

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.

- 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

- Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires: Wrinkled pages may film slightly out of focus.

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.

Vol. II. }

SAINT JOHN, N. B., JULY, 1840.

} No. 2.

CONDUCTED BY W. W. EATON.

Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.—*Peter*. On this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it —*The Lord Messiah*.

[FOR THE CHRISTIAN.]

JAMESTOWN, OHIO, 4th July, 1840.

Dear Brother Eaton,—Your favor of the 9th ult. accompanied by the first volume of "The Christian," has been received, and I hasten to thank you for the present. I have not had time to examine its contents to see what you have already laid before your readers; but in looking over the index, I saw that you had written several essays on the "Kingdom of Heaven," in which I expect you have shewn its commencement, its constitution and laws, together with its positive institutions, and their designs.

One of the chief difficulties in setting forth the reign of Messiah, is to show the difference between John's ministry, the personal ministry of Jesus, and the ministry of the Apostles. Some have classed John and Jesus as Ministers of the Law; while others have classed them as Ministers of the Gospel—neither of which classifications can be sustained; properly speaking, they neither ministered Law nor Gospel. John was a prophet, and ministered as a prophet; that is to say, he ministered prospectively; he taught the people to look forward to the kingdom of heaven, and to the thorough reformation that would be ministered in the reign of him that was to come after him. John did not teach the people that Jesus had taken away their sins, but that he would do it, hence he taught, saying, "Behold the lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world;" or, in other words—this is the lamb chosen of God, to be offered as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. The offering was not made in John's day; I mean the offering to which he pointed, for he did not point them to the offerings made under the Law, but to the true offering chosen of God. John taught his disciples to believe on him that was to come after him, and to repent of their sins, and to be baptized; assuring them that through these means they should receive remission; and Jesus, when baptized of John, ratified these means as the medium through which he would remit the sins of all who put their trust in him. John proposed the conditions—Jesus acknowledged them, by submitting to them, and afterwards sealed them with his blood, and God confirmed them, by raising him from the

dead; and by his resurrection, a release from sin was secured: "He rose for our justification;" He died for our sins, but the release came by his resurrection, or escape from the consequence of sin—which had been foreshown by the scape-goat. It was not the dead goat that bore away sins, but the living one, so that John's disciples received remission by *prospective faith*, as did all to whom the prophets ministered.

Those to whom the Gospel is ministered receive remission by *retrospective faith*, the sacrifice having been made and accepted; God having confirmed it by signs and wonders, and divers gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Remission of sins is either a matter of knowledge or a matter of faith. Those to whom the prophets ministered believed their sins would be remitted through the means appointed of God. Those to whom the Apostles minister believe their sins are remitted at the time they comply with the means appointed of God; so that both they and we enjoy remission by faith: the former by a promise, the latter by confirmation and the oath of God.

During the personal ministry of Jesus, those whose sins were remitted *viva voce* of the Saviour, *knew* it, and so did the bystanders who heard his voice; to them remission was a matter of *knowledge*, and not a matter of faith. The personal ministry of Jesus differed from all other ministrations in regard to the remission of sins, as widely as knowledge differs from faith. But now, in the absence of Christ, "we walk by faith, and not by sight," (or knowledge)—so says Paul. Therefore, all things in religion are now matters of faith, and not of knowledge; no man hath heard the Lord say, "thy sins are forgiven," since he left this earth. While we remain in these earthly tabernacles, the Apostle says we are absent from the Lord, and walk by faith; so that by faith we receive the remission of sins, and by faith Jesus Christ dwells in us—and by faith the Holy Spirit dwells in us; by faith we are constituted the temple of God, in which he dwells by his spirit. We are now governed by three great moving principles, "FAITH, HOPE, and LOVE," and if we lack either of those, we are destitute of enjoyment in matters of religion.

I go for the remission of sin by faith, and without faith there is no remission. But then, faith must be perfected by complying with the conditions imposed. If repentance, baptism and prayer be conditions, then faith cannot take hold of the promise until the conditions are complied with. The conditions may be aptly compared to distance over which faith has to travel, before it reaches the thing promised.

Recapitulation. The remission of sins, as ministered by the prophets, was prospective. The remission of sins, as ministered by Jesus Christ in person, was matter of knowledge; and the remission of sins, as ministered by the Apostles, is retrospective, and has been fully confirmed by divine attestations.

Affectionately yours,

M. WINANS,

From ABBOTT'S "Principles of Maternal duty."

ADDRESS TO MOTHERS.

CHAPTER II.—MATERNAL AUTHORITY.

I HAVE thus endeavoured to show the mother how much her happiness is dependent upon the good or bad character of her children. Your own reflections and observation have, doubtless, impressed this subject most deeply upon your heart; the question has probably often presented itself to your mind while reading the previous chapter, "How shall I govern my children so as to secure their virtue and happiness?" This question I shall now endeavor to answer.

Obedience is absolutely essential to proper family government; without this all other efforts will be in vain. You may pray with and for your children; you may strive to instruct them in religious truth; you may be unwearied in your efforts to make them happy and to gain their affection; but if they are habituated to disobedience, your instructions will be lost, and your toil in vain. And by *obedience*, I do not mean languid and dilatory yielding to repeated threats, but prompt and cheerful acquiescence in parental commands; neither is it enough that a child should yield to your *arguments* and *persuasions*, it is essential that he should submit to your authority.

I will suppose a case in illustration of this last remark; your little daughter is sick, you go to her with the medicine prescribed for her, and the following dialogue ensues:—

"Here, my daughter, is some medicine for you."

"I don't want to take it, mamma."

"Yes, my dear, do take it, for it will make you feel better."

"No it won't, mother, I don't want it."

The mother continues her persuasions, and the child persists in its refusal; after a long and wearisome conflict, the mother is compelled either to throw the medicine away, or to resort to compulsion, and force down the unpalatable drug; thus instead of appealing to her own supreme authority, she is appealing to the reason of the child, and under these circumstances the child, of course, refuses to submit.

A mother, not long since, under similar circumstances, not being able to persuade her child to take the medicine, and not having sufficient resolution to compel it, threw the medicine away; when the physician next called she was ashamed to acknowledge her want of government, and therefore did not tell him that the medicine had not been given. The physician finding the child worse, left another prescription, supposing the previous one had been properly administered. But the child had no idea of being convinced of the propriety of taking the nauseous dose, and the renewed efforts of the mother were unavailing; again the fond and foolish, but cruel parent, threw the medicine away, and the fever was left to rage unchecked in its veins; again the physician called, and was surprised to find the inefficacy of his prescriptions,

and that the poor little sufferer was at the verge of death. The mother, when informed that her child must die, was in an agony, and confessed what she had done, but it was too late; the child died. And think you that mother gazed upon its pale corpse with any common emotions of anguish? Think you the idea never entered her mind that she was the destroyer of her child? Physicians will tell you that many children have thus been lost; unaccustomed to obedience when well, they are still more averse to it when sick; the efforts which are made to induce a stubborn child to take medicine often produce such an excitement as entirely to counteract the effect of the prescription, and thus is a mother often called to weep over the grave of her child, simply because she has not taught that child to obey.

