

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. XII.

COBOURG AND BRIGHTON, JULY, 1858.

NO. 7.

CLOSE COMMUNION TOPPLING.

From the Gospel Tribune.

So the Rev. J. R. Graves, editor of the Tennessee Baptist, seems to think. In a recent number of his journal he says:—

"That a scheme is being plotted, and the elements at work, to *open communionize* the Baptist denomination in America, we have had reason to fear; that a large body of Northern Baptists are upon the verge of the plunge into open communion at the table, as well as in baptism, and in the pulpit, we have long been satisfied; and that there are men in the South ready to second the move cannot be questioned—men whose published sentiments are even now preparing the way before the denomination."

"*I lotted!*" indeed friend Graves, that is just the way that Popery spoke of old; everything done and said against it, was adjudged *plotting*, and so now, when thousands upon thousands of your own brethren, as well entitled to the right of following their honest convictions as yourself, approach the conclusions reached by the Jesses, Bunyans, Halls and Carsons of the old world, and are preparing to break from their necks the galling yoke of close communion, these brethren must be reproachfully spoken of by you as *plotting!* Fie! Fie! Graves. What is close communion, that action taken against it must be characterized as plotting? Is it worthy of this mode of defence? Is it self-evidently holy, righteous and good? Are the decrees of close Baptist churches and associations, enforcing it upon the faithful under pains and penalties, to be regarded as *infallible* decrees? It will not do, friend Graves;

your beloved close communion is being put into the scales to test its scriptural weight, and many are being startled by the results. It is being cast, with other things, loudly puffed as gold, into the terrible crucible of free and independent research. This, the "*Tennessee Baptist*," and nearly every other Baptist Paper in the Union, has done its best to prevent, by keeping every column most rigidly locked against the admission of any kind of discussion on the subject, and by circulating all manner of warnings, and also the most hideous caricatures of the doctrine and practice of unrestricted Christian communion. But all in vain—time rolls on, and some how thousands of Baptists have been reading the Bible on this subject, and talking together so earnestly and effectually that the whole "Baptist Denomination in America" is likely to be "*open communionized*." Close communion seems toppling to its fall. And the Rev. J. R. Graves, able to restrain himself no longer, puts the trumpet to his mouth, and sounds it over the Union, that "a large body of the Northern Baptists are open communion." Very well, friend, your figure is a bounding one, which reminds us of vast fields of broken ice, rapidly nearing the falls of Niagara having broken loose from their frozen moorings. On they come! and in a long and glorious avalanche "plunge" over the Falls—thence, hurrying along, with the arrow-like speed of the impetuous Niagara, they quietly emerge from its open mouth, and spread themselves over the bosom of Ontario, "*The Beautiful Lake*." She gently bearing and warming them upon her bosom, they gradually yield up the last of their icy peculiarities, and lo! the immense fields of ice, broken, chafed and fretted by endless collisions, have all dissolved, and now mingle in a communion and fellowship so broad, deep, and intimate, as to make it a fit emblem of the unrestricted Christian communion, into which the Northern Baptists are seen ready to plunge. Truly, and with the whole heart, we can say, *May the Lord hasten it in His time.*

MISSIONARY SOCIETIES, NO. 9.

From the *Christian Review*.

We insert, this week, in another column, the remarks of Brother Oliphant in reply to our remarks in a former number. It may be that some of our readers may think we should make some reply to his remarks, but we do not think any reply is demanded at our hand. For the present, we shall allow him, unmolested, to proceed till we can see

some point distinctly defined, and some issue clearly formed; that we can reply to understandingly. We are not yet fully satisfied what it is that he is opposed to. At some times he rather appears to be at war with all missions; then he appears to be offended with the Christian Missionary Society in Cincinnati. We have invited him to define distinctly what it is that he is at issue with. But as yet he has not stated precisely where the difficulty lies. Nor need he spend any more time, or space, in telling us how well *he loves us*. We have not doubted that he feels right towards us. He is kind enough, and we are not so young and sensitive, that he need to give us a lump of sugar, every now and then, to keep us in a good humor. We need no lengthy controversy. A few plain matters will settle the whole affair:

1. Is he in favor of the missionary work?
2. Is he in favor of missions in any form? or does he think that every man should do what he can, in his individual congregation, without any concert of action?
3. Should we, or can we, in any way, in harmony with the New Testament, call a man and send him to a certain mission?
4. Does he believe in the co-operation of churches, in calling, sending and sustaining missionaries in any field, home or foreign?
5. If he does, will he give us an outline how it is to be done? If we are not doing right, we wish to be shown how we shall do right.

It is the easiest thing a man ever did to declaim against unscriptural societies and all that. But this is simply assumption. What are we doing that is wrong? Is it wrong for brethren and churches to co-operate and send Bro. Barclay to Jerusalem, and Bro. Beardslee to Jamaica? Is it wrong for brethren and churches in a State to call and send missionaries to destitute portions of the State? or why cannot our brother co-operate with us?

But we must close, as we are simply hastily sketching a few words before being off to a missionary meeting, as an apology for not replying to the Banner.—B. Franklin.

It is refreshing to listen once more to the 'Christian Review,' although the satisfaction is at a discount arising from the perceptible signs of a full retreat.

Either a better memory to preserve the remembrance of promises, or greater circumspection in making promises, would be nearly as useful at the missionary head quarters as a touch of reformation in mission matters. Only last January, our friend the 'Review' promised to serve up to the community anything we would write on the subject of the new society, if we so desired, provided we published what he had to offer. More recently, both in a private line and in print, the devoted Franklin promised to reply to our scrutiny of his article that appeared in May. We allude to these promises, but we have other busi-

ness on hand just now than to offer a desertation upon the reason why they have not been kept.

We would amend the sentence where our brother says 'we need no lengthy controversy' by saying *we need no controversy at all*. A little investigation, however, extending over some 50 or 60 pages of this monthly, is, according to the view taken from our Observatory, very essential if not indispensable. Are we not told by strong friends that their missionary arguments are many and mighty? Do we not hear it more than hinted that the salvation of the world of sinners and the salvation even of saints depend upon the missionary arrangements such as are at par value at Cincinnati? And shall we be informed in the same breath that these big ecclesiastic reasons, and these vitally essential arrangements, are not to be examined elaborately in their bearings?

For the second time a gentle wave of wonder comes to us relative to what we are opposing. It appears not to be considered that if there be any dubiety in the premises, it is by reason of the imperfect picture of things drawn by the missionary artists at Cincinnati. Friend Franklin has, by good official authority, told us of 'a creation of the brethren' in the likeness, power, and nature of a missionary society; and to a goodly few we have made it clear that we do and can lawfully oppose this late 'creation' by pious men. If neighbor Franklin now tells us that he does not know what this modern creation is—that the creature formed in his own city, and much admired and praised, is not comprehended by him, and therefore does not comprehend what we oppose, we will feel obligated to take its likeness anew and send it to the 'Review' office; and a ticket or label will be put on the creature's forehead, just beneath its jutting horns, with these words distinctly marked: 'This is the creature that D. Oliphant considers dangerous, either as a free commoner in the open country or in a city vineyard.'

Touching the queries of the slightly over-sugared 'Review,' they have, we opine, already been all answered before seeing them. But we will engage to bestow upon them marked attention, provided our excellent relative will answer our fourth query propounded in February last and give us the proof that he responded to our third question correctly. Let us trust that the intelligent 'Review' will pleasantly accord to us liberty to conclude that he cannot manfully, and with an open Bible, answer these our queries and make the answer fit with his missionary drapery.

