

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. VI.

COBourg, DECEMBER, 1852.

NO. 12.

A NARRATIVE

OF THE ORIGIN AND FORMATION OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFSSION.

No. IV.

They were next engaged in making out "a directory for public worship" instead of the old liturgy. This directory passed the assembly with great unanimity, none but the independents demurring much about it. It was, however, with much difficulty introduced into the congregations throughout the kingdom, and the parliament were obliged the next summer to pass another ordinance obliging the "common prayer" to be cast out of all the churches, and the new directory to be the law of worship. Great tyranny was exercised in getting the people to worship according to the new directory. A fine of five pounds for the first offence, ten for the second, and a year's imprisonment for the third, was the penalty for only reading the common prayer in private families. "All ministers who do not observe the directory in all cases of public worship, shall forfeit forty shillings." This ordinance was issued August 23, 1645. "These," says Mr. Neal, "were the first fruits of presbyterian anarchy." The baptists, too, at this time, were written against, preached against, and some of them shut up in prison; and even one Mr. Otes in Essex was tried for his life for the murder of Anne Martin, because she had died a few days after she was baptized. "On the next day after the establishment of the directory, Dr. William Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, received sentence of death. He had been a prisoner in the Tower almost three years, upon sundry impeachments. His trial excited great interest and occupied much time." He had been a tyrant in the church and state, and a cruel persecutor. But the presbyterians measured to him as he had measured to others. Mrs. Macaulay in her history of England, vol. iv. page 147, very correctly observes that "the parliament ought to have left this aged prelate an example of their mercy, rather than to have made him the monument of their justice." "It is plain, adds she, that he fell a sacrifice to the intolerant principles of the Presbyterians, a sect who breathed as fiery a spirit of persecution as himself." The archbishop died by the executioner in the seventy-second year of his age, and the twelfth of his archepiscopacy. Such were the religious spirit and zeal of the times, and such the proceed-

ings at Westminster while the creed of myriads was on the stocks, and the faith of the orthodox was delivering to the saints.

The parliament ordained, April 26, 1645, that "no person shall be permitted to preached who is not ordained a minister in this or some other reformed church, except such as attend the ministry, who shall be allowed for the trial of their gifts, by those that shall be appointed thereto by both houses of parliament; and it is earnestly desired that Sir *Thomas Fairfax* (a military chieftian) take care that this ordinance be put into execution in the army. It is further ordered to be sent to the lord mayor and committee of the militia in London, to the governors and commanders of all forts, garrisons, forces, cities and towns, with the like injunctions; and the mayor, sheriffs, and justices of peace, are to commit all offenders to safe custody, and give notice to the parliament, who will take a speedy course for their punishment." This is the way to make and establish orthodoxy, and to show the divine institution of the clergy and presbytery, without the trouble of interrogating the twelve apostles. Thus the clergy had their lips opened, and the laity had theirs shut by the laws of the land; and the military and other rulers were to guard the conscience of the people with a drawn sword.

"At the same time the lords sent to the assembly of divines to prepare a new directory for the ordination of ministers of the church of England, without the presence of a diocesan bishop. This took up a great deal of time by reason of the opposition it met with from the Erastians and independents; but was at last accomplished, and passed into an ordinance, November 8, 1645, and was to continue in force by way of trial for twelve months. On the 28th of August following it was prolonged for three years, at the expiration of which time it was made perpetual."

The two fundamental rules of this *new* directory, which is now thought by many to be as *old* as Paul's time, ran thus:—*First*. "The person to be ordained must apply to the presbytery, with a testimonial of his taking the covenant, of his proficiency in his studies" &c., whether he can conjugate *tupto*, and decline *hic, haec, hoc*. &c. &c. *Second*. "He is then to pass under an examination as to his religion and learning and call to the ministry." If he be called by God as Aaron was, to be a high priest, and can tell how religious he is, he is then to be anointed by the presbytery: if not he must return to the plough or loom, and forever after hold his peace. *Lastly*. It is resolved, That all persons ordained according to this directory, shall be forever reputed and taken, to all intents and purposes for lawfully and sufficiently authorized ministers of the church of England, and as capable of any ministerial employment in the church, as any other presbyter already ordained or hereafter to be ordained." So this point is made orthodox and of divine authority.

The Independent maintained the right of every particular congregation to ordain its own officers. This was debated ten days. The arguments on both sides were afterwards published in a book titled "*The Grand Debate between Presbytery and Independency*." At length the question was put, "that it is requisite no single congrega-

tion that can conveniently associate with others, should assume to itself the sole right of ordination." It was voted in the affirmative. The following distinguished ministers entered their dissent:—Thomas Goodwine, Phillip Nye, Jeremiah Burrows, S. Simpson, W. Carter. The majority, however, ruled, and in such cases always regulates the conscience and decides what is divine. For the voice of the majority is the voice of God.

"It was next debated whether ordination might precede election to a particular cure or charge." That is, whether a man might be married without a wife, and afterwards take whom he could get by virtue of his marriage, or whether a man might be appointed to a charge without having any. This could not be fairly carried, and was compromised with the Independents, who agreed to the imposition of hands in the ceremony of ordination, "provided that it was attended with an open declaration that it was not intended as a conveyance of office power."

A debate of thirty days was held in the assembly on this proposition, "that the scripture holds forth that many particular congregations may, and BY DIVINE AUTHORITY ought to be under one presbyterial government." The Erastians would not except against the presbyterial government as a political institution, but opposed the claim of divine right. But the Independents opposed the whole proposition, and advanced a counter divine right of independency. Fifteen days they took the part of opponents, and fifteen days they were upon the defensive.

The chief enquiries were concerning the constitution and first form of the church at Jerusalem, the subordination of synods and of lay elders. The Independents maintained that the Church at Jerusalem was *one* congregation; the Presbyterians affirmed that there were many congregations in this city under one presbytery. The ablest critics in the assembly, such as Dr. Temple, Selden, Lightfoot, Coleman, Vines, &c. were divided upon this head. But it was carried for the Presbyterians. The Jewish Sanhedrim was proposed in the assembly as a model for their Christian presbytery, and great skill in Jewish antiquities was exhibited in this part of the debate in settling what were the respective powers of the ecclesiastical and civil courts under the law.

PREACHERS—PEOPLE.

NUMBER THREE.

When Paul was a preacher he would have the whole members of the body of Christ to "strive together for the faith of the gospel." Very little was then known about "clergy" and "laity." They were all the Lord's clergy—they were all the Lord's laity. The brother who could publicly plead in the name of Jesus, and the brother who assisted him by his earnings or estate to keep his lips open and his voice warm, were regarded as equally subserving the interests of Christ's cause, and alike worthy of the approbation of the Chief Master. There were no high stations and low stations, no most honour-

able and less honorable offices, in the house of God in these days of grace. There were, it is true, the "greatest" and the "least;" but not through office or the want of it. He was the greatest who was the most conformed to Jesus in his life and character, whether in or out of office—he was the least who was the farthest from this heavenly model. Such was the standard of greatness and littleness while yet the message of the gospel was fresh from the lips of its primitive and only ambassadors. Christian greatness is neither place nor power, neither office nor fame—it consists in doing the will of the Master because it is his will.

Well would it be for the church—for each and every member of the church—were it always remembered that true greatness 'in the sight of the Lord' is not founded upon office but upon character.

"The body is not one member, but many." says that apostle in whose words we Gentiles have very great interest. Hence, in the work of Christ, devolving upon his body the church, not a member can say to another, 'I have no need of you.' The Lord has bound together the many members of the one body, his church, so that in the work he has assigned it there is no such thing as "exemption from duty" like some of our military arrangements. True, indeed, it is seldom we find what are called private members of the church realizing their responsibility to take part in making known the gospel of Jesus Christ. They indicate by word and deed that this department belongs to preachers. Now this would be to make preachers the church! They are indeed members, or if any one please officers or servants of the church; but surely they are not the whole church!

