

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear
within the text. Whenever possible, these have
been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

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

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

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
					✓						

THE
CHRISTIAN BANNER.

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

VOL. XI.

COBOURG AND BRIGHTON, APRIL, 1857.

NO. 4.

DR. SHEPARD REVIEWED, No. 2.

For the Christian Banner.

Pursuant to promise I now resume the farther consideration of Dr. Shepard's address published in the Dec. No. of the Banner. That part of the Dr's address which I shall take up at present is to what he says about church authority. Dr. Shepard says page 369 "the church has no authority." As I differ from Dr. S. I shall now produce my reasons, but before proceeding, I would say that it is freely granted here, that the Lord Jesus is king on Zion's hill, and the sole Lawgiver in His kingdom, and that no church, no man, nor class of men, has any authority to add to, alter, amend, or set aside, any one of the laws of the kingdom, without incurring the king's displeasure. But while this is freely granted and even contended for, I also contend that the Lord Jesus (being now absent in body) has committed to the churches a certain amount of power and authority, to be by them exercised in His absence, in accordance with the laws of the kingdom, see Rev. 2: 5, 16, chap. 3: 2.

I shall now enumerate some of the things which in my opinion the church has authority to do. 1st, The churches have authority to receive members into their communion, upon a confession of their faith in Jesus as the Son of God and the Saviour of sinners, and professing a willingness to conform to the laws of the kingdom, and also to reject persons seeking admission into the church, if these are known to hold sentiments subversive of the truth contained in the christian scriptures. 2nd, The churches have authority to exercise a certain amount of super-

vision and care over their own members, warning the unruly, comforting, exhorting, and even reproofing (by those appointed by the church) those who require such dealing, and finally to expel out of her communion unworthy members, who neglect to reform, after the instituted means for reclaiming them prove fruitless. Matt. 18 : 15, 18 ; 1 Cor. 5 : 5, 7 ; 1 Thess. 5 : 14 ; 2 Thess. 3 : 6. 3rd, The churches have authority to judge of the qualifications and elect (or choose) their own office-bearers, Acts 6 : 3, 6. And I respectfully ask, why not ordain them also, for it is easier to ordain than judge of the necessary qualifications. 4th, When any difference arises between members of the same church, respecting worldly matters, which cannot be adjusted by the parties at variance, the church has authority to appoint fit and proper persons, to examine into, and judge between the parties at variance, to prevent expensive lawsuits, which would disgrace the christian name. 5th, The church has authority to collect money from her own members, to defray the necessary expense of religion, and supply the wants of the poor or destitute persons, and to furnish support to those proclaiming the truth to the unconverted, or any other charitable or religious purpose calling for support, such as the undertaking in which the Bible Union is engaged, or any sudden calamity falling on any locality, Acts 11 ; 27, 2 Cor. 8 : 2, 16, Phil. 2 : 25, chap. 4 ; 15, 18. In the collection of money care must be taken that no person is oppressed, or compelled to give beyond their own free will, although as a general rule equality should be observed, that is, every one to give according to his ability. 6th, When any thing is to be done abroad, beyond the limits of the church, which cannot be attended to by the ordinary office-bearers of the church, (these being stationary in the church) the churches in such cases have authority to choose fit and proper persons to go on such errands, and transact such business as the case may require, including the choosing of fit and proper persons to proclaim the truth to the unconverted, or assist weak churches needing help. Persons thus sent may be and are properly called, "the Messengers of the churches," (but if the churches had no authority they could have no Messengers, being destitute of authority to appoint such.) Acts 15 : 22, 28, 1st Cor. 16 : 3, 2nd Cor. 8 : 19, 23, Phil. 2 : 23.

In the performance of all we have named above, the churches have sufficient directions how to exercise their authority, in the constitution of the kingdom. But there are many other things which churches may

and as religious bodies must do, and about which the laws of the kingdom say just not one word, neither could be expected to say, as these must always be regulated by *times* and *circumstances*. Some of these I shall now mention.

Every church has authority to appoint the hour and place of meeting, whether for worship or business ; some churches meet in a rented house, some purchase a house, others meet in a school house, some in a private house, and there have been meetings in barns, and even in the open fields. I have attended church meetings in all such places myself. Other churches have built houses for worship, and when this happens the church has authority to determine the shape and size of the building, also of what materials, wood, stone, or brick ; authority also to appoint proper persons to superintend the building, purchase ground, &c. Now as about all this the constitution of the kingdom is silent, every church has full power and authority to follow their own judgment and discretion, and choose that plan that suits best their own circumstances, providing that nothing be done to oppress the christian people, or transgress the laws of the kingdom. Take away from the churches the power of doing all we have mentioned above, and the churches are left powerless indeed. Transfer the power of doing all we have named above, to any man, or class of men, call them evangelists or what you please, and it will soon reduce the churches to a state of tyranny and oppression, very like popery, and ultimately to confusion and disorder. Let any man, or class of men, enter the churches, and attempt to claim the power of doing all we have named above, and I feel confident the churches will rise in their might, and ask by what authority they do these things, and who gave them such authority. And as I believe that no man can prove that he has such authority from the Head of the Church, it will follow as a matter of course that the authority is in the church, the only place where it ought to be, or where it can remain with safety.

I have examined Dr. Shepard's address with some care, and I cannot help saying that in my humble opinion Dr. S.'s address has a striking resemblance to popery, in more than one particular. Let us examine a little. Any one the least acquainted with popery knows that popish churches are powerless, that is, the common people who of course compose the churches, must yield a blind obedience to the priests, the whole power is in the hands of the clergy, chiefly in the hands of these

grades called Popes, Cardinals, Right Reverend, and Doctors of Divinity. Let us now examine Dr. Shepard's plan. He says, page 369, "the church has no authority," thus rendering the churches as powerless as the popish churches; here is one point of agreement. Dr. S. gives all the power to a class of men called evangelists; these resemble in power and authority the popish grades above named. The evangelists according to Dr. Shepard are now the highest grade (or order) in the churches. This order seem to have authority over all classes of christians, while they themselves are subject to none. They have according to Dr. S., the sole power to propagate or perpetuate their own order, also the sole power to form and organize churches, choosing and ordaining church office bearers, and of entering into churches and re-proving publicly the rulers or overseers of churches, and of course all other classes of christians, while as far as appears from Dr. Shepard's address no man or church can call them in question for what they may do or teach, and as far as I can see, the Dr. has not left a single avenue open, through which the people when oppressed by this order of men, could obtain any relief. Even matters of difference arising between members of the same church, and which the Lord Jesus gives authority to the church to determine (see Matt. 18 : 18,) in the last resort, Dr. S. true to his creed, will not allow the church to meddle with; he transfers it to his favorite order the evangelists, see page 367. If this is not laying aside the commandment of God, and teaching for doctrine the commandments of men, I cannot tell what would be doing so. Let the reader turn to Dr. S.'s address, page 365 line 7 and 8 from the foot, let him then read Matt. 18 : 15, 18, then turn to page 367 and read lines 4, 5, and 6, from top, and say if Dr. Shepard is not a complete democrat according to his own definition of the term. I now ask the reader to show me where I have charged Dr. Shepard with anything that is unfair. Although my hand shakes, being now in the 73rd year of my age, perhaps after I get a rest I may overhaul another part of Dr. Shepard's address.

River John, N. S., Feb. 14th, 1857.

JAMES SILLARS.

UNION—AN INTERESTING DIALOGUE.

CHAPTER IV.

Present, a Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Lutheran, and Christian—all preachers. Prayer by brother M.