It is certainly the duty of parents to convince their children of the reasonableness and propriety of their requirements; this should be done to instruct them, and to make them acquainted with moral obligation; but there should always be *authority* sufficient to enforce prompt obedience, whether the child can see the reason of the requirement or not; indeed it is impossible to govern a child by mere argument, many cases must occur in which it will be incapable of seeing the reasonableness of the command, and often its wishes will be so strongly opposed to duty, that all efforts to convince will be in vain. The first thing, therefore, to be aimed at, is to bring your child under perfect subjection, teach him that he must obey you, sometimes give him your reasons, again withhold them, but let him perfectly understand that he is to do as he is bid; accustom him to immediate and cheerful acquiescence in your will; this is obedience, and this is absolutely essential to good family government. Without this your family will present one continued scene of noise and confusion, the toil of rearing up your children will be almost insupportable, and, in all probability, your heart will be broken by their future licentiousness or ingratitude.

We come now to the inquiry, how is this habit of obedience to be established? This is not so difficult a matter as many imagine; it does not require profound learning or a mysterious skill which pertains but to the few. It is not greatness of talent or profound learning which is requisite to teach a child obedience; the principles by which we are to be guided are very simple and very plain.

1. Never give a command which you do not intend shall be obeyed. There is no more effectual way of teaching a child disobedience than by giving commands which you have no intention of enforcing; a child is thus habituated to disregard its mother, and, in a short time, the habit becomes so strong, and the child's contempt for the mother so confirmed, that entreaties and threats are alike unheeded.

"Mary, let that book alone;" says a mother to her little daughter, who is trying to pull the bible from the table.

Mary stops for a moment, and then takes hold of the book again. Soon after the mother looks up and sees that Mary is still playing with the bible, "Did you not hear me tell you to let that book alone?" she exclaims, "why don't you obey?"

Mary takes away her hand for a moment, but is soon again at her

forbidden amusement. By and by down comes the bible upon the floor. Up jumps the mother hastily, giving the child a passionate blow, and exclaims, "There, then, obey me next time." The child screams, and the mother picks up the bible, saying, "I wonder why my children do not obey me better."

This is not a very interesting family scene, but every one of my readers will admit that it is not an uncommon one; and it is strange that a child thus managed should be disobedient? No. She is actually led on by her mother to insubordination; she is actually taught to pay no heed to her directions, even the improper punishment which sometimes follow transgression is not inflicted on account of her disobedience, but for the accidental consequences. In the case above described, had the bible not fallen, the disobedience of the child would have passed unpunished: let it be an immutable principle in family government that your word is law.

I was once, when riding in the country, overtaken by a shower, and compelled to seek shelter in a farm-house. Half a dozen rude and ungovernable boys were racing about the room, in such an uproar as to prevent the possibility of conversation with the father, who was sitting by the fire. As I, however, endeavoured to make some remark, the father shouted out, "Stop that noise, boys."

They paid no more heed to him than they did to the rain. Soon again, in an irritated voice, he exclaimed, "Boys, be still, or I will whip you—as sure as you are alive I will." But the boys, as though accustomed to such threats, screamed and quarrelled without intermission.

At last the father said to me, "I believe I have got the worst boys in the country, I never can make them mind me."

The fact was, these boys had the worst father. He was teaching them disobedience as directly and effectually as he could; he was giving commands which he had no intention of enforcing, and they knew it. This, to be sure, is an extreme case. But just so far as any mother allows her authority to be disregarded, so far does she expose herself to the contempt of her children, and actually teaches them lessons of disobedience.

And is there any difficulty in enforcing obedience to any definite command? Take the case of the child playing with the bible. A mild and judicious mother says distinctly and decidedly to her child, "My dear, that is the bible, and you must not play with it." The child hesitates for a moment, but yielding to the strong temptation, is soon playing with the forbidden book. The mother immediately rises, takes the child, and carries her into her chamber. She sits down, and says calmly, "Mary, I told you not to touch the bible, and you have disobeyed me. I am very sorry, for now I must punish you."

Mary begins to cry, and to promise not to do so again.

"But Mary," says the mother, "you have disobeyed me, and you must be punished."

Mary continues to cry, but the mother seriously and calmly punishes her. She inflicts real pain—pain that will be remembered.

She then says, "Mary, it makes mother very unhappy to have to punish you: she loves her little daughter, and wishes to have her a good girl."

She then, perhaps, leaves her to herself for a few minutes. A little solitude will deepen the impression made.

In five or ten minutes she returns, takes Mary in her lap, and says, "My dear, are you sorry that you disobeyed mother?"

"Almost any child would say, "Yes."

"Will you be careful and not disobey me again?"

"Yes, mother."

"Well, Mary," says her mother, "I will forgive you, but God is displeased; you have disobeyed him as well as me. Do you wish me to ask God to forgive you?"

"Yes, mother," answers the child.

The mother then kneels with her daughter, and offers a simple prayer for forgiveness, and the return of peace and happiness. She then leads her out, humbled and subdued. At night, just before she goes to sleep, she mildly and affectionately reminds her of her disobedience, and advises her to ask God's forgiveness again. Mary, in child-like simplicity, acknowledges to God what she has done, and asks him to forgive her and take care of her during the night.

When this child awakes in the morning, will not her young affections be more strongly fixed upon her mother, in consequence of the discipline of the preceding day? As she is playing about the room, will she be likely to forget the lesson she has been taught, and again reach out her hand to a forbidden object? Such an act of discipline tends to establish a general principle in the mind of a child, which will be of permanent operation, extending its influence to every command, and promoting the general authority of the mother and the subjection of the child.

I know that some mothers say that they have not time to pay so much attention to their children. But the fact is, that not one third of the time is required to take care of an orderly family, which is necessary to take care of a disorderly one. To be faithful in the government of your family, is the only way to save time. Can you afford to be distracted and harassed by continued disobedience? Can you spare the time to have your attention called away every moment, from the business in which you are engaged, by the mischievousness of your wilful children?

Look at the parent surrounded by a family of children who are in the habit of doing as they please. She is very busy, I will suppose, in making some articles of dress, which it is important should be immediately finished. Every moment she is compelled to raise her eyes from her work to see what her children are about. Samuel is climbing upon the table. Jane is pulling out the drawers. John is galloping about the room upon the poker. The mother, almost deafened with noise, wonders what makes her children so much more troublesome than other people's.

"Jane, let those drawers alone," she exclaims. Jane runs away

for a moment, chases Charles around the room, and returns to her mischief.

"Charles, put up the poker." Charles pays no heed to the direction.

The mother, soon seeing how he is wearing the carpet, and bruising the furniture, gets up, gives Charles a shake, and places the poker in its proper situation; but by the time she is fairly seated, and at her work again, Charles is astride the shovel, and riding at full speed.

I need not continue this description; but every one knows that it is not exaggerated; such scenes do often occur. Thousands of immortal spirits are trained up in this turbulence and anarchy and noise, for time and for eternity. Now this mother will tell you she *has not time* to bring her children into subjection; whereas, had she been faithful with each individual child, she would have saved herself a vast amount of time and toil.

