

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

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

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

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

THE CHRISTIAN.

VOL. IV. }

SAINT JOHN, N. B., AUGUST 1848.

{ No. 8.

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 Hell shall not prevail against it.—*The Lord Messiah*.

RESTORATION OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF THINGS.

No. VIII.

ON THE BREAKING OF BREAD—No. III.

WE have proposed to make still farther apparent that the primary intention of the meeting of the disciples on the first day of the week, was to break bread. We concluded our last essay on this topic with a notice of Acts xx. 7. "And on the first day of the week when the disciples assembled to break bread." The design of this meeting, it is evident, was to break bread. But that this was the design of all their meetings for worship and edification, or that it was the primary object of the meeting of the disciples, is rendered very certain from Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, chapter xi. The Apostle applauds and censures the church at Corinth with respect to their observance of the order he instituted among them. In the second verse he praises them for retaining the ordinances he delivered them, and in the conclusion of this chapter he censures them in strong terms for not keeping the ordinance of breaking bread as he delivered it unto them. They retained in their meetings the ordinance, but did abuse it. He specifies their abuses of it, and denounces their practice as worthy of chastisement. But in doing this, he incidentally informs us that it was for the purpose of breaking bread they assembled in one place. And the manner in which he does this is equivalent to an express command to assemble for the purpose. Indeed there is no form of speech more determinate in its meaning or more energetic in its force than that which he uses, verse 20. It is precisely the same as the two following examples. A man assembles laborers in his vineyard to cultivate it. He goes out and finds them either idle or destroying his vines. He reproves and commands them to business by addressing them thus—"Men, ye did *not* assemble to cultivate my vineyard." By the use of this negative he makes his command more imperative and their guilt more apparent. A teacher assembles his pupils to learn—he comes in and finds them idle or quarreling. He addresses them thus—"Boys, you did *not* assemble to learn." In this forcible style, he declares the object of their meeting was to learn, and thus commands and reproves them in the same words. So Paul addresses the

disciples in Corinth—"When ye assemble, it is *not* to eat the Lord's supper;" or (*Macknight*), "But your coming together into one place, is *not* to eat the Lord's supper," plainly and forcibly intimating that this was the design of their meeting or assembling in one place, commanding them to order, and reprovng them for disorder. Now it must be admitted that Paul's style in this passage is exactly similar to the two examples given, and that the examples given mean what we have said of their import; consequently, by the same rule, Paul reminds the Corinthians, and informs all who ever read the epistle, that when the disciples assembled, or came together into one place, it was primarily for the purpose of breaking bread, and in effect most positively commands the practice. To this it has been objected that the 26th verse allows the liberty of dispensing with this ordinance as often as we please. In the improved translation of Macknight it reads thus: "Wherefore, as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, you openly publish the death of the Lord till the time he come." Either these words, or those in the preceding verse, ("This *do*, as often you drink it, in remembrance of me,") are said to give us the liberty of determining when we may break bread. If so, then the Lord's supper is an anomaly in revelation. It is an ordinance which may be kept once in seven months, or seven years, just as we please, for, reader, remember, "where there is no law there is no transgression." But this application of the words is absurd, and perfectly similar to the papist's inference from these words; for they infer hence that "the cup may sometimes be omitted, and under this pretence have refused it altogether to the laity." And certainly if the phrase, "as often as you drink it," means that it may be omitted when any one pleases, it is as good logic for the papists to argue that it may be omitted altogether by the laity, provided the priests *please* to drink it.

But neither the design of the apostle nor his words in this passage have respect to the frequency, but to the manner of observing the institution. If this is evident, that interpretation falls to the ground; and that it is evident, requires only to ask the question, What was the apostle's design in these words? Most certainly it was to reprove the Corinthians, not for the frequency nor unfrequency of their attending to it, but for the manner in which they did it. Now as this was the design, and as every writer's or speaker's words are to be interpreted according to his design, we are constrained to admit that the apostle meant no more than that christians should always, in observing this institution, observe it in the manner and for the reasons he assigns.

And last of all, on this passage, let it be remembered, that if the phrase, "as oft as," gives us liberty to observe it seldom, it also gives us liberty to observe it every day if we please. And if it be a privilege, we are not straitened in the Lord, but in ourselves.

But, say some, "it will become too common and lose its solemnity." Well, then, the seldomer the better. If we observe it only once in twenty years, it will be the more uncommon and solemn. And, on the same principle, the seldomer we pray the better. We shall pray with more solemnity if we pray once in twenty years!

But "It is too expensive." How? Wherein? Is not the "earth the Lord's and the fulness thereof?" It costs us nothing. It is the

Lord's property. He gives us goods that we may enjoy ourselves. We never saw or read of a church so poor that could not, without a sacrifice, furnish the Lord's table. To make one sacrament," requires more than to furnish the Lord's table three months. I hate this objection most cordially.—It is antichristian—it is mean—it is base.