D. O.

—NO. 10.—

A very objectionable feature of the modern society is the practical countenance it gives to what we may call the worldly bargain system. It is conceded that the gospel laborer is as deserving of liberal reward as any workman this side of the new heavens and new earth. But the bargains made between churches and preachers, and especially between 'a missionary' and a 'missionary society,' are, doubtless, seriously deficient of inspired sanction. Our Lord in heaven never deals with us either in things temporal or spiritual according to the wise conceptions of commercial propriety in the employment of evangelists. God guarantees, in what we call the natural world, that our 'bread shall be given and water shall be sure;' but he never provides in advance a stock of necessaries and bargains with us that we shall receive so much per day or per year. He superintends the world and keeps all nature's ordinances in good order; then we plow, sow, reap, and receive according to our faithful service and his bountiful providence, but not upon the stipulation plan. It would indeed be a curious sight, even in this calculating and speculative age, to see a modern patriarch of the field withholding his hand from the plow or reserving his seed in the granary till he received a guarantee from heaven that he was to be rewarded so much for his labor.

Looking back upon our very dear brethren who freshly from the lips of the apostles accepted the glad word, how, let us ask, did they operate? Did any of them enter the field of their labors upon the bargain-in-advance principle? Is there anything like it in the Pure Creed? Ah! but a voice is heard; it tells of prudence. Yes, in whatever chapter of amendment we are working, this same smooth-talking gentleman will preach from his standing text—discretion.

But although a state missionary society might, so far as purity of terms would indicate, be a mere contrivance of the state to carry out state purposes, and the missionaries be mission-men to fulfil a political mission, we are sometimes logically informed of the utility of such a society by reason of its having kept certain laborers at work; that so many sermons have been preached; and that so many converts have been made. This species of logic is supposed to settle the whole question. While we would rejoice with an apostle that the gospel is preached and men saved, even if the preaching should be through envy and strife, it is too much for us to call this reasoning reasonable.

Heaven's models are not thus to be set aside and trampled under the heel of prudential zeal. The labors of the brethren in Christ, without a missionary society, are larger, warmer, and every way superior for the capital purpose of evangelizing and bringing men under the divine government. Let these devout reasoners—and we freely admit their piety—take the bands off all their missionary machinery and enter the field as the Lord's faithful disciples, working as the brethren did primitively, and then recount to us the fruits of their labors. Will fewer addresses be delivered? Nay, will there not be many more? Will less zeal be possessed or manifested? Rather, will there not be a bigger and purer stock of it? Will a lesser number of souls be saved? Who believes it?—will there not be two or ten or twenty or a hundred to one?

Refer to facts. Where and when did any missionary society perform what the first disciples performed among Jews and Gentiles? They did certainly 'with one mind strive together for the faith of the gospel,' not merely to edify one another but to 'hold forth the word' to turn sinners from sin to salvation. Where and when did a missionary superstructure make such headway in working and winning as a handful of disciples in Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio and other parts between 1816 and 1836?

But discretion again meets us and tells a pitiful tale concerning the sacrifices made in the early efforts of brethren in America. And were these sacrifices too great? Can we calmly look upon our Lord on Calvary and in the grave, and complain of sacrifices? The religion of Christ never will, we conclude, while the current dispensation lasts, be permitted to make its way over the world in silver slippers. The Lord intends to make drafts upon us according to the measure of his superabounding favor and affection; and if we are not prepared to make sacrifices, calling and accounting all our duties so many pleasures, from the love we bear to Christ our Redeemer, like the true laborers we read of, we ought to be ready to deliver ourselves up to the safekeeping of the flesh at once. We cannot thus belong to the Lord's company of spiritual men.

There is however a sentiment uttered by friend Franklin that is not only endorsable but praiseable. He says in effect to brethren, 'Do not dispute about plans.' Agreed! Let the friends at Cincinnati, then, show the example by actively repudiating their organized discretionary plans, go to work after the sure model, and teach all to follow

them as they follow Christ. We need workers. We need strong, zealous, big-souled workers. Organizations and their plans are far worse than useless. Nice dove-tailed schemes, showy conventions, loud-sounding resolutions, home-made laws, commercial memberships at so many dollars apiece, salaried agents to procure salaries for others, bargains with missionaries for a certain number of days' preaching for a given amount of funds,—let all such latter-day patchwork and prudential planning be thrown into the Dead Sea, and let the health-indicating and health-inspiring proceedings of the model brethren be substituted. Thus will the world be converted, for thus the world was once converted.

We require workmen, living, spirit-stirring, light-shedding, love-diffusing, zeal-producing, fruit-bearing, sin-subduing workmen; yes, men whose minds are quickened by the electricity of heaven, and whose souls are expanded to overflowing with the Lord's life-message which he asks his people to carry to all who dwell beneath the skies. Workers we must have—workers we must all be, or perish we certainly shall as all idlers ought. We need workmen who are gossypally robust and self-sacrificing, whose zeal is not created or regulated by the missionary hot-bed, but in whose hearts Christ dwells by faith, and who are therefore enabled to show Christ to others and implant in the souls and affections of men what is deeply and abidingly implanted in themselves.

D. O.

NOTE TO B. FRANKLIN :—You have been pleased to turn to me your backplate instead of your breastplate. Since it is not your pleasure to consider jointly with me the queries proposed from the Jerusalem standpoint, will you have the goodness to write out a sufficient suit of queries from the Cincinnati standpoint, covering in your estimation the whole ground, and I will unite with you in their consideration. Or if you offer the questions proposed in your last sketch as embracing the essential germs of the investigation, I will begin at once and proceed in this form.

D. O.

G. L. SCOTT AGAINST T. M.

Although neither a D. D., an L. L. D., an M. D. nor even an A. B., I venture to make a few strictures upon T. M.'s affirmations respecting 'Modern Sadduceism' trusting that a rigid adherence to brevity and courtesy will go far to make up for my lack of degrees.

At the commencement of the article we are informed that the writer's design is to "make an exhibit of a certain error, touching the words life and death, that greatly dilutes the force and eternal bearings of these interesting and solemn terms." Some five quotations are made to prove that "death is not simply a loss of life, but separation of the heart and affections from God." And that life "consists in our being united spiritually to him who is emphatically Eternal life." By turning to a dictionary we find that death is defined as "extinction of life" and life, as "existence." The fact that animals and men who never enjoyed the favor of God, in common with Jesus, who never lost his favor, are spoken of by the sacred writers as having died, proves that they sometimes use the term death in the sense of extinction of life; while on the other hand, the fact that the same parties are spoken of as having life, without reference to their union or disunion from God, proves that the same writers sometimes used the term life, in the sense of mere existence. Again if we turn to all the instances in which the terms occur in the bible, we will find that in an overwhelming majority of cases they signify extinction of life and existence respectively, therefore those are their primary meanings. For the true import or primary meaning of a word is determined by its derivation, or the manner in which it is generally used by good writers. Furthermore, it is a well-known rule, that while a word may have more than one meaning, or may be used metaphorically, a secondary meaning is not to be taken till the primary one has been found inapplicable. Without a rigid adherence to this rule, language loses its power and becomes incapable of conveying any definite idea. Having settled the true import of the terms by the general usage of the sacred writers, what they may mean in the particular passages quoted by T. M. is irrelevant to the subject, and for the sake of brevity may be passed unnoticed.

The apostle Paul, indeed, tells the saints in Rome that 'the wages of sin is death,' and John spake of a second death; but in neither case is there anything to warrant the "affirmation" that more is meant by them than extinction of life. John tells us that life will be extinguished by the parties being cast into the lake of fire, and the effect of fire upon a corruptible body is beautifully and philosophically explained in the twenty-seventh Psalm. "The enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of rams, they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away."

