

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

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

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

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

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

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

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

Showthrough/
Transparence

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

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

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

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

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

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

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

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

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

CHRISTIAN BANNER.

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

VOL. IX. COBOURG & BRIGHTON, SEPTEMBER, 1855. NO. 9.

MENNO SIMON.

Menno was eleven years younger than Luther—brought up like him in the Romanist faith—made in due time a Roman Priest—finally studied the scriptures for himself, and in some particulars escaped a little further from the city of Babylon than the great Luther. After giving a short account of himself as a Priest, he says, in an address to a reader, now before us—

At length I resolved I would examine the New Testament attentively ;—I had not proceeded far therein, ere I discovered that we were deceived. My conscience, which was troubled on account of the sacramental bread, aforementioned, soon obtained relief, without any human aid or advice ; though I was encouraged by Luther in the belief, that human authority cannot bind to eternal death.

Through the illumination and grace of the Lord, I continued daily to examine the scriptures, and was soon considered by some, though undeservedly, as being an Evangelical preacher. Every one sought my company—the world loved me and had my affections, yet it was said that I preached the word of God, and was a clever man.

Afterwards it happened, before I had been aware of the existence of brethren, that a pious, patient man, named Sieke Snyder, was hanged at Leuwarden for having his baptism renewed. It sounded strange to me, to hear a second baptism spoken of. I examined the scriptures, and meditated on them assiduously and earnestly, but could find nothing in them concerning infant baptism. After I had discovered this, I conversed with my pastor on the subject : and after much discussion, we carried it so far that he had to confess, that infant baptism had no scriptural foundation. Notwithstanding all this, I dare not trust my own understanding, but consulted several ancient authors. They taught me that children were to be washed by baptism from their original sin. I compared this doctrine with the scriptures and found that it made baptism take the place of the blood of Christ.

Afterwards, desiring to know the grounds for infant baptism, I

went and consulted Luther. He taught me that children were to be baptized on account of their own faith. I perceived that this also was not in accordance with the word of God.

Next I consulted Buoyer. He taught that infants were to be baptized—that their baptism would cause those who had their training to be more careful in bringing them up in the way of the Lord. I perceived that this doctrine too, was without foundation.

I then consulted Builiget. He directed me to the covenant and circumcision. This I found incapable of being substantiated by scripture.

Having thus observed that authors varied greatly among themselves, each following his own opinion, I became convinced that we were deceived in relation to infant baptism.

Shortly after, I went to the village in which I was born, called Witmarsum. Covetousness and a desire to obtain a great name, were the inducements which led me to that place. There I spoke much concerning the scriptures without spirituality or love, even as all hyprocrites do.—I made disciples of my own stamp, such as vain boasters and light-minded persons, who, alas! like myself, took but little of the scriptural instruction to heart. And though I was able now to understand much of the scriptures, yet I wasted that knowledge, through the lusts of my youth in an impure, sensual, unprofitable life. I sought nothing but gain, ease, favor of men, splendor-reputation and honor, even as they all generally do, who embark in the same course of life.

Thus, my readers, I obtained the knowledge of baptism and the Lord's supper through the illumination of the Holy Ghost,—through much reading of the scriptures, and meditating upon them, and through the gracious favor and gifts of God, but not by means of the service of misleading sects, as it is reported of me. I hope that I do not seek vain glory; though some, doubtless, may have contributed to my assistance in the pursuit of truth, yet will I, for this, render thanks to the Lord forever. * * * * I began in the name of the Lord to preach publicly from the pulpit, the word of repentance—to direct the people into the narrow path—and through scripture to reprove all ungodliness and sin—all idolatry and false worship—and to present the truth concerning baptism and the Lord's supper, according to the doctrine of Christ.

The zealous Menno made a large mark in society by his labors. In Germany and in Canada there are those who cling around Menno Simon as a great and good religious teacher. As a thorough reformer he was the first in the age and nation in which he lived.

D. O.

AGREEMENTS & DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BAPTISTS & DISCIPLES.

No. 1.

We need a few articles upon these differences and agreements.—Something of this character has been in demand for years, but like

numerous other calls and demands, it has been put off and pushed into the dormant corner of postponement until to procrastinate further would be a downright dereliction of duty.

Any one reading and believing the article in our last, written by Mr. T. L. Davidson, of the "Messenger" at Brantford, would unhesitatingly conclude that the Baptists in Canada stand upon the only true ground as a religious people, without one taint of the unction of sectary sentiment or sectary action, and that the Disciples, called by a nick-name, are a body of godless subtloists, dangerous as religious leprosy, and as far removed from perfect Baptist orthodoxy as Father Pius IX is unlike Dr. Simon Peter.

If indeed all Baptists were adorned with the same species of meekness, grace, and goodness as our friend Davidson and a few other rather tall dwarfs who could be named here if their names were worth recording, we should allow every one of them to snarl, bark, or bite exactly as it might suit their convenience, soothe their feelings, ease their conscience if they had any, or please their fraternity; never for a moment thinking they were out of place, so long as they bore their own stamp, in witnessing that there was the width of a world between us and them. In this case made and provided, the greater the difference they could 'show up' between their standing and our standing, and the further they made their doxy from our doxy, the more fully we should be relieved of the unpleasant task of exposing them if there should be the slightest ground for supposing that the community would class them and us together as brethren.

It so happens, however, that the Baptists as a people are on the whole to be loved and accounted brethren—not because of some of their "Baptist usages," for some of these might as well be given over to the dark ages, whence doubtless these usages came. But notwithstanding the list of things uncircumcised of God that we find among them, we view the Baptists, as a body, in a light very different from all other bodies; and if it be a sin in us to account them brethren, though they do not in very many instances account us so, then indeed this is a sin to be charged to us. And this is precisely the measure of criminality—the sin unpardonable—that such watchmen as the Brantford scribe find in us. Were we to esteem the Baptists less, were we to view and treat them as we view and treat Congregationalists, Presbyterians, or Wesleyans, it is morally certain that we should be viewed by Baptist scribes and orators as they

view other professing people whom they do not like so well as they like themselves.

But behold our sin! Let it stand out in the broad breadth of its awfulness!—the Disciples, notwithstanding the crusty way in which they have been treated by some stilt-walking little Baptist spirits, clothed with stiff clerical overcoats, and girt round the shoulders with significant fringes partly if not wholly shaped by the Lady who wears Scarlet; notwithstanding all this and much more, the Disciples will look upon and call the humble and bible-loving Baptists their brethren in Christ. And this is accounted presumptuous as well as criminal; for who so blind as not to see that in calling the Baptists our brethren, we affirm at the same time, to say the very least, that we occupy as safe, as sound, and as saving ground as they!! This is a double-breasted sin for which it appears there is no Baptist forgiveness, provided always that Mr. Davidson and his specially regular relatives are just judges.