Presbyterian. I have been looking over the report of our last meeting in the newspapers, and I am disgusted with Mr. C.'s remarks just before we separated. I see that he is catering to the prejudices of the people, and drawing upon their feelings by his everlasting plea for *union*, as if the salvation of the world depended upon it.

Methodist. That is my mind well expressed. I see that Mr. C. is ready to take advantage of the sympathies of the people to defeat us; but he can not get round me in that way.

Christian. You admit then, gentlemen, that the prejudices of the people, their *sympathies* and *feelings* are in favor of union.

Presbyterian. Yes, sir, I admit it, and you know it, and now appeal to them to make head against us.

Christian. Then you can see that our churches have done right in making us responsible for *division*; for the people are opposed to it. If we were all of the same mind with our brethren, disunion would soon be at an end. But why complain of me for appealing to this popular feeling in favor of union among the members of our respective churches? Is not the feeling right? Is not the heart of that husband right in the sight of God, who feels an ardent desire to be united with his own wife? Is not the heart of that parent right, who desires to be united with his own children? Is not the heart of that child right who wishes to be united with its own father and mother? Are not the prejudices, feelings and sympathies of all the good everywhere right, who wish to be united in one body in accordance with the will of God? If they are not right, the prayer of Jesus, that they *might be one*, as he and his Father are one, is not right.

Presbyterian. Mr. C., I can not restrain my feelings, when I hear a man talk as if the salvation of the world depended upon Christian union.

Christian. Well, sir, restrain your feelings or not, Jesus prayed for the union of believers, "that the *world might believe*." Whether you think the salvation of the world depends upon union or not, the Lord saw, when he uttered this prayer, that the *faith of the world*, in some respects, depends upon the union of the followers of Christ. We may argue with infidels as we please, and send missionaries to the pagans, and they will never believe and never be converted, unless the professed followers of Christ unite.

Methodist. I see no use in everlastingly harping upon Christian

union. It is not the Alpha nor the Omega of the religion of Christ. Beside, I know that I have enjoyed the love of God without all this ado about union, and God will bless us again.

Baptist. Brethren, I should like to look at this matter coolly. If it is true, as brother C. argues, that the conversion of the world depends upon the union of believers, the subject is a more serious one than I had thought it was. It appears much, as brother P. said, as if the salvation of the world depends upon union. One thing is becoming obvious, viz: that *our support depends upon our union.*

Presbyterian. Dr. Rice has shown, that we now have Christian union, and that the union we now have is better than if we were all amalgamated in one church.

Lutheran. I read all that Dr. Rice said on that point, with the fond hope that he would make an apology for our present condition; but I felt more condemned at the close of my reading than at the commencement. I have never been able to twist my conscience so far, as to think that when Paul exhorted the Corinthians to be perfectly joined together in the *same mind* and in the same judgment, and that there be no *divisions among them*, he only intended such a state of things as we now have. And when he said, "There is one body," he meant that we now compose that body.

Episcopalian. Brethren, I have spent much time in perusing ancient Church History, and I am free to admit that there was but one church, but one order, denomination, or communion in the apostolic churches. The apostles all belonged to one church, and all the first Christians. No man the least acquainted with church history can deny this.

Baptist. Brethren, it has now been a little over two months since my brethren suspended my pastoral labors by withdrawing my support. I have had but little to do but read and meditate upon this subject; and I not only agree to the statement that there was but one church in the apostolic age, but they had but *one faith*. And, to be candid, ever since I have been a minister of the Gospel, when I was most engaged in the cause, and felt the deepest emotions of piety, I always prayed for the union of all the children of God.

Methodist. Brethren, I do not know what you all mean, in the strange turn things seem to be taking; but since you are expressing yourselves so freely, I will state candidly that when I got religion—

yes, Mr. C. *got religion*—I must use that good old expression, though I know it grates upon your ear—I say, that when I got religion, I felt that I could take all the followers of Christ in my arms; I loved all the children of God. And, since reflecting, I can recollect that I have always prayed for the union of all the good, in times of revivals, and when I felt more fully the power of religion. I must confess too, that I have always, in my secret prayers, most fervently prayed for the union of good people.

Christian. I have observed, brethren, in all the prayer-meetings I have attended, where the more spiritually minded are always to be found, that I rarely heard a prayer without a special petition for the union of all the God-fearing. It is the very spirit of piety that cries to heaven for the union of the Lord's people. The Lord prayed for it. The Holy Spirit, in his holy teachings through the apostles, commanded it. The holy martyrs of Jesus prayed for it. All holy men from the beginning of the reign of Christ to this day, in their most devotional, spiritual and solemn hours, have not only desired the union of the saints, but prayed for it. All the good are in favor of it. The Bible is in favor of it. The Holy Spirit requires it. Jesus prayed for it. Almighty God commands it. All the angels in heaven and the redeemed spirits would unite in a shout of hallelujah to God and to the Lamb, to see all the holy and pious on the earth unite.

Presbyterian. Gentlemen, I know not whether you are carried away with excitement, or driven by the loss of your salaries; but one thing is certain, at the rate you are going, you will all find yourselves caught in the "gull-trap" of Discipleism. I am not prepared to be carried away with such humbuggery.

Baptist. I would first remark to brother P., that I am an old man, and was in the ministry when he was born, and that rashness is a fault of young men. Ugly expressions, hard speeches and sarcasm may show an evil temper, but can never exhibit the spirit of Christ. I do not plead guiltless in keeping up these divisions. I can say this: I always desired to do right, but I find it is easy to produce an effect, different from what we desire. I can see now, that I preached many sermons calculated to keep up party feeling. But one thing I now see, and that is, that when I was successful in revivals, I was always on other themes—themes that inspired love among the people, and love in my own heart. You, my young brother, may indulge in hard names

and party feelings, but will never save one soul, build up your church, or gain the approbation of Jesus in that way. We shall account to the Lord for our work. Our salary, that has been referred to, is a small matter; but our acceptance with God is a great matter. You see the expense we have been at in our town, in building churches, sustaining preachers, etc. You see also, what we have done and what we are now doing. Six of us have preached here during the past year, and we have not converted a dozen persons. Some of our members have run into Universalism, some into infidelity, and others back to the world.

Presbyterian. These are weak-minded persons that have taken up with these fooleries.

Baptist. If so, they should not have their minds perplexed with partyism; and we are the more to blame for not taking care of them. But I was going on to ask what can we do in our divided state? That we can do but little, if any good, in our town, is now as manifest as day. That we can not stand before Romanism, infidelity, and the pagan world, in our present condition, is beyond dispute.

Lutheran. Brethren, it appears to me that the course you are about taking, will amount to the same as an acknowledgment that the resolution passed by the private members of our churches, was a just resolution. It is a bold push when the private members of churches correct the *ministry* in doctrine.

Episcopalian. I think as much. If this state of things is to be maintained, the rulers will become the ruled.

Presbyterian. I have been surprised all the evening, that you could not see where you were going to. We will look well, submitting to the private members of our churches to correct us in doctrine!

Christian. Brethren, I hope you will not let pride drive you from doing what you know to be your duty. Aquila and Priscilla, *private members*, taught the mighty and eloquent "Apollos the way of the Lord more perfectly." Let us be as humble as he.

FOR WHOM IS BAPTISM INTENDED?

[There lies before us a pamphlet entitled 'The Apostolic Commission: A Discourse delivered by Dr. S. E. Shepard, delivered in the Disciples' Chapel, New York.' The subjoined extract from our friend's address may serve to show how brother Shepard treats his subject, and also

serve to arrest the attention of some who are studying the ordinance of baptism in the light of God's oracles.—D. O.]

FOR WHOM IS BAPTISM INTENDED ?