Mr. M. will excuse me for finding fault with the following extract: "God only has immortality, but it is nowhere said that God only has everlasting being, and while it is fearfully true that those only will have immortality who seek for it, it is not said that none but them will have eternal existence." Admitting this to be true, it would by no means prove that men must necessarily exist for ever, for negative evidence alone can support no proposition. But it is a mistake to say that it is nowhere said 'God only has everlasting being.' The word immortality, strictly speaking, occurs only three times in the New Testament; once in 1 Tim. 6:16; and twice in 1 Cor. 15:53, 54. In the first instance it expresses a quality belonging to the uncreated

God. In the other instances it expresses a quality to be assumed by the bodies of the saints when the last trumpet sounds. Mortal, means subject to death, immortal means not subject to death; when a body dies it is speedily resolved into its original elements, and becomes extinct. If then God only possesses the property of not dying, and consequently of not becoming extinct, it follows that he only *inherently* possesses everlasting being: again, immortality (in this instance literally incorruptibility) is for those who seek for it by a patent continuance in well doing. Corruption is the chemical action which takes place when organized matter is left to itself, and the result is the total destruction of the body and a return of the matter of which it was composed to its natural static condition. Those who fail to secure incorruptibility must therefore of necessity be ultimately reduced to the dust from whence they were taken, and hence those only who 'seek for immortality' can exist for ever.

Although Paul acknowledges himself a pharisee, he by no means endorses all the dogmas taught by that sect; his belief in the existence of angels and spirits did not necessitate a belief in the existence of disembodied human Spirits, nor was that the point on which he was called in question, but in two great and important truths, the hope, and the resurrection of the dead, as a perusal of the narrative will make evident.

Mr. M. calls "profound attention to the fact" that while disputing with the Sadducees the only argument Jesus employed to correct the sadduceean error was, the separate living state of the spirits of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." With all humility I solicit your profound attention to the two following facts; and to the conclusion logically deduced from the second. First—The spirits of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not once alluded to in the narrative. Second—Many of the pagan philosophers believed in the immortality of the soul, and its existence in a separate living state after the death of the body, while they did not believe in the resurrection of the body. Hence the conclusion must follow that a belief in the resurrection does not necessarily accompany a belief in the "separate living state of the spirits" of dead men. Such being the case, although Jesus had proved that the spirits of the patriarchs were alive, the great question of the resurrection would have remained untouched, and the Sadducees unanswered. Jesus argued "now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, for he is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him." Had they been actually living at that time their resurrection would have been unnecessary, but God "who calls those things which be not as though they were," even as he called Abraham when as yet he had no child, a father of many nations because he made him so; calls the patriarchs alive although sleeping in the dust, because they will be raised in the future.

The reference to 1 Cor. 15, is rather unfortunate for Mr. M. From the tenor of his article the 127 hymn, on the 106 page of the Christian

Hymn Book, appears to embody his ideas of the state of the spirits of "departed saints."

How happy are the souls above,
From sin and sorrow free,
With Jesus they are now at rest
And all his glory see."

If the souls of "the dead in 'Christ'" are really at this moment happy in the enjoyment of heaven, how could the apostle say they are perished if the dead rise not? With him, "in whose presence there is fulness of joy" and at "whose right hand where are pleasures for ever more" they have little interest in the fate of this body of sin and death and may without regret leave it to "corruption, death, and worms." But, if the saints now sleeping in the dust of the earth remain entirely unconscious, until awakened by the trumpet's sound, how utterly and hopelessly must they have perished if the dead rise not.

G. L. SCOTT.

Paris, C. W., April 18th, 1858.

REMARKS.

It is not my design to review in detail the above four manuscript pages of mistakes, but merely to correct over again the capital blunder continually perpetuated by our materialistic friends—their persistently faulty definition of the words *Life* and *Death*. This will straighten the whole article, for every argument attempted in it is founded in this mistake. This is almost the only question for them to examine. Does the word 'Death' (first and second) *always* refer to the mere dissolution of bodily organization? Does the word 'Life' *always* refer to the bodily life? Or do not these terms frequently refer to the *condition* or *state* of the soul? I will simply submit two considerations for the calm reflection of all concerned.

1st. The meaning of a term ought always to make sense, if substituted in any passage, for the word itself. If "Death" never means more than annihilation of conscious being, what will friend Scott think of Paul's definition of it? "To be carnally minded is death," that is, "to be carnally minded is to have no mind at all." No carnally minded man then has any consciousness at all; and how then can the carnal mind be *enmity* against God? 'He that loveth not his brother abideth in *annihilation* or *unconsciousness*.' And how could the poor creature be expected to love his brother, if he were totally unconscious of having a brother? We know that we have passed from death, i. e. annihilation or non-existence unto life, because we love the brethren.' It is well that we have some way of finding out that we are not still vacant nonentities. I know our good friends will not, as sensible men, endorse

a doctrine when properly considered so easily exposed to a just ridicule ; for they know, as well as we, that it would amount to an unvarnished perversion of truth. Spiritual death does not imply unconsciousness, but separation of the affections from God, which may be on either side of the grave. Physical death or "extinction" of bodily life has no effect in changing the spiritual man into unconsciousness.

2nd. *The Greek language has no term in it that primarily means annihilation.* Such a word is found neither in Classic Greek, the Septuagint, nor the New Testament. If friend Scott will look into any English or Greek Dictionary, instead of his pocket dictionaries, that translates all English words into Greek, that have any equivalent in Greek, he will find the word *Annihilate* is not among the words translated ; simply because, like many other English words, such as Printing Press, Telegraph, Railway, Steamboat, &c., it has no just equivalent in that language. How then could death, in "an overwhelming majority of cases, mean extinction of life," that is, annihilation of conscious being ? There are, it is true in the New Testament, two or three allusions to annihilation, but in those instances it was referred to only to be *stamped with divine disapprobation* ; and even this had to be done by the accommodation of words that do not primarily signify annihilation. These two considerations understood and applied will correct the whole nineteen specific mistakes in the above short article which I cannot spend time to notice individually.

T. M.

EVANGELISTS—THEIR POSITION AND WORK, NO. 3.

When we depart from Scotland, or from the late religious abode of Archibald McLean, and journey to Ephesus in Asia, and accept the privilege of looking upon the Lord's congregation in that city, we hear ambassador Paul begin a letter to the brethren, thus: 'To the saints who are at Ephesus.' The apostle, while remembering that all the saints in Asia and in Europe are one body, remembers that they are not all at one place, and therefore he immediately addresses that portion of them dwelling in that city. Afterwards he says: 'You are of the household of faith,' clearly suggesting to us that they did not constitute the household, but were *of* the household,—a difference as great as that between a whole and a part. Again: 'I Paul, the prisoner for you Gentiles.' This is worthy of note ; for the term 'you Gentiles' has

reference, not alone to the few at Ephesus city, but to all the Gentiles with whom, as a workman for Christ, he was connected. Further on he says: Christ loved the church, and gives himself for it.' The apostle certainly had his eye upon more than the friends in Ephesus while using this language. 'Pray for me . . . that, as an ambassador [now a prisoner] I may speak (not timidly, but) boldly, as I ought to speak.' They therefore had an interest in the apostle's speaking wherever he spoke. 'That you may know my affairs, how I do, Tychicus, [an evangelist] will make known to you all things.'

From these and from other plain words in this one brief epistle written by an apostle, we come to the grave conclusion that brother McLean with his independence of each church and the inspired Paul with all the saints and a portion of the saints before him, do not exactly agree. We have not the slightest hesitancy in telling friend McLean, although we only find him in his writings, that we have more confidence in the apostle as a teacher than in him. It appears to us conclusive that no one could ever gather from the epistle to the friends of the Lord at Ephesus that churches were then independent; and hereafter we may have occasion to examine whether any of the other inspired letters will permit us to speak of church independency. When the apostle says to these same relatives: 'There is one Body and one Spirit,' we almost feel like asking an independence advocate if they had an independent Spirit at Ephesus in those days.