"It is unfashionable." So it is to speak truth, and fulfil contracts. So it is to obey God rather than man. And if you love the fashion, be consistent—don't associate with the Nazarenes—hold up the skirts of the high priest, and go to the temple. But all objections are as light as straws and as volatile as a feather.

To recapitulate the items adduced in favor of the ancient order of breaking bread, it was shewn, as we apprehend—

1. That there is a divinely instituted order of christian worship, in christian assemblies.

2. That this order of worship is uniformly the same.

3. That the nature and design of the breaking of bread are such as to make it an essential part of christian worship in christian assemblies.

4. That the first church set in order in Jerusalem, continued as steadfastly in breaking of bread as in any other act of social worship or edification.

5. That the disciples statedly met on the first day of the week, primarily and emphatically for this purpose.

6. That the apostle declared it was the design or the primary object of the church to assemble in one place for this purpose, and so commanded it to the churches he had set in order.

7. That there is no law, rule, reason, or authority for the present manner of observing this institute quarterly, semi-annually, or at any other time than weekly.

8. We have considered some of the more prominent objections against the ancient practice, and are ready to hear any new ones that can be offered. Upon the whole, it may be said that we have express precedent and an express command to assemble in one place on the first day of the week to break bread. We shall reserve other evidences and considerations until some objections are offered by any correspondent who complies with our conditions.

A. C.

LITERAL FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY.

THE patriarch Jacob had left the consolatory assurance that the sceptre should not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh, came, (Gen. xlix. 10.) and, accordingly, it was not till about the time Christ publicly appeared in the temple, in the twelfth year of his age, that the last king, was dethroned and banished. The Redeemer was not only to be of the tribe of Judah, but of the family of David; and his genealogy, both by natural and legal succession, have, in Scripture, been preserved as evidence. Matt. i. Luke iii. Isaiah predicted that a Virgin should conceive and bear a Son; and, in due time the fulfilment of the glorious prophecy was attested to Mary's espoused husband by an angel from heaven. Isa. vii. 14. Matt. i. 20. Prophecy had pointed to Bethlehem Ephrata, as the place of his nativity; and two of the Evangelists inform us Jesus was born there. Micah v. 2. Matt. ii. 1.

Luke ii. 4, 6. The prophet predicted to Jerusalem the approach of her lowly King riding upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass, and the Evangelist records its exact fulfilment, when Jesus so entered the city amid the hosannas of the multitude. Zech. ix. 9. Matt. xxi. 1. Prophecy declared, "When we shall see him there is no beauty that we should desire him;" and we know that "he came unto his own, and his own received him not." Isa. liii. 2. John i. 11. It was said by the prophet, "We hid, as it were, our faces from him;" and the Evangelist informs us, "All his disciples forsook him and fled." Isa. liii. 3. Matt. xxvi. 56. The Saviour, in prophecy, complained of being laughed to scorn; and his Evangelists narrate the contempt with which he was treated: "Herod with his men of war set him at nought," and the Roman soldiers having arrayed him in the emblems of mock royalty, bowed the knee before him in derision. Psal. xxii. 6. Matt. xxvii. 29. Luke xxiii. 11. If he said, "I hid not my face from shame and spitting," the pen of inspiration records that he was thus ignominiously treated. Isa. l. 6. Matt. xxvi. 67. Prophecy had foretold, "They shall smite the Judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek;" and its fulfilment was witnessed, when "they spit upon him, and took the reed and smote him on the head." Micah v. 1. Matt. xxviii. 30. The prophecy is, "He was oppressed and afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth;" the fulfilment is, "When he was accused of the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing." Isa. liii. 7. Matt. xxvii. 12. The prophet predicted he should be "despised and rejected of men;" and when, by their law, a prisoner must be released, the Jews clamorously preferred Barabbas, a robber and murderer, to the holy Son of God. Isa. liii. 3. Mark xv. 15. Did prophecy portray him as "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief?" He not merely "endured the contradiction of sinners," but suffered under the hiding of his father's face, and in our room experienced the bitterness of divine wrath, till in his agony he sweat blood, and exclaimed that his soul was "exceeding sorrowful even unto death." Isa. liii. 3. Heb. xii. 3. Matt. xxvi. 38. If it was foretold that he who did eat his bread should lift his heel against him; "Jesus answered and said, he that dippeth his hand with me in the dish the same shall betray me." Psal. xlix. 9. Matt. xxvi. 23. It was predicted that he should be prized at "thirty pieces of silver;" and it is also narrated, that Judas covenanted to betray his Master into the hands of his enemies for that sum. Zech. xi. 12. Matt. xxvi. 14, 15. And the Lord said unto the prophet, "Cast it unto the *potter*;" and when the traitor returned the reward of his treachery to the chief priests, "they took counsel and bought with it the *potter's* field to bury strangers in." Zech. xi. 13. Matt. xxvii. 7. In prophecy the Saviour complained, "They shake the head, saying, He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him; let him deliver him, seeing he trusted in him;" and in the very words did not the chief priests, with the scribes and elders, "mocking him," say, "He trusted in God; let him deliver him now if he will have him?" Psal. xxii. 7, 8. Matt. xxvii. 43. In prophecy the Saviour complained, "They gave me gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink;" and it was verified when, at Golgotha, "they gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall." Psal. lxix. 21. Matt. xxvii. 34. The prophet fore-