Dreadful as it may sound in the ears of certain of these *Regulars*, it is nevertheless true that some Baptists of the past century were such good Disciples that we could not ask for better teachers and expositors of what is now sneeringly called *our* views. Seventy or eighty years before our friend Davidson was born, a document was written, entitled, "Serious Reply to the Rev. John Wesley, by Gilbert Boyce, a Baptist." Will the editor at Brantford, and Mr. Frazer his correspondent at Kincardine, open their eyes and their ears that they may see and hear the following four paragraphs from brother Baptist Boyce:—

"Upon the whole, I may safely and without erring conclude, that let a man pretend to what he will, 'tis certain that he never can be led by the Spirit of God, who is not led by the Word of God; for the Word and Spirit are one, and are agreed in one: they speak the same thing. Whosoever, therefore, opposes and contradicts the Scriptures, opposes and contradicts the Spirit. The Spirit doth not say and unsay—hath not said one thing by the Apostles and another by the Methodists. No, no—He cannot be guilty of self-contradictions; therefore, whoever are led by the Scriptures, are led by the Spirit; for the Scriptures are the divine breathings of the Spirit of God. And whatever secret whispers any one may pretend to have as an overplus, if those whispers contain any thing in them which is contrary to the plain spoken words of the Scriptures, they are not the whispers of God's Spirit, but of the Devil. Every man, therefore,

ought to be very careful how he entertains a whispering spirit.

“Baptism is necessary to penitent believers to entitle them to the promise of forgiveness of sins, which is freely given to all such through His precious blood, according to the riches of God's grace—Ephes, i: 7. Accordingly, St. Peter says to his new made converts at Jerusalem, ‘Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.’—Acts ii: 38. It ought to be observed that remission of sins is not promised to repentance only, but to repentance and baptism. The Apostle seems to make baptism as necessary as repentance to entitle them to the promise—not to either of them singly and separately, but to both conjointly. Therefore, it appears plain that baptism is to be an inseparable companion with repentance, as faith is to be with them both in order to receive the promise. If any man will be so venturesome as to cast out baptism from the above text, and declare remission of sins to repentance only, I may, by the same authority he can produce cast out repentance and declare remission of sins to baptism only.—But I will only add the case of Paul, which seems plainly to confirm the necessity of baptism to entitle penitent believers to the promise of forgiveness of sins.—Acts xxii: 16. Ananias undoubtedly understood the necessity of baptism to answer its designed end, or he would not have expressed himself in such terms.—Now, suppose the three thousand mentioned in Acts ii. 41, and Paul in the above text had objected against and refused to have been received as members of the Church of Christ, would the Apostles, and the rest of the brethren, the Church, have admitted them into fellowship with them? Or would they, without such admission and baptism, have received remission of their sins? If not, then what I have said of the necessity of baptism under this head is just and right—Therefore, if it was so in the Apostles' time, it must be the very same in our time; and I appeal to you, Sir, and every serious knowing Christian, for a decision on this point.

“Baptism is also previously necessary not only to entitle penitent believers to the promise of forgiveness of sins, but also to the promise of receiving the Holy Ghost.—Acts ii: 38, as above cited. Nor do we certainly know of any one person besides Cornelius and his friends, that ever received the Holy Ghost before he was baptized.—As to the wild enthusiastic notions of some about their having received the Holy Ghost, I am sure no wise and judicious Christian—no sober, thinking person, will pay any regard to them.

“Wherein may we not this day expect to receive remission of sins

and every spiritual blessing in the same way, or in using the same means they were wont to do in the days of the Apostles? Why not? Do you know of any man who lived in the Apostles' days, who received remission of sins, &c., before he believed, repented and was baptized? Or can you show me any promise that God has made that it ever should be so in any age of the world? If not, what reason have you to think it so now? Have a care that you are not led by an enthusiastic spirit."

Brother Boyce speaks well. It is good, genuine, wholesome Baptist doctrine, nay, better, it is sound New Testament doctrine—the very doctrine of the Confession of Faith used by the Disciples of our Lord. Will Messrs. Davidson, Frazer, Austin, Charles Campbell, Fitch, and a few others be pleased to scan brother Boyce's language, and then send us their reflections? Or if they prefer silence will they please be silent!

—Our No. 2 next month.

D. GLIPHANT.

SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

(For the Christian Banner.)

Butler, N. Y., June, 1855.

I gave a lecture in * * * about the first of Dec., 1854, upon some points of order pertaining to the service of the church: in which I assumed that the Lord had ordained that there should be teachers in the body. And I really thought that this would not be disputed by any one. I was therefore greatly disappointed to find all the leading talent and influence of the congregation against me. One interrupted me while speaking, with a challenge to prove that it was the business of any one to teach, when I quoted Eph. iv—"and he gave some apostles," &c. Another objected that evangelists, pastors, and teachers being mentioned in the same connexion with apostles, prophets, &c., as these must have been confined to the same age. A third endorsed this objection, and further strengthened it by arguments which we shall notice by and by. A fourth allowed that there should be bishops now-a-days, but denied that it was not a necessary qualification of a bishop that he be "apt to teach."

Thus I learned to my surprise that there was a very important issue between us—an issue materially affecting the means of extending the knowledge of truth among men, and equally affecting

the means of church edification—an issue superlatively grave and practical—a question, the decision of which involves consequences of almost inconceivable magnitude. If my position be negatived, the most we have a right to do, is, to throw the Bible among the people and leave them to themselves. But if it be admitted, the crudition, the research and vigorous thought, of mental labor, in the acquirement of Bible knowledge, of men of age, experience, and talent in the ranks of faith, may have, and by divine law will have all their power thrown into the scale on the side of truth. What a host of tongues, moved by hearts purified by the knowledge and the love of God, and the hope of the gospel, and true heaven-born philanthropy will plead the Lord's cause with the persuasive eloquence of faith and love? or be silent—as this question may be decided.— And all this may be said, with more than a show of propriety, to depend upon the construction we put upon a single scrap of scripture, viz., Eph iv. 11; for it is clear that if this text confines evangelists, pastors, and teachers to the apostolic age, there is no other text that can ensure their continuance; therefore a careful examination of the objections brought against my use of that text, and of the text itself, is the design of these few pages. And now, gentle reader, I shall proceed without further preamble, and it is your business to judge and decide for yourself.