Some respond, for adults—some, for infants. But the Sacred Oracles say nothing of either. Not one word is said, in all the Revelation of God, concerning either infant or adult baptism. No man was baptized by the Apostles because he was an adult—no one because he was an infant. It is not written, He that is an infant, and is baptized, shall be saved; nor yet, He that is an adult, and is baptized, shall be saved. But it is written, "*He that believes* and is baptized shall be saved." How different this from the institution of circumcision. The law in that case, 'made and provided,' reads, "He that is eight days old shall be circumcised." Faith and unbelief had nothing to do in the affair of circumcision. As it regards qualification for that institution, they were equivalents. Not so with baptism. It matters not how old, or how young one may be. That is not the question. "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest," is the exponent of the qualification required. But as the phrase "infant baptism," in this controversy, is used of the baptism of persons too young to believe, I shall use it in that sense. And here we take the broad ground, *that there is not a single command, in all God's word, to baptize a babe.* And farther, *that there is not a single instance, on the Sacred Record, of the baptism of a babe.* No man living can show a command of God for it, or an example of it. John did not preach the baptism of babes, but the baptism of penitents. The Apostles and their joint laborers preached, "*He that believes* and is baptized shall be saved." "Repent and be baptized, every one of you." "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest." In accordance with this preaching we are assured that when the Samaritans "*believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women.*" But not a word is uttered concerning the baptism of their babes. Read over all that has been written in defence of infant baptism, and you will find, that not one author has ever found a command to baptize a babe, or an example of its having been done by any of the Apostles. It is, therefore, entirely destitute of Scripture authority. The Catholics are honest. They confess that it is not to be found in the Scriptures, but justify it on the authority of their Church.

But, out of respect to Protestants who practice this rite, and who desire to find some Scripture premises from which they can infer it, I will notice "the household baptisms," so often referred to by them, in justification of their practice.

Read the 16th chapter of Acts. Lydia and her family were baptized. On this statement great reliance is placed. But let me inquire, Who was this Lydia? The answer given in the narrative is, she was "a certain woman," "who worshipped God"—who "heard" Paul and Silas preach Christ. Where did she hear them? At "Philippi." Did she reside there? No, she was "of the city of Thyatira." What did she come to Philippi for? She was "a seller of purple." Was her little child with her at Philippi? The Book says nothing on that point. Had she any little children? The Book is silent. Had she any children? All is silent. Where was her husband? No one knows. Had she a living husband? No man can tell. Was she ever married? All is silent. Silence reigns. Now if there is no evidence that Lydia had ever been married, or ever had any children—or if she had children, that any of them were too small to be believers in Christ; what kind of evidence is there here of infant baptism? Certainly we ought to require the proof of, at least, one babe; and the advocates of infant baptism should show that she had a little babe, and that it was with her at Philippi.

THE HOLY SPIRIT, No. I.

I invite all Disciples who are willing to *review* the subject of the influence of the Holy Spirit to a candid perusal of a few brief essays touching this doctrine; not because we are all supposed to be in error here, nor because we imagine ourselves able to instruct many; but rather that some good people have, undeniably, but indistinct vision, and others entertain real errors of no trifling concern in reference to the Spirit. And as we profess to be guided by the one Book in all religion, its authority, even when it refutes our most cherished views of christianity, ought to be ultimate.

Should any one discover that he has misunderstood the scriptures at this point, the disgrace will not consist in yielding to truth, but in obstinately clinging to an error. And if I be found in error and should any brother in a christian temper administer a correction, I hope to be

able to receive it in meekness. Much attention is being directed to this subject among our brethren in different parts of the Union; a wide spreading dissatisfaction is being experienced with a certain theory promulgated years ago among us, and as the Reformation, in the absence of Creeds, forms a great Bible Class determined to learn the truth, this matter will be likely for a few years to command no little attention.

Simply as a theory, the error alluded to deserves no more attention than any other abstract proposition, but as our conduct is regulated in so large a measure by our theories, these, if they stand in the way of our spiritual good, should be promptly met and fairly exposed. I do not now refer to the long-since exploded dogma, so willingly cherished by most protestant sects, that the Spirit must abstractly, without means, quicken every faculty ere one can either believe or obey, and that, without the word, he reveals God's will to mankind, but I mean an error which is as great, viz: That the christian is not to expect to enjoy the Holy Spirit as a personal agent, a spiritual existence, an entity; but rather the mind or disposition of Christ; that we need not pray for the indwelling of the Spirit itself, but rather pray that we might possess the spirit of christianity, the spirit of the gospel, the fruit of the Spirit, &c. Now, that we should possess the mind of Christ and all the other fruits of the Spirit, there can be no doubt; but is this all that is meant by the injunctions to be filled with the Spirit, to be strengthened with all might by the Spirit, to have the fellowship and communion of the Holy Spirit, and to pray for the Spirit? In what chapter and verse do the apostles exhort us to be filled with the spirit of the gospel or the spirit of christianity? The belief and obedience of the truth certainly is followed by the gift of the Spirit, but the Spirit given is not the spirit of christianity but the Spirit of Christ, not simply the spirit of the gospel, but the Spirit of its Author. We must not regard the Spirit that "dwelleth in us," as a mere ghost of the Holy Spirit, an attenuated shadow of it, or as an unreal, vaporous nothing. We make no pretension in explaining what or how it is in the heart; we call it neither body nor substance, but only say that whatever it was that raised up Christ from the dead and that shall quicken your mortal body, is the same thing that "dwelleth in us," Rom. 8: 9. The Spirit of God is everywhere represented as a personality and not as an airy, unorganized, impersonal influence. "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." By his Spirit he "garnished the heavens." He in-

structed the ancients "by his Spirit in his prophets." "Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." The things that eye hath not seen God has "revealed unto the Apostles by his Spirit." No intelligent disciple would dilute the strength of these scriptures by substituting anything instead of the real personal Spirit of God mentioned therein; and is it not the same Spirit that God sends unto the hearts of all his children? When the Saviour promised the Holy Spirit to those that ask for it, shall we weaken the whole passage by making it offer nothing but a kind of disposition? which is indeed a fruit of the Spirit, but not the Spirit itself.

It is quite possible for us to fail of the richness and depth of God's blessing by limited views of his promise. Who can say that we may not now, as in primitive times, be filled, not with miraculous power, but with the comforts of the Spirit, enjoy the peace that passes all understanding, and be filled with all the fulness of God? In answer to all these promises of the Spirit it is quite easy to say; 'Oh! these belong to the days of miracles.' 'That was said to the Apostles and is peculiar to the ancients.' True, there is now no need of miracles, and these promises imply no miracle. But all the comfortless now, as well as then, need the comforts of the Spirit; the weak need to be strengthened with might by the Spirit in the inward man; and all need the love, the communion, and fellowship of the Spirit. Let us not become too liberal and give away all the dearest promises of the Bible. What is the special office of the Spirit and how far we ought to carry our expectations of aid from on high, may be better understood when more fully discussed.

T. M.

CHRIST'S GOSPEL AND CHRIST'S KINGDOM.

BROTHER OLIPHANT:—My object is not to have the last word in controversy, or to exhibit tact, shrewdness, or witty sayings to suit the itching ear of the vain, but the honor of God, and benefit the honest hearted after truth. Neither do I hold myself responsible for all the errors, enthusiasm, and speculative fanaticisms, dreams, and visions of those called Adventists; but 'What saith the scriptures?' 'how readest thou?' But why should I be under the necessity of stating again my belief as to the centre-point in preaching to sinners? Answer: Because you have neglected entirely the arguments and Bible testimo-

ny which I adduced on that point. But I will present them again as you will find it on page 246 of August Banner, 1856 :—"When any one believes the gospel of the kingdom as preached by the apostles, and in the name of Jesus Christ as the rightful heir to David's throne, according to Acts 2 : 30, and is willing to reform and take Jesus of Nazareth as his lawgiver, priest, and king, we, by the authority of Christ, baptize him into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit for the remission of sins."