Now, beyond all contradiction the Lord has committed to his church, and not to certain members, the solemn and responsible duty of converting the world. "That by THE CHURCH might be made known the manifold wisdom of God" says the inspired penman whom we call our apostle; and "holding forth the word of life" is a prominent part of that wisdom to be made manifest by the church of God.

There are two or three leading errors at the bottom of the idea that preachers, and preachers only, are to make known the truth. It indicates a total misconception of the framework of the Church, and it also implies that the conversion of men chiefly or wholly depends on speaking, and that this speaking is to be attended to in the shape of a sermon "on the Sabbath." Were this latter notion correct, should we not have a passage in the inspired writings specially addressed to the preacher in language like this:—'Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work for thyself and all thine, but on the seventh day thou shalt preach a sermon.' A very easy and convenient arrangement for the enlightenment and regeneration of the nations! Are there not some who would vote for such a passage to be appended to their New Testament?

Let no man deceive himself. All are to take part in sounding out the word of life; and let no man think that another is more responsible than himself. He is self-deceived who thinks it. What a thought!—to think that Jesus asks some of his friends to do more in this cause than others; nay, in the great work of his church, the reclaiming the world from darkness and death, a certain few are to do

all, and the rest nothing! Perhaps no one would like openly to affirm so much as this; yet, when all the fancy is extracted from the reasonings of some, when their deductions are reduced to sober reality, it comes to this at last. And if this be not producing a practical schism in the body of Christ, making one part of the church say to another part of it *We have no need of you*, we need some other book than the New Testament to explain it. The Arch-Bishop of Canterbury will have to be called to give us a sanctified chapter upon the division of the church into ecclesiastics and lay members. But even his Grace the Bishop's divinity would have use for what he would call 'the laity,' for if unfit for anything else they would be taught that a very important part must always rest with them, viz., the support of the clergy!

We could desire to put an everlasting veto upon the very popular but very pernicious doctrine that the church of Christ contemplates a *preacher interest* and a *private member interest*. It has a bad root—the trunk and the branches are bad—and the fruit is bad. Call it all the pretty names we please, there is a virtual schism and a real war in every religious community where the preachers have *their* interest and the other members *another* interest—as though the great Master had organized his church upon the principle of keeping up a constant jar. In Paul's day it was exactly as it should be. "That there be no schism in the body" says the apostle, "whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it." There is no division of interest here: there is no internal or practical war among the members: there is no schism either open or hidden, one having an interest in this, another in that. Paul's church is a church with many members, making one body, with one great object. The head, the foot, the heart, the hand, all move sympathizingly and uniquely, for one end; and the basis of the whole is two simple thoughts: *personal attachment to Jesus: personal responsibility to him*. And hence how natural for another apostle to press the duty upon every individual member, "As you have received the gift, so minister or serve."

We must press home to the heart of every individual member of the church that it is *his* duty to hold up the light of truth—*his* duty to make known the Lord who redeemed him—*his* duty to rescue men from death by teaching them the way of life. Salvation, from first to last, is a personal matter between the sinner and the Saviour; and from the first hour of his Christian life to the close, the saved man is personally obligated to further the interests of his Lord and Redeemer. This is not only right in itself, but it is benevolence on the part of the Supreme Master to require it: for no one can enjoy himself as a redeemed man unless practically alive to the things which pertain to the Lord Jesus Christ. All the saved are all alike responsible—"every one shall give an account of himself to God," which would not be true if every one did not first receive something for which an account is to be given.

Still farther. There are three things which must regulate every man's labors in Messiah's government: Natural gifts—temporal possessions—openings or opportunities. 'Yes,' says a professor, 'if I had

the mental endowments of brother A., I would feel myself greatly responsible.' 'And if I had the wealth of brother B.' says another, 'I should consider myself greatly accountable to the Lord.' 'If I were situated and had opportunities like brother C., and was looked up to as he is,' says a third brother, 'how much more I would do for the Lord.' Now, if we could get these three brothers by themselves, knowing that they had such feelings, duty would prompt us to address them in words similar to these:—Brethren! you have zeal, but it is not zeal for the Lord. The essence of it comes from the Old Enemy—You would do much for the cause of the Master if you were talented—if you were wealthy—if you had an extraordinary opportunity; and you would do it because it might make a great sound and redound to your fame. Your zeal is not religious—it is of the flesh. Old satan himself would be zealous upon the like principle. You are chargeable with two faults: 1. you look to others instead of to yourselves; 2. you deceive yourselves in thinking you would do more if you were in the place of others. How do you know what you would do were you in others' place? If you do nothing now, or next to nothing, with all the privileges you have, what guarantee is there that more would be done by you if more talented, more wealthy, and had more of an opportunity? Perchance those very men you desire to be like, though not doing much, are doing a hundred per cent. more than you would if you were placed where they are. Did you never hear of the lady who gave much while she was comparatively poor, and who gave little when raised to wealth by a fortune? It is an instructive lesson. She was asked how it was that when a widow and comparatively poor she could give pounds, but now that she was in wealth could only afford to give shillings. 'Ah!' said she, 'before I inherited this fortune I had the pound heart, and I gave pounds; but now I have the shilling heart and give shillings.' Sir Isaac Newton could not have given a better reason. And you brethren, talk of doing if you were like others! There is another sin in this. You speak as though God should have given you greater capacity, entrusted you with more of this world's goods, or put you in a different position. To your lack of zeal, you evidently murmur and complain at your lot, and lean somewhat toward both envious and impious reflection.

And this will answer these three brethren for at least one lesson.

D. OLIPHANT.

PREACHERS—PEOPLE.

NUMBER FOUR.

There is one truth clearly developed in the gospel of our Lord which has been and is now almost if not altogether overlooked. It is the great truth that when men are converted by the gospel, they are henceforth the Lord's—with all their mind, their means, and their influence. "You are not your own" was said to the primitive converts. They were the Lord's purchased people, and as such they yielded themselves as servants of righteousness in cheerful and constant compliance with the will of him who redeemed them. This was their business—there pleasure. It was the centre-point of their lives.

Every aim or desire was made subservient to this one. Every object bowed to the one great object. The body, the soul, and the spirit, with all that pertained to them, were regarded as the Lord's own, not only at the time of turning to him, but ever afterwards while they retained the love of God; and hence there was no debtor and creditor account kept by them as good church members now try to keep; so much for the Lord and so much for themselves—devoting this to Christ, and that to the world—a certain part to the interests of the Spirit, and a certain greater part to the interests of the flesh.

We are almost led to conclude, in view of the existing condition of what is called religious society, that the spirituality and godly devotion recommended by the Christian oracles have wholly fled from our world for want of a suitable habitation. We have not a particle of confidence in the religion of any man who spends the major part of his thoughts, his means, and his aspirations according to the common pattern set forth by modern society, genteelly Christian and fashionably moral. We care not what men's professions are. All the fine sentiments and all the pretty looking theories in the world will not make men disciples of the Lord—will not make men the Lord's temple who think very pious thoughts at times, but who are meantime working with all the ability that God gave them in order to lay up treasures as far below heaven as the heavens are high above them.

Paul, in his fervency to labour and see labourers in the field, finding many too worldly for him, was tempted to say "All seek their own, not the things of Jesus Christ." Ah! Paul—you are not personally present in this age of progress! Had you lived in the year of grace 1852 you could not only say 'all seek their own things' but you could add that all seek to maintain that they are in the path of duty in so doing! This is the saddest and most hopeless feature of the whole. Yes, the religious principle is so weak, and the anti-religious principle is so strong, that men are strangely under the impression that they are serving God while they are devoutly serving their own dear selves. This is the direst state in which men can be found. They are proof against every appeal. The hardness of a dozen Pharaohs concentrated into one could be more easily moved. 'We are rich and have need of nothing' is the flattering unction which the men of this generation apply to themselves; and hence the whole weight of every inspired argument is warded off as a child's arrow by a casement of steel. They know not that they are poor, and blind, and naked; they realize not that they need riches and raiment from the great store house of the Lord of All.