We will suppose the case of another mother, who has the same work to perform. She has taught her children prompt and implicit obedience. She gives three of them, perhaps, some blocks, in one corner of the room, and tells them that they may play at "build houses," but that they must not make much noise, and must not interrupt her, for she wishes to finish some work. The other three sit in another corner of the room, with their slates, and tells them they may play at "make pictures." The children, accustomed to such orderly arrangements, employ themselves, very quietly and happily, for perhaps three quarters of an hour. The mother goes on uninterrupted in her work. Occasionally she raises her eyes, and says an encouraging word to her children, now noticing the little architects in the corner, and now glancing her eye at the drawings upon the slates; thus showing the children that she sympathises with them, and takes an interest in their enjoyments. The children are pleased and happy; the mother is undisturbed.

She does not let them continue their amusements till they are weary of them. But after they have played perhaps three-quarters of an hour, she says,

"Come, children, you have played long enough, you may take up all your little blocks, and put them away in the drawer."

"Oh, mother," says Maria, "do let me play a little while longer, for I have got my house almost done?"

"Well, you may finish it," says the judiciously kind mother, "but tell me as soon as it is done?"

In a few minutes Maria says, "There ma', see what a large house I have built!" The mother looks at it and adds a pleasant word of encouragement, and then tells them to put all their blocks in the proper place. She tells the children with the slates to hang up their slates, and put away their pencils; so that the next day, when slates and blocks are wanted, no time may be lost in searching for them.

Now which mother has the most time? and which mother has the happiest time? and which mother will find the most comfort in the subsequent character and affection of her children?

Perhaps some one will say, this is a pleasing picture, but where are we to look for its reality? It is indeed to be regretted that such scenes are of so unfrequent occurrence, but it is far from being true, that they do not occur. There are many such families, of happy parents, and affectionate children. And these families are not confined to the wealthy and the learned. It requires not wealth, and it requires not extensive learning, to train up such a family. The principle of government is simple and plain. It is to begin with enforcing obedience to every command; it is to establish the principle that a mother's word is never to be disregarded. Every judicious parent will indeed, try to gratify her children in their reasonable wishes; she will study to make them happy; but she will never allow them to gratify themselves in contradiction to her wishes.

To illustrate this, let us refer to the children playing with the blocks. Maria asks permission to play a few moments longer, till she can finish her house. The mother, desirous of making her children as happy as she can, grants this reasonable wish. Here is a judicious indulgence. But suppose again that the children had continued playing, without regard to their mother's command. They intend perhaps to continue their amusement, only till they complete the pile then in progress. Here is an act of direct disobedience. The children are consulting their own inclinations instead of the commands of their mother. A judicious parent will not allow such an act to pass unnoticed or unpunished. She may perhaps think, considering the circumstances of the case, that a serious reprimand is all that is required. But she will not fail to seize upon the occasion to instil into their minds a lesson of obedience.

It is said that by noticing such little things a mother must be continually finding fault? but it is not a *little thing* for a child to disobey a mother's commands. This one act of disregarding authority, prepares the way for another. It is the commencement of evil which must be resisted. The very first appearances of insubordination must be checked. There are doubtless cases of trifling faults occurring, which a wise parent will judge it expedient to overlook. Children will be thoughtless and inadvertent. They will occasionally err from strict propriety, without any real intention of doing wrong. Judgment is here requisite in deciding what things must be overlooked. But we may be assured, I think, that direct and open disobedience is not, in any case, to be classed among the number of trifling faults. The eating of forbidden fruit banished our first parents from paradise. The atrocity of the offence consisted in its disobedience to a Divine command.

Now every mother has power to obtain prompt obedience, if she commence with her children when they are young. They are then entirely in her hands. All their enjoyments are at her disposal. God has thus given her all the power, that she may govern and guide them as she pleases. We have endeavoured to show, by the preceding illustrations, that the fundamental principle of government is, *When you do give a command, invariably enforce its obedience.* And God has given every mother the power. He has placed in your hands a helpless

labe, entirely dependent upon you, so that if it disobeys you, all you have to do, is to cut off its sources of enjoyment, or inflict bodily pain so steadily and so invariably, that disobedience and suffering shall be indissolubly connected in the mind of the child. What more power can a parent ask for, than God has already given? And if we fail to use this power for the purposes for which it was bestowed, the sin is ours, and upon us and upon our children the consequences must rest. The exercise of discipline must often be painful, but if you shrink from duty here, you expose yourself to all that sad train of woes which disobedient children leave behind them. If you cannot summon sufficient resolution to deprive them of enjoyment and to inflict pain, when it is necessary, then you must feel that a broken heart, and an old age of sorrow, will not be unmerited. And when you look upon your dissolute sons and ungrateful daughters, you must remember that the time was, when you might have checked their evil propensities. If you love momentary ease better than your children's welfare and your own permanent happiness, you cannot murmur at the lot you have freely chosen. And when you meet your children at the bar of God, and they point to you, and say, "It was your neglect of duty which has banished us from heaven, and consigned us to endless woe," you must feel what no tongue can tell. Ah! it is dreadful for a mother to trifle with duty. Eternal destinies are committed to your trust. The influence you are now exerting will go on, and will extend onwards through eternal ages.

BROTHER MITCHELL,

In the June number of the *Christian*, we promised a notice of your suggestion relative to the assertion that "no man believed that Jesus Christ would die as a sin offering, or rise from the dead, from Eve to Mary Magdalene." This was an assertion of Br. Campbell; whether it is well sustained or not, the following article, from the *Christian Baptist*, will show.—ED.

"That the glad tidings were announced to Abraham, that in his seed all the families of the earth should one day be blessed, I rejoice to know. But whether Abraham, or any of the Patriarchs after him, apprehended the character of this seed, or the nature of the blessing in which all nations were to participate, I have much reason to doubt. When Abraham offered up his son Isaac upon the altar, it may be presumed, from what Paul says, that he saw *the day* of the resurrection: "Abraham rejoiced that he should see my day, and he did see it, and was glad," said the Messiah. He desired to see it; and in receiving his son Isaac from the dead, *in a figure*, he desired, as afar off, the resurrection of the antitype of Isaac. But all this, and much more to the same effect, found in the Prophets, is not enough to refute the assertion on which your remarks are predicated. That the sufferings of the Messiah and the glory to which he was destined, and the sufferings on account of

Christ, and the glories to which they led, were literally and symbolically portrayed by many of the Prophets, I am happy to learn. But whether they who uttered these predictions, or they who read them, understood the import of them, is just the question. Peter authorizes me to think they did not understand them; for, says he, "they searched diligently to know what people and what times and things these were, which the spirit which was in them mean." Now if they who uttered the voice of the Spirit did not understand that voice, what reason have we to believe that their hearers understood it? But take, for example, a parallel case. No event was more clearly or frequently foretold, than the calling of the Gentiles into the family of God. David and Isaiah describe it in the plainest language, and in the most striking symbols. Yet, not one of the Apostles, till long after Pentecost, apprehended it. So universal was the mistake, or rather so perfect was the secret, that Paul says, "It was a secret hid from ages and generations," which none of the ancients understood—"that the Gentiles should be fellow-citizens with the saints," or Jewish converts, and members of the family of God. Now the argument is, if an event as clearly and fully predicted as any of the gospel facts was not understood by the Apostles during the lifetime of the Messiah, nor by any of the intelligent converts, highly gifted by the Holy Spirit, until the conversion of Cornelius, what good reason have we to conclude that because the sacrifice of Christ and his resurrection from the dead were clearly predicted, they were more distinctly understood, or more fully comprehended! But the fact that not one of his disciples expected his resurrection, nor knew why he died, is the fullest proof that can be offered in confirmation of the assertion. And have we not reason to think that during the lifetime of the Messiah there was as much knowledge of his mission and its object, as at any former period of the history of the nation. But when I write on the Jewish Age and Religion, it will become my duty to make these matters more plain.