See Ephesians, iv chap. from 11th to 14th verse. It was objected, that evangelists, pastors, and teachers being mentioned in the same connexion with apostles and prophets were necessarily confined to that age, and must of course be withdrawn at the same time. But I know of no rule or usage of language to sustain this objection, or which makes it a necessary consequence in speaking of gifts or favors that every item mentioned in the same connexion must be withdrawn at the same time; but I can think of instances enough where it is not so. For instance, we speak of the Dower which a father gives a daughter and we mention a score of articles, some of them from their nature and use expected to fail in a week, while others will naturally last for many years. It is therefore entirely dependent on the nature and use of the different items, how long they are to continue. In this case, the body of Christ is the destination of the gifts, and they must be manifested somewhere from its commencement to its perfection; and whether they shall be found in every age, or in one generation only, is of course dependent upon the place they occupy and the functions they perform in the body.

From the connexion of the text, it would seem more consistent to expect them to be manifested at the same time than that they should all be withdrawn at the same time. But even this was not so : they appeared as the number of disciples increased and as the consequent interests of the body required. But we shall say more of this by and bye.

Second objection. These gifts, apostles, prophets, &c., were spoken of not as belonging to a local church, but to the church general. This is clearly true, as the connexion shows, though church is not in the text. But "the body" is ; of which "body" Christ is the Head, and that is equivalent to the church universal, that is, to all the Lord's people which form his body. If there be any point to the objection, it assumes that the apostles have ceased or been withdrawn from this "body." And just here the premises are false, unless we suppose Christ to have a "body" in every age, and therefore as many bodies as there have been ages since he "ascended up on high ;" and this would contradict Paul in the same connexion (see verse 4th) He says "there is one body." Christ, though now in heaven, "is the Head" or "one Lord" of the "one body," of which the apostles are a prominent part, an indispensable and an abiding part.—They were placed just where the real interests of the body required them to be placed. They have not ceased from the body : so this objection is set aside.

Third objection. See versæ 12, "For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry," means for the qualification of these servants named in the preceding verse for the work assigned them—this must have been accomplished when the measure of revelation was complete—and this measure was complete when the last apostle died ; therefore they must all have pertained to the apostolic age. This objection virtually assumes the question in debate, and then argues from it as from an established law, viz, that all the "evangelists," &c., lived in the apostolic age, else they could not have been taught in that age—revelation could not have affected them before they were born. The same license to assume will prove that they lived in every succeeding age of the church, for evangelists, &c., could not have been perfected for the work of the ministry before they were born, therefore they must last to the consummation of the Christian Era, that is, until Christ comes again. In this example the logic is just as good as in the objection, and disproves the objection.

The construction put upon the phrase, "For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry," is probably correct; and yet it is hardly supposable that there could be in it any allusion to the qualification of the apostles for their work, though they were prominent among the gifts named. For apostles were not given to qualify apostles to be apostles, but to convert men to Christ and to teach the "all things" which their Lord commanded them. It was undoubtedly their business to teach evangelists, pastors, and teachers. Read Paul's two letters to Timothy and the one to Titus, written to teach the duties of evangelists. See also Acts xx. 17 to 33; also 1 Pet. v. 1 to 5, and understand how they taught pastors their duty. And it would be instituting a cause without regard to the effect, to qualify men with so much care for a specific work or ministry when the ministry itself was to be abandoned as soon as they were qualified for it.

It often turns out in the common concerns of life, in the department of causation, that there is a considerable chain, in which the effect of one cause becomes in turn the cause of a new effect; and thus link after link is added to the chain. Indeed it is only now and then that the first link brings us to the ultimatum of our wishes. Precisely so in the case under consideration. The ministry of evangelists, pastors, and teachers was instituted, and means ordained to qualify men for such ministry, "for the edifying of the body of Christ." The apostle did stop when he had spoken of the gifts in the 11th verse, as being "for the adapting of these saints to the work of the ministry," [see New Translation]—but clearly makes this ministry the Lord's means ordained "for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man (people)," &c.—"that we henceforth should be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine;" but that all "may grow up into him in all things, which is the Head," and thus "the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

It strikes me that it is pretty evident, that this organization was instituted as a means of, and was to last until the body of Christ attains its greatest magnitude and its highest perfection:—then what becomes of the third objection?

[To be continued.]

THOMAS LAING.

[Our good brother will excuse us for serving up his essay in two portions, as we are crowded for space; besides, the common reader will thus be likely to examine the whole more thoroughly.—D. O.]

CHRISTIAN--PARTIZANS.

No. V.

Another clear and evident mark of a party man, is his attachment to a distinguishing name as a professor disrespectful and dishonoring to the Lord. This is our fourth, and, at present, our last specification of the undoubted indications of a partizan.

It is questionable if there be a more palpable badge of partizanship in the whole catalogue of signs and indices of sectary character than the one here mentioned. The religious name that a man approves and accepts, is not a mere breath of wind—a mere spelling and pronouncing so many letters in the alphabet. In every family name, and no less so in every adopted name, there is a deep, wide, radical meaning. The relationship, obligations, and sympathies between father and child are far more than a name, but yet the family name, strictly speaking, indicates them all—the relationship indeed is the root and ground of the name, and the name therefore is an expression of the relationship. Hence, in the theology of the family, there is something—a very big something—in a name. It has a meaning as broad, as long, as deep, and as great as unchangeable relationship.

This idea loses nothing when we turn it over to the Lord's sacred household, or to those who claim connexion with the Lord. It will be found that a man's ecclesiastic name is not a mere breath or a mere sound, but that it indicates his religious centre, expresses the leanings and leadings of his heart, and, like an index to a volume, shows where he belongs and to whom or to what he is related. We speak not of a name that may be forced upon a professor by another. Names are sometimes given by carnalized professors to cotemporary professors which are not only rejected, but highly disapproved and abhorred. But we refer to the religious name that the professor himself accepts and approves conscientiously.

He who sits humbly at the feet of Christ, yields to his teaching, loves him, delights in him, is, properly speaking, a Christ's man or christian—a disciple of Christ. Not only has the Lord who saves him a right to give him a name, but the saved man, out of affection for his Lord, is desirous of constantly wearing and faithfully maintaining a name unequivocally indicating the connexion between him and his Divine Deliverer. No matter then what others call such an one, he makes a vow somewhat similar to the uncorrupted Joshua,

'As for me and my brethren, we will serve and honor our Lord and Master, accepting, approving, and loving the things and the names acceptable and approveable in his sight.'