In these last days the prophetic perilous times have come upon us. "Men [professing men] are money-lovers, boasters, proud," and much more of the same category of virtue, in respect to which satan is the chief chaplain. Go, ask that steady church-goer who is a full average stockholder in the Bank of Heaven, who repeats his prayers, talks religion, and sometimes sighs heavily; go, ask him to reckon with himself for the last twelve months—what time he has spent in self-examination comparing his spiritual state with the unerring word, the hours he has devoted to, making plans for the good of others, the seasons he has spent in fasting and prayer in his zeal to keep himself from the

love of the world and be a religious example in society, the efforts he has made to give men the light of life, the amount of his substance he has saved from the wants of the flesh and consecrated for the direct promotion of the divine cause, and how he has made all his labours and means directly or indirectly subserve the one great purpose of a godly life; ask him—and what is his answer? I have been so deeply immersed in business I found little time to examine anything but my affairs; my best plans were necessary to get along in the world and keep up to my neighbours: hav'nt had a minute to spare; as to fasting and prayer on special occasions I don't believe in them at all, I think there's more popery than religion in them; I have a poor faculty of communicating truth, and I don't often try it; and really as it respects giving for the support of preachers, I have been so much pressed that I have thought it scarcely honest to give until I'm more independent—and besides, I don't know that these preachers ought to be supported as many think' If there be a professor in America who fully approves of a *Christian man* like this one, we would willingly receive an epistle from him to guide us into the secret of the difference between his life and the life of a man of the world, even though he sometimes talks religion and dutifully takes upon himself to reprove "the sects" for their shortcomings and numerous sins.

But says a brother, "Are you aiming at me?" Yes, brother, we are. *We mean you*: and you need it if you are like this pious church member, and if you are not like him we do you no harm. But we mean you, and no one else under heaven. Take the whole to yourself, and if it makes you feel awfully bad, it operates precisely as it ought; and if it does not fit you in full but strikes in part, just feel bad accordingly. Blame us if you will, but see that you take as much blame to yourself as will surely lead to a reformation. Let it be godly sorrow. Let it be deep contrition. Let it burn like fire in your bosom until you say, "O Lord, forgive me—I will sin no more." Let it bow you down before the cross in soul-subduing humility, until you cry, "*Lord what wouldst thou have me to do?*"

Talk about supporting preachers! Preachers—who are worthy of the name—ask no such thing! Are they a class of public beggars? This idea of support to preachers, as though they needed gratuities and favors, is fearfully erroneous, and must be plucked up by the root as a plant of a strange vine. We have contended, and we still contend, and we are determined to contend, that every friend of Jesus, or, what is the same thing, every member of the church is obligated to promote the cause through which he himself is redeemed from death to life; and every friend of Christ is to do this as God has given him ability;—and if any number of brethren, in the name of Jesus, call on a brother to spend and be spent in preaching the gospel, and hence to devote more of his time to spirituals and less to carnals, he has the same title to their funds, their substance, and their influence as they have themselves. He is a servant of the Lord and the Lord's people; and as such *he has a right* to the simple things necessary to the present life—and therewith he in turn is bound to be content. The Lord so enacts, and hence it is no beg-and-get scheme of any man or

class of men. "The workman is worthy of his hire," and still he is no hireling. He is a hireling who careth not for the flock, and so soon as any man is found to be of this stamp, whether teacher or preacher, the brethren should reform or disown him at once.

Reader! what now? The year 1853 is about opening upon us: are we prepared to live to God and not to ourselves?—to be more like our Lord Jesus and less like the world?—to be spiritually minded which is life rather than have the fleshly mind which is lifeless as well as joyless?

But we must postpone farther thoughts and reflections till we have more space.

D. OLIPHANT.

AN EXCURSION.

About the middle of September I left home to visit Eastport, Calais, St. Andrews, and Perry to see relatives and brethren, but more particularly in pursuit of health. Six hours steaming brought us to Eastport, and four more, the next day, against a strong wind and tide, landed us at the most eastern city in the United States, called Calais. To give the reader some idea of my business here I must give a sketch of the religious state of the people at a part of the "eastern city" called Milltown.

The first Baptist church formed in this part of the State of Maine was organized at Milltown some twenty years since. From this church others have been set off. Or rather it has been productive of the second church of Calais—two miles below a church at Baring—and several others. The church, for a long time, was large and prosperous, and built a fine meeting house &c. Some few years since however, a time of trial came. The church became divided. As it is unsafe for a stranger to interfere in family quarrels, I shall not venture to place on paper even my opinion relative to the cause, progress and termination of this unhappy state of things. It will answer my purpose merely to state that in the division two deacons had the honour of being ostensibly the head of one party, and the minister of the other. Each party, as usual in such cases, considered itself right, and the first Baptist Church of Calais—as the lawful possessor of the church property, especially of the meeting House. Fire suddenly burst from the steeple of the house at a season when no fire was used in it—and it was soon a heap of smouldering ruins! Suspicions were many and freely expressed relative to the party who could have incited such an act of wanton destruction. Each party blamed the other, and each claimed the land and the insurance. The deacons party however obtained the money and built another fine house. Immediately after the destruction of the first building, the minister and some two thirds of the church that sympathized with him, fitted up a Hall and continued their meetings.

According to Baptist usage a Council of ministers and messengers was called, whose decision was unfavorable to the minister; but notwithstanding this, he and his friends kept up their meetings for some time, and considered themselves the first Baptist Church.

Finally the minister left and the flock was without an under shepherd.

About this time brother Thomas V. Berry of Boston visited Robinsonston with his excellent sister wife, then in her last sickness, that she might die among her relatives and at the home of her nativity.

Although it became necessary for him to be near her most of the time, yet he frequently spoke in the vicinity. Being but about a dozen miles from Calais, and this church without a preacher, he was invited to visit them and to address them. They were so much interested in his efforts that they soon gave him a formal invitation to spend at least half of his time with them. He frequently addressed them during the last winter. Much against their wishes, and greatly to their disappointment, he left them last spring without any scriptural organization and with but a remote prospect of any permanent supply of a teacher to lead them in the ways of apostolic christianity.

Elder James B. Barnaby, of Deer Island, N. B. addressed them occasionally for some time, and immersed one—an excellent brother; but brother Barnaby felt himself embarrassed in his efforts when he learned that the people's hearts were placed on brother Berry. They finally sent a brother to Boston for him—but he had left for the "West;" that "great West" that eats up all our preachers. On his return I was honored by a visit from another brother seeking advice and assistance. I responded that I was not able to preach much, but the Lord willing, I would come and see them. This, then, was the design of my visit to Calais. I wished to see the brethren and to give them a word of exhortation, if not of advice and counsel. The next Lord's day morning and evening I addressed them on the Ancient order of truth and worship as taught in the Old and New Covenants, in contrast with the modern doctrines and commandments of men. In the afternoon some twenty or thirty of us broke the loaf in honor of our Divine Lord, and we listened to many interesting remarks from the brethren.