It being no virtue to cultivate 'the spirit of fear,' let us calmly look into the citadel of independency from another angle. The cardinal service of the sentiment that each church is independent, is to prevent a tyrannical bishop from growing, or from using power if he should grow. There are so many errors branching out from this one root of a foreign vine, that it would take twenty pages of this monthly to enumerate and illustrate them. For does the making of every company of brethren independent preclude ecclesiastic tyranny? If tyranny we are to have, why cannot a score of tyrants in a score of churches work as much mischief as one tyrant among the same number of churches? But we sweep the whole of this reasoning into the same waves that rolled over Pharaoh's perished army, and then stand up for the enactments and sanctions of Jesus apart from all dominancy whether by a little or a big pope.

But what about the authority of the church? In offering a few words in this chapter, let it be noted that we are not particular whether

the church is interpreted as referring to believers in one city, one province, or the whole world. The question is, Has the church authority? We answer, It has not, and never had. We mean the church of Christ; for the church of Rome has always had authority and always will while it exists. One of the Archbishops puts it down in strong orthodoxy when he states: 'The church was prior to the bible. We believe in the church first: and we believe in the bible which the church presents to us. If there is anything clearly taught, it is the authority of the church.' We trust that this hint from the Archbishop will moderate the ardor of fervent friends who talk so fluently concerning papalism; for if there be any virtue in a good Roman sentiment, our friends who speak of the authority of the church have this virtue. With us it proves nothing one way or the other to agree or disagree with Rome; for if we should find a jewel in the pope's inner parlor, or in a font of holy water, we could not think that popery had gone so far into the jewel as to spoil it. There is both despotism and democracy at Rome. The Ecclesiastic Chairman, the avowed occupant of Peter's seat, is elected!

Carefully have we searched the oracles for something like 'authority of the church' either as it respects terms or signification; but up to this moment our search has been unrewarded. The reason, we must think, is, that during the labors of the apostles before their personal departure the church was not a democracy. When we hear wise men telling us about the authority of the church to meet at a certain hour for worship, or to erect a place for the purpose of worshiping comfortably, or some other expedient, we cannot help thinking of a person explaining to us the authority he has to dress himself every morning, or his authority to sit at his table to partake of food. There is as much authority in the one case as in the other. Authority has reference to the making of law or the enforcing of law with appropriate accompanying penalties. Hence, the assembly we call the church, whether a church or the church, has not one particle of authority so far as we have learned.

The authority of the Head of the Church is all-sufficient: and that there might be enough of this authority on earth for all practical purposes, he imparted authority to certain inspired men, and thus stereotyped and fixed fast his authority on earth for all people and all time. The church therefore is built upon, and is presided over by, both the Lord and his chosen apostles. We need authority above, and we need authority below. The Lord in person exercises the requisite authority

in heaven: the Spirit-endowed ambassadors exercise the necessary authority on earth. We ask nothing more as it respects authority. Will any one explain to us what other authority is required?

But an intelligent and worthy company of evangelists speak up here and inquire if they also are devoid of authority. Yes, brethren, you also are without authority. You have no power to make a law—no power to enforce a law by penalties. The reason is clear: Christ never gave you this power, and what you have not received you do not possess. This may be a hard lesson to learn; but be patient, brethren, and we will very composedly bring out what has been avowedly learned from the Master relative to the place that you fill. And if you feel aggrieved, speak up. You shall have the hearing ear. Meantime we centre everything in the exalted Lord, who is at the base, the top, and in the midst of his temple composed of the precious materials called believers.

Next, then, for the sake of brevity, let us ask the question, If it be correct that the church has no authority, what is the value of the church's decisions? The authority of the church and the decisions of the church evidently go together—if the one can be made good, so can the other; if the one hangs on nothing, the other hangs on the same nothing! It is very certain to us that no such wares as these came from the true mother church, where the Spirit of wisdom and of power enabled the chosen witnesses to begin and continue to teach the things of Christ Jesus, our Life, our Hope, and our Joy.

Having therefore made a fair but short metre effort to sweep off these encumbrances, and to free ourselves of the scraps and fringes which are enstamped with unauthorized grace, we may march up to the Big Priest in the Great City in Italy and question him thus: How or why do you make ecclesiastic decisions? 'By my authority' he replies. Where did you get your authority? 'From the church' is his response. And where did the church obtain it? 'Obtained it from heaven' is the answer. Here is the chain with three nicely welded links which binds over a hundred millions of people to one man and enables him to be as perfect a despot as can be made this side of the palace of All Evil. And is it too much to affirm that there is not one Scotch Baptist on earth who can meet the Roman argument?

But the Large Bishop turns and asks us, 'Where did you get your authority?' We reply that we have none. 'Why then do you labor since you have no authority?' Our answer is concise: We labor in the

Lord's business by the Lord's authority; and what is practically as good, we can prove it to every man who will accept reliable testimony. Thus, in all our studies and in all our operations pertaining to the affairs of the *ekklesia*, we go up for directions to the standard college where the authoritative Faculty consist of Jesus and his Twelve.

D. O.

EVANGESISTS—THEIR POSITION AND WORK, NO. 4.

Seeing that all disciples of Jesus are one people, meeting in different places for convenience' sake, a general workman in the gospel like Titus, Silas, Barnabas, or Silvanus stands related to the whole; and he is to care for all and they are to care for him as their needs and as his needs demand. Any one intelligently calling for the proof that this is speaking as the oracles of God, will be courteously answered. And since a workman of this character has no authority, he never can be an arch-bishop, a supreme ecclesiastic, or a sceptred priest.

But we know that some one wants to repeat to us Paul's words as he addresses the evangelist in the Island of Crete: 'These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority.' Yes, but *whose* authority? If Titus possessed the authority, why did the apostle address, instruct, and direct him?—! It was Jesus' authority, unerringly enforced by Paul upon Titus, who, in his labors, was to be governed accordingly. The apostle needed no one thus to address and direct him—he stood on authoritative ground—hence the vital difference between the position of Paul and the position of Titus; and what is true of Titus is true of Silas, Timothy, and others of the evangelizing class. The apostles were a fountain of authority as it respects testimony, doctrine, and action; evangelists were no more than learners and workers by the apostolic authority.

More than a little is heard respecting the inspiration of primitive workmen called evangelists. We will not ask any son of modern logic to prove to us that Timothy and Titus wrought miracles, for the proof, we believe, has not come to us; but we concede at once that Silvanus and Timothy jointly with Paul wrote to the brethren in Thessalonica, and Dr. Luke and John Mark, both evangelists, and, because inspired, more than evangelists, gave us three portions of the standard creed; and we know also that Philip could and did perform miracles. All true; and it is also true that Philip, Stephen, and others were possessed of the Spirit in greater than ordinary power while in the deaconship; and

if Philip could work miracles while a deacon as well as while engaged as an evangelist, how do our friends who bring up the miracle argument manage the matter? Are they willing to un-deacon every one now because not like deacon Philip able to show supernatural power? The argument against evangelists then, so far as relates to the question of miracles, runs against itself and breaks itself to pieces just here.

The very name of such general workmen and the tenor and scope of their work would seem to embrace convincing evidence that they are needed in every age. For a little variety and to make certainty still more certain we have here taken up the Greek Testament and Lexicon to look at the old term from which we have made the word evangelist. This name, if we trace its origin and character fairly, means simply *good angel* or *right messenger*. We find that the ancient word *evangelistes* is made to signify 'one who announces glad tidings' as well as a 'teacher of the christian religion.' Look now at the business of this workman as sketched by undisputed authority. When Paul enjoins his gospel son at Ephesus to 'do the work of an evangelist,' he lays out the work for him; and it appears that his labor is chiefly included in these terms: Preach—Teach—Exhort—Exemplify—Admonish—Rebuke. Two sets of questions arise here. Does it require inspired power to preach or announce the gospel?—inspired power to teach?—inspired power to exhort? to be an example to the believers? to admonish? to rebuke? We say, No. Is the proof demanded? An instalment of one kind of proof is given in a short sentence: No one doubts that men preach, teach, exhort, and rebuke in these days, and no one believes that we have any inspired men. This is enough until more evidence is asked.