But here comes a professing friend, a hale, hearty, high bred man, a strict professor, who calls himself and is known by the title of a Church of England man. He glories in that name, and in what that name represents. No other name would suit him. No other name would he have. And does any one need to be informed that his name tells us where he is religiously, what and how he worships, what principles and practices he approves, and where his heart centres? When posted up relative to English ecclesiastics, it is understood that there is a church of England as well as a church in England, a ponderous national organization, with lords, arch-bishops, arch-deacons, priests, prebendaries, an earthly sovereign, a carnal creed, and a mighty host of ecclesiastic nationalities founded upon expediency and managed by policy. Now, the name English Churchman is quite in keeping with the machinery of this establishment. How important therefore is this name—the man who accepts it has a name expressive of his religious position, indicating the relationship existing between him and this national church. Nothing could be more significant. Here is, not a disciple of Christ, but a disciple of the English Prayer Book and of the English ecclesiastic nationality; a partizan of a particular stamp; and his name properly indicates it. There is the Church of England and there is the Church of Christ,—the sovereign of the British realm the head of the one, but Christ the Head of the other; and hence he who is related to, and is a member of the first, ought to have credit only for that sort of membership and should be distinguished by the name of English Churchman; while he who has been adopted by Christ should have the name indicative of this relationship, and be called Christ's man, christian, or Christ's disciple.

But while the man of the one Book takes the name of his Saviour and the national professor glories in the name of the institution to which he is attached, a third in his own way has whereof to glory in being called by the name of a man, saying, 'I am of Wesley, a Wesleyan.' Now, who was Wesley? and how did he receive his name? Was and is his name divine or human?—was he himself divine or human? Samuel Wesley, an English Churchman, was the father of John Wesley; and hence it is a family name, expressive of the fleshly connexion between an English Church clergyman and his

son. As such it is a very pretty, appropriate, and innocent name. Any one giving up the name of his own family and accepting the Wesley family name, would be committing only what we may call social violence and be guilty only of family fraud. But so soon as the name Wesley is forced out of the family circle, and Wesley is made to stand before us, not as a certain man's son, but as a new religious teacher and reformer, then indeed the man who calls himself by his name commits two offences against heaven—the first, by looking to and relying upon a man as divine authority—the second, by accepting a name expressive of greater relationship to an earthly teacher than to the heavenly Teacher.

And the party name, expressing the party character, is so complete that it has not, to our vision, one redeeming feature. We never hear of christian Wesleyans or Wesleyan christians. It seems rather that the man Wesley is regarded as the embodiment of heaven's grace, doctrine, and authority; and therefore his teaching, policy, and even his fleshly name, are taken as though they bore the signet and endorsement of our Great King—as though the Lord of Life had withdrawn the authority originally given to the Holy Twelve, and commissioned the son of Samuel surnamed Wesley to 'Go into all the world and make Wesleyans.'

Wesley taught many excellent things—so did the great Saxon reformer—so did Calvin—so did Arminus—so did Knox—so did Fuller; but for a professor to call himself a Wesleyan, a Lutheran, a Calvinist, an Arminian, a Knoxite, or a Fullerite, is not only highly disrespectful to the Founder of christianity, but it strongly indicates that christianity itself is misapprehended.

D. O.

DUTIES OF ELDERS.

For the Christian Banner.

The reciprocal duties of elders and congregations have largely engaged the attention of writers and speakers, but we do not remember to have seen or heard any thing on the duties of elders to each other. The duties of elders to each other we conclude must be important and we shall introduce the subject by presenting our cogitations upon it for the consideration of all those who may feel interested in it. That elders must have duties to perform towards each other will appear from the fact that they have duties to perform both

collectively and individually, and for which they are collectively and individually responsible to the body over which they are appointed to preside. Since the Head of the church has approved the ancient and venerable maxim that "in a multitude of counsellors there is safety" by appointing that the eldership should consist of several persons, we think that it becomes a part of their duty to observe it in their treatment of each other and in the performance of all the duties belonging to their office.

The eldership being personally and collectively responsible for the feeding and ruling of the flock, are individually responsible to each other for the performance of every duty which their position and the circumstances of the flock may require them to perform. Their position requires them to be a pattern to the flock in all meekness and holy conduct, and to be consistent must be so to each other; and as their duties may lead them to differ in judgment they will require to exercise great patience and forbearance towards one another. Though the position of elders is one of the most honourable and dignified in which a man can be placed, yet there is no position in which he will require to exercise more self-denial and humility. It may be asked, have elders a right to follow their own individual judgment in cases which may require their attention? We think not, else counselling would be of no use; and we doubt whether an elder should follow his own judgement independently of his associates in any case, for he is not to be self-willed. Wherever responsibility is conjointly incurred and is to be conjointly borne, there must be a yielding of individual judgment whenever there is a difference of opinion. The elders should be a pattern of unity to the flock, and should aim at unity in judgment and action in every thing which demands their attention. We feel doubtful whether an elder, tho' well instructed and highly esteemed, should take action in anything in which he may be liable to err or which may effect the interests of others without consulting his fellow overseers.

Each elder having important and solemn duties to perform to the congregation, is bound to treat his fellow elders with due respect, showing a fellow feeling and sympathy with them in all their labours undertaken for the good of the flock; and when called on to assist in discharging a duty to waive all personal considerations and convenience, and show a willing co-operative disposition without which their duties will be very irksome and the influence of their example greatly impaired. For the eldership to attempt to disci-

pline a congregation without mutually conferring with one another on its condition, wants, and prospect, must prove in the end to be very defective. By discipline we mean training, including teaching, admonishing, exhorting, ruling and everything necessary for the prosperity of the body. If the wants of the body are not investigated, they cannot be supplied; and if the teaching is done without consultation and arrangement as to quantity and quality, and by whom performed, it may be very unsuitable to accomplish the purpose designed. We do not think that all elders are alike able to teach, admonish, exhort, and rebuke: hence the necessity of all things being carefully arranged, that each overseer may act his part most advantageously.

From these facts and consideration we conclude that elders have important duties to perform to each other as well as to the congregation, and we feel constrained to conclude that the eldership which does not meet to consult and advise each other on all things pertaining to their duties and office, are not fully carrying out the design of the Lord in their appointment, and can not expect to be successful in maintaining the purity, harmony and life of the body. How elders can maintain the esteem and confidence of the church without exhibiting a deep solicitude for its welfare in all their arrangements and a thorough acquaintance with each other's minds, accompanied by a humble, patient, and courteous bearing toward each other, we cannot comprehend, nor do we know of any better way in which they can more advantageously prepare themselves for bearing their responsibilities and performing their arduous duties than by meeting each other frequently to converse on the interests of Zion and encourage one another by mutual exhortations.

These few thoughts and remarks are presented for the consideration of all, but especially those whom they particularly concern, with much fraternal regard.