During the week I learned that a general desire prevailed among the brethren to be organized as a congregation of the disciples of Jesus Christ. I therefore, resolved to remain another Lord's day and render them all the assistance in my power. I obtained a list of names, determined to call on all, and question them particularly as to the state of their affections for their Saviour, towards each other, and the world. As there had been much strife and contention in the city, I deemed this step expedient. I had long since learned that the success of the cause of truth depends under God, more on the state of the disciples' affection for each other, than on great talents or splendid gifts. But my throat became so painful and my strength so exhausted that I had to give up ere my task was really begun. As a substitute, however, I drew up something like the following preamble and resolutions which were unanimously received, and to which all their names are affixed. Here is the document:

"WHEREAS divisions, strife, and contention not only characterize the world, but also too many of those who profess to be the followers

of Jesus: We, the disciples of Christ deeply deploring such a melancholy state of things, more especially as our Divine Redeemer prayed that all his disciples might be one; and being fully convinced from all the efforts which have been made to unite on human Creeds, Disciplines and Confessions of Faith that they ought not to be bonds of union for Christians; and further, believing that the word of God has been given "to be a lamp to our feet and a light to our path"—that "the scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus"—that they are "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" and to make "the man of God perfect and thoroughly to furnish him unto all good works."—We therefore in the fear of Jehovah and in the presence of his servants, give ourselves anew to God and to the word of his grace and to each other *as the disciples of Jesus Christ*, promising by his assistance to be guided alone by the Holy Spirit, as he speaks to us in the words of the new covenant: And, further, being anxiously desirous that all christians should form *one body*—be animated by *one Spirit*—cheered by *one hope*—acknowledge but *one Lord*—have but *one faith, one baptism, and one God and Father of all*. we promise to receive to the arms of our christian affection, all the members of the body of Christ, to enjoy with us all the ordinances and blessings of the Lord's house: and thus to know each other and to be known by all men simply as the disciples of Jesus Christ."

The following Lord's day (the 26th of September) although cold and wet, we met to consummate the union. In great weakness I gave them an address in the morning on the proposition: "The Church of the living God is the pillar and support of the truth." In the afternoon, after reading the above document, and calling their attention to the fact already submitted relative to the constitution of a congregation of the Lord, I called upon all the disciples present desirous of uniting upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, to separate themselves from the rest of the people and to take a stand in the centre of the Hall. *Nine* brethren and *fifteen* sisters—most of them middle aged, did so; and in the presence of the Lord we recognized them as a church of Christ by prayer and the formal presentation of the right hand of fellowship.

Brother A. W. Rideout of St. Andrews was present, and with me entered his name in the church book as a witness of the union. We had a joyful and a solemn season breaking bread and encouraging each other. May the Lord add many of the saved to their number.

During the previous week I was present and witnessed the dedication of the new meeting house covering the site of the former one. The sermon by a young Mr. Lincoln was, in composition and doctrine, notwithstanding a few touches of Calvinism—highly creditable to his head and heart; and if he always keeps before him his text—to glory in nothing but the cross of Christ—and make it the motto of his life, he will doubtless be blessed and prove a blessing to others. May this be the case.

But the dedication exercises, as a whole, were cold and formal.—There was much more of the "letter" than the "Spirit" in them;

more of Solomon than Jesus. The scriptures read were from Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple—Haggai, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Not a syllable to show the hearer the difference between temples under Moses, or Solomon and a meeting house for Christians to worship in. For all the people learned that day to the contrary, a meeting house is just as necessary to the worship of God as was the temple of Solomon. The musical instruments too—among which the little fiddle stood out most conspicuously, would lead the mass to conclude that these things were a part of Christian worship, and might suggest to some inquisitive mind the question, why not also have the ancient altar, and the burnt sacrifice? For, every argument that would justify the latter would authorize the former. The following Monday evening, I addressed a little school house full of Her Majesty's subjects on the East of the St. Croix, near St. Andrews. This I ought not to have done: for I could scarce speak above a whisper; but I had promised to be there, and nothing over which I have control has ever prevented me meeting my appointments.

The next Wednesday I happened to be present at an ordination of a Unitarian clergyman over the "second Congregational church and society" in the town of Perry, the residence of my honored parents. The sermon on this occasion was by the "Rev. Calvin Lincoln, of Boston." The text was a noble one for bringing out the entire gospel. "Christ suffered for sins," &c. I expected to hear something for or against "evangelical views of the atonement;" but was entirely disappointed. The minister had a mild heavenly countenance. He seemed just the man to preach Christ and him crucified; but, alas! he did not begin here. His proposition was "The design of the gospel is to bring us to God." The example, the labors, and the teachings of Jesus and his apostles, had that object always in view. All he said was good—very good; but the great, the all important gospel facts were slurred over or entirely omitted. The first part of the text as certainly proclaims the sacrificial death of Christ as that his mission was to bring men to God. Paul preached first of all "that Christ died *for our sins*"—not merely for our faith—not only to attest his sincerity and to seal the truth of his mission—not only to show the great love of God—but that God might be *just in justifying sinners*. So says Paul; and the redeemed family sing "To Him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, to Him be glory." The principal phase in the character of Christ to be presented to the world, then, is as a suffering victim. "Behold the Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world." Thus was he introduced to Israel by John, and like a lamb that has been slain he now stands before the throne in the heavens. To preach Christ, then, is to proclaim his person, character, teachings, work, death, burial, resurrection and his subsequent requirements by his apostles. To omit the annunciation of the sacrificial death of Christ is to take from the whole system of salvation its entire soul! In view of such a system, the intelligent disciple of Christ, with Mary exclaims, "They have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid him!"

Mr. Lincoln's fine moral essay was a beautiful house without any foundation. He may, however, have presumed that his predecessor in that pulpit had said enough, on that part of the text, that it was now his duty to fill up the outline.

The exercises during the day were interesting generally. The singing for the first time on such an occasion in the United States—when I have been present—was entirely vocal! With this I was much pleased. Had the singers all been disciples of Jesus and the tunes been true to nature, I could have commended the style to all as worthy of imitation.

The reader must indulge me in a few remarks on singing though it may seem to be a digression. In the first place no one can give a reason why those who stand at one end of the meeting house to sing praise to God ought not to be as devoutly christian as the man who occupies the stand at the other end. If gifts and talents are the only prerequisites to engaging acceptably in singing the most solemn and sacred truths, why not place the pulpit on the same basis? It soon *will be* by those who employ godless men and women to take part in the worship of God, or I know nothing of the tendencies of human nature.

A large majority of our modern tunes are unfit to sing in a place of worship. They are entirely destitute of those chords which awaken the spirit of devotion. Tunes like *Barby, Dundee, Mear, London, or Old Hundred* may be sung, by a single voice, from morning till night, while the soul feasts upon the sentiment uttered: but these modern tunes have no music in them unless several parts are moving at the same time; and then it is not harmony that creates the interest, but the sentiment uttered. No one thinks of singing one of them without his note book and some select company about him. Their use in the church is turning all devotion out of it. Hence the other extreme of introducing into the prayer meeting many trashy song tunes for fear of the coldness and death which would certainly follow the use of the tunes sung with the organ on "the Sabbath."

Nature has ordained certain chords to fall harmoniously on the ear. Our modern tunes set nature at defiance; for there are as many discords as chords in some of the most fashionable church tunes. I do not know but that I am alone in my views in this matter—but such are my convictions, and I believe they can be mathematically demonstrated! But this I must defer to a more suitable occasion.

To return to the little choir of Perry singers. I admired the singing because it was perfectly natural. Countenances wore the same expression that reading the same thoughts would have brought out. There were no vociferations. There was more attention bestowed upon the sentiment than even on the time in which the music was written. They did not sacrifice the thought merely for the sound, as most singers do. To give the reader an idea of my meaning, I will, to the best of my recollection, give one of the stanzas of the ordination Hymn. (I took a few notes on the occasion, but I have mislaid them. I must trust to my memory.)

“ And when he sinks in death—by care

Or pain, or toil, or years oppressed,
 O God, remember thou our prayers
 And take his spirit to thy rest."

This I think was the last or near the last stanza. No other part of the exercises commanded such breathless attention as the singing of this Hymn. At this part of it every eye seemed fixed, and my own heart beat with emotion. I may have felt the sentiment more than many others, for the same hymn was sung at my own ordination. "And when he sinks in death"—was sung with dignity, and yet with a solemn emphasis that made you feel as though you were by the bed-side of a beloved minister.