"In the mean time I could wish that all my readers would keep in mind that where there is no testimony there can be no belief. And where neither testimony nor the evidence of sense assures us of any fact, event, or existence, there may be opinions, but there can be neither faith nor knowledge. And in all matters of opinion the utmost liberty ought to be conceded.

"That the Messiah was anticipated and expected to be a Prophet, a Priest, and a King, I may believe; but that the nature and design of these offices were understood as we christians understand them, by any of those who lived under the letter or law, evidence to my mind, at least, is wanting.

"A. CAMPBELL."

TO GIVE REFORMATION, or to give repentance, common version *dounai metanoian*; Acts v. 31. Doddridge makes Josephus explain this phrase. He quotes from Josephus the phrase, "*Dounai metanoian epi tois pepragmenois*," to publish a pardon to those who lay down their arms. To give repentance, is to afford scope for it, or to make a proclamation offering inducements to it.

It is seldom we take the liberty of publishing private letters addressed to us. But that the friends and enemies of our publication may know the reception that it meets in other places, we have trespassed on the confidence of our brother so far as to give a part of his letter to our readers. While the *Christian* has such friends, we fear not any want of patronage. We shall feel ourselves much gratified, as well as obliged to Br. Bryden, when he finds time to furnish the proposed communication.—ED.

LIVERPOOL, (Q. C.) N. S., JULY 6, 1840.

My dear Brother Eaton,—There is some no small gratification in addressing you as above—as one who, in the course of providence, is set for the advancement and defence of the truth—the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as it is revealed to mankind in the word of God. Who that fears, loves, and obeys God, is there that would not be willing to comply with the terms of the “*The Christian* ;” devoted as it is to the restoration of the people of God to the full enjoyment of their heirship. Many, very many, who profess themselves heirs of all that is heavenly, are not willing to obey God and the Saviour, according to the word of God, are not willing that the *Christian* should be circulated, such are not willing that the ancient simplicity of the Christians, in all their acts of obedience, should be pressed home upon their attention. I have found this to be the case in these parts ; yea, the ultimatum of all their joys and hopes, are not what was done 1800 years ago ; but, “*I FEEL*, and because I *feel* as others have *felt*, I’m not only saved, but never can be lost. A crown of glory awaits me, for I have *felt*—yes, I have *felt* my sins forgiven ; my soul washed in the blood of the Redeemer, and he never will forsake me—never will leave me.” But touch them with the two-edged sword, and they shrink, they dodge, they leave you ; they fly from you as from a serpent, and traduce you with epithets that a *genteel unbeliever* would not disgrace himself with using. This may seem harsh, but it is true, and I lament it ; would that it were otherwise.

But I have not written that which I intended, and I do not know that I can at present. At some future period, not far distant, if spared, I shall give you an exact account of the state of this County with respect to religious matters, for your own personal knowledge. In the mean time I have only to say to you, that there is not a Church in this county established and acting upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, having Jesus as their chief corner stone ; disallowed indeed of men, in this place, but chosen of God. “*The Christian*” had but a very limited circulation in these parts the past year, and I do not know that I can warrant it any other this year ; but an effort shall be made. I am happy that brethren Howard and Doyle have agreed to travel through the province for this year ; and do think that if one or the other could make a stay in this county for a month something good would be done. There have been, and are, some enquiries, “when

will Mr. Howard be this way? I want to hear him again,"—"he has spoiled my ear for hearing sermonizing;" and many such like questions and sayings.

I hope you have obtained a sufficient amount of assurances to risk the second volume. Go on, my brother; and He who overrules all, and in whose service you are heartily engaged, will do more and better for you than all your fears.

Is there any hope of Brother Alexander Campbell visiting these Provinces this season?*

I must bid you adieu for the present, and remain, yours in the bonds of peace.

WILLIAM BRYDEN.

* Not this season.—Ed.

From the Christian Messenger.

To the Rev. W. W. Eaton, Editor of the *CHRISTIAN*, Saint John, N. B.

DEAR SIR—I have received the three last numbers of the *Christian*, and I have carefully read and examined the letters you address to me in them. Your object seems to be to expose what you consider the unscriptural practice of the Baptist Churches in these Provinces in requiring a Christian experience, or in examining the effects of faith and repentance on the hearts and lives of persons wishing to be baptized.

The joys, the sorrows, and the hopes of the young convert, you compare to the delusive feelings of the *Romanists*, the *Free-Thinker*, the *Mahomedan*, and the *Hindoo*, after they have performed their idolatrous worship. Godly sorrow for sin, with the love of God in the heart, and joy and peace in believing, and all the exercises of the christian's mind, you condemn as the workings of a deceitful heart. You say you are bold to assert, "that all who are trusting in these things are trusting in themselves," trusting in that for which we have neither precept nor example in God's word.

In my humble opinion, your censures and denunciations against the practices of others on this subject, arise from unscriptural and erroneous views of faith in yourself. Such indistinct views as deprive faith of all its scriptural properties, and make it no better than the influence of tradition and the effects of education.

The faith of the gospel is the same in every age. But it must be admitted that circumstances and time give weight and evidence to a profession of that faith, more at one period than at another. In the Apostolic age, when men professed the religion of Christ, they had to suffer the loss of all things, and often the loss of life itself. Trajan, the Roman Emperor, passed an edict condemning to death all who professed the religion of Christ. In giving directions to a Roman Governor how to proceed in prosecutions against christians, he said, "when brought to trial, if they desecrate Christ, and worship the gods, let nothing further be done, but if they openly profess Christ and will not worship the gods, let them be condemned as guilty of capital crime."

Who will say that for one in such circumstances to say *he believed in Christ*, did not carry with it greater evidence of the genuine nature of faith, than for one now in the age in which we live, and under the circumstances in which we are placed, to say that *he believes*. Then to profess the gospel of Christ, was to invite reproach, persecution, and death; but now to profess that gospel, is often the way to honor and preferment in the world.