I asked, and now ask again, Is this right? Will you please give a definite answer? Please give what credit you can to "friend Chase," if you can't in conscience call him brother.

But to saints, the centre-point is the second coming of Christ. But what do I mean by centre-point? Answer: The point or period where God's promises concentrate—the realization of the Christian's hope; in fact, where faith and hope vanish away before the grand and glorious realities of enjoyment. In proof of this I referred to Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians, 2 : 19. "For what is our hope or joy or crown of rejoicing? Are not even you in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ *at his coming*." Again, 4th chap., "For this we say to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain to the *coming* of the Lord, shall not prevent (or go before) them who are asleep: for the Lord himself (not his ghost) shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall be ever with the Lord. Therefore comfort one another *with these words*."

Shall we comfort our brethren with these words, brother Oliphant, or shall we comfort them with the devil's doctrine of going to heaven at death? Please state definitely for the comfort and consolation of the brethren. We wish to know the centre-point of their joy and crown of rejoicing.

Brother Oliphant says, "If I understand the scope of the Adventists preaching on this subject, Christ is set forth as filling the throne of David at his second coming."—(This is true.)—Then you proceed to say: "Now, the inspired preacher who held and used the keys of the kingdom, referred to a prophesy from David's own lips to show that Christ was to be raised up to sit on David's throne, and proceeds to

prove that he was raised up ; while you [L. H. Chase] take the ground that between his being raised up and the occupancy of his throne there is all the space elapsing from his first to his second advent."

Answer to the above : 1st, " Christ is set forth (by Adventists) as filling David's throne at his second coming." This charge I think is true. And for the following reasons : 1, David never had but one throne ; 2, That throne was literal in every sense of the word ; 3, That throne was on Mount Zion in Jerusalem, in the land of Palestine ; 4, That throne, at Christ's first advent, was overturned or perverted, according to Ezekiel 21 : 25, 27. " And thou profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come : Thus saith the Lord God, remove the diadem and take off the crown ; this shall not be the same : exalt him that is low and abase him that is high. . . . I will overturn, overturn, overturn it (the throne or tabernacle of David) and it shall be no more until he come whose right it is ; and I will give it him ;" 5, That throne or tabernacle was not built again, neither set up, as described in Acts 15 : 16 at Christ's first advent ; therefore it is in future ; 6, God did raise up Christ, according to promise, but has not yet placed him on David's throne, but at his own right hand, on *his throne*, according to Rev. 3 : 21.

Brother Oliphant says : " You have a *future* kingdom for men *now*." I answer : We have no kingdom for men now or hereafter ; but God has a kingdom in reserve for his Son and those that are his at his coming. " Come, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Christ is represented as the nobleman going into a far country to *procure a kingdom*, and return. Peter said " if you do these things you shall never fall ; for so an entrance shall be ministered to you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour." This saying was spoken to those who were already in your Pentecostian kingdom, but not in the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Brother Oliphant ; are you in the kingdom of Christ *now* ? If you are, do you hope for an abundant entrance into *it* ? Can you hope for that you already possess ? Paul says, if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.

Yours for the whole truth,

Adrian, Mich., 19th Feb. 1857.

L. H. CHASE.

Seeing that friend L. H. Chase asks a direct answer to some things re-produced in the preceding letter, we shall endeavor to accommodate

him. While to us it seems most evident that we replied to the major points of our friend's letter published last August, there is we believe no law, social or spiritual, which would prevent an honest attempt to make a plain subject still plainer.

The investigation before us, let it be here said, was brought up by certain remarks in the Christian Banner precisely one year ago. We affirmed then, and still affirm, that "There are three or four reasons why the Adventists will never build up a spiritual temple such as was built by the apostles;" and the first of these reasons, Mr. Chase will remember, was in these words: "The centre-point of Adventists is the coming of the Saviour *in the future*: the centre-point of the apostles is the coming of the Saviour *in the past*."

To this our correspondent at Adrian replied that the Adventists preached to saints as we stated, but not to sinners; and then he was pleased to show us a sample of the gospel he preached to sinners. In our response, instead of taking up this Adventist gospel in detail or piecemeal, we struck for the citadel of Mr. C. at once, and supposed that our zealous friend would perceive at a glance where he was and where we were. Believing that the gospel which he approved and preached was made to centre in the assumption that Jesus will at some future time fill David's throne, and that "promises" formed the basis of friend Chase's gospel, we offered a carefully expressed response, part of which was in the following language:

'The promises to the fathers, you say, are preached by you to sinners. Does not this indicate very definitely that your centre-point, even for the unconverted, is away in the future, seeing that *promises* refer invariably to the future? So did not preach the apostles of our Lord, provided we have a faithful registry of their preaching. They laid events, not promises, before both Jew and Greek as the capital groundwork or centre of their salvation. The basis they built upon was already laid—not a prophetic one away in the distance.'

Again, our response said—

'You have therefore a *future* kingdom for men *now*; and I believe I am not mistaken in affirming that you baptize men, not into Christ, but into the hope of this kingdom which is to come. So far from the apostles preaching such a gospel with the main elements of it yet to be developed, they preached what was and what is, proclaiming the glad message which carried with it and exhibited Christ once abased on earth and now exalted in the heavens, with *all* power in heaven and earth already possessed.'

With these very pointed and palpable sayings before him, and other

remarks equally plain, what could Mr. Chase be studying when he introduced himself to aver that we "entirely neglected" what he stated on this subject?

But since we are solicited to answer still more definitely at least two queries proposed in the present communication from the devoted Mr. Chase, we shall with hearty earnestness proceed to the work. His first question, asking whether his preaching is right, we answer with a full-faced No; and his second query, requiring us to say if we are now in Christ's kingdom, is answered by a plump and parallel Yes. A few words revealing why we so respond will now be in place. Dropping the pronoun "we," and no longer speaking *of* but *to* our earnest friend, let us directly address him and exhibit before his vision two pictures:

Do you see, Mr. Chase, away over yonder on mount Prophecy a preacher whose name is Mr. Second Advent? I go with you to within hearing distance of this preacher, and I ask you to watch his eyes and ponder his words. He is talking to a sinner and pointing him to salvation. Elevated above all obstructing hills and far above every intervening mountain, standing as he does upon the high prophetic mount, the preacher sees the city of Jerusalem in the land of Judea AS IT WILL BE, and beholds Jesus on the hill of Zion crowned king as it is presumed HE WILL BE HEREAFTER. With his eyes fixed on these future things, he opens his lips and says to the sinner, 'Look yonder, see your salvation, behold the king who grants you remission of sins.' Something is also said relative to Jesus as he first came, and the scenes at the Cross, at Joseph's tomb, and on the mount of ascension; but these are all minor items, while the central and capital article in his gospel is—Christ and him crowned at his second coming.

— urn now and examine another picture.