The reader must pardon this long digression. My particular friends will; for I have written so little for so long a time! The next Lord's Day I walked to the meeting house, in expectation of hearing the young, lately ordained minister—this being the only place of worship in the town. Quite to our surprise, there stood a venerable man in the pulpit, who, we soon learned, belonged to the Trinitarian School of Congregationalists. He read a very good discourse on the Atonement. He took, however, but a hasty glance at the subject. The two or three hymns, two prayers, sermon and benediction were all pronounced and sung within sixty minutes. But O, how cold, how dull, how formal. How marvelous that such solemn themes as the sacrificial death of God's own Son could be pronounced by a venerable man, with all the calm coldness and apathy of a dull teacher of mathematics. And these common-place awful themes, too, must all be written out so that the preacher needs not even to open the book where the text is to be found. No wonder that "orthodox" pulpits are so frequently occupied by "heterodox" ministers when a profession of evangelical principles infuses so little celestial fire into their souls. The citizens of Perry will probably alternate between the two systems before them until some man of energy, perseverance, and of such devotion to the truth that he will sustain himself without a salary, lifts up his voice in defence of the ancient faith, order, and practice of the Gospel, and then the line will be drawn between those who love and serve God and those who have but a form of religion.

No opportunity offering to return to St. John, I spent the next Lord's Day at Eastport. In the morning I heard a discourse from a minister of the Christian Connection. He uttered many interesting truths; but, according to my judgment he came not within hailing distance of his text; and I have many serious doubts as to the truth of his proposition. The text was Luke iii 24, "Strive to enter into the strait gate, &c." He labored to prove that the salvation of the soul was exceedingly difficult. His remarks were confined principally to the difficulty of becoming the disciples of Jesus. Now the whole connection of the passage makes it apparent to a superficial reader, that the Saviour had reference to the eternal salvation; and yet the speaker confined himself to the difficulties that were in the way of a sinner's believing the truth and crediting the testimony of the people of God, &c. I do not remember that any apostle or evangelist of Christ represented the way to become a disciple of Jesus as difficult; but to overcome the obstacles which impede the disciple's progress,

requires not only seeking but *agonizing*—as it is in the original. It is comparatively easy to enter a school, but difficult to master all the hard problems. It is easy to sign the ship's papers and become one of the crew; but in storms and tempests to fulfil all the duties of a seaman, how hard, how much courage, energy and perseverance is necessary. So with gospel truth before the mind, well sustained by the testimonies of prophets and apostles. How easy to believe and obey the truth; but how few fight the good fight of faith and lay hold on eternal life.

I have, since writing the above, brushed the dust off Doctors Macknight, Clarke, Campbell, and Barnes; and those who have said any thing on the text understand it as referring to the ultimate salvation—the entrance upon the eternal rest that remains for the people of God. When a teacher of christianity stumbles at the obvious meaning of his text, I cannot be greatly edified, though he utter many interesting considerations.

In the afternoon I gave the disciples of the Lord, who continue to meet every Lord's Day to commemorate his dying love, a short address on the grand motive which should influence us in the service of God, "The love of Christ constrains us."

After an absence of four weeks, I arrived home safely, and but little benefitted by my excursion; for one Lord's Day's effort convinced me that I must desist from speaking until an essential change shall have taken place in my vocal powers.

I owe our readers an apology for the small space occupied in the *Banner*: but the fact that I neither study nor write, unless in my study among my books, must be accepted as the only apology which I can now offer.

W. W. E.

THE CHARGE OF UNITARIANISM.

The following letters will explain themselves. Many of our readers are fully aware of the tactics frequently employed to damage the cause which is urged and advocated by the Disciples. Vigilance is needed to keep pace with the open attacks, and far worse secret insinuations and grave misrepresentations, of opposers. On hearing some time since that our old friend Davidson, formerly of Markham but now of Brantford, was pleased to represent me as one of the Unitarian school, a note was addressed to him in these words:—

MR. DAVIDSON, MINISTER:—May I ask you a question? Have you at any time intimated or asserted to a brother minister that the writer is a Unitarian? I have learned that you were pleased so to testify; and I desire to have the report either confirmed or disowned by evidence from yourself.

As I am always desirous to cultivate religious friendship with all intelligent Baptists, many of whom I greatly esteem for the truth's sake, you will at once perceive how requisite it is that we fairly un-

derstand one another on this subject.

Yours, with no disrespect,

D. OLIPHANT.

3rd August, 1852.

P. S. You know that Cobourg is my address, at which place I will be glad to receive your response.

Brantford, Sept., 4th, 1852.

MR. OLIPHANT, MINISTER :—May I ask *you* a question? Who told you that I said you were a "Unitarian?" What is this brother minister's name; and where does he live, and *when* and *where* does he say he heard *me* say so?

Before you can, with any show of reason or fairness, expect me to answer the accusation, you must give me the *name* of my *accuser*.

To this, of *course*, there *can* be no objection. When you do so, I am prepared to give you an answer which will be quite satisfactory to you on this point.

I do not make it a practice to receive either accusations or testimony against others, as true and valid, on that kind of evidence generally termed, "*I saw a man that saw a man that said he saw the King.*" Hence I demand of you the name and residence of this "brother minister."

In haste, I am, &c., &c.,

THOS. L. DAVIDSON.

MR. T. L. DAVIDSON—

KIND SIR.—Your note in reply to mine is received. The question you propose is, in my judgment, unlawful to answer without authority from the party whose name you ask me to disclose. My object being to cultivate a brotherly and holy feeling among those who acknowledge the one Divine Master, rather than stir up strife uselessly, I decline to mention the name of the very respectable Baptist minister who stated that you informed him that I was a Unitarian. Neither the time nor the place is known to me; and they have no possible bearing, so far as I can conceive, upon the *fact*. It is the thing itself, and neither the time of his speaking, nor the place where he heard you speak, which concerns me—and which, also, if my judgment does not deceive me, is of interest to you. Were I to reverse our respective positions, and were I to be enquired of by yourself whether I had ever called you a Unitarian, my sense of duty, gleaned from the Master's rules, would immediately stimulate me to say *Yes* or *No* to the question, happy in saying that I never so thought, spoke, or wrote, if I could say it truthfully. Would you not think, honestly, that if I hesitated to answer, asked the person's name who told you, required to know the moment the words were spoken, the geographical spot the person occupied when he spoke, whether he was standing or sitting when he gave the information, and other particulars of that category,—would you not think I was too nice to be innocent?

I am sorry, then, to conclude, after my designedly respectful

treatment of you personally in past correspondence, that the worthy and influential minister was not mistaken (which, in charity, I hoped he was) when he stated that you told him I held a doctrine as foreign to my views as the Red Sea is distant from the Grand River which runs past your door in Brantford. Silence, you know, is sometimes as full of meaning as speech. To me it is so on the present occasion. And I must let it be known, not only to some, but to many, for the sake of my own standing as a follower of my Lord, that you have spoken what is absolutely and unqualifiedly untrue in respect to my religious views. Whether or not you knew it to be untrue is another question—a question which I cannot take upon me to decide, but would rather think so than otherwise that your statement was made before receiving my last epistle in 1850, which answered one of your own questions on the subject so pointedly.

My impression is that were I to solicit the Brother Baptist minister to permit me to use his name in this important affair, he would most gladly consent, though it would not be relished by yourself; but neither Christian law nor the law of social expediency calls for it. I referred to my authority in general terms for asking the question, that you might not consider it based upon a fancy, a report, or something worse, impertinency. But the question itself, according to my best judgment, needs no name to entitle it to an answer, but my own. I will, then, once more, courteously, put the query, Did you ever, to any one, intend to make the impression that D. Oliphant was or is a Unitarian?

Charitably, yours.

D. OLIPHANT.

Cobourg, 12th September, 1852.

This brought a lengthy response marked "*Private*," which, of course, we cannot present to our readers. We are however at liberty to announce that he affirms that he never, to his recollection, represented myself as a Unitarian, while he may have spoken of some others in general as leaning to that doctrine. If Mr. Davidson should allow this to meet his eye, he must be distinctly informed that the Disciples as a people are wholly free from Unitarianism.—All the *isms*, indeed, are slightly esteemed and of little worth in our religious market.

D. O.

AN EPISTLE FROM A. P. JONES.