The scriptures establish the truth, that more is implied in believing in Christ, than the assent of the mind, in men saying they believe. Faith is said to work by love, in Gal. 5—6. *But faith that worketh by love*—It purifies the heart, Acts 15—9. *Purifying their hearts by faith*—It justifies and gives peace of mind. Rom. 5—1. *Being justified by faith, we have peace with God*—It imparts holy joy. 1 Peter 1—8. *Believing we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory*—It sanctifies the soul. Acts 21—18. *That is sanctified by faith which is in me*—It produces good works. James 2—17. *Faith without works is dead being alive*—Once more, it makes Christ precious. 1 Peter 2, 7. *To you that believe he is precious*. Is it not evident from the above scriptures, that the faith which the gospel requires, which saves sinners, and qualifies for the ordinances of Christ, possesses these qualities; it works by love; purifies the heart; justifies the sinner; gives peace of mind; sanctifies the soul; imparts holy joy; produces good works; and makes Christ precious to the soul. The faith of Jesus is inseparably connected with all those holy feelings against which you so loudly proclaim, as injurious to the souls of men; and which you compare to the orgies of the Hindoo and the blasphemies of the Free-Thinker. Holy feelings, which we could as much separate from true faith, as we could separate light and heat from the sun.

I think, Sir, it must be clear to every prayerful reader of the Bible, that your charges are more against the word of God, and the faith therein revealed, than against those who require the true marks and properties of faith; in order to enjoy the fellowship of the Church of Christ.

In your second letter you ask, “can any exercise of the mind be proof, that we are in the favor of God.” Again you inquire, “where, in all the volume of inspiration, are we informed that, because we have had serious impressions, anxiety of mind, that peace ensues; that we therefore are born of God?” You answer that “in no age of the world, has any man’s feelings been recognized as *proof* of his being in the favour of God.”

My dear Sir, I am surprised to hear a man who is not only a professed minister of religion, but professes to be engaged in restoring primitive christianity, make such assertions; assertions as much opposed to God’s word as light is to darkness. Have you not read Christ’s words in John 14, 21, ‘He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father,’ verse 23, ‘and if any man love me my Father will love him,’ and 1 John 4, 7, ‘He that loveth is born of God.’ No feeling so strong as love! it is even said in Songs. 8, 9, to be stronger than death. Whether we are to believe God or you, judge ye.

That the first Preachers of the gospel required such a faith as we have described, will be plain, if we consider the profession made by the first christian converts, and the character of that faith which was required of them.

When the forerunner of our Lord was baptizing in Jordan, many of the Sadducees and Pharisees came to his baptism. There is no doubt but they professed repentance and faith in the Messiah which was to come. John did not refuse them baptism but for want of fruits meet for repentance. And let it be remembered that the Pharisees were proverbial for their morality; therefore the fruits required of them could not be moral acts, but must mean those fruits which are ever produced by repentance in both the moral and profane, such as broken and contrite hearts; godly sorrow for sin; disclaiming all confidence in our own righteousness, and a turning from sin to God. Indeed, Sir, John the Baptist and you are so much at variance in your views and practice, that he required what you consider unnecessary, and commended what you condemn. Between his practice in not receiving to his baptism without the fruits of repentance, and the practice of our Churches, there is such a striking resemblance, that all the evils you charge to the baptists must with equal force have applied to the forerunner of our Lord.

On the day of Pentecost, when Peter preached his memorable sermon, and three thousand souls believed, what account is given of the persons baptized? It is said they were pricked in their hearts, and said to Peter and the rest of the Apostles, "men and brethren, what shall we do?" They were not only brought to feel pungent convictions for sin, but holy joy in the Saviour. "They received the word gladly." They were the subjects of all those sorrows and joys we require of persons wishing to be baptized.

When the Eunuch said, "here is water, what hindereth me to be baptized? Philip said, if thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest." Here a belief of the heart is distinguished from assent in words. The heart is a general term used, sometimes for the conscience, as in John 3, 20, "*If thy heart condemn thee,*" &c. On other occasions used for the understanding, Rom. 1, 20, "*Their foolish hearts were darkened.*" Mat. 22, 37, it is used for the affections. "*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart.*" It is plain that to believe with the heart implies the exercise of the conscience in convincing us of our sin, and need of a redeemer, and of the understanding, in discovering the suitableness and all sufficiency of Christ, as our saviour, and also the exercise of the affections in embracing him as the gift of the father's love.

In James 1, 19, it is said that the devils believe and tremble. With your greatest charity, you must conclude that the faith of many who say they believe is not so great as the faith of devils. How many say they believe, who never trembled for their sins, nor felt alarmed on account of their danger. Alas! is it not too true that the profane swearer, the sabbath breaker, and the drunkard, will often say they believe? And can we, in view of the judgment seat of Christ, indulge the sinner

that he is safe, while he is without that *faith*, which works by love and purifies the heart? A minister of religion is like the master of a vessel at sea, who if he takes a wrong course, not only endangers his own life, but the life of all on board.

In the close I would say, I feel grateful for the christian esteem you express toward me in your letters, and as I conclude your object was to expose what you considered error, and nothing personally, I hope you will view this in the some light. In my next letter, I purpose to examine the place assigned to Christian Baptism in the scriptures; and in what sense remission and washing away of sin are applied to it; and what I conceive is the path for Ministers and Churches to pursue, in admitting persons to that holy ordinance.

With ardent desires that you and I may be led into all truth, I subscribe myself yours, in christian esteem,

SAMUEL ROBINSON.

St. George; April 16, 1840.

REPLY TO MR. ROBINSON'S LETTER.

My dear Sir—I have deferred an answer to your letters until it has become apparent that the conductors of the "*Messenger*" are determined neither to publish my letters nor furnish a reason. Should I act after the "*manner of men*," a few sentences only, of your letters, would make their appearance in our publication. The natural dispositions of men prompt them to do unto *others* as *they* do unto them, and on this principle sectarian periodicals are conducted; but the golden rule is, "*as ye would that others should do unto you*," &c. It was my desire that my letters should have appeared in the "*Messenger*," so that those who saw one side, might be able to see who had the greatest amount of truth to present to an inquiring public; but the editors of the *Messenger* appear to be unwilling so to act, and being myself, at least *desirous* of acting up to the rule by which I profess to be guided, I have given your letter to our readers entire. Of them, we have only one request to make, after they have carefully examined your letter, viz.: Turn to the first volume, and read those letters to which this purports to be a reply. I do not, however, attach any blame to you, sir, for the course pursued by the *Messenger*, for I think that your magnanimity and sense of justice are so high, that you would have the Baptist community hear both sides. And here, perhaps, an apology from me may be considered necessary by some of our friends, for a remark in the June number, relative to your unwillingness to have both sides appear before the same readers. Since that was printed, I have learned by your last letter that you *had furnished* my letters to the editors for insertion, "*if they saw fit*." They are not so disposed. The reader knows the reasons as well as I do, and you perhaps better! I am, therefore, left to do unto others as *I would* they would do unto me; and I pray Heaven that I may never be left to advocate a sentiment against which I shall feel unwilling to hear what any honest man can say!