In the people's valley, not far from Calvary, and within sight of the lowly sepulchre where the Lord lay and from which he arose, see a humble man engaged in pleading and preaching, whose name is Mr. First Advent. A sinner is before him, who is listening to him as he tells the simplest, the most earnest, the loveliest, and most touching story that ever passed a speaker's lips, all relating to One Person and all referring to the past and present. Facts, fulfilled prophecies, miracles, divine witnesses, and divers attestations are all wrought into a living panorama before the mental and moral eye sight of the listener as the preacher proceeds, and the hearer's attention being secured, the speaker

turning his eyes to Calvary, lifts his voice and says, 'There is the Sacrifice for the world's sin;' and turning to the tomb of the man of Arimathea, he says, 'There—he that was dead is alive, our life and our justification;' and turning to the mount called Olivet, the speaker points and declares, 'There, he ascends to the holiest of all, our intercessor and advocate;' and turning once more, while the music of a great wind is heard, he again says, 'There, see, the promised Spirit is given and the proclamation of remission of sins begins.' Precepts, privileges, promises, gifts, joys, hopes, unroll from these stupendous transactions, and the sinner, touched to the heart with heaven's sympathy for him, expressed and demonstrated in living documents reaching from Bethlehem's Manger to Calvary's Cross and from Calvary's Cross up to the right hand of God, exclaims and responds, 'O Lord Jesus, I give myself to thee, thou Lord of lords, thou King of kings; my Life, my Light, my Lawgiver, my Liberty, my Love; I humbly come under thy government at thy bidding to enjoy the bliss, spiritual and eternal, growing out of what thou hast already done.'

Rich promises, large hopes, pure and dear joys, present and future, are here unfolded by the preacher; but the grand central article of his gospel is—Christ and him crucified.

Now, I could almost appeal to yourself, my friend, to say which of these two gospels is the apostolic. And may I not hint, in a delicate yet explicit manner, that there are two prominent defects in the preaching of Mr. Second Advent: 1st, That of making his centre away yonder at Christ's return instead of the foundation spoken of by an apostle, which 'is already laid;' and 2nd, That of gliding too swiftly and unreflectingly past the bleeding Saviour as he dies for sinners. Knowing however that the Adventists are divided into three different orders, I trust that this last specification may not reach or touch you, friend Chase.

Not sparing time to review your definition of the term 'centre-point,' I hasten to say a word relative to being in the Lord's kingdom.

Yet, my dear sir, do not misunderstand me here. The mere word 'kingdom' is, with me, of small importance. While believing that at least 84 preachers before this dispensation began were active in telling the sons of Abraham that the kingdom of Messiah was at hand—while believing that my brethren in the city of Colosse were in this kingdom—while believing that when the Lord returns he will gather out of his

kingdom all things that offend—while believing that John, the beloved, and the brethren of seven churches which he addressed were in the kingdom and patience of Jesus—and therefore believing that if under the same rule I am also in the same kingdom,—I nevertheless have little to assert by way of controversy in respect to the mere term. The government of Christ is as rich and full of meaning as the kingdom of Christ. Any man who is under the government of Him who has all legitimate power on this earthly footstool and in the world of celestials, is, in heaven's oracles, accounted a brother in the family of the saved.

And this term 'saved' suggests to me a reflection which I am inclined to submit. You, Mr. Chase, regard yourself saved by the gospel now, do you not? Still, you hope to be saved. How is this? Saved *now* and yet HOPE to be saved in future! 'O yes,' you affirm, 'I am at present saved by the gospel, and I have a lively hope of the salvation yet to be revealed.' Precisely. In like manner you speak of life in Christ. You say that you have life in Christ now, and still hope for life in him; because it is gospel life that is enjoyed at present, and everlasting life is to be enjoyed hereafter. Whenever you reconcile to yourself these expressions, I will use your arguments to help me to maintain that I can be in the kingdom of the Lord now and yet hope to be in his eternal kingdom.

You are very liberal in furnishing reasons why you argue that the throne of the venerable king David WILL BE, *in the next age*, occupied literally by the Lord Jesus. I shall have no objections should your revelations prove true; while I have many serious objections to your attempting to teach the things of the future government of Christ in place of teaching the things of his present government.

But you tell me, not by prophecy but by way of history, that David the king had only one throne, his throne being in every sense of the word literal, and this throne upon mount Zion. These are three of your facts in a cluster. Unfortunately they will not bear the scrutiny of the oracles. For Israel's king reigned no less than seven years in Hebron, over twenty miles from mount Zion; and the fact that David reigned first and for years in Hebron, *unimportant though this fact be*, is sufficient to take the force out of your whole reasoning—for while you are gazing at mount Zion to behold the king on David's throne, lo, he comes to Hebron and reigns there! But whether the literal throne of Jesse's son will be discovered at Hebron, or whether it was

removed to Jerusalem and hence will have to be taken back again, has not I believe been determined by my friend L. H. Chase, or friend Marsh of the 'Prophetic Expositor,' or Elder G. Storrs, or Dr. Field of Indiana, or even Dr. Thomas. Now, do not call this hint by an unhandsome name, for you will remember your own language that David's throne "was literal in every sense of the word," and it is not to be forgotten that you plead for the literal fulfilment of the prophecy that Christ must sit down on David's throne; and if the location be important, the official seat on which Israel's king sat, whether wood, marble, or gold, must also be important.

There are two grand facts in sacred history, connected too with prophecy, and connected likewise with the coming of the Lord, which have done more to shape my mind in the mould of modesty on the subject of unfulfilled prophecy than all the treatises I ever read or all the lectures I ever heard. The first fact is that, notwithstanding the clear and explicit prophesies concerning Christ at his first advent, not a man among the millions in Canaan had one correct practical conception of what was his design, what his work, or what his authority when he appeared in Judea. A fact very remarkable, instructive, and suggestive. The other fact is, that all truly honest and humble men, at the coming of the Lord, were blessed by him—all, I mean, who were at the time of his coming faithfully engaged in doing what God had previously enforced; observe, not attending to duties learned from prophecy, but duties expressly enjoined.

Now, then, my beloved sir, it does appear to me that we could all stand upon the one already laid basis, all rally round the one divine centre, all be built up one spiritual temple, all receive the same practical lessons, all work together in the faith, love, and joy of the gospel,—forbearing to thrust fine theories of things future upon one another on pain of the greater excommunication (!)—and when the Lord comes, whether he comes at midnight, twilight, or at noon, whether he comes this year, next year, or a hundred years hence, whether he comes to Palestine, Michigan, or Egypt, whether we shall meet the Lord in the air and be escorted to another planet—some rolling sphere where sin and satan were never heard of—or dwell on the earth after all the marks of satan and all the stains of sin are wiped out by the Lord himself; we will enjoy the kingdom prepared for God's chosen, be happy in the company of every true and pure spirit redeemed by grace, and

participate in the feast of spiritualities arranged by Him who has every blessing at full command.

Yours desirous of being 'on duty' and 'ready.'

D. O. IMPIANT.

REVIEW OF S. E. L. ON PUNISHMENT:
AND STRICTURES ON MR. SCOTT'S STRICTURES.

In the Christian Banner for February we see an article headed "The Wicked and their Punishment," signed S. E. L., some things in which we design to review. The writer begins by referring to some work published he says by a "Papal Divine," but we do not understand what resemblance the essay in the November Number of the Banner which he seems about to review can have to this papal work from his description of it. The resemblance must be in his imagination.

Our reviewing friend enquires how it can be inferred "that God could make an evil Spirit to be the powerful active enemy of the human race." As to this inferential enquiry, we would say that we never inferred any such thing, nor do we affirm that God made or caused the devil to be the enemy of man; but we know an evil Spirit has become the enemy of man and the accuser of the righteous; for the word of the Lord informs us that the devil is the author of sin and "the father of lies." He also rules "in the hearts of the disobedient," and blinds the mind of "the unbelieving." Our friend also enquires "how God could prepare a place burning with fire and brimstone." As to how God could or could not do it we leave others to say; but we boldly say that fire represents hell which is or will be prepared for the devil and his angels, and that in it the wicked will have their portion. Matt. 25; 41, 46.

