by the hand of Inspiration. They have broken the connexion, and have put asunder that which God had joined together. The golden chain of divine truth, the links of which have been joined by the skilful hand of Inspired Wisdom, have been rudely broken asunder by the unskilful hand of the creed-maker.

Every human creed is consequently without the divine form, and void, being destitute of divine power, and consequent darkness pervades the minds of the people.

Hence so long as we receive a human creed as the form of sound words in preference to that which, like its author, is perfect and divine, we deprive ourselves of that which alone can save, sanctify, unite, and bless the children of men.

Every truly enlightened Christian, who prays for the conversion of the world and the union of believers in the bonds of Christian fellowship, will, therefore, as a loyal subject, uses only that form of sound words, as the grand instrument furnished for this desirable purpose, by the Head of the church himself. Such a one must be the uncompromising opponent of all church standards of human contrivance, as means of conversion; or as bases of ecclesiastical union. And from the fact that such ecclesiastical standards or orthodoxy are common amongst us—he is to regard them as the signs of the times, and he can make it as clear as a sunbeam that the present are those perilous times of the latter days, in which professors, under the forms of religion, shall be money-lovers, despisers of good men, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God.

The religious reformer of the nineteenth century must feel, in all its weight and importance, that solemn charge given by the Apostle to Timothy—"To preach the word, to be instant in season, out of season: to reprove, rebuke exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine;" for the prediction he now sees fulfilling, seeing the time has come, that many have departed from the faith, giving heed to seducing teachers, and will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own desires have heaped to themselves teachers, having itching ears, who have turned away the ears of the people from the truth unto fables. By thus contending for, and holding fast the form of sound words, the faith formerly delivered to the saints, he may consistently pray: "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven."—*Harbinger*.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO G. L. SCOTT.

Mr. EDITOR : DEAR SIR :—

I hope it will not be thought that I presume too much upon your liberality in replying to the remarks upon the short article from my pen, which appeared in the June Number of *the Banner*. They are so indirectly aimed that it is difficult to reply to them without losing sight of the position originally assailed. Indeed no attempt has been made to meet any of my arguments, but rather an endeavour to withdraw attention from the array of facts presented by combating an opinion not advanced, and attacking a position but casually introduced.

While contending that the gospel preached by the apostles after the resurrection was the same as that preached previously by Jews, I do not say that the great facts of his death, burial, and resurrection were preached before he poured out his soul unto death. Although inseparably connected with it, these, taken as mere isolated facts, are not the gospel and are never so called. The approach of the Kingdom of God, in which Jesus will occupy the throne of David, and with his saints then glorious, honourable, and immortal, reign over all people, nations, and languages, thus blessing all the families of the earth, according to the promise made to the fathers, is the gospel he preached and commanded his apostles to preach to the world. To the introduction of that glorious age, all things have been made subservient. It was to prepare the way for it that Jesus died and was buried. It was that he might sit upon its throne that God raised him from the dead, and it is to take out of them a people for his name, who will be ready to enter upon its glory and dominion, when the time comes for the saints to possess the Kingdom, that the things concerning it are now preached to the Gentiles, and repentance and remission of sins offered to the believer in the name of Jesus.

I am rather at a loss to perceive the force of the arguments founded on the facts that the church was not built during the sojourn of the Saviour on earth, and that the apostles were witnesses to the world of his resurrection. I do not mention the church one way or other and therefore could not say it was built nearly four thousand years ago. The fact that God has fulfilled a promise made to David, and intimately connected with the blessing promised in the gospel is no proof that they had a new gospel to preach.

The popular mind being unenlightened by the teaching of God's

word ; its opinions, whether favorable or the reverse, are not regarded by the students of the Scripture. So that my standing upon a popular eminence, a position by the way of which I was not aware, will not in any way affect the truth of my statements.

If we are to judge of the seed sown by the fruits, then assuredly we will come to the conclusion that it has been the same in all ages.— That sown in the heart of Abraham produced a character worthy of being called the friend of God. Daniel, to whom it was promised that he would be present when the saints are put in possession of the kingdom, is called *greatly beloved*, an epithet which would not have been used had not his character warranted it. The apostles are called friends of Jesus, and those who keep his commandments are not only his friends but his brethren. Is not the same fruit the product of the same seed ? and is not that the incorruptible seed, the word of God which liveth and abideth forever ?