ADELPHOS.

USEFUL NOTES ON AN OLD TOUR.

[The paragraphs which follow are not yet too old for the people of this generation. We copy from the Christian Baptist.—]:

We have both read and travelled in quest of information, and have found additional proofs that there is a great difference between reading geography and travelling over the surface of a country; between

hearing of, and seeing the religious world ; between viewing men and things with our own eyes, and looking at them through the media of books and newspapers ; between contemplating society in the closet, and mingling with it in actual operation. We have been long convinced that to live to purpose in any society, it is necessary, in a certain sense, "to catch the living manners as they rise." Man is a creature incessantly developing himself — perpetually exhibiting new and strange appearances. And while it is true, "as in water face answers to face, so does the heart of man to man." it is equally certain that the varied year and the ever-shifting scenery of the heavens and the earth are but emblems of the changes continually exhibiting in human society.

Society is continually in a progressive state. It is either advancing in intelligence and virtue, or marching downwards in ignorance and vice. Regardless of the spirit and character of this age and of this great community, many are for holding the people down to the standard of the 16th and 17th centuries. Hence we find the creeds and forms that suited the age and circumstances of our ancestors, cotemporary with Charles I. bound with new rivets on the necks of our countryman. This is not more absurd than to oblige men to wear the apparel which suited them when boys, and to compel men when they have no taste for the pranks and amusements of children, to go through all the forms.

We are happy to find that in spite of the reigning doctors of traditions, the people are gradually awaking to a sense of their religious rights and privileges. We find a large majority of most religious communities are quite unsettled in their views of religious principles and practices. They have lost the greater part of that confidence of being the most reformed christians, and the wisest in the world, which was the characteristic of every sect some quarter of a century ago. Many who thought their church almost infallible, now readily admit that she not only may, but that she actually does, frequently err. And there is a spirit of inquiry marching forth, before which, most assuredly, the rotten systems of tradition and error must and will fall.

We learn however, from experience, as well as from books, that the human mind is prone to extremes in all circumstances. We see when men have been long enslaved in church or state, they become anarchists in both. Tyranny and anarchy, if not themselves opposites, are, in this respect, the extremes of certain principles and

practices. When a tyrant is dethroned, and his vassals liberated he finds his quietus in a guillotine, and they convert his palaces into towers and strong holds for each other in rotation. So in the church. They who call the Pope Antichrist, and renounce any successor of St. Peter, set themselves up as Popes, and thus a whole congregation of protesters become a college of cardinals, and they will have no Pope because each one wishes to be a Pope himself. Democrats in politics, and Independents in religion, are not unfrequently the greatest tyrants in the world.

There is anarchy in the church as surely as there is anarchy in the state, and mutinies and insurrections are not confined to sailors and soldiers. My friend Thomas Biblicus, in every sect of which he was a member, and he had been a member of at least four, always opposed every appearance of tyranny in the priests and rulers of the congregations of which he was a member, and was ever and anon talking against his ecclesiastic ruler and priest, and declaiming long and loud on the liberties of the children of God. Finally he became an Independent, and was called to become the president of the meeting, and soon became a full grown despot that could bear no contradiction, and aimed at absolute power in the church.

James Libertas, too, an old acquaintance, eternally declaimed against creeds as impositions on men's consciences, yet he was always employed in imposing his own opinions upon his brethren, and frittered the society of which he was a member to nothing, by multiplying non-conformists at every meeting. Indeed, many are praising the life they will never lead, and condemning others for their own sins. My cousin, William Puritan, was always lamenting that he never heard "a sermon preached" against evil speaking, and was always telling what evil things his brethren were saying of one another, and yet he always concluded his remarks by observing, that while so many indulged in evil speaking, he must call them all hypocrites and railers.

In my late tour of a thousand miles I was reminded of what I have had before discovered, that religious sects and forms cover the earth as the different sorts of timber the soil. In one place it is all oak; in another, all pine; in no place all hickory; in some places every sort of timber. Here it is all Presbyterian, and Methodist underwood; there it is all Methodist, and Presbyterian underwood. Here it is all Baptist, and there it is all sorts. Here some bend before they break, and there some break before they bend. I often

asked myself, is this all nature and that all grace? Or is it nature that covers this soil with Baptists, and grace that covers that with Presbyterians? Here Calvinism reigns predominant, and there Arminianism. On one side of the hill they pray to be kept from Arminian errors; on the other side from Calvinistic errors. To tell a man in one country that he is an Arminian, is to traduce him; to tell him in another that he is a Calvinist, is no honor to him. Again I asked myself, is this nature or grace? Upon the whole, I discover that many are Calvinists in the things pertaining to the next world, but Arminians in the things pertaining to this. They believe that all things in the next world will be as decreed; but in this they believe that men are rich or poor, honorable or base, according to their works.

REPENTANCE AND FAITH, OR
FAITH AND REPENTANCE—AGAIN.

MY DEAR BROTHER OLIPHANT:—When I forwarded my article upon repentance and faith, or faith and repentance, I expected you would put it through your fanners. The first thing that attracted my attention when I got my eye on your remarks, was the length of your article. I knew you to be a man of superior abilities, and in prime of life, having also the advantage of a polished education. And I was well aware that I am now an old Highland man, having no other education than what I received some 60 years ago, at a common country school, in the Highlands of Scotland. Under these circumstances it occurred to me, that you might have been able to blow away all the chaff that might be in my article, altho' you had confined yourself to a commonly acknowledged rule, namely, to occupy no more space on the pages of the periodical than I had done. I felt surprise when I saw that for every page I had occupied, you needed about a page and half. I have no intention to follow you through all you have said, (even where I think I might get a hit at you) lest I might get bewildered in a mist. Now, my dear brother Oliphant, there is no man that I am more willing to learn from than you, and none that I am more unwilling to be in opposition to, but I am not satisfied with the way you left the subject. My object in my former article was to make an attempt to put a stop to what appeared to me, to be *striving about words to no profit*, and although the length of your article convinces me that I have com-

pletely failed as far as you are concerned, I intend to make another attempt.

First, then, there is a contention about whether faith or repentance should be first in order. Some say that faith in the Son of God should always be before repentance; others say that repentance should be before faith. Your view seems to be that during the personal ministry of Christ, that repentance was called for before believing the gospel, but after the resurrection of Christ this order was reversed, and in all cases faith in Christ was called for first, and after that repentance. Now my view is that faith and repentance stand in the same order and relation to each other after the resurrection of Christ that they did before that period (see Mark i. 15, Acts xx. 21, Heb. vi. 1.) that the commands to repent and believe the gospel come to the sinner in the *same breath*. And at whatever time a sinner repents he is commanded that every *instant* to believe the gospel, and at whatever time he believes the gospel he is commanded that very *instant* to repent. I cannot see how any man can believe the gospel without repentance accompanying it. In the teaching of the Holy Spirit they seem to me to be *inseparable companions* and if any one would tell me that he believed the gospel, but had not yet repented, I would consider him to be telling an untruth.