Our reviewer seems to think that the punishment of the wicked does not accord with the character of God as developed by the Saviour when on earth, but from what this is learned he does not say; certainly not from the fearful threatenings given by the Saviour and his apostles. Matt. 7: 23, 25, 41; 2nd Thess. 1: 7, 8, 9. He admits that every violation of law will be followed by punishment, and then refers to the cases of the prodigal and Judas seemingly to prove that all punishment is in this world; but whilst these cases may show that these sinners did

suffer in this world, they do not prove that there is no punishment awaiting sin hereafter. The case of the prodigal may show very clearly how readily the repenting sinner will be received by the Lord, but it gives no proof that the unrepenting sinner will be accepted when he has ended his career in sin and pollution.

If sinners are not to be punished hereafter, why has the Lord commanded "all men everywhere to repent?" Why has he "appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness?" Why are we told "the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life?" Why is a crown promised to the righteous and not to the wicked if both are to enjoy alike?

After finishing his comments on the case of Judas, he reminds us that "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved;" but he should have begun one verse sooner and read one farther, and then he would have seen that salvation is based on faith in the Saviour which implies obedience to him in all things. To represent God as a being who acts from but one attribute, even though that one be love, is not doing his character justice; for his government is based as much on justice, purity, and truth, as on love. Whilst he loves the creature, he hates sin, and whilst he will reward the obedient he will punish the rebellious. Isaiah 48: 22.

Our friend yields the whole point when he says, "All wrong doing needs to be repented of in order to be forgiven." Since forgiveness follows repentance or reformation, then those who do not reform can have no forgiveness, but "the wrath of God abideth on them." Referring to the Old Testament times S. E. L. says, "mercy or forgiveness was vouchsafed to those who confessed and forsook their sins," and that the gospel dispensation "was inaugurated by proclamation of repentance answering to amendment of life." Our friend informs us that the Lord is pleased "with these sacrifices and not the substitution of the innocent in the room or stead of the guilty." To call confessing and forsaking sin and repenting, sacrifices, in the sense in which our friend does, sounds too much like the language of Rome to be received by any well read student of the Bible in this day of light. This exalting of human acts to the dignity of *sacrifices* and making them more acceptable to God than the Saviour's death for sin, is a virtual denial of the Lord who bought us. It makes the Saviour's death, so far as

the forgiveness of sin is concerned, a mere redundancy and of no importance in human redemption. We now invite the attention of our friend and all others who hold similar views, or would place these things called sacrifices by S. E. L. in the place of the Saviour, to the following scriptures. 'And he said unto them, Thus it is written and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem.' Luke 24: 46, 47. 'And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world.' 1 John 2: 2. 'And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves but unto him who died for them, and rose again.' 2 Cor. 5: 15. 'For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus: who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.' 1 Tim. 2: 5, 6. 'For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' Rom. 5: 6, 8.

When S. E. L. has duly considered these scriptures we hope he will not again say that God is better pleased with anything man can do than with the death of the 'Innocent' or the Saviour for the guilty.

With reference to G. L. Scott's strictures on our essay on punishment (see Banner for March) we observe that his reasoning on all the quotations he assails is fallacious. Referring to the quotation we made from Daniel 12: 2, he teaches that since the term everlasting is joined with the contempt to which some are to arise, it will be indulged in by the righteous, and the shame endured by the wicked. Now the prophet has joined the shame and contempt and predicated them both of the same persons; hence our friend has no authority to separate them as he has done. It is possible to indulge in contempt, and it is possible to endure the contempt indulged in by others, but where was it learned that the righteous shall indulge in contempt? Not from the prophet Daniel. Our friend says the shame felt by the wicked is unqualified as to duration, and would "necessarily cease when they return to dust," but the prophet speaks of what will take place after the righteous and wicked have both been in the dust, consequently his views and assertions do not affect what we said on this passage. In referring to a quotation we made from Isaiah 33: 14, he affirms that all contained

from the 18th verse to the end of the chapter is a prediction of Jerusalem when "her light has come." This unqualified assertion is doubtful; for it will be difficult to make some things in that passage apply to a city. It is rather a novel idea put forth by our friend that the righteous can or shall dwell with devouring fire. We understand very distinctly from the 16th verse that "He who walketh righteously and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppression, &c.," shall dwell on high; but the prophet does not affirm that the righteous shall dwell with devouring fire. We do not admit that this quotation proves the opposite of what we intended nor that G. L. S. has a right to force any thing more on our remarks than they were intended to convey.

Our friend's strictures on our views of Matt. 25, 41, 46, do not show that he has very exalted anticipations of the future; for if his proposed translation be admitted, the life which the Saviour spoke of is left as momentary or short as our life here, for aught we know. If 'everlasting' in Mat. 25, 46 does not indicate endless duration, neither can it do so any where else; hence Paul was greatly misled in his anticipations about his house from heaven which he speaks of in 2 Cor. 5: 1, and whose durability is described by the same word used by the Saviour in Matt. 25: 46. A theory or set of views which leaves the life which the Saviour came to procure for his people indefinite as to duration, or rather gives it no duration, must be defective in scripture authority and dissonant with sound philosophy.

The idea that the smoke spoken of in Rev. 14: 11 as ascending "up for ever and ever" is only the smoke of the fire in which the wicked have been consumed, is very unwarrantable. Nothing is said in the passage about the wicked being consumed, but it is plainly declared the *smoke of their torment* will ascend for "ever and ever," but G. L. S. says torment can have no smoke--hence he and the bible differ.

Our friend began by informing the reader that we had attempted more than we could do, but the truth of this we leave others to determine. He accuses us of making garbled quotations, handling the word of God in a loose way, jostling passages together and not being scrupulous as to meaning. These accusations contain no argument and as little truth, and serve only to indicate the state of mind and the teachings under which the whole article was written.

Though we present what we believe to be truth freely, yet we do not

wish to provoke any controversy which may not be friendly nor arouse any feelings which would not be commendable.

J. B. JR.

CO-OPERATIVE EFFORTS, No. IV.

Brighton, C. W., 22nd March, 1857.

EXCELLENT AND EXEMPLARY BROTHER LIONS: Before making a pause to hear you show cause why sentence of scripture should not be pronounced against a society specially created to call out, send, and pay missionaries, suffer me to say a word more.

My next cardinal objection to the missionary societies of the times, is, that the avowed liberality they inspire is less pure and less spiritual than the Master approves. Nay, if a little freedom of expression is allowable, I should say that this method of operation is one of the most successful ways to worldize the congregations of the Lord. Not that this effect, to any considerable extent, is supposed to follow all at once; for, if I have examined history correctly, or made use of my observation to much advantage, there are few sudden or startling revolutions wrought in the world of intellectuals, socials, or spirituals.

But what is the legitimate tendency of a 'national' movement to procure and equip 'missionaries' such as you, my devout brother, desire to see inaugurated? Certain agents of the churches, with a stock of instructions from these churches, and a greater stock of discretionary power, meet in Cincinnati, Philadelphia, or St. Louis. Full soon a society is created or organized. It is a great society, originating in the wisdom of a great number of brethren, for the great work of the church. A tincture of pride is felt in consequence of the existence of such a society. In the meantime the law goes forth from the society that membership in it shall be bought; and the sentiment obtains, through the officers and friends of the organization, that he who purchases a membership is a very fine man, exemplary, pious, and zealous.