In relation to your letters I have said, "that in them I am charged with sentiments I never uttered!" Now for the proof. In the second paragraph of the letter now before me, you say that I compare the joys, the sorrows, and the hopes of the young convert to the delusive feelings of the *Romanist, Free-thinker, &c.*" If by a young convert you mean one who professes to be a Christian, who is not an obedient believer in Jesus Christ, I plead *guilty* to the charge. But, if by a young convert you mean one who has been born again, which, I presume, is your meaning, I am *not* guilty. Such a sentiment I never penned, neither did it ever enter my heart. In summing up my argument, these are my words, [vol. 1, p. 239,] "He who believes that he is a christian because of his dreams, visions, or feelings, is leaning on a broken reed." The hopes of such persons I compared to the sincere among the Romanists, Free-thinkers, &c. I never compared "Godly sorrow for sin, with the love of God in the heart, and joy and peace in believing," &c. to the workings of a deceitful heart! I never have asserted that those who are trusting in these exercises, are trusting in themselves. You may enquire, to whom then had I reference. If you will please to look at my second letter again, (p. 238,) you will see that it was not those who had "the love of God in the heart, and joy and peace in believing;" but this is my language: "those who are trusting in any thing they have *felt*, are trusting in *themselves*." How is it possible, my dear sir, that you would run the risk of marking as a quotation a part of a sentence; giving the readers of the *Messenger* to understand that they were my own words, when I had neither uttered or written any such thing! This is the case with the sentence under consideration; the first words of mine that you have attempted to quote! You copied so little of my letter, that, truly, you ought to have given what I *did* say, when an effort was made to give my words!

There are many such *little* things in the first letter which I have not time to notice; and had I, perhaps it would not be agreeable to the feelings of many to go into such an exposure. The reader can exercise his own judgment. To the decisions of the *partial*, I am perfectly willing to submit, relative to the candor and christian spirit exhibited in such "assertions are as much opposed to God's word as light is to darkness!" I shall not attempt to draw such conclusions. With the diligent student of the Living Oracles I shall leave such decisions. Should the same persons read the *Christian* attentively that read the *Messenger*, I should have no fears as to the result!

That you may be fully apprised of the sentiments for which we plead, and those against which I aimed my second letter, I shall now make a fair statement of both sides.

When I would draw my conclusions relative to the state or condition of one of my fellow creatures, I endeavor, from himself and others, to learn what his *faith, practice, and determinations* are. If they accord with the word of God, I feel myself bound to acknowledge him a disciple of Jesus Christ; and consequently, an heir to all the privileges and immunities of the kingdom of heaven. But if, on the contrary, his *faith and practice* do not correspond with the words of the Holy

Spirit, however joyful and zealous he is, a disciple of Christ he cannot be! Pious and devout he may be considered; honest and sincere none would question; he may *feel* happy and willing to die—he may profess to love God and all the human family; yet, if he is not obedient to Jesus Christ—if he does not take up his cross and follow him, “he cannot,” says the Saviour, “be my disciple.” My object, therefore, has been to draw off the mind from self, and have it placed wholly on Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, by fixing it on the word of God. This, sir, has been, and is now, the *ultimatum* of my labors!

On the other hand, from what I have seen, read, and heard of the practice of Baptist and other churches, I have been led to the conclusion that they place the evidences of their conversion and acceptance with God on what passes within themselves. The faith of the candidate for admission to the privileges of the church is not scrutinized. Of this you are unquestionably aware—for you have more than once, even in this City, given the “right hand of fellowship” to those who were as much Arminian in sentiment as any Wesleyan clergyman in the Province! You must have been sensible of this at the time. I am not aware that you even question the candidate relative to his faith in the Lord Jesus. And as to his repentance: Is the inquiry made whether he has “ceased to do evil,” and is now determined, by the Grace of God, “to learn to do well?” Is this not designated by the majority of Baptist preachers, only a “legal repentance?” What, then, are the inquiries? Are they not in substance the following? Do you *feel* to trust in God? Does Christ appear precious to you? Have you *felt* the burden of your sins? Do you now *feel* that your sins are forgiven you? How do christians appear to you? Did you ever feel that it would be just in God to cast you off forever? This last question has frequently been put in another form, as—Did you ever feel as willing to be damned as to be saved? Such in substance are the questions put to a candidate for baptism, in order to ascertain whether he is a disciple of Christ or not.

If this is not leading an individual to trust in himself, will you be so kind as to inform the readers of the *Christian* what is meant by trusting in one’s self? This, sir, is what I oppose. If our feelings spring from the heart, and we trust in them, aside from the sanctions of Holy Writ, we certainly are trusting to our own hearts! and how much better is the foundation on which such persons stand, than that of the greatest fanatic in the realm? This is the origin of all the ignorance, coldness, apathy, and indifference in the land. So long as the person feels “thus and so,” he considers that he is an heir of glory; but when these feelings subside, he either becomes a worldling again, or he falls into a state of despair, and sings:

“’Tis a point I long to know,
Oft it causes anxious thought—
Do I love the Lord, or no?
Am I his, or am I not.
* * * * *

“Lord, decide the doubtful case!
Thou who art thy people’s sun,
Shine upon thy work of grace,
If it be indeed begun!”

This is the unhappy state of those who are trusting in themselves. Such was not the experience of the primitive Christians! They knew in whom they believed. They laid an humble claim to the promise, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." They remembered the words of the Lord Jesus, and built upon them. They felt safe, because their feelings were the result of their faith and obedience. They looked away to him who had become the consummation of all sin offerings. They treasured up such truths as the following, "whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who built his house upon a rock;" and they acted so as to lay claim to them. If at any time they had doubts and fears, it was in consequence of departing from the straight and narrow path; and even these did not distress them relative to the past, but the future. They believed their sins *were* forgiven them, for *God had said so*; their only fears were, that through the force of temptation, they might be induced to leave the path of life and happiness. This is evident, from every epistle written to the churches.

With this before you, sir, I trust you can have no remaining doubts as to the sentiments I oppose, and those I advocate. They are just as different in their effects and their results as the word of *God* and the words of erring *man*!

On one point, and one alone, you join issue. I asserted (page 238, vol. 1,) that "in no dispensation, in no age of the world, have any man's feelings been recognized by Heaven, as proof of his being in the favor of God." You express surprise and astonishment that a minister of religion should make such an assertion! Why did you not produce testimony from the word of God where individuals were said to be followers of Christ, because they felt that they loved God? The words *feel*, and *feeling*, are found but *twice* in the New Testament, where they can *possibly* refer to the question before us, and in neither place do they refer to the question under consideration! It is said, Acts xvii. 27, that God conferred many blessings on the heathen, "if happily they might feel after him, and find him," &c. And of the same characters the Apostle, Eph. iv. 19, declares that they "were past feeling." Instead of giving direct evidence to sustain your views, the fact that love to God is a proof of acceptance with him, is then presented. With cheerfulness we will hear what the Lord says: "He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father." John xiv. 21. The inquiry then which naturally rises is—And who loves the Saviour? Hear the *whole* verse, "He that *hath* my commandments, and *keepeth* them, he it is that *loveth* me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father," &c. Here him again, verse 23, "If a man love me he *will* keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." Now, sir, does this testimony aid the cause of feelings, or the sentiments for which I plead? You say that the feelings of poor, ignorant, fallible, passionate man are evidence that he is born of God; we say they *are not*, unless he has *obeyed* the Gospel, and then they are only secondary. I do not see why we may not as well call faith, repentance, and baptism, feel-

ings as well as love. But be this as it may, of one thing we are certain, that no man can prove that he believes the Gospel, or loves God, unless he obeys his commands. Here, then, we are at the place from whence we started, viz. "No man's feelings are an evidence of pardon." You might properly have also quoted, "by this we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." And how do we know that we love the brethren? "By this we know that we love the children of God, (synonymous with brethren,) when we love God and keep his commandments." How shall we ascertain that we love God? "This is the love of God that you keep his commandments."