Again, if the exercise of these abilities and the fulfilling of these various duties did not make usurpers and young popes of Barnabas, Titus, Silvanus, Philip, Timothy, Luke, Tychicus, Mark, Epaphroditus, Stephanas, Silas, Trophimus, Apollos, Archippus, Epaphras, and others like them who were general laborers, on what intelligent principle can it be shown that the exercise of abilities in the same work and the fulfilment of the same duties by men now will issue in usurpation or high headedness? Will the inspiration of the former and the non-inspiration of the latter account for the alleged difference,—inspired power keeping the pope out of the primitive workmen and the want of it letting the pope into the existing race of workmen? There might be force in such a position were it not for half a score of considerations,

two of which we may name: 1st, it is maintainable that evangelists possess no authority whether they are Paul's immediate companions or are laborers in the nineteenth century; and 2nd, inspiration never was a personal gift for personal purposes. The man who was inspired received his power, not for himself, but for others. It did nothing special for him. Even the chiefest of the apostles, whose supernatural gifts excelled, required to secure his own salvation like the humblest saint. And this great teacher sends arguments and presents motives by letter to evangelists in Ephesus and Crete which indicate that these workmen are themselves to be saved and to labor to save others the same as men uninspired. Does any man dispute this? If any one is bold we are bold also; and if a student of the oracles has a logical or scriptural weapon long enough to reach through our armour, we offer him the opportunity to let us see it and feel it! Let him bring out his strength, and we will yield to it at once if it be from above.

Were we to submit this question entirely to reason and follow the lead of logic alone, we would be free to take the very opposite ground taken by the anti-evangelist friends. Would it not seem plausible that the more a brother did in exercising his gifts and the greater variety of duties he fulfilled in the Lord's work, the more Christ-like he would be, and therefore the more humble and heavenly? Men who are only parts of men, illy balanced, imperfectly taught, and qualified to do only a little, if indeed they can do anything well, are just the sort who are liable to be puffed and swelled with pride and the domineering spirit. Those who have a varied assortment of gifts and who exercise them constantly, become more humble and zealous as they increasingly see the favor of heaven by the study of the gospel and the measure of responsibility resting upon them as the Lord's laborers.

But we belong to the matter-of-fact and not to the theorizing class, and therefore we claim the liberty of glancing at facts. What does history testify? Will any document, inspired or uninspired, show to us that dangerous evils have grown out of the evangelistic office? It is easy to show that the overgrown Bishop at the City on the Tiber represents the abuse which has been made of the bishop's office; an office that almost all acknowledge without a note of demur. How is this? A single fact, clearly attested, outweighs the weight of a hundred plausibilities or as many theories. We have no record of usurpation

or despotism. springing from the office of evangelist; but plenty of supremacy and well marked tyranny protuberating from the office of bishop. Can not some of our friends shed a ray of light upon this angle of the subject? It is needed. We indeed demand it, if the argument respecting the papalizing tendency of the evangelistic office is to be regarded and received as good reasoning currency.

But even this mode of working, solid and safe as it seems, must be considered as not enough like a rock to rest any part of the Lord's structure upon. Men who avowedly execute the Lord's business are not in their place if the Lord has not appointed them; and therefore without either democratic or ecclesiastic rationalism we appeal, not to Caesar, nor to his distant son Constantine who became a church Sovereign, but to the only Lord of the church as he speaks by authoritative servants. And as these servants are to be heard in the scriptures, the question of questions on this as on every other item of the religion of heaven, is, What do the oracles declare?

All admit that in the first age of the church there were general workmen termed evangelists. The whole controversy therefore must turn upon one plain query, Are the duties enforced upon primitive evangelists such duties as are demanded now for the church and the world? For be it understood that, with us, office and work, in a practical point of view, are the same. As to successorship it is not to be named only to be kindly opposed or vigorously exposed. Work, or something to be done, is the ground of office, and hence where there is no work there is no office, but where well defined work is to be done, the office is exactly as long and as broad as the work. Papacy, prelacy, and the presbytery have taught the world sad lessons on the subject of office. They tell us that office or official grace must precede labor, and therefore all work performed must be executed on an official basis; whereas it is true to affirm that work—work to be done and work actually done—is the basis of office in the economy of the Redeemer. This single thought destroys the whole temple reared up by ecclesiastics.

But who dissents from the position that preaching, teaching, exhorting, rebuking are now as necessary as ever? Not one man, learned or unlearned. Hence to bring the question to the level of settlement we only need to consider whether it be as proper at this day for one laborer to give attention to all these duties as it was anciently. Here, at length, we have arrived at a final and decisive stand-point, and there-

fore let us devoutly open the Book which is profitable not only for 'instruction' but for various kinds of 'correction.' First, we will slowly read over these words:

'Be strong in the favor that is in Christ Jesus: and the things you have heard of me [not the things received by direct inspired power] the same commit [deliver in trust] to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also: endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus.' Several distinct things claim our attention in view of this language. 1. Who speaks? An apostle who has authority. 2. Who does he address? An evangelist. 3. What did the evangelist do? Preached, taught, exhorted, rebuked as occasion demanded. 4. How did he learn to do these things? He heard every thing and learned them all from Paul. 5. Were these duties to be performed by others? Yes, if the apostle's instructions are obeyed; for the evangelist is told to deliver in trust to others who are competent the very same things that he had learned. 6. Are the directions of the apostle addressed, in one sense at least, exclusively to evangelists? Obviously they are; and if there are no evangelists in these days, who work as such workmen did primitively, there are no less than three epistles in the true creed which are addressed to no persons on earth! As this is an important halting place, we pause here. A few additional words next month.

D. O.

THE TERM 'ORGANIZE,' THINGS DISCRETIONARY, AND PREACHING.

River John, N. S., May, 1858.

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT:—In the April Number of the Banner I see you are for cashiering the word organize, resolution, &c. You are in doubt if they belong to 'the family language of the Lord's household.' Perhaps you are right in this. I am of opinion that if religious disputants were to confine themselves to scripture language, their articles would be shorter, simpler, and of course easier understood. But it seems to me that we are now so circumstanced that it is scarcely possible for us to dispute or converse about religion without mixing up the language of the schoolmen with the language of scripture.

Just look at *your own* article where you find fault with the term organize; in the first paragraph (only nine lines) I counted twenty-four words which I cannot find in the Bible. Now, respected brother, I am surprized to see a man dealing so liberally in the language of the schoolmen finding fault with a word so generally used as

the term organize, for this word has been frequently used by the brethren for many years. The term organize, according to your own showing, is equivalent to, or of the same import with *make*, and you ask did the apostles ever organize churches. Now I ask you, who formed the first churches; they must have been made, formed, or organized by some party. It is an old proverb that law-makers should not be law-breakers, and again, example goes before precept. Now it appears to me that you will not govern yourself by the rule you prescribe to others. This seems rather unfair. . . . I am of opinion that if churches and individuals would do their duty we would have no need of missionary societies; but I cannot see the reason why you are so much against such societies and in favor of building colleges. The one appears to me to have as little support from scripture as the other.

Did the primitive workmen need or use colleges to help them to advocate the truth? If they did, their proceedings do not seem to have been left on record. Why then such noise about building colleges? Are they any part of the christian institution?

We have not the means to educate all our preachers at colleges, neither have we the means to support them after they are educated. In all my long experience I never saw a college bred preacher who was willing to soil his hands with manual labor. Colleges are not intended to teach people to labor, but to teach them something that will enable them to get through the world without labor; and the great drawback upon us in this age, is, that we depend too much upon college preachers. Without support we cannot get their service, and for this reason many churches are without preachers, and often without religious ordinances. Now, brother Oliphant, need I tell you that the first preachers were educated not in colleges but in the churches. Need I tell you that they generally travelled on foot and often labored with their own hands to procure support. Of course less money was needed to support preachers in that primitive age. The Lord Jesus travelled on foot, and was weary in his journey. Let it not be supposed that I am against riding in a carriage or on horseback; far from it. We must give up depending upon colleges for preachers, otherwise primitive christianity will disappear from the land. Primitive christianity is marvelously adapted to the wants of the human family. It is the cheapest religion that ever appeared on earth. Even two or three can meet together and enjoy all its blessings and privileges although poor as Lazarus.