The attempt to prove the gospel preached to Abraham different from that preached by the Apostles to the Gentiles, will have little weight with those acquainted with the biography of the patriarch ; the statements made in reference to him being far from according with the facts as recorded in the Bible. You say the object of the preaching was something else than the salvation of Abraham, for before the gospel was preached to him he was the friend of God. Paul testifies that Abraham was justified by faith ; whatever ulterior designs then, there may have been, it is evident that his salvation was the result of the preaching of the gospel. Again, it is nowhere said that he was the friend of God while living with his father Terah, the worshipper of strange gods ; the first time that honorable title is given to him being after his justification, which was nearly ten years after he heard the gospel. Had the items of the promise made to Abraham been stated, it would have been found that for the most part they are still unfulfilled, and include all the future blessings promised in the gospel preached by the Apostles. That is a very unscriptural definition of the Gospel which would restrict it to mere facts. The faith accepted of God has more reference to the future, it is the confidence of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen ; a vague expectation is not such a faith. God promised to Abraham and his seed, that in them should all families of the earth be blessed ; and that they should inherit the land of Canaan for ever, which implies a resurrection from the dead and eternal life. The scriptures inform us that the seed of Abraham is

Christ, and that this blessing will be manifested through a kingdom of which he will be king—the kingdom of God. A participation in the inheritance, glory, honor, and immortality of that kingdom is what is now offered to the Gentiles on condition of their believing the things concerning it and the name of Jesus Christ testified in the scriptures. The baptism of such a believer into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, constitutes him one of Abrahams seed and an here according to the promise.

There is then no ground for your assertion that the gospel preached to Abraham is different from that preached by the apostles ; and the unanswered arguments of the previous article prove that the gospel which begun to be preached in the province of Galilee *was the gospel* preached in Jerusalem after Jesus was raised from the dead.

Yours respectfully.

GEO. L. SCOTT.

Paris, July, 1855.

It seems that our earnest friend, Mr. G. L. Scott, labors under the impression that we failed to keep to the point in offering a very brief reply to his former letter ; but if he will re-peruse our remarks, exercising a little candor and taking to himself a good touch of Bible common sense, he will find that our response, short as it was, replies both to his former and present letter.

D. O.

THE TEXT SYSTEM.

[From the Christian Baptist.

The scrap doctors or text expositors have not only very generally obscured the words they proposed to illustrate, but they have made their office accessible to every novice, and introduced a band of "public preachers" that are a disgrace to the age in which we live. Any body with, or without common sense, can become a scrap doctor. A man that can neither read nor spell can "preach a sermon *on* a text, or preach *from* a text." I am authorized to state, as a well attested fact, that, not long since, a certain textuary did take for his text the words of a wicked man, found in Matthew 25: the false accusation of the wicked servant who told his lord—"You are an austere man." This was the-text. The preacher could not

spell well, and he made it, "You are an *oyster* man." But the misfortune was, "he raised his whole doctrine" on the word *oyster*. In his exordium, for he too was an orator, he told his audience that his object was to show how fitly the Saviour was compared to an oyster-man, or oyster catcher. Accordingly his method was—1st, To show the coincidence or resemblance between his Saviour and an oyster-man. 2d. To point out how suitably oysters represented sinners. 3d. To demonstrate how beautifully the *tongs* which the oyster-man uses to take up oysters, represented "ministers of the gospel." 4th. To prove that the oyster-man's boat was a fit emblem of the gospel and of a "gospel church," into which the oysters or sinners are put when caught or converted. His fifth head I have forgotten; but perhaps it was to show how the cooking and eating of oysters represented the management and discipline of those sinners caught by those ministers of the gospel. He concluded with a few practical hints according to custom.

What a happy mistake was this and how fortunate for the audience! And yet he was called and sent by God to preach his gospel!!!!

I once heard, with my own ears; a pious textuary deliver an introductory sermon to an assembly of divines from the words of the devil, or from what was equivalent—the words of a damsel speaking from the impulse of a spirit of divination. The soothsayer said of the apostles—"These are the servants of the most high God which show to us the way of salvation." He did not "stick so well to his text" as the aforesaid textuary; for while the divining damsel applied her words to the apostles, the divine preacher appropriated them to himself and such folks as the oyster expositor.

A pious divine, who may, for aught I know, be yet dubbed D. D. whose spirit within him was vehemently moved at the knots of ribbon on the ladies' bonnets; ransacked from Genesis to Jude for a text to afford a pretext for giving scope to the fervor of his soul against those obnoxious knots, found the following words—"Let him that is on the house *top not come down*." Not being a perfect speller, though a good preacher; and wishing to have a text just to the point, he selected these four words—"Top not come down." *Pro causa euphoniae* he prefixed a *k* to the narrative particle and converted it into a noun theological. His method was natural and easy—1st. He proposed, to explain the top knots. 2d. To give a divine command for their demolition. 3d. To expatiate on the reason.

ableness of the injunction, *come down*. 4th. To denounce the eternal perdition of the disobedient. He, too, was a preacher who appropriated the words of Isaiah: "How beautiful are the feet of them that publish the gospel of peace, that bring glad tidings of good things." He was sent by God—if we could believe him.

Now, courteous reader, will you allow me to say what I am sure is a fact; that I have heard hundreds of sermons, and read volumes of them, on texts, and from the learned too, which, though not so evidently ridiculous to every body, were really as absurd as the above.

WILLIAMSVILLE ACADEMY.