Why, sir, I am surprised that you would partially quote a few such sentences on this important subject! Had I not supposed them familiar to all my readers, I should certainly have given them in my letters as proof of my position, viz.: that no man could produce an evidence that he was a child of God, until he had obeyed his commandments! Were your "young converts," those who were filled with "love and joy," of the class relative to which the Saviour and the Apostles spoke? If so, their feelings, no doubt, were such as should be cherished and encouraged; but if our feelings tell us that we are the followers of the Lamb, when we are living in disobedience, they are not from God. Ah! my dear sir, let us teach ourselves and hearers not to love merely in "word and in tongue," but in "deed and in truth." O let it be ever impressed on our minds, that let our feelings and impressions be what they may—though our fellow creatures should say that such feelings were evidence that we love God; yet, an Apostle under the direction of God's spirit has said, "if we say we know God and keep not his commandments, we are liars, and the truth is not in us!" How then shall we be assured of an interest in him? Hear the same Apostle—"Hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments."

I suppose, from what has been written, I shall be held up again to the public as an opposer and scoffer at a religion of feeling! This, however, is not a fact; for he who believes the truth and obeys it, is ever filled with joy. The individual who places implicit confidence in the word of God, and is assured that his conduct is under its guidance, is in the enjoyment of uninterrupted good feelings. I go for a doctrine which has first a place in the understanding, shewing a sinner what he is, and what God requires of him; thus captivating the heart, and enlisting all the finest feelings of our whole rational nature.

I appeal to no human testimony in proof of the sentiments we advocate. But, sir, even in this city I have sat by the bedside of those baptized on a profession of their faith in Christ; and those, too, who had been baptised on a profession of their experience, and in every instance, sir, would I rest the whole controversy on your own decisions, relative to the enjoyment and good feelings of the parties! The former were, without an exception, calm, resigned, and happy; willing to live or die; perfectly resigned to the will of God. The other, sometimes happy; and then, again, filled with distressing doubts and fears—mourning the absence of the Lord. I have gone from the bedside

of the one to the other; ah! what a contrast. In one room I have been surrounded with gloom and sadness; in the other, transporting joy has filled my soul, in hope of soon meeting the dear saint of God in a brighter world of bliss! As to the eternal destiny of the other, I would not now express a doubt; but of this I am certain, that he who is led entirely by the word of God, enjoys ten thousand times more in this life, than he who is under the dominion of his feelings.

On this point, I suppose, I have written enough already; but, as I desire not only to put the subject at rest, but also to make it plain to the most ordinary capacity, I shall add a few more remarks.

Where there is no intelligence communicated to the mind, there can be no feeling on the subject. For example: no person ever desired to go to heaven until he heard there was such a place; no sinner fears hell until he believes there is such a place. Women never mourn the loss of a husband until they have reason to believe that they are gone. I did not *feel* surprised that you furnished another publication with answers to my letters until I heard and saw the fact! From these common sense principles may we not assert without any fear of contradiction, that no person can *feel* his sins forgiven until he believes this to be the case. On what testimony then, sir, does your "young convert" believe that he is pardoned? It must be either a direct revelation from God, or testimony found in the Bible, or human testimony. If the first, then, God's special revelations differ from the old one, for that does not testify that any man, since the kingdom of the Lord was set up, was pardoned until he obeyed that "form of doctrine delivered to the Apostles;" but your converts rejoiced in belief of pardon *before* they were obedient! The inevitable conclusion then must be that they believed, they were forgiven on human testimony alone! And pray, sir, how much better is it to trust in the testimony of one of our poor fellow creatures than to trust in ourselves? You know, sir, that it is very common for many to say, "If baptism is for remission of sins, what then is to become of this *good* man, and the other dear soul, who have died without it!" The ultimate destiny of such is not the question under consideration now. That shall receive our attention at some future time, the Lord willing. Those, however, who appeal to those "young converts" and these "good and great men," show a greater fondness for *human* than *divine* testimony, to say the least!

Do not the majority of the Baptists conceive, that for a person to have an evidence of remission of sins, he must have a special revelation from heaven? I do not accuse them of holding such a sentiment, but, really, it appears to me that this is the case! I should have no objection to these new revelations, dreams, &c. if they would keep within the bounds of old revelation; but, generally, they are like the modern creeds and articles of faith, either going beyond, falling short, or contradicting the word of God. I, therefore, enter my protest against all new revelations, creeds, confessions of faith, &c. I shall adopt none of them, until I find God's revelation and confession of faith insufficient!!

The conclusion, then, upon the whole premises, is, that no person

should feel that his sins are forgiven, until God says so; for those who do are trusting either to their own hearts or others! The question—Who are they to whom God makes this declaration? will come more properly in the second letter.

I now proceed to ascertain whether it be indeed a fact that my sentiments have originated from "erroneous views of faith," as you have asserted. You, however, in the very outset, admit that "the faith of the gospel is the same in every age." And what was the faith of the ancients? Was it not a firm persuasion of the truth of God? Neither myself or brethren, so far as I am informed, ever said that faith was only "the assent of the mind in men saying they believe;" and, from whence you receive authority to make this last assertion is to me rather a mystery. With us, "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom x. 17. The Lord Jesus prayed for all those who should believe in him through the Apostles' words. John xvii. 20. If there is any other kind of faith I desire not to know it, for this good reason—the blessed Jesus did not pray for any but those who had the above faith! If I were encumbered with another kind, I fear that I should lose sight of this, and I know that I should stand a poor chance without the intercession of the Lord; and he has given me no reason to expect his intercession, destitute of faith in his word. As to the subject of faith, however, the Apostle John settles the whole question. He declares that "these things are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his name." Now, you may call this "historical faith," an "assent of the mind," or what you please; but it is the faith that brings the soul into the enjoyment of life, and that is all I desire. All the other kinds of faith are not worth a straw, so far as our salvation is concerned!

You certainly were very unfortunate in your quotations to show the fruits of faith. The question before us—What effects are to be expected from faith *alone*! Now all these persons had not only believed and repented, but also been baptized. This was then the fruits of obedience. Those who add to their faith obedience, God fills them with "love;" "purifies their hearts;" they are "justified," and have "peace with God;" fills them with "joy;" "sanctifies them," and to them Christ is "precious;" then their faith "lives." All this is plain; but your "young convert is a *disobedient believer*!"

I think that you were rather hasty in saying that "the faith of Jesus is inseparably connected with all those (above enumerated) holy feelings;" for certainly, those on the day of Pentecost, who were pierced to the heart, believed; yet they did not rejoice until they were assured that there was pardon for them; then they "received the word gladly." Saul of Tarsus, no doubt, believed in the Saviour when he cried "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" and yet he was three days without sight, destitute of joy and happiness; and would have so continued until his dying day, had he not obeyed the command of God by Ananias. And, to the present day, did ever a sinner grieve on account of his sins, until he believed the word of God?