told that "threescore and two weeks" of years after the edict for rebuilding Jerusalem, the Messiah should be cut off (Dan. ix. 26.); and history testifies this to have been the precise time that elapsed between the giving of that decree by Artaxerxes and the death of Christ. If it was promised that he should pour out his soul unto death; Jesus said, "It is finished, and he bowed his head and gave up the ghost." Isa. liii. 12. John xix. 30. Though to be put to a violent death, and "cut off out of the land of the living," it was added by the prophets, "but not for himself;" "for the transgression of my people was he smitten;" and accordingly he who was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," "bare our sins in his body." Dan. ix. 26. Isa. liii. 8. Heb. vii. 26. 1 Pet. ii. 24. Yet the prophet declares, "He was numbered with transgressors;" and the Evangelist records, that "with him they crucified two thieves, the one on his right hand and the other on his left." Isa. liii. 12. Mark xv. 27. The prophecy is, "They pierced my hands and feet;" and an incredulous disciple was convinced of the reality of his Master's resurrection by witnessing in his hands the print of the nails by which he had been transfixed to the accursed tree. Psal. xxii. 16. John xx. 27. Again, it was predicted, "They shall look on me whom they have pierced;" and it is also recorded, that "one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith there came out blood and water." Zech. xii. 10. John xix. 34. If it was farther foretold, "They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture," inspiration also informs us, that in this very manner did the attendant soldiers divide the Saviour's raiment. Psal. xxii. 18. John xix. 23. The Passover had typified, and the Psalmist predicted of the Righteous One, that "the Lord keepeth all his bones, not one of them shall be broken;" and the beloved disciple saw and bears record, that while, at the request of the Jews, the legs of the malefactors were broken, the Saviour being already dead, they brake not his. Ps. xxxiv. 20; John xix. 33. It was predicted that he should be with the rich in the state of the dead (Isa. liiii. 9.); and it is also recorded by the various evangelists, that Joseph of Arimathea, an honorable counsellor, having begged from Pilate the body of Jesus, he wrapped it in fine linen, and laid it in his own new sepulchre, wherein never man before was laid. It was again said, in prophecy, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption;" and early in the morning of the third day, his resurrection was declared to his disciples, by an angel whose countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow. Ps. xvi. 10. Matt. xxviii. 3. And, lastly, it was prophetically declared, "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive;" and so it is recorded, that "while his disciples beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight." Ps. lxxviii. 18. Acts i. 9. Eph. iv. 8.—*Begg on the Prophecies.*

RECIPE FOR A HAPPY MARRIAGE.—Choose a wife who is religious, has a sweet temper, a refined mind, and a cultivated understanding, and who is not rich; then be to her a good husband. This receipt never fails; content and happiness are the results. Example of this kind of marriage—that of Boaz and Ruth.

LECTURES TO CHILDREN.

BY JOHN TODD.

LECTURE II.

REPENTANCE FOR SIN.

They went out, and preached that men should repent.—MARK vi. 12.

CHILDREN, I am going to use a hard word, and I must tell you what it means. The word is *conditions*. I would not use it if I did not think I could make it easy. Suppose a little child goes to school, and wants a new book. Her mother says, "Well, Mary, if you will be perfect in your lessons and behaviour for two whole weeks, I will buy the book for you." This is a *condition*. A little boy asks his father to let him ride. He tells him he may ride with him to-morrow, on the *condition* that he governs his temper and is a good boy all day to-day.

So every good thing in this world has some such condition, and for every thing we have something to do. I will only name four things which have such conditions.

1. God has so ordered things, that any child shall grow up greatly beloved and respected, on *condition* that he is kind and obedient to his parents and teachers, and kind and affectionate to every body.

2. God has so ordered things, that a man may be learned, on condition that he studies and reads, and wastes no time.

3. God has so ordered things, that medicine will frequently cure the sick man. But the condition is, that it must be carefully taken.

4. God has so ordered things, that any body may know all about God and heaven, on condition, that he faithfully reads the Bible, and obeys