Williamsville, N. Y., Nov. 14th, 1852.

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT.—After a long silence, I have concluded to again break the seal and trouble you with the note of a few thoughts, incidents, and reflections. Somewhat of this world, both of its good and its ill, I have been permitted to experience since I saw you and yours. I have not been able to labor but a small part of the time for one year past. But it is not comely to repine. Truth gains slowly but steadily in this region. Though there is a large work to be done here before there will be a complete triumph of the truth.

But nevertheless, we are inclined to look for a triumph. Yet before that event we must employ more energy, zeal, and courage than we have heretofore done.

There must be more love of God and humanity, and less of the world and wealth. Before that time comes we shall see—well—“what we shall see.” We ought to praise the Lord for endowing us with the ability to *hope*. And we can sometimes almost “hope against hope.” What ignoble ideas some persons seem to attach to the responsibility of their stations. Evidently there are some who think there is to be nothing to do in Heaven but to sit still and revel in selfish pleasure, and who suppose the present life to be a state of preparation for that. So they appear to reason, for so they act. Is it not wonderful that God is still merciful? Look at our race—how many there are, who “are bought with a price,” and then sell themselves back again to Satan for a little sum of £. s. d. Gold will not bribe “turnkeys” nor pay ferrymen in the future world. But the patience of God holds out yet, through many generations of ingrates, and it will not do for us to be angry in the midst of *one* generation.

I think much of your article, entitled, “Preachers—People,”—especially No. II. I wish I could induce all the *preachers and people* too, to read that article every day for a week. We want preachers who seek for “the honor which comes from God alone”—and we want a people who will share the responsibilities with the preachers. But generally, the preacher who fears God and declares the truth, fails to please the *people*. He must eat—so must his family—and he is under obligation to provide the things necessary for his own household. He has offended the people, and his supplies are stopped. He is *tempted* to compromise a *little* for the sake of his family’s and his own wants. And who is equal at all times for such things? The enemy’s money has too frequently been able to dictate terms of accommodation. But wo to that preacher whose mouth is open or shut with “Achan’s wedge.”

In a note to your article, you say you “have not searched after apologies for preachers in their delinquencies. They will themselves furnish their own apologies.” If *they do furnish*, I certainly hope *you will not publish*. If any among them have made sacrifices, let them be remembered in Heaven, not in our periodicals. I am always pained when I hear preachers talking much about their labors and sacrifices. That preachers will have and do have, as much occasion to complain, (if they are faithful to their trust) as any other class of persons, there is not the least doubt. But he who should plead for the reformation of the world in the name of Jesus Christ and his gospel, must not expect to enjoy the world’s smiles. It crucified the Lord and murdered his apostles anciently—and it is not yet in harmony with them, but with itself. The world never reforms itself—never pays the agent of reform till after he is dead, and then he don’t need it. Suppose his labor and toil are unrequited—he entered the service expecting it, and what right has he to complain?

If he is not equal to the labor, let him retire: Let me say one thing more before dismissing the subject, it is this:—the preacher who finds himself well paid for his labors, surrounded by the smiles of the public, may well doubt whether he is reforming the world. He is much more likely to be a conformer than a reformer.

Respecting the great question of the responsibility of the brethren in the direction of preaching the gospel, I would be glad to say many things. We are no where, as a people, employing ourselves for the purpose of raising up and qualifying men either young or old, to preach the gospel. It will not do to say we will leave that matter to God. He never accomplishes anything by miracle, after he has ordained a system of means to that end.

We are trying to get into exercise in this section of New York a system of co-operation, that will work on year after year—the need of which was represented by Brethren Anderson and Kilgour at the close of their year's labor. I intend to give you an outline of our system as soon as it is brought to bear.

But when I sat down to write to you it was to pay a tribute to the memory of a departed brother. And while thinking of the wonders of the ways of God and the responsibilities of man—why the devoted zealous servant of God—the man of usefulness and promise, should be removed from the field of his labor, while others are left to idle away a few more years, I wandered off as above. What think you, Brother Oliphant, has the Lord a place of employment in that more glorious world, which he fills up by transplanting his saints from earth? While we are on the earth, we are permitted to stand round about the palace of the King, only looking from the courts into the halls. May we not suppose that our departed brethren have in the mansions above a happy home, and employment suited to their tastes?

Brother SOLOMON GAINES, of Castle, Wyoming county, N. Y., was called home some time last spring. The precise date I do not now remember. I did not, indeed, hear of it till I saw it announced in the "Christian Age," some two or three months subsequent to the event. Brother G. was about fifty years of age; and had been for a number of years a devoted servant of the Lord. I knew him well—his patience, his faith, his liberality.

A rent is made in the circle of my earthly associations. The remembrance of such men is well calculated to make us stronger in the faith. Brother Gaines was strong in the faith while living, and triumphant in death. When near his end, he was enquired of if he was ready to die, to which he replied, "*That has been the business of my life—I am ready.*" Verily he "endured, as seeing him who is invisible." Of such an exit from time we may well employ the lines of the poet:

"Sure the last end
Of the good man is peace. How calm his exit!!
Night dews fall not more gently to the ground,
Nor weary worn-out winds expire as soft."

Yours, in the hope of that immortality which is brought to light by the gospel.

A. P. JONES.

ANOTHER SENEX.

The following was sent to us after the note which was inserted in our last was printed. When the writer did not see his note in the October Number, the subjoined was written:—

Nov., 1852.

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT:—Had I anticipated the position in which I find myself now in relation to Senex and the Marriage Question before I wrote what he calls my essay, I would not have written it. I am sure that any intelligent disciple must have discovered the weakness of his arguments, so as to render any attempt unnecessary in his or her behalf, and I have only provoked him to go on to more extravagant aberrations.

There is no reasoning with such an opponent as Senex, who, in order to carry a favourite point, can deliberately affirm "that the words 'only in the Lord' is(are) unconnected with any part of the chapter," and then connect them with marriage himself: but a marriage of which he confesses Paul does not speak throughout the Chapter. (*Banner*, March, page 83.) He can easily dispose of the like of me, dress me in a fool's cap, make me affirm what I never said, and with a convenient supply of 'things and their opposites,' temporal marriages, spiritual marriages, marriages only in the Lord, marriages only out of the Lord, shew me off to his satisfaction; but how can he answer for charging Paul with giving us scripture *out of connexion*?

If you and your readers will exercise patience with me, I will endeavour to show in this my final letter that Senex' assertions ought to be received with caution on the important subject on which he writes; and if after this some of your readers conclude that "no where the smallest restriction is laid on the freedom of choice," and therefore marry infidels, and become infidels, and bring up infidel families I will be no partaker in their guilt.

As a reasoner, Senex is not to be trusted. Of this I was satisfied since I read with astonishment his critique on Mathetes. I wondered that you published it. Mathetes, speaking of a believer, says, "the condition of his being a son of God is his being separated from the world." On this Senex remarks, "Now according to Mathetes, if a member of the church marry a member of the church, they are separated from the world; consequently they are a son and daughter of God; but so it is that they may be thus married and not be a son or daughter of God—so that temporal marriage cannot be the condition of his being a son of God." After such a display of logic as this, and it is but a specimen, what subject can be safely trusted in his hands? He contradicts himself. On page 84 of the *Banner* for March he says: "The next quotation is the law that prevailed among the Jews where intermarriage with the nations round them is PROHIBITED," and on the next page he produces "three credible witnesses," one under the Patriarchal dispensation, another under the gospel, and the daughters of Zelophehad *under the law*, to prove that there was NO PROHIBITION, but that in harmony with the *law* and the gospel the whole of Adam's posterity have the liberty of being married to whom they will.