This Institution, located at Williamville, Erie Co., N. Y., ten miles N. E. of Buffalo, on the turnpike, offers great and liberal inducements to the public generally, and to the Brethren and Friends of Primitive christianity in particular, as a literary institution of a high order; in which all the elements of a classical education can be acquired. Its location is in a very healthful and beautiful part of our state, in the midst of a population noted for its love of order, morality, and religion. Located in a quiet and retired village surrounded by rural scenery of exquisite beauty; among a people mostly engaged in agricultural pursuits, and free from the temptations peculiar to a city, it is one of the most eligible sites for an institution of the kind known to us. The design of the school is to afford to both sexes, a moral, religious, scientific, and classical education; an education in harmony with the whole man—"body, soul and spirit." An education in which the sacred literature of the Bible will be taught as well as the languages and the sciences.—While the physical and intellectual powers and susceptibilities will be carefully attended to, the moral and religious culture of the pupils educated here, shall ever be regarded of primary and paramount importance. Such an Institution is a *desideratum* in this part of the world; and being situated in so central a position to the East and West, and so contiguous and accessible to the Canadas, must commend itself to the favor and patronage of the friends of such liberal and unsectarian enterprises, both in the States and the Provinces.

The friends with the aid of a few in the Provinces, have succeeded in erecting a very substantial and beautiful brick structure, capable

of accommodating three hundred pupils, and at a cost of about \$5000. They have contributed about as much towards its erection as they feel able to do at present, and they do not wish to deprive others of the opportunity of doing good, and also desiring, if possible, that the School should open its first session early in the Fall, they confidently appeal to the Brethren and Friends, in N. Y. and the Canadas especially, to aid them by their contributions and investments. They believe the appeal will not be in vain. Let us all remember that we are only constituted Stewards of our possessions and means; and that we must render a faithful account of our Stewardship to the great Head of the Church—our Lord and Master. It is written: *the Lord loveth a cheerful giver—and he that soweth bountifully shall reap bountifully—and the liberal soul shall be made fat.* What encouragement to give liberally for the promotion of benevolent and christian enterprizes.

This Institution will not only benefit the youth of our country intellectually and morally, but it may be directly beneficial to the church. Pious young men can be educated here for the ministry; and surely this is an important consideration to the Churches in this country. It will, doubtless, be a valuable auxiliary to the cause of primitive christianity; and trust its importance in this respect will be appreciated by the brotherhood.

It will require about \$2000 to complete the building which is now under roof. It is divided into shares of \$25 each; any one taking a share will have an interest in the concern, and be entitled to a vote. So soon as it is ascertained that the edifice will be ready by a specified time, a principal, with a corps of competent Teachers will be selected. The Institution will probably open by the first of October next.

The Trustees will send an Agent, Eld. J. R. Frame, who will visit the churches and solicit Stock and donations for the Academy. He purposes visiting the churches in Canada soon after the middle of July. They will receive him as an authorized Agent and any transaction with him, pertaining to the Academy business, will be endorsed by the Trustees of said institution.

Williamsville, N. Y., June 28th, 1855.

A BIT OF ADVICE.—Have you enemies?—Go straight on, and don't mind them. If they get in your way, walk round them, regardless of their spite. Let the poor fellows talk—there will a reaction, if you perform but your duty.

CO-OPERATION MEETING IN NOVA SCOTIA.

[The following arrived at our office after the pages of the July Number were all in type.—]

On the 25th of June, 1855, a meeting was held at Milton, Queen's County, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward's Island, to consult upon the most efficient means of sounding out the word of the Lord in these Provinces. At this meeting it was unanimously Resolved—

1st. That the disciples meet annually at a given place in Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island for preaching and for missionary business.

2nd. That the annual meeting be called a Branch of the North-Eastern Co-operation.

3d. That the next annual meeting be held with the church at Douglas, Nova Scotia, on the first Monday in July, 1856.

4th. That this meeting acknowledge through their Secretary the sympathy and aid extended to the churches in the Provinces by the Christian Missionary Society of Cincinnati; and should that Society continue to favor our infant cause the same will be gratefully received.

5th. That brethren John McDonald and Donald Crawford be engaged as evangelists for the ensuing year, to end at the next annual meeting.

6th. That evangelists be directed to collect for the Society where it may by them be deemed expedient:

A Board of 7 brethren was then chosen to correspond with the evangelists and conduct any business that may be required before the next annual meeting.

WILLIAM MURRY was chosen President.

LEVI MINARD " Secretary.

ALLEN MINARD " Treasurer.

Resolved that the editors of the *Christian Banner* and *Christian Age* be requested to publish the above.

On behalf of the meeting,

NATHANIEL MINARD.

Secretary.

SUNDRY COMMUNICATIONS now on file will appear in the *Banner* in their turn. Brethren Laing and Adelpnos must be heard in our next; also our good friend B. Franklin, of Cincinnati. We may likewise find space for some queries now on hand. D. O.