Speedily it is perceived that another society is requisite. Not only is a publication society believed to be of general utility, but its usefulness is argued from the fact that it will be the official reporter of the society got up to enlist, send, and support missionaries. He who sends a donation to the missionary society, or buys a membership, is certain to have his name with the amount not simply recorded, but published

abroad far and wide through the official organ among the people ; and if he adds an extra dollar to what is usual, he is heralded as a particular saint. Is it not a cheap, short way of purchasing a godly name ?

Nor these things alone. A great society must have a great missionary, and both these greats call for another great—a great salary. And worse than all, or as bad as the worst, the zealous worldly men who have stock in the society, can not see why the missionary with a salary equal to his brother missionaries should fail to be as popular, and they demand that his dress, his official manners, and his preaching shall be popularized.

And yet, contradictory as it may seem, there is comparatively a trifling pittance collected from the brotherhood for evangelizing, notwithstanding the special flattery that awaits and awards those who contribute. Can I not say in truth that christian liberality is narrowed down, stagnated, and stunted into the veriest meagreness, only amounting to one degree above nothing, by this method of 'national' contributions ? Whereas a brother who is able to give and who ought to give from one hundred to five hundred dollars per year to herald forth the message of life, the appeal of the 'society' may peradventure extract from him twenty or thirty dollars every five or ten years ! While therefore the community of disciples, embracing a population of more than a million in America alone, ought to number its evangelists to foreign countries by the score, and evangelists in our own country by the hundred or the thousand, you and I are mortified on realizing that our 'foreign missionary societies' and our 'home missionary societies' have sustained only one laborer abroad for a few years, and have kept in the field not constantly but occasionally a dozen or fifteen workmen in what we call our home territory. And in my judgment, brother Loos—I speak frankly—it must be so while we operate through these cold calculating dollar and cent societies.

There are those—I have seen some of them and heard of others—who enter a caviling protest against the 'missionary society' because they are ill with the mammon leprosy. They determine not to give because they have no heart for it, and they create a convenient barrier between them and liberality by objecting to the *manner* of giving. If these gentlemen would give largely to the Lord in some other manner, their logic could be heard with some respect. As it is, neither brother Loos nor brother Oliphant can value either them or their reasoning. Were

America full of these cavillers and idlers, they would not convert one son of Adam in a whole century, except perchance they might convert him from liberality to miserliness or from activity to indolence. We do not ask gentry of this stamp to be 'members of our parish,' as saith the Scottish Divines.

No longer looking at this chapter of things, my brother, but turning a new leaf and taking the oracles of the Lawgiver, let the question be proposed with all its point and pith: What better or more efficient co-operation is required than the co-operation of the Lord's friends composing the churches, without one new officer and without a modern and man-invented organization? Let us suppose that the Lord's people in the state of Ohio desire to concentrate their liberality either to convert their neighbors in the state, or to christianize their neighbors in Africa, India, or the Isles of the Pacific. There are, we shall say, five hundred churches in Ohio. Not to burden our vision with too wide an outline, let us make the churches in Cincinnati, Marietta, Cleveland, and Columbus the representatives of all the congregations in the state. These churches, or rather each of them, if modelled after the old-fashioned model, will have a treasury for the joint liberality of the members; and according to the original pattern, each treasury will have scriptural officers to keep and manage it. There is wisdom enough among the chosen of the Lord in Cincinnati to make the right use of the sacred fund in the purse of the church; there is equal wisdom in Marietta, Cleveland, and Columbus; and all being the Lord's people, all having the same love, and all have the same willingness to do the Lord's work, the contributions in each treasury are either sent to the laborers whose hands the brethren resolve to hold up, as Paul and his companions received from various churches, or their contributions are brought together into one treasury, as the churches in divers places sent their funds to the treasury of the brethren at Jerusalem for a specific purpose.

Now if the brethren of two or ten churches are able to be fellow helpers together in working for the general interests of Christ's cause without the aid of modernly equipped officers or a newly framed organization, on the same principle all the churches of a state or of a whole country could co-operate. Nay, all the brethren in all the churches in America could work together without a humanly devised society.

Would it not seem as though a single church knew little of the institutions of Jesus if it set its wisdom to work to 'organize' a 'society' to collect and manage its own funds, either for missionary or other

purposes? Yet where is the difference IN PRINCIPLE when we have before us a number of churches? Are not all the churches under the legislation of Christ as much as one church? Have not the friends of the Lord in one church and the Lord's friends in a plurality of churches the very same obligations according to their ability and opportunity? Or shall we take the liberty to persuade ourselves that heaven's legislative wisdom is not so perfect in view of multiplied brethren forming many churches as it is in view of a company of brethren forming a single church? Or is it safe to assume the ground that the brethren of one congregation have not sufficient discretionary power to erect a new society, unknown to apostles and prophets, but that several congregations of brethren have the requisite discretionary power to constitute such a society?

To these and to other sentiments expressed in this brief series of brief letters I know there are objections; and hereafter some of the strongest and most robust of them will be considered. Your budget of objections, if forthcoming, I will endeavor to treat with due respect. I trust that my pen hitherto has marked down my reflections without one syllable offensive to you or to any one called a brother, so far as concerns manner. My instrumental tongue, with which I have communicated to you, has been bridled with a double curb bit, lest it should prance ungentlely against you or some other good friend of truth.

Let me add that I am fully conscious that it is an ungracious task to stand up among brethren and proclaim that there is a greater or less departure from scriptural simplicity. The response is apt to come forth in not overly pleasant tones, 'You, sir, have the conceit that you are right, and all except yourself wrong.' The censure implied in this must be endured if it comes; and if it may not be endured cheerfully, it may be patiently. Meantime my unfeigned prayer is that you, and I, and all, may, by the lessons of the gospel, speak the truth in the love of it, to the praise and honor of Him who has brought to us and set before us the grand enterprizes embraced in the divine salvation, and who has invited us to co-operate with him in saving ourselves and saving others.

I am yours in fraternal love,

D. OLIPHANT.

☞ Idleness is the dead sea that swallows all virtues, and the self-made sepulchre of a living man.

ANNUAL CO-OPERATION MEETING.

Report of the Annual Meeting of the Board of Co-operation convened according to appointment in Esquesing, near Norval, Canada West, on 6th February, 1857.

James Black being chosen to preside and Ira VanCamp Secretary—after which reports were received from the various churches represented at the meeting which were as follows:

130 Church in Jordan, by James Saure and H. J. Wood, who handed in the following report dating from June, 1856: 1 member moved away, 1 died, 4 expelled, 3 added by letter, 2 reclaimed, 6 added by confession and baptism: 100 present number of members

21 Church in Esquesing, by John McIntosh and Peter Laird, who reported as follows, since June, 1856: 1 member excluded, 1 removed by death, 21 present number of members.

33 Church in Pickering reported by letter: 8 members added by confession and baptism since June, 1856: 33 members present number.

74 Church in South Dorchester reported by letter: 1 member excluded, 1 died, 7 added by letter, 11 by confession and baptism: 74 present number.

100 Church in Bowmanville represented by C. J. Lister and Ira Van Camp: 1 moved away, 1 died, 40 added by confession and baptism: 100 present number.

22 Church in Eramosa West represented by Charles Head and H. Tolton: 2 added: 22 present number.

65 Church in Eramosa East represented by Norris Black and Rufus Everts: 1 removed by death, 10 have been added by confession and baptism: 65 present number.

85 Church in Eramosa Centre represented by A. Anderson and Robert Royce: 1 member was excluded, 11 added by confession and baptism: 85 present number.

113 Church in Erin by Charles McMillan and John Thompson: 2 removed by death, 5 moved away, 22 added by confession and baptism: 113 present number.