When he quotes the scriptures he mutilates them. Num. xxxvi. 6 fairly quoted reads, "Let them marry to whom they think best; only to the family of the tribe of their father shall they marry." 1 Cor. vii. 39 reads "She is at liberty to be married to whom she will, only in the Lord"

He can make the astounding assertion that scripture is out of connection even when the admission is ruinous to his purpose. Let us grant him to leave "only in the Lord" out of 1 Cor. vii. 39, and then it reads "she is at liberty to be married to whom she will," and what then becomes of his spiritual marriage there, for he maintains that in it we have "the same subject, the same reasoning," and the same decision as in Rom. vii. 2, 3.—synonymous with "putting on Christ," and he says "none will dispute it."

In the above expose of Senex' logic I do not mean to insinuate that he is not honest, or that his Christian character is impaired. but if I have done him justice, and I believe I have, his assertions must be received with caution.

I ask you, Do you think it proper to publish to the world and "record it in a book" that Enos the son of Seth, who was born in the 235th year of Adam's life, was an infant in the days of Noah—his own descendant of the eighth generation; and that all who have set up the regular worship of God with the exception of Adam and Seth were of Cain's posterity. Consequently Abel, Enoch, Noah were Cain's descendants!!! I hope that no one may seize upon Senex' letters as a specimen of our Bible knowledge, and expose us to the derision and contempt of sensible men.

I assure Senex that I did not lose my temper, but that I am mortified at seeing his letters in the hands of the public. I never meant to review all his positions. I only intended to shew at a gallop that his witnesses would not sustain his assumptions; for I was fearful that some might be induced by the boldness of his assertions to sin against themselves. I have done so. I understand myself and others also understand me. I do not make him say anything that he denies. I do not intend to make his views appear different from what he says they are.

The distinction which he makes between what he calls spiritual marriage and temporal marriage, the first being in the Lord and the other out of the Lord, I do not admit. I only said, and I now repeat it, the marriage spoken of in 1 Cor. vii. 39 is that in which a believing widow may enter, and that nothing concerning his spiritual marriage can be found there. I offered two reasons to shew the incorrectness of his view of the passage, and they cannot be set aside. I am now done with the subject whatever Senex may write and you publish on it until something in the shape of a proposition on which we differ appears, and with friendship for you both,

I remain,

ANOTHER SENEX.

OUR LABOURS SOUTHWARD.

MR. EDITOR: DEAR BROTHER:—I have been a reader of your valuable periodical "The Christian Banner," for the last few months,

and I can truly say that I have been instructed in the perusal of its pages.

The articles headed Position and Principles of Disciples in particular are valuable. I am much pleased with the able manner in which you have treated the subject. It is what is called for, so that the religious community may know our position, and views of the word of God. I like the manner in which you have treated of the covenants—the difference between them you have made plain to my mind. It is a subject not understood by many, even by those who are religious teachers.

I hope you will go on with your well begun work, and that much good will be the result of your labors.

That you may be blessed and a blessing to all whom you visit, is the prayer of a sister reader of your paper.

A. A. T.

☞ We shall live, thrive, and be triumphantly successful as an editor if intelligent sisters give us their religious sympathy as above. Will our sister receive our acknowledgements? We are happy to say that she has consented to be an agent.

D. O.

ELDER CAMPBELL OF ALDBORO, CANADA.

Some little enquiry has been made since our last relative to who the Campbellites are who appear in the Census—reported in the official Gazette. The following from H. Morison, a faithful brother in Chatham, will throw all the light that we have on the subject:—

“There are different sorts of Baptists in these regions, and one class of that denomination are some times called Campbellites, after their Leader or Elder, a Mr Campbell, a Highland Scotchman, who I believe lives in Aldborough township. What their views are, I know not—never having been at any of their Meetings only once in the township of Lobo, some twelve years ago; and every thing was in an unknown tongue to me, being in *Galic*. But, I well remember that there was great noise and confusion among the hearers, and falling from seats, no less. I have learned that this Campbell is one of the followers of a person by the name of Mc Arthur, who held some strange views and belonged to the West Highlands, and afterwards settled in Caledonia, York state.”

That these are the identical ones who appear on the Census Roll, we cannot doubt. And that they have no religious intercourse with us, nor we with them, is just as evident as that we do not religiously mingle with the Burmese or Chinese. The Disciples recognize no man as a Leader. He of whom the prophet spake when the Spirit moved him to say, “I have given him to be a Leader of the Gentiles,” is the great Captain whom we professedly follow.

D. O.

THE CO-OPERATION.

Eramosa, Nov. 22nd, 1852.

DEAR BROTHER:—At a meeting of the P. C. Committee held yesterday it was made my duty to inform you that it is the will of said committee, that you fill up the time that remains of the present year as far as practicable in the work of Evangelizing. As brother Kilgour is now labouring with brother Black, you will use your discretion with reference to the expediency of your co-operating with those brethren, or of your laboring alone. At the close of the year please inform the committee, how long you have been employed in their service since the commencement.

Affectionately,

BROTHER D. OLIPHANT.

W. OLIPHANT, *Sec P. C. C.*

I shall do what lies in my power in accordance with the above, now that health will enable.

D. O.

FIVE HUNDRED NEW SUBSCRIBERS.

To the Editor of the Canada Christian Advocate.

Sir:—I am much pleased with the appearance of the *Advocate* in its new dress. But my object is not to praise the *Advocate*—it speaks for itself—but to make the following proposition: I will be one of one hundred who will pledge myself to procure *five* new subscribers for the ensuing volume. Now, I feel sanguine, that if a united and vigorous effort should be made immediately, *five hundred* new subscribers could be obtained without much difficulty. Let the brethren, enter heartily into the work at once, and the object is achieved. I send enclosed the names of two new subscribers, to commence with the volume, and next week I hope to be able to furnish the other three. Come brethren, let us give the *Advocate* a handsome Christmas present. Let us make a "long pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether."

FAITH AND WORKS.

☞ The above is from the *Canada Christian Advocate*, published at Hamilton, C. W., organ of the purest and most reformatory Methodists in the Province, so far as we are advised. What cannot be accomplished by the resolution and zeal, the "faith and works," of the writer? Can we or ought we to learn something from it?

D. O.

PROSPECTUS OF THE CHRISTIAN BANNER.

1853 or Vol. 7.

This periodical work differs, in some respects, from every other religious paper in British America. It aims to plead the principles of the gospel and maintain the doctrine of the church of Christ as advocated by authority of the Lord when christianity was pure and

unadulterated. It testifies against partyism. It lifts its voice for unity—unity of faith, form, and spirit. It has no preferences for any class of principles, any modes or customs, any form of doctrine, only as a 'Thus saith the Lord' sanctions and approves. Its character, so far as can be specified within the limits of a Prospectus, is described in one sentence: It urges with all the motives in its power a thorough reformation in all things wherein the christianity of modern times is not like the christianity of primitive times.

There is one essential feature in the editorial management of the *Christian Banner*, universally acknowledged to be fair and equitable. It allows every professor, of whatever religious predilections, to occupy its pages and reply to any of its positions, provided the language employed be respectful or sufficiently decorous for public use.

The *Christian Banner* is published Monthly at Cobourg, Canada West, and St. John, New Brunswick. Its editors are D. Oliphant and W. W. Eaton. It is 32 pages large octavo—subscription price only 5s. per annum if paid within three months after subscribing, or 6s. 3d. after that period.

Where there is no agent, parties may become their own agents and order the work by letter. Sample Numbers sent when desired. We shall be happy to honor all orders of this character.

Parties not able to pay, but who desire to read, will have this paper sent to them gratuitously.

UP TO THE TIMES.

Since September we have enjoyed—yes, enjoyed the privilege of sending out our paper within the same month for which it is dated. This, we are free to say, gives us more pleasure *one hundred times over* than any one reader in Canada, in the east, or beyond the American lines. By the blessing of the Lord we trust never, while we publish, to be defeated in the regular issue of the *Christian Banner* as during a portion of the present year. None more than ourselves desire to be up to the times in all laudable respects—in all things but virtue, and in this we desire to be far, very far in advance of the times.