JAMES SILLARS.

The preceding is in our judgment useful, and therefore it is given to the public; but it is not critical enough. For example, in formerly speaking as we did respecting the term 'organize,' it is noticeable that we had reference to the things of the divine household. In speaking to one another relative to the Lord's ordinances, commands, promises, or

whatever pertains to the Lord's house, we require, in strict purity, to speak spiritual things in spiritual words, using the very terms brought to us by the Holy Spirit or the equivalent of these terms if our language furnishes them. But in treating of things out of the household of God for the purpose of saluting and exposing error, it is not only lawful but essential to employ other terms that people understand who are fastened to, and encompassed with, these errors.

Let us have an illustration. There is a feast in the Lord's family called the Lord's supper. But there is in the religious world (pardon the phrase *religious* world) a something called 'a sacrament.' This term originally meant a bond or oath. Afterwards the mystics took it and made it mean a particular religious mystery. Finally, the 'Universal Bishop' put the word through his mill, and then 'sacrament' meant an ecclesiastic grace wherein the real body or personality of Christ appeared to men. Now all that we have to do in order to disown this foreign affair, is to show that neither the term sacrament nor its equivalent can be met with in the creed of Christ's religion. But shall we not have liberty to use the word sacrament because not found in the Bible when treating of things *out of* the church! or in exposing its use *in* the church!!

It is true that 'organize' is an old term. So is 'sacrament.' But we are inclined to take the ground, until other premises are before us, that those who cannot teach the whole of heaven's religion without either 'sacrament' or 'organize,' have other things to teach than can be found in the oracles of God. The Bible is a very wise book from a very wise source; let us learn its language and its meaning, and be governed from heaven and not from the earth.

As to colleges, we hinted that one college was evidently beneficial, but we cannot argue the matter. On things pertaining to discretion—or things purely discretionary—the friends of truth may pursue just what course they please without one logical attempt on our part. We agree with the brethren generally in this prudential chapter, that colleges are of service. In critical strictness, they are, with us, necessary evils. If wicked, unfaithful, se'⁶sh, ecclesiastic men had not entrenched themselves and their systems by college bulwarks, we should give one vote—for we are democratic in discretionaries—to pull down every college, except perhaps one or two great centres of the highest order of literature for a whole nation.

There is forty per cent. too much truth in the remarks of friend Sillars in reference to men making a trade of preaching. Here we are compelled to boast a little. It is not profitable, and yet it is profitable. To teach in good faith, we must teach by example as well as by language spoken or written. In 1854 we began looking over the New Testament with careful and special reference to the earthly lot and the temporal reward of public servants in the work of the Lord. Only a few lessons were learned before arriving at the firm determination that we could not make a bargain or enter into any contract with believers or unbelievers to speak a certain time or labor so many days, weeks, or months for a specified price. And by the favor of the Master we have kept our faith without wavering from that time to the present moment. We knew then, as we know now, that the flesh would never be pleased with it. A tincture of suffering has been connected with it, but where the sacrifices have abounded the consolations have much more abounded. We believe that we have enjoyed the Lord's approbation, and this is always worth the price of obtaining it.

Shortly after this determination, a number of brethren made known their desire for our labors. After the first address to the public, we were requested to state how much of the 'needful' would be required. The scriptural doctrine, as far as it was known, and our matter-of-fact position, together with the fact of home obligations, were opened to the view of the friends; and on them, together with us, rested the responsibility of the amount of labor we could bestow in that region. While, then, this resolve has, from the first day till now, cost us something, it is to be remembered that the reformer John lost his liberty and his head for genuine faithfulness; that Peter lost the worth of very many of the fine fish of lake Galilee because of his faith in Jesus; and that Paul lost the approval of respectable acquaintances made at Dr. Gamaliel's college, lost his standing as a captain in the military, and lost all praise as a zealous assistant of the Jewish high priest, on account of the excellency of the knowledge, love, and hope he found in the favor of Christ. -And, too, it is to be recollected while partaking of the grace of suffering either by reason of narrow temporalities or of false or cold-hearted brethren, that the Lord of Glory was scorned, condemned, and contemptuously placed on a cross by men for whose welfare his soul agonized. In view of these soul-moving pictures, and in anticipation of the surpassing blessedness hereafter to be enjoyed by the faithful, ought not a true man rather regret that he is not able to labor and

suffer more, than deplore his lot because of suffering so much while actively at work in copying the life of Christ and making men like him ?

But in setting out on the principle of faith, instead of sight or feeling, as before hinted, we omitted to teach sufficiently or frequently the duty of the friends with whom we labored to co-work with us by way of contributing. This, although arising from a species of backwardness in such matters, was an error. Apart from all our fine feelings, all our sensitiveness, all our pretty delicacy, and even in view of all the fearful evils which have been developed by selfish men making a money traffic of the gospel, the word of the Lord is to be brought out and the sanctions of heaven exhibited plainly, kindly, and earnestly. 'That there may be an equality' in this as in other departments, the Master has been pleased to legislate; and what we need, is, the living development of the whole truth, and every man whether a public or not a public worker, standing up in his place as a true soldier of the Captain to push forward the divine enterprise.

Yet we must doubt the sterling spirituality of the brother of ability who ceases to plead because others will not perform their part in the work. The Lord, and the Lord's true men, will not require so much of him if his opportunities are curtailed; (but on an average of years who has seen a true man's field curtailed?) and it will not be reliable orthodoxy in the time of the great settlement to tell his Master that he did not work because others would not. If men were only answerable one to another, the majority of spiritual idlers and religious sloths would justify a public brother in being idle and slothful too. But every man has a personal account to settle with his Lord; and in view of this, as well as the present pleasure of being like Him who ceaselessly engaged in speaking words and performing acts of favor, the public as well as the private laborer will be as busy as the amount of his intellectual capital, his stock of knowledge, and his condition in life will permit. Like the veteran Joshua he will say, not in words but in zeal, 'My brethren may choose to serve whom they may; but as for me I will serve the Lord.'

It is however an unhappy symptom in this evil generation to find churches uttering loud complaints against their public brethren. When we find a community of fathers complaining of their children, it carries more than a shade of conviction to our mind that the fathers who have trained these sons and daughters are not too perfect. Our public men

are, on an average, the express image of the churches. The churches have made them; and they, in turn, mould the churches. There is reciprocity in these matters; and the church that speaks up against the public brother may be as much to blame by not having made him more perfect.

D. O.

THE GOSPEL TRIBUNE AND UNION.

Neighbor Tribune at Toronto is pleased to copy a part of the strictures we made on his exemplification of the union principle. He also offers an additional word or two, on the premises. We take the following from the pages of our liberal brother:

It is very cheering to the conductors of the "Gospel Tribune," to be continually meeting with new indications that the *principles* of Christian Union, as advocated in its pages, are warmly cherished by many in each of the evangelical denominations of Christendom. In the last issue of the Christian Banner, understood to speak the sentiments of the denomination known as Disciples, we find the following:

"When a man—like the treasurer of Queen Candace, for example, (see Acts viii.)—after hearing Christ preached, says, 'I bow to the Divine oracles, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God,' we correctly affirm that he is a disciple of the Saviour, a member of the church of Christ. And any number of men, in the four quarters of the globe, who have been thus taught, who thus believe, and who thus confess, are at once saved and united in Christ.