Therefore, faith must precede all sensations, whether of sorrow or joy.

A remark may be necessary here on repentance. I wish you and all our readers fully to understand what we mean by these cardinal words, viz. *Faith, Repentance, and Baptism*. The first, I hope, is already made plain. On the meaning of the third, between us, there is no controversy. And as to repentance, I have just to say, that by repentance I always mean such a grief for sin as induces the individual to forsake it. When I exhort a sinner to repent, I desire him to "cease to do evil and learn to do well." "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts," and then he will be, in my estimation, at least, a penitent sinner, and one who should be baptized for the remission of sins.

But those Pharisees whom you esteem as "proverbial for their morality!" John calls a "generation of vipers." The Lord says, "Woe unto ye, Scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites, for you devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers!" *Very moral, truly!!* I notice these things, not that they particularly affect the question at issue, but that you and my readers may see how easy it is for *great and good men* to make mistakes!

Now, sir, it appears to me that nothing can be more evident than this, viz. That the repentance of the Old and New Testaments was a change of purpose, action, or conduct. With this definition we can understand what is meant when it is said "God repented." When the "Ninevites repented at the preaching of Jonah"—that is, turned away from their wickedness, "God repented"—not that he became sorry and grieved, but he pursued another course of conduct in relation to them, and spared a city which was devoted to destruction. This, too, is in accordance with fixed principles, laid down in Jer. xviii. 7, 10.

I have again to repeat the position taken in one of my former letters (page 260) that the repentance required by John was a turning from sin. The people heard John say "bring forth fruits meet for repentance," and inquired, "what must we do?" John answered them all according to their circumstances. See the whole as recorded by Luke, chap. iii.

To conclude—permit me to say, that all which I have written has been with the purest of motives—the *elucidation of truth*. The Lord knows that I close this hastily written letter with feelings as benevolent as when we providentially met at the water's side, and together united in the interesting services connected with the holy ordinance of baptism; and believe me, sir, nothing would give me greater satisfaction than to see all who truly love and serve the Lord Messiah united here as they expect to be hereafter. This is the will of the Saviour; which will not be done until all his disciples are one, even as He and his Father are one.

That we may be actively engaged ushering in that glorious day, I am, sir, the prayer of your's affectionately,
W. W. EATON.

P. S. After the above was nearly written, and some of it printed, I learned the true cause of the non-appearance of Mr. Robinson's letter.

first in the "Christian." The news came several hundred miles. I presume, however, that it is none the less true for that. Mr. R. being asked, by one of his own brethren, why he resorted to the *Messenger* for an insertion of his letters, replied, "*Had they been printed first in the Christian, my brethren in St. George and elsewhere would have been desirous of seeing them, and this would have induced them to take that paper, and I feared that it would do more harm than good!*"

This, then, tells the whole story. Mr. R. and the baptist preachers generally know, that it will not do for "their people" generally, either to read our publications or hear our preachers! This will explain to the readers of this publication why it is that the Baptist Meeting houses are closed against brethren Howard and Doyle, in Nova Scotia, and those in New Brunswick against brother Garraty, and why in a great many places they exert all their influence even to prevent them from occupying school houses in which to hold meetings. And yet Mr. R. thinks that the days of persecution are gone by, and that now "to profess the gospel, is often the way to honor and preferment in the world!" It may be to profess the gospel which he preaches; but to advocate the gospel that Peter preached on Pentecost and in Jerusalem, is to draw down all the slander and detraction which the laws of the land will permit. Yes! it is as true now as it was eighteen hundred years ago, that "if any man will live godly in Christ Jesus he shall suffer persecution!" Brethren, this is part of our salary, let us receive it patiently, and praise the Lord that we are "counted worthy to suffer for his name." EDITOR.



SYNOPSIS OF A DISCOURSE ON THE KINGDOM.

BY M. WINANS.

"Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

It is admitted on all hands, I believe, that the above affirmative proposition contains in it the gospel which was every where preached by the Apostles. The question then is, where was this gospel first preached to the people? The answer to this question is, that it was first preached to the Jews on the Pentecost, mentioned in Acts chap. ii. and to the Gentiles, at the time mentioned, in Acts, chap. x. That the above gospel was not preached before Pentecost, can easily be shewn by reference to the prohibitions enjoined on the Apostles by the Lord, saying, Mat. xvi. 20, "Then charged he his disciples, that they should tell no man, that he was the Christ;" and again, Matt. xvii. 9, "And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of Man be risen from the dead," and again, Mark ix. 9 and 10, "And as they came down from the mountain, he charged that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the son of man were risen from the dead, and they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another, what the rising from the dead should mean."

The foregoing scriptures clearly show that the Apostles did not preach Jesus, nor the resurrection to the people, before Pentecost, for they did not understand what the rising from the dead should mean. And in addition to this, it is evident that they did not, nor could not, preach Jesus in his official character to the people before Pentecost: what I mean by his official character, is that he was not preached as King, Priest, and Lawgiver, or as "Lord of all." This fact will be seen in its full force by such as know the scriptures, for it is said in Hebrews, that he could not be a Priest while on the earth. And again, it is said, that he as a Priest entered into the holiest of all, into heaven itself with his own blood to make atonement for sins, and it is self-evident that he did not take of his own blood before it was shed. Again, it is said in Corinthians, that no man can call Jesus Lord, but by the Holy Spirit: the reason is obvious—none but the Holy Spirit witnessed his exaltation, which took place in Heaven. After which the Holy Spirit came down from heaven, and preached the gospel to men.—See Peter on this subject. And it is evident that the Holy Spirit did not come down until Pentecost, for the Holy Spirit was not given until Jesus was glorified—see John on this subject. And besides, the Lord, after his resurrection, and just before his ascension to heaven, promised the Holy Spirit to his disciples, and told them to tarry in Jerusalem until they received it, or were endued with power from on high. If further proof were necessary, we would give the fact, that from and after Pentecost, every thing was transacted *in the name of Jesus Christ*; all authority was vested in that name. So that at the name of Jesus, every thing in heaven, hell, and hades, had to bow—to the glory of God the Father. If in that name an apostle spoke to a demon, he bowed submission, and if he spoke to death itself, it yielded up its victims.

If then, an apostle has commanded men to be baptized in that name, how dare they refuse to obey? When by such refusal, they dishonor God the Father.

PRECIOUS CONFSSION.

THE following is an extract from the sentiments delivered by the Rev. Dr. Burton, at an association of the congregational clergy, at Thetfort, in the state of Vermont, and published by the Rev. Ignatius Thompson, who was present at the association. It may be depended upon as authentic.

"The Calvinistic sentiments never will prevail till the colleges are under our influence. Young men, when they go to college, generally have not formed their religious sentiments. We ought to have a president and instructors who have the address to instil the Calvinistic sentiments without the students being sensible of it—then, nine out of ten, when they leave the college, will support the Calvinistic doctrine—they will go out into the world, and will have their influence in society. In this way we can get a better support, without law, than we ever had with it. And besides, when once all our colleges are under our influence, we can manage the civil government as we please."—*Ch. Bap.*