D. O.

THE EYE OF CRITICISM will see sundry blunders wrought out in some of our Numbers for this year. We should have one hundred eyes, and at least two bodies—one to stay at home and the other to travel with—in order to prevent typographical imperfections. We note only two or three of the errors that the discerning reader may perceive. In our No 1, at the close of the first article on the Position of Disciples, we have these words: "Is this position, are these principles, shall such aims and views, be contended against &c". This is incorrect: but put the comma after instead of before the word *be*, and it will read grammatically orthodox. Again, in the May No., page 143, tenth and eleventh lines from bottom, we find the words, "refused to be known by any other name than that of Christian Jones" A bad place for Mr. Jones! The sentence should terminate with the

word *Christian*. Also, in our last No., page 304, 'tenth line from bottom, we have "natural and revealed religion and there differences," when every scholar knows that the adverb *there* should still be in the printer's case, and the pronoun *their* be in its place. But we have neither time nor taste to proceed farther in this department.

D. O.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ELDER W. F. HUGHES—This brother has been, as far as we can learn, laboring acceptably among the brethren in Nova Scotia, since July. While absent from St John he also addressed the citizens and brethren here two Lord's Days. I introduced him to the newly constituted congregation at Calais. After spending two weeks and making arrangements for continuing his labors the melancholy news reached him of the death of his only son, a youth of promise, in his twentieth year. He was far from home, (at Newburyport, Mass.) and died amongst strangers after an illness of eight days. Our brother passed through this city soon after this severe bereavement, to convey the heart-rending news to his mother and two sisters, residing at Charlottetown, Prince Edward's Island.

ELDER GEORGE GERRARD has been on a visit to Liverpool, where he immersed one. He gave us an excellent discourse on the Lord's Day he remained in the city.

ELDER DONALD CRAWFORD also spent two Lord's Days with us, and gave us several interesting addresses. He had immersed two more at Weymouth. He finds a large field of labor before him in Nova Scotia. During the second Lord's Day he was in the city, I immersed one young lady.

We have also enjoyed the labors of ELDER RICHARD THOMPSON, one of the Editors of the *Christian Visitor*, the organ of the Baptist denomination of this Province. We were edified and much interested by his address on the Lord's Day. The brethren, 't'hen, are kindly aiding me at this time: and I would thus tender to them my gratitude: May the Lord bless and prosper all his faithful servants.

W. W. E.

Oshawa, Nov. 10th

BROTHER OLIPHANT:—Knowing the anxiety of the brethren to know the true state of things in each locality, I take upon myself to state as follows:—

Near the last of September I left home in the company of two good brethren from Prince Edward county. The evening of the second day arrived at Hillier, where is a church, with which brother Black and myself had laboured in July last. The brethren received me gladly, and in good health and happy in the gospel I commenced to preach the word of life, and almost every evening for eight or ten days pled the claims of Zion's King. We had good attendance, a deep interest appeared to be taken by the community, particularly the Methodist people, some of whom confessed the ancient gospel truth; and many requested me to visit them and their families. One brother

was restored to the church, confessing his wrongs with brokenness of heart, one baptized, and a very interesting lad expressed a willingness to yield himself to Christ, but was thought (perhaps judiciously) by his father to be too young.

About the 9th of October I went eastward to Hallowell. In this field Universalism and other isms flourish. This fact together with internal storms which this church has met and repulsed, led me to hope (seeing their zeal and love of truth) that God designed better days for them yet. This is the field of Jacob Platt's labors—a man whose reward is on high.

Prompted by a love of truth, and in my weak way, I opened the artillery of eternal truth upon Annihilationism and all the isms, soul-sleeping also, and for three weeks endeavored to pour torrents of truth on large congregations. The solemn attention with which they heard and the kind manner in which they treated me, gave proof that truth was doing something. The church was animated and I hope benefited—many were almost persuaded to be Christians. One interesting young woman nobly confessed her love to Jesus and was buried with him; other two appeared to drink of the wormwood and the gall, confessed their faith and wished to be baptized, but were thought to be too young. I did not urge the matter, also when on the point of leaving I took the confession of a promising young man, whom I left to be baptized by brother Platt forthwith. In this region are many precious spirits, dear to me. Never have I seen greater liberality in rewarding laborers for their services than in this people. I spake to them respecting their need of a Meeting House as a rallying point, as they are somewhat scattered. I know that this would be conducive of much good to that people, and think, there are both ability and a willingness in them to do so if they were assured of help from the co-operation by receiving the visits of the Evangelists free of tax while building the house.

Cannot something be done for them? There are gold, silver, and precious stones there. Or must a Tribe perish from Israel? May God grant grace and wisdom to direct to all the holy brethren, and I will subscribe myself your poor frail brother in hope of a glorious deliverance.

JOHN DOYLE.

BROTHER OLIPHANT.—I have intelligence to communicate, that to you, I feel assured, will be of the most acceptable kind. Bro. C. J. Benedict, from Ohio, in his tour through central New York, made his engagements so as to be with the brethren at Pompey, at our annual meeting, Oct. 17th.

He delivered a series of lectures to the brethren and citizens of Pompey on the great and important topics connected with Christianity in a very clear and lucid manner, in which he proved himself a master workman, of whom the brotherhood may well feel proud.

As the result of our meeting, nine persons, intelligent and well informed came forward and took their seats, to whom we with a hearty greeting gave the right hand of fellowship, receiving them to all the enjoyments of freemen in Christ the Lor^d. Of the above number, two were from the Baptists, two from the Presbyterians,

two from the Methodists, and three from the world.

Our meeting has been of the most interesting and instructive kind, and our hearts have been made to rejoice in the Lord, to whom be praise for the adaptation of his truth to the human mind.

H. KNAPP.

Pompey, N. Y., Nov. 8th, 1852.

Wainfleet, October 7th, 1852.

DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT,—Having a desire to communicate to you the result of the meeting in Wainfleet, I must say that we had a joyful time. The Lord has truly blessed the efforts that have been made by the brethren in this place.—We have the satisfaction of recording the number of ten penitent souls who confessed the Saviour in baptism. [Seven of these previously reported.—D. O.] Oh! that the Lord would enable them to live to his praise, to the honour of his cause and advancement of his kingdom. You already have a report of laborers. They form a mighty phalanx in presenting truth and opposing error. May the Lord send more such laborers into his vineyard.

The cause of God is prospering in many places in Canada. Brother Shepard when here last June stated that the Old Gospel was progressing in South Dorchester—that there was a great desire to hear and know the truth. We have reason to thank God and take courage. Brother Oliphant, we have the pleasing news to relate that three out of the above number were quite young persons, my little daughter who was only twelve years old was one of them. Oh! how pleasant to see young people turn to the Lord. Children may at a very early age learn the system of salvation and participate in the love of the Saviour.

Brethren Black and Anderson after leaving Wainfleet, started for Rainham to hold a meeting of several days, which commenced Thursday evening following. We attended part of the meeting, and had the pleasure of seeing six more confess the Lord, and one added formerly a Baptist.

Your Brother, T. BRADN.

The brethren in these regions are deserving of encouragement and good cheer and the Lord is not unmindful of them in their past and present exertions.

We learn from brother Lister that twelve have lately been added to the congregation at Bowmanville. May they keep on the narrow way to the end, is our prayer.

D. O.

CORRESPONDENTS will please observe that our pages are crowded. We will do them all the justice and all the honor in our power. We thank brethren Sillers, Fisher, Overholt, J. B., jr and others for their religious sociality with the pen. Along with various communications, our No. 12 upon the Position and Principles of Disciples is pushed over to the January Number. It is our confident hope that the *Christian Banner* for 1853 will be the richest and most acceptable volume, God willing, that we have published.

VOLUME FIVE AND SIX.—Our readers understand that our issues for 1850 and 1852 are designed to be united as predecessor and successor. The Nos. issued in 1851 we pronounce and regard experimental. Hence, as an index is given every second year, we give the index for vols 5 & 6 in this Number.

D. O.

✠ William Hooper, Universalist Pastor at Halifax, in our next.