In page 104 I respectfully asked those who contend for repentance first, how long the person was to continue in a repentant state before he was commanded to believe the gospel. Was he to continue a year, a week, or even an hour. And I reversed the question for those who contend for faith first; is the person to have faith for a month or an hour before he is commanded to repent. Answers to these questions in my opinion would cast light upon this contested point, and perhaps might go far toward settling the contest.

It occurred to me that the reason why you contended for repentance before faith during the personal ministry of Christ, was that repentance was first in order in Mark i. 15. I therefore referred you to a number of texts, all *after* the resurrection of Christ with repentance *still before faith*. From this you seem to have understood that I was contending for repentance before faith. Perhaps my words were not so well defined as they should have been, as my faculties are now upon the decline. I request the reader to examine my former article with care, and I think he will see that the view I contended for was to make faith and repentance go hand in hand.

In page 107 you take up several of the texts to which I referred,

and you attempt to turn them against me. This compels me much against my will, to turn again to some of these. I find in Acts xx. 21. and Heb. vi. 1. repentance and faith in the same order as in Mark i. 15. This compels me to the conclusion, that faith and repentance stand in the same relation to each other *after* the resurrection of Christ, that they did before that period, and in place of dividing them that they are inseparable companions in the teaching of the Spirit. I also understand these terms (faith and repentance) in their ordinary acceptation in the above texts.

Your attempt to turn Acts iii against me, surprises me very much. I request the reader to turn to that chapter. First, we have a cripple man miraculously cured, (verse 7); 2nd, the people wonder, (verse 10); 3rd, Peter explains the means by which the lame man was cured, he ascribes the cure to faith in the name Jesus of Nazareth, (verse 16); he also charges the murder of Jesus upon his hearers (verse 15) *and before any one of his hearers gives any evidence that they believed his testimony, he calls upon them to repent of this crime, (verse 19).*

Now, my brother, do you think that it was too soon to call upon them to repent, until they had given evidence that they had believed the gospel. For my part I never consider it too soon to repent of any sin. *After* Peter calls upon them to repent, he goes on to reason with the people, draws their attention to the ancient scriptures shewing that Jesus the Son of God was the Prophet like unto Moses, and urges upon the people as the children of the prophets and of the covenant that God made with their fathers *to turn from their iniquities*, that they might receive the promised blessings. I now remark upon this, that testimony for faith and a call to repentance, is submitted the same time in the same discourse. It is freely admitted that Peter's discourse produced great effects, many of them which heard the word believed, Acts iv. 4, but what I contend for is, that a call to repent goes along with testimony for faith, so that repentance and faith or faith and repentance go hand in hand.

I now request the reader to turn to Acts xvii, where Paul preaching at Athens follows the same course with Peter at Jerusalem. Paul submits testimony for faith on various subjects. *And before any of his hearers give any evidence that they believed his testimony, he tells them that God NOW commands all men everywhere to repent, and as a motive to led them to repentance, he warns them of a coming Judgment.* Here then we have again testimony for faith on various subjects and a call to repentance in the same discourse.

And this seems to be in accordance with Paul's general practice, for he says, that he first shewed unto them at Damascus (where he commenced his labors) and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance, see Acts xxvi. 20. When Felix desired to hear Paul concerning the faith, Paul in addition to that, reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and Judgment to come, so that Felix trembled. Stubborn and obstinate sinners must be *solemnly and faithfully* warned of the impending Judgment of God. Every faithful teacher while he is careful to hold forth Christ crucified, as the foundation of hope for the guilty, will also lay hold of such other subjects as appears to him to be likely to impress the minds of his hearers, with a view to produce the desired effect. No man will ever believe the gospel until he is convinced that he is a ruined sinner (for the whole need not a physician, but those that are sick,) and as soon as any one is convinced that he is in a ruined state, the seeds of repentance are then planted in his heart, thus proving that faith and repentance go hand and hand.

In my former article, page 104, I remarked that although I could not see how any one could believe the gospel without repentance accompanying it, that I could see how persons could repent, that is, be distressed and even alarmed on account of their sins without believing the gospel, but that I considered this to be the effects of ignorance, or false teaching. The case of the Phillipian Jailor I considered to be one of these, and I put two questions to you page 103, on that case, 1st. Did not the Jailor repent before he believed on the Lord Jesus Christ? (I think he did.) 2nd, was not his coming in trembling, and falling down before Paul and Silas, asking what he should do to be saved, marks of *sincere* repentance? Paul seems to have thought so, for in answering the Jailor's question, he tells him to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ; not a word about repentance. I now ask why did you not answer my questions. To be consistent with yourself, you should have done so.

Now, brother O., this little quarrel between you and your humble servant, is not about the meaning of faith and repentance, but the relation or order in which they stand to each other. I have an intention to forward an article on the meaning of these terms, but least any thing should prevent this intention, I would here observe that I understand repentance to mean a change of mind, or purpose, and when

applied to man, it includes sorrow for what we have done amiss, and a resolution and sincere desire to turn from evil to good, or carry out reformation of manners, or doing works meet for repentance, or making the best amends we can for the harm we have done.

I hope our readers will give us credit for sincerity, however much we may be mistaken in understanding one another.

I remain as affectionate as ever,

Your brother in Christ,

JAMES SILLARS.

I am, my brother, confirmed in the impression formerly expressed that we do not materially differ. So highly satisfied am I with your remark that, "a call to repent goes along with testimony, so that faith and repentance go hand in hand"—which touches the very heart and soul of the topic we have been considering—that, after heartily endorsing the sentiment, I am free to bid the subject adieu and allow the whole to remain substantially as you have presented it. Differences of expression, when we are at one in the main, are of no greater account than bright green leaves and dark green leaves upon branches of the same tree bearing the same fruit.

Allow me, however, to say two things, not by way of argument, but by way of illustrating my position as a responsible workman in view of this whole topic. 1st, We have in these latter times one thousand and one teachers who preach sermons and write books to persuade the people that repentance is a preparation for faith—that there is no such thing as faith in Christ until after repentance. According to my best judgment and knowledge of things spiritual, it is not striving about words to no profit, to encounter this grave error and give it battle with the sword of God's Spirit. 2nd, In a majority of cases what is called the order of these two graces, would be settled by a simple and veritable definition of what they are—what faith is and what repentance is. I will illustrate. Suppose some wise man or some simpleton should assert that, in order of time, James Sillar's son was before his father. The simple definition of the terms father and son would settle the matter at once; not only would we have the terms father and son defined, and know what they were, but the order of time in which they appeared in the world would be fairly apprehended. So, to my vision, the entire critical investigation and theological discussion of the question of faith and repentance would

be closed, as it respects the order of them, by a fair and full definition of the terms.