"Soon as we all learn that Christianity, instead of consisting of a set of debatable doctrines or theoretical abstractions, is simply a knowledge of, submission to, and affection for ONE PERSON, admiring and loving Him because He is the Highest, the Greatest, and the Richest, who though so High, and so Rich, yet for our sake became both low and poor,—accepting the divine creed because he gave it, trusting his sacrifice because he made it, listening to his word because he uttered it, honoring his ordinances because his authority is in them and with them, loving his people because he dwells in them and reigns over them,—then we shall enjoy spiritual and scriptural union: one Zion, one Lord Jesus, one college of ambassadors, one gospel, one model of Christian manners, one family of the saved, one pure fountain of affection filling every heart in the holy brotherhood."

This is, or looks like, a full avowal of our Union Principles. True, the Banner does not see an exemplification of these principles where the "Tribune" is confident they were exhibited. This, however, is a circumstance of comparative indifference, respecting which there need be no contention, seeing "the root of the matter" is firmly held. Let the Banner go on making observations—rejoicing in all the manifestations

of Union and Christian sympathy which it can accredit as such. The "Tribune" will do the same, and should it find a few more occasions of rejoicing than the Banner, let not the Banner on that account envy the "Tribune;" but let both glorify God by a harmonious exhibition of all the graces of His Spirit.

Our brother at Toronto is aware doubtless that we have from his first issue fully sympathized with him in his liberalizing and brother-acknowledging labors so far as object is concerned. For years, there has not been, to our mind, a broader and better mark of the gospel of our Lord than the oneness that it makes among those who receive it; nor has there been a more notable symptom that the gospel is neither understood nor livingly appreciated than is to be found in the fact of party antipathy and antagonism. Although the eldest editor of the Tribune calls himself a Baptist and the writer takes the name of Disciple as a union as well as an authorized name, we have as much brotherly regard for our cotemporary as the following capital elements of spirituality imply:—1. He has heard Christ; 2. He has believed in Christ through the gospel; 3. He holds Christ as Lord and Lawgiver, the Prince of favor and Head of the church; 4. He has acknowledged these grand items of christianity to society and the world by the public confession of Christ; 5. He is willing to be taught 'all things' by Christ through his inspired servants in order to live a true and loyal subject of the only Redeemer. We have called, do now call, and expect to call all men brethren who are thus saved by, and bound to, Christ. What more or what less does our brother ask in order that we may plead union with him to the extent of his plea?

It appears perfectly clear to our mind that it does not belong to us who are only a race of fallibles in the sight of heaven, to lay down principles of union. To us, it is one of the things of faith to simply accept union principles from the Lord's creed. The elements of union, we most joyfully believe and proclaim, are found in salvation. The same gospel that saves likewise unites. And, therefore, for our part, we would as soon think of giving a man food to preserve life and then give him something that is more than food to impart to him strength, as to think of saving men by the gospel and then employing some other element or elements to bring them together into one brotherhood. ☞ Convert men to Christ by the gospel of Christ without admixture of human elements, and they stand united and will operate together unitedly as a necessary consequence of their relationship to Jesus by

being turned to him. Are we with one another here, brother Tribune? Let us trust so; but whether or not, our brother need have no fear of 'envy.' We pray and work, and work and pray, for union.

D. O.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

For the Christian Banner.

The kingdom of Christ is a spiritual kingdom, and not like a kingdom of this world; and a very good exercise of the heart is it to contrast these two kingdoms.

Christ laid down the corner stone of His kingdom on earth and marked out the boundary between it and the kingdoms of this world, most definitely; and the "field notes" of that survey, describing the original landmarks, are recorded in His last Will and Testament.

The old monuments and landmarks have been obscured by the rubbish of human opinions, which for centuries has been accumulating about them; and human creeds and human doctrines have grown over the old marks, so that it requires careful observation to enable us to find the true line.

Theologians with their human theories and human science have been running the line with the sectarian compass, without consulting the Old Field Notes, and the consequence has been, that there are now as many different lines marked out as there have been different surveyors, each one following his own compass, without making the proper calculation for *local attractions* and *variations*. Hence many really honest and pious people, are occupying "grounds" which were never granted to them by the Lord of the vineyard—they have got the wrong line, and do not know it.

Others know better, having had the old bounds pointed out to them; yet from selfish motives, and worldly desires, they are not willing to give up their possessions, and the result will be, they will lose their claim to Christ's kingdom; for "where their treasure is," their heart will also be.

How many there are who covet the fine "apples" that grow on the world's side, and try every means to "reason" themselves into the belief that the scientific Mr. B. has run the line right, and that "*that tree*

is mine." "What beautiful apples, to contribute to a charitable purpose, at a DONATION." (This good brother has a very choice nursery)—and "that great Oak tree, what beautiful staves it will make for barrels, to send flour to the suffering Irish." (This good deacon has a celebrated mill)—But let the old-fashioned surveyor come along, with his compass, which is true to the pole without the modern inventions, and take out the Old Field Notes and dig up the old corner, and chop out the old marks. The good deacon will soon say, "That is not where the Rev. Mr. B. begun,—and Mr. B. is a man of science, and knows all about it,—and perhaps some mistake may have been made in recording your Old Notes, and I am quite sure *that tree is mine*, although your line will take it away from me."

Oh how many are pretending to be citizens of Christ's kingdom, and are yet looking to the world for popularity—allowing the world to dictate to them, in matters which ought to distinguish us, as "a chosen generation; a royal priesthood; an holy nation; a peculiar people." 1 Pet. 2: 9.

Could we but "read our title *clear*," and find the old corner, laid by the Master Himself; look up the boundaries of our inheritance; cultivate the ground well, watch the field so that no bad seed shall be sown by the evil one: "resist" the evil one; wait "patiently for the early and the latter rain;" let "the effectual fervent prayer of the righteous man" be often heard from the family altar; let the word 'love' be defined by our actions, more than by vain repetitions of profession; in short, look for the real spiritual substance more than for fleeting show, we would beget a revival that would be unto life.

Men of the world have been invited into this kingdom for ages past. They have been exhorted to repentance of late years by the fell destroyer, that swept its millions from the earth, and though the neighbor who was called to the death scene of his friend at noon, and requested to look after his little orphans, was himself a corpse by sunset, and left a little flock to be looked after by a cold world; and though year after year the plague returned, men only appeared to grow more reckless, and never was an age more characterized by wild speculations and a disposition among men to grab and rob from individuals and from the State than that which is known as the Cholera time; and yet no "revival of religion" (as partizans call it) resulted therefrom. But, when the "money crisis" laid its blighting hand upon the purses of the

triflers, they were reached. Old Pharaoh could see his crops destroyed by the ravenous locusts, and his costly apparel covered with vermin, and still "would not let Israel go." But when God smote his first-born, his heart was melted. Shame on the world! But blessed be God, for those who *do come*. 'Tis a glorious thought that the dark spot upon the earth, though so dark that it "may be felt," is growing less, and that Christ's kingdom is every day extending its benignant light aboard. Let us trim our lamps.

T. W.

Williamsville, N. Y., May 18th, 1858.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Eramosa, June 9th, 1858.

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT:—According to my promise I send you an abstract of the last report of our indefatigable and zealous evangelist, brother Lister, who at present and for some time back labors alone in Bowmanville, Brooklin, Butterfield Settlement, and Charlesville and their vicinities.

In Brooklin very little was done in the way of preaching by our brethren till brother Lister's visit, and though a few brethren and sisters lived there, it appears the community was very ignorant of the character of the disciples and gave credit to the evil reports of unscrupulous men, who called us "Campbellites" and say we have no religion and all the and-so-forths. The consequence was that the meetings were thin, and for some time rather discouraging; but by patience and faithful exhibition of the truth, our brother was cheered to see good fruit resulting. Three promising disciples were baptized and one was reclaimed. Moreover, the heaven is impregnating other societies. The Methodist minister *had to go down into the water*. He says there are 16 or 17 disposed and some of them even determined to work together in that place; no church formed yet.