17 Church in Oshawa represented by Joseph Ash: 1 member added from christian connexion, 2 by confession and baptism: 17 present number.

40 Church in Owen Sound represented by W. A. Stephens and W. Boyd: 40 present number of members.

Church at St. Vincent, as reported by W. A. Stephens, has 60 members.

Church in Trafalgar, as represented by W. Beaty: 1 member died, 3 moved away: 25 present number.

Brother R. Royce, Treasurer of the Board, presented a statement showing the various amounts of money received and paid out, and a balance in hand of £33 5 8. There was also as shown by Brother A. Anderson in his hands £22 2 6 which as the Agent of the Board he had collected but had not yet handed over to the Treasurer.

Moved and resolved, That the following Brethren do compose the Board for the year 1857, viz:

James Black, A. Menzies, Dugald Thompson, Charles McMullen, Robert Royce, Alexander Anderson, Lazarus Parkinson, Henry Tolton, James Mitchell, Donald Black and John Thompson.

Moved and resolved, That the members chosen to act as the Board for 1857 do meet and organize on the third Lord's day in February.

Moved and resolved, That the Board be and are hereby instructed to procure the services of brother Sheppard to labor permanently as an Evangelist.

Moved and resolved, That the Board procure the services of one or two more efficient Evangelists to labor in proclaiming the gospel so soon as means are provided for their support; and that those churches which have not been recently visited on behalf of the funds of the co-operation be visited to that end, and that those churches that have recently contributed, be asked for further aid to support the preaching of the gospel, and that the Secretary of this meeting communicate with the Elders of said churches requesting them to bring this matter before the churches, and communicate the result to Robert Royce, Treasurer of the Board, Eramosa, within one month from this date.

Moved and resolved, That this meeting do adjourn to meet in Bowmanville (D. V.) on the first Friday in February, 1858, at 6 o'clock, P. M.

EVANGELISTS' LABORS.

REPORT NO. IV.

For the Christian Banner.

Cobourg, April 2, 1857.

On 7th December we journeyed to Clarke, where we held meetings until the 10th: six baptized, three reclaimed. Had one meeting in Charlesville with a view to set some things in order.

Held some meetings in Bowmanville, and some in Eramosa till 20th. One added.

Held meetings two weeks in Eramosa Centre East, and Rockwood: nine immersed.

Went on our way to Erin, which place we did not finally leave until 3rd March. Visited in the meantime, Caledon, Garafraxa, and Esquesing. Thirty one immersed, one from Baptists, and one returned.

Held some meetings in Bowmanville: three immersed and one reclaimed. Proceeded to Clarke where we remained (visiting Bowmanville occasionally, and Charlesville once) until 30th March. Three immersed in Clarke. On the evening of the 30th March we spoke to the friends in this place, where we intend (the Lord willing) to labor for a while. We hope before long to be fellow-laborers with the friends of Jesus in the localities of Oshawa, Whitby, Pickering and King.

52 immersed, 5 reclaimed, 1 from Baptists.

KILGOUR & LISTER.

NEWS FROM ROCKFORD, ILLINOIS.—The devout brother Richards, of Rockford, state of Illinois, in an epistle received to-day (March 17th) says—

“We are now blessed with a comfortable Meeting House for the worship of God, and we are blessed with a small society of warm-hearted brothers and sisters, and as a general rule we are all united, striving to walk in the way of our Lord and Master. We are now holding a continued meeting. Brother J. J. Moss and brother L. J. Correll are our speakers.”

Our brother also speaks of a company of brethren in Iowa who are “making an effort to reform the reformers,” and adds, “I am firm in the belief they are improving.” This is all good news to us. Heaven will most assuredly bless every brother or sister who labors diligently to reform what needs reforming.

D. O.

NEWS FROM PARIS, ILLINOIS.—Brother A. D. Fillmore, one of the faithful laborers, now stationed at Paris, Illinois, writes to us under date of March 24th, in the following words:—

“The cause of our blessed Master is prospering in Illinois. Indeed

I may say that in all the Western States, truth is onwards its march of triumph. Sectarianism, on the part of those without, and covetousness on the part of those who have a name with us, are the two great obstacles we meet with here. Both are being shorn of their power.

I have been laboring in and about Paris the past year. We have doubled our numbers, and have organized two other congregations near here. Pray for us, that the word of God may have free course, and that we may finish the work committed to our hands in the spirit of our Master."

NEWS FROM MICHIGAN.—The zealous brother Rose, writing from Buchanan, March 21st, says:

"On last Lord's day at Paw Paw, I had the pleasure of baptizing one person into Christ. Within the last three or four months my heart has been gladdened by the return of some fourscore souls to their Redeemer the king of Kings and lord of Lords. I have been laboring mostly in conjunction with Elder William Anderson, a faithful and beloved brother in the Lord. May the Lord preserve us all unto his heavenly kingdom."

SMART PREACHING.

There is a style of discourse coming into use in some quarters, which for the honor of the pulpit and the cause of pure religion as well as sound sense, we would fain hope might sink into that contempt which it deserves. We have denominated it "flash preaching," for it is evidently of that kind that only takes powder enough for a flash to attract an audience, and concerns itself little about shot, bullet or correct aim. Its tribute is an admiring stare, rather than a wounded conscience. Its aim is popularity instead of usefulness, and its results are lamentable.

The roots of the evil undoubtedly are found in a lack of vital piety, false taste, and an ambition to attract notice and produce "a sensation." Candidates for vacant pulpits must vie with one another in claims to popularity. They feel that they must say something vivid, striking or odd, that will remind their hearers of some great man. They would imperfections, and envy Cromwell the wart on his nose as an indication of genius. In some cases this "flash preaching," has a kind of merit. It would read well among the sentimentalism of a magazine. It would not be altogether out of place in the first chapter of a religious novel. But when it is graced with those witticisms which set an audience in a titter, we must pass it over with contempt. In any case, it is a dishonor to the majesty of divine truth and a perversion of the true aim of preaching.

DEMISE OF MOTHER OLIPHANT.

Sophia Oliphant, sen., relict of the late D. Oliphant, sen., and the beloved mother of the writer, no longer lives here below! She died at her residence in Eramosa, on the 26th day of March, passing away as one fully ripe for the eventful change. While her memory is cherished by a few near relatives, and by more than a few who were acquainted with her noiseless virtues, no one mourns this change on her account. Death and the tomb, and the great day of the Lord when the Books shall be opened, were armed with no terrors to her who has lately left us.

Mother Oliphant's years were 71, lacking six days. She was born March 26th, 1783, in the city of London, England; was taken at an early age to Scotland, where she was married and became the mother of seven children—two of whom only are now among the living. Having been fifty or fifty-one years associated with the Lord's people, first with the Scotch Baptists and latterly with the Disciples—having passed through very trying vicissitudes and afflictions without even a whisper of a murmur—and having been steadily active though unassuming in manifesting an interest in the Saviour's cause, she has worked out, through Him who strengthened her, a christian pattern which it is hoped may not be forgotten by her children, grand children, and other relatives and friends.

D. O.

OBITUARY.

Our beloved sister Roxena Hall, of Bowmanville, fell sweetly asleep in Jesus on the 13th January. Shortly before her death she selected for her funeral a passage of scripture, hymns and preacher. Two verses of one of the hymns read as follows:

When languor and disease invade
This trembling house of clay,
'Tis sweet to look beyond my pains
And long to fly away:

Sweet to look inward and attend
The whispers of his love:
Sweet to look upwards to the place
Where Jesus pleads above.

We "sorrow not as those who have no hope."

L.