If, beloved brother, we had set ourselves out for controversy, it would not have been genteel in me to have occupied more space in these pages than yourself; but, fortunately, the idea of controversy between you and me was not once thought of on my part. Before entering the battle-field I sharpen up a lance or two. I trust I used no sharp weapon against you. And so far as the occupancy of space is concerned, I judge that on the issue of this Number I will not be found a transgressor!

In verity and love, yours,

D. OLIPHANT.

For the Christian Banner.

PEDOBAPTIST LOGIC EXAMINED.

MR. EDITOR :—Among the rest that write and talk about christian baptism, will you allow me to offer a few thoughts. I do not intend to write in continuous argument, but shall briefly notice some of the leading arguments of the advocates of pedobaptism. My first—*the fortress of infant baptism.*

We are told that the seed of Abraham had a right to the seal of the covenant, and that baptism came in the room of it, and is the seal of the new covenant, consequently the children of *believers* should be baptised. This appears to me like begging the question; at least they should prove the premises before they assume the consequence.

But if we allow Abraham to have been the head of the church typical, and the type of baptism was circumcision (a sign of a sign!) it would prove those so sealed but Ishmaelites—that they are the fleshly heirs of some pious man, sealed with the seal of the covenant, but not born of Sarah, the lawful wife. They have thereby no share in the promise; for it is written, "The seed of the bond woman shall not be heir with the son of the free."

But Ishmael was circumcised! Yes, and when the rite was given the promised seed was not born. "And it is written, in Isaac shall thy seed be called." But why in Isaac! Because he was by promise, the son of the free woman. If Abraham be the head typical, Christ is the head real. Sarah, then, is the mother in the type—the church, the bride, the Lamb's wife, must be the antitype. See Gal.

iv. 25, 26. "For this Ager (or Hagar) is mount Sinia in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above, is free, which is the *mother of us all*." And in the 23rd verse he says, "But he who was of the bond woman, was born after *the flesh*."

Ishmael then took part in the rite as the other male members of the household; but this did not make him an heir, or an inheritor of the promise. Nor did its continuation in the posterity of Ishmael give them any claim upon the land that was given to Abraham and to his seed forever. Must not this fact at times trouble the mind of such as suppose themselves baptized because their pious parents had them sprinkled in their infancy? Or should it not awaken some perplexing reflections in the mind of those parents who have thus anticipated the grace of God, and warped the word to accommodate their sympathies?

Christ says, "ye must be born again." We are told, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." After baptism we shall walk in newness of life. This new life is after the Spirit, not after the flesh. These are born, not of the will of men, nor of the flesh; but of the incorruptible seed of the word. Hence the apostle says, Gal. iii. 22, "But the scriptures hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." "For we all are the children of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus," verse 26th; and previously, at verse 7, he tells us, "Know ye therefore that they who are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham."

"It is written, Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond maid, the other by a free woman. But he of the bond woman was born after the flesh, but he of the free woman was by promise. But as then, he that was born after the flesh, *persecuted* him that was born after the Spirit, EVEN SO IT IS NOW." I am aware that some will try to tarn this argument against us, from the fact that all that were in Abraham's house were circumcised. I grant it. Had it not been so the Allegory would not be complete, and I should have been without my argument. Baptism is a sign of faith in the resurrection of Christ from the dead. But can the child believe? "What is not of faith is sin"—and what ground of faith where no promise is given? That which is born of the flesh, is flesh, notwithstanding the piety of the parents.

Ah! me! cry some of those sympathizers—What!—would you

have our children remain like the unbaptized heathen? Dear children! poor things!! Baptize them, then, and make them ISHMAELITES, guile or no guile.

LET US HEAR BROTHER FRANKLIN.

Cincinnati, Ohio, August 9th, 1855.

BROTHER OLIPHANT: DEAR SIR—Your excellent *Christian Banner*, kindly sent to my address, containing a notice of my little books was thankfully received on yesterday. I am not at all sensitive, nor unwilling to have my feeble and imperfect efforts criticised, especially in matters of importance; nor am I moved to write for the benefit of my books. But I fear, that you have, *unintentionally*, made a wrong impression upon a very important point.

I never use the "certain kind of 'ite' and 'ism,'" alluded to by yourself, as my own language, unless in reply to the use of it by another party, and then in such a manner as to discountenance not only the use of such terms, but the thing itself which they import, and recommend simple christianity—being simply christians. Hence your remark, that "Opposers of a pure speech are responsible for the language *they* employ—disciples of Christ are responsible for the speech *they* use or in any wise countenance," is wholly inapplicable; and your other remark, that "This is a right-handed compliment to our cotemporaries and a left-handed compliment to the oracles of Christ," is utterly groundless.

But the main matter to which I wish to call your attention, and which I was very sorry to see, is your apology for the author—that "it has become common, if not commendable among the friends of reform in the city of Cincinnati, to speak freely of these 'ites' and this 'ism.'" This is a very incorrect statement, and not only injurious to my books, but doing great injustice to "the friends of reform in the city of Cincinnati." I do not disguise the fact, that some few here may be somewhat under the influence of such impulses as you represent; but I do deny that "it has become common or commendable among the friends of reform in this city," to speak as you represent them. I disavow what you make my apology having any influence upon a single sentence or word in my books.

As I wish to be distinctly understood, let me emphatically declare to all whom it may concern, that I am laboring under no mer-

bid state of feeling towards our brethren at Bethany, and I am not and never have been of that class who envy the well-earned and extended influence of that great and good man, Alexander Campbell. I disclaim against being C——ites, Lutherites, or even Paulites, as Brother Campbell has done and as Paul did, and against C——ism or any other ism, being the doctrine we hold; but never did I intend any such disclaimer as a caveat against the influence of brother Campbell. I am glad he has a great influence and a good one, and would that any who envy his name or his influence had as good a name and influence.

I never make any sly thrusts, but say what I have to say openly, so that all men can understand me.

Respectfully yours,

BENJ. FRANKLIN.

MY BROTHER :—The impression I sought to make was similar to the impression that your present letter will make on the same subject, else I mistake the meaning of your language and mine. But whether or not, all candid readers have the remarks that we have both made, so that they can judge “according to righteous judgment.”