In all the other places there were churches before, that are in a healthy condition. To each of them, some were added by his labors, especially to the Charlesville church; 12 were added to that body, 6 of them by baptism. The additions in all the places where he labored since last heard from are 21. Oh that all the brethren realised more than they do the value of souls, and then they would not idle away

their time and let the white fields perish discussing the respective merits of sickles, cradles, and reaping machines. All would exert themselves in the way they best could if by any means they could save some. Then, instead of one lonely individual harvesting, his strength trying to keep up meetings in three several localities many miles apart in the same week, we could have evangelists *in pairs* in many promising fields in our country saving souls from sin and death, thus honoring the Saviour and building up saints.

Yours truly,
 JAMES BLACK,
 Sec'y Board of Co-operation.

Milton, N. S., 27th May, 1858.

DEAR BROTHER:—I know you will be glad to hear of the prosperity of the cause of the Lord in this place. About the last of February a young man came forward and offered himself for baptism, and in a short time another was baptized. It was then supposed it would be profitable to hold a lengthy meeting. The brethren wrote to the United States to see if an evangelist could be obtained for a time, but not being able to get one just then, it was considered best to make an effort ourselves. The whole church joined heartily in the work. [A church so working is a famous converting instrument. D. O.] Every night for the space of two or three weeks we had prayer and exhortation, and the happy result was 19 additions and the church greatly edified. The prospect is fair for more. The church numbers one hundred at present, all walking in harmony and love.

Yours in the good hope,
 JOHN McDONALD.

The news sent from Milton, in New Scotia, by our much beloved brother, is welcome and more than welcome. Ever since having the pleasure of seeing a number of friends residing at Milton, and the public brother who writes the above, we have cherished a good degree of hope for that region. If the brethren will live actively for the Lord, constantly and consistently keeping to view the pure light and true life of the gospel, they will certainly induce every honest person in all that country around them to think more of Jesus and heaven, and less of self and the world.

D. O.

Marilla, N. Y., 31st May, 1858.

DEAR BROTHER:—The work of reform goes on prosperously here. Since I last wrote we have received 15 additions by confession, and one who had previously been baptized, making 47 additions since the work began. We expect more shortly. What is peculiar in this work, is, that out of the 47 all are heads of families but six, and most of them in the prime of life. We have been locked out of the school house where we have been meeting, but we complain not, for we fare better than did our Master. [Brother Brown is doubtless glad that these lockers have no authority: for if entrusted with the keys given to Simon Peter, he and the friends with him would be not only locked out of a school house, but out of the eternal tabernacle. D. O.] We were cordially received into a Hotel to occupy a spacious ball room by the keeper of the Inn, where, from the musician's stand, I sound the gospel trump to the astonished crowd who come to see the house of recreation converted into a house in which to worship God.

Your aged fellow-laborer,

L. J. BROWN.

Through a friend who writes to the 'Review,' Cincinnati, the news comes to us that a number have lately confessed the Lord in Deer Island, New Brunswick; some 30 were immersed, if we mistake not. A. W. Rideout was chief laborer.

A portion of the periodicals published by the brethren in the month of May, and the 'Record' for June, bring us news of 1491 additions. Of these, about 35 are reported in the British Millennial Harbinger. We observe by our Nottingham cotemporary that brethren King and Rotherham are laboring in England as evangelists, and from their efforts and success they appear to be every way worthy of their position.

The evangelists in Canada, it will be seen by the reports of their work, are actively sounding out the Lord's truth, and they are animated in their labors and sufferings by witnessing men turning from the love of sin to the love of the Lord. There was great joy in Samaria consequent upon the labors of the inspired brother Philip; and the same gospel, faithfully announced and heartily received, carries with it the same joy to men in this Province.

News comes to us that brother Livingston of Cornwallis, N. S., lately immersed 6 persons, with a good prospect that others will confess ere long.

D. O.

THE LATE JOSIAH I. LOWELL.

Readers will recollect that the departure by death of this public brother was spoken of in a recent Number. We have since seen a brief sketch of his life from the pen of his sister companion, and believing that it will be acceptable to the lovers of truth everywhere, we judge it expedient to copy it. Enjoying a personal acquaintance with the late friend Lowell, we are enabled to testify that his general and critical knowledge of the sacred oracles was many degrees above medium; indeed few men excelled him in a comprehensive, correct, and lucid understanding of the scriptures pertaining to the scope and proclamation of the gospel. With his knowledge of church order, we can not speak particularly.

D. O.

My dear departed one was born May 10th, 1799, Thomaston, Maine. Was immersed into Christ by the Baptists, March, 1831, in Manlius, Onondaga county, New York. The same Spring, that church gave him license to preach. According to an invitation from the Baptist church in Cicero, he became their minister in January, 1833. That church called a Council to ordain him. After a tedious examination, they resolved, "That we approve of Brother Lowell's Christian experience and call to the ministry; but, whereas, some of Brother Lowell's views are not in accordance with revealed truth, we postpone for the present his ordination." They were called upon to tell to the world what those views were that clashed with the truth, but they refused. Mr. Lowell said—"Brethren, you approve of my call to the ministry; thank you for that. If God has called me to preach, I can dispense with man's call." From that hour till the day of his death, April 10, 1858, his life has been a constant warfare. Branded by that powerful denomination with heresy, thrown out upon the world poor, with a young family to support, not knowing that a single Brother's heart was or ever would be in unison with his own, (as he had never come across any of the writings of the reformation,) with the Bible alone in his hand, he commenced proclaiming the old Jerusalem gospel at Cicero, at Pompey Hill, and at different places in Onondaga county. His principal means of getting a living, for twelve or fifteen years, was teaching. He would attend to his school during the week, then start on foot and walk some twenty or thirty miles, and speak, and back in time to commence school Monday morning. For eleven years, the brethren have enabled him to devote himself principally to writing and speaking the Word.

"OUR CHURCH."—What is "our church?" Is there any true church on earth or in heaven but Christ's church? "I hope," said a good sister, "these meetings will build up *our* church."

REFORMATION HINDERED.

Every effort at reformation in the church has heretofore proved a failure, owing to a disposition in the masses to settle down upon the "views" of a single individual, and thus save themselves the trouble of thinking for themselves. Each religious party is thus a mere echo of the opinions of its leader; nor is there a single one of them that really and truly takes the Bible as the standard of religious truth. We, as a people, shall have profited little by experience, if we shall begin to inquire for the "burden of the Lord" of those who speak a "vision of their own heart," and shall cease to ask in humble trustful faith that only wise and most necessary question: "What hath the Lord spoken?"

The above is from the pen of a disciple who is a professor in one of the colleges of the brethren. It is as true as the Book of Job or any of the Books in Old or New Testament. Read it—commit it to memory—ponder it—and then carefully read the first five verses of the epistle written by the apostle Jude.

D. O.

BRITISH PULPIT ELOQUENCE.—The London Times expresses its opinion very plainly in regard to English preaching. It says: We would leave it to the decision of any one of ordinary candor, intelligence and education, to say whether men, in any other profession, could carry on their business with success if they took no more pains about the matter than an ordinary preacher does in the composition and delivery of an average sermon. The truth is, that in England pulpit eloquence has fallen to a low ebb indeed. With the finest theme in the world before them, with all the hopes and anxieties which agitate the human breast, during the brief interval which separates the cradle from the grave, as their subjects, our preachers miss their opportunity."

TYPES OUT OF PLACE.—Typographical errors are as common as printing. We usually notice them not. Consequent upon our not seeing the revise of some of the first pages of this Number, there are noticeable mistakes. 'Faultly' should have been printed *faulty*; 'desertation' ought to be *dissertation*. And 'forhead' is not so correct as *forehead*. All friends will please make other corrections according to ability and taste!

D. O.

☞ The Gospel of Christ—or Christianity—No. 4, will be forthcoming in our next. It visited our "copy" drawer just one day too late for this Number, but a month's delay in the circulation cannot subtract from the virtue of a good essay.