At this meridian, being some 700 miles from Cincinnati, we have no means of ascertaining what is “common” among the disciples there but through the papers and publications which come from that quarter. For years it has been my good fortune to peruse the Weekly published in Cincinnati, which, in the main, has given no uncertain sound in favor of reformation. Still—if it even should prove to be weakness in me—I must frankly avow that the *ites* and *ism* referred to, frequently seen in its columns, have made me “feel” like telling an unpleasant “experience,” especially on putting the paper in the hands of parties whom I desired to be instructed in the unadulterated speech of the divine oracles.

Your closing remarks, I am happy to say, are not required to convince me that you are a straightforward, conscientious, and far from envious public laborer. You use no cunning side winds to take you into port. It was because I had every confidence in you as a lover of our Lord, his cause, and his friends, that I ventured to offer a plain sentence or two respecting the use of terms, in my judgment, not consistent with the sacred cause both of us love and advocate.

Very cordially your brother,

D. OLIPHANT.

THE NEXT ANNIVERSARY.

THE approaching Anniversary of the American Bible Union, which occurs on Thursday, the 4th of October next, and marks the period of the sixth year of the organization of the Society, promises to be a season of unusual interest to all who may enjoy the privilege of participating in the exercises of an occasion heretofore so full of spiritual enjoyment and edification. It will be held, like all the Anniversaries that have preceded it, in the Meeting House of the First Baptist Church in the City of New York, corner of Broome and Elizabeth streets. The usual business meeting, at which officers and managers are chosen will be held at nine o'clock, A. M., on the day above named. The public exercises will commence at ten o'clock, the same day and place, and meetings, beginning at such hour as may be agreed upon, will be held for two days, or longer, in the morning, afternoon, and evening. Attention will be given to the accommodation of the friends of Revision from abroad, who may desire to be present, and they are requested to register their names at the Bible Union Rooms, as early as practicable, after their arrival in this city.—*New York Chronicle.*

PRESBYTERIANS IN SCOTLAND.

The divisions of the Presbyterians in Scotland, though often alluded to, are but little understood. In the reign of Charles II. there were two parties in the Church of Scotland—the Revolutionist and the Remonstrants. The first accepted a license from the king; the second would accept of no compromise. These corresponded with the parties that ever since existed—Moderates and Evangelicals. In 1733 a dispute arose respecting the settlement of a preacher, which resulted in a controversy and a secession, which took the name of Seceders. In 1747 the Seceders became divided on the question of taking the Burgher's oath, and were separated into two sects, called Burghers and Anti-Burghers. The Established Church was again divided in 1775 on the question of the settlement of a pastor, when a sect went off and took the name of Relief Presbyterians. In 1800 the Burghers were again divided on the question of uniting the civil and ecclesiastical authority, and the seceders took the name of Associate Synod of Original Seceders. In 1821 the Burghers and Anti-Burghers, under the title of the United Associate Synod, united

but a portion dissented, and formed the original Burghers' Associate Synod. In 1843 the Establishment was again divided by the secession which formed the Free Church. Thus there are now seven distinct bodies, each having its own prosbyteries and synods, viz :—the Established Church, the United Synod, the Associate Synod of Original Seceders, the Original Burgher's Associate Synod, the Free Church, and the Old Reformed Presbyterians.

WORLD-WORSHIP.

The object to which a man bows down and worships, leaves its own impress stamped upon his soul ; and as the years roll on he must inevitably, by the very law of his being, become more and still more like the God he adores. If a man give himself up entirely to the pursuit of wealth, pleasure, or any one of the fashions of this world they each in turn become his God, and at the shrine of each he bows down and pays his homage. Day by day he finds some one or all of these objects become increasingly necessary to his happiness—and even to his existence ; and spurred on, as by an unseen power, he plunges forward in hot pursuit of his object, until death, that solemn sentry, bids him stand ! They who saw him in life knew that “ God was not in all his thoughts.” He was not to be found among those who “ went about doing good.” The noble and god-like enterprises of the day—though they loudly demanded—did not obtain his aid and co-operation. He was *of* the world, and to *it* he gave all he *had* and all he *was*. Thus do all those who love not our Lord JESUS CHRIST.

A WORD ABOUT SOME OF THE CHURCHES.

From brother Overholt we have intelligence to the effect that the brethren in Rainham “still keep up their weekly meetings” for the purpose of keeping the ‘ordinances of the Lord’s house.’ The friends of reformation in that locality have need of a large share of prudence, zeal, patience, and perseverance. With much confidence we look to brethren Holmes, Overholt, and Yager to “take heed to themselves” in teaching, watching, counselling, and praying for the upbuilding and welfare of all.

The congregation at Wainfleet, is, from last accounts, on the whole, prosperous. Trials, severe and grievous, have been felt in Wainfleet.

But the Lord is yet in heaven—has still a gracious smile for his people—and all his people will continue to love him. Greatly disappointed have we been in not being able, ere this, to see the joint heirs with Christ in Wainfleet and Rainham. But like Paul's weak Jew, so at times "that which I would, that I do not."

At Dorchester the church is in usual health. Several were added to it a few weeks since.

On holding a short interview the other week at London with brother Sinclair, of Lobo, we learned that the brethren in Lobo and vicinity are in common prosperity. Two or more were to be immersed at Lobo.

Brother W. A. Stephens, of Owen Sound, informs us that brother Bamford was lately at that point and addressed the brethren and friends there. Some time has elapsed since hearing from the congregations at Sydenham and St. Vincent, but we trust that, as in the past, the members are "edifying one another in love" and "holding forth the word" according to all their opportunities.

The brethren at Cobourg are cheerful, having lately participated in the joy of welcoming new members into the family.

At Athol, near Picton, the friends of the Lord are carrying out their resolves in meeting regularly on Lord's day. We have endeavored to be with them at least once per month. May a whole harvest of favor attend all who are walking according to the oracles of our Lord.

D. O:

FALSEHOOD SOMEWHERE.—A letter appeared in the "Messenger," of Brantford, written by A. Clegborn, which contradicts, in the most pointed manner, a number of the statements in brother Chase's report of the labors of J. D. Benedict at Carthage, N. Y. We have posted Mr. Clegborn's letter to friend Chase. It will therefore shortly be known where the palpable and very reprehensible falsification belongs.

D. O:

THREE NUMBERS of the "Gospel Advocate" Nashville, Tennessee, conducted by Fanning and Lipscomb, have made their appearance in this meridian. The "Advocate" is as pretty as a picture, and the tone of the work better than good. Why may not some of our men of means in Canada send for the Gospel Advocate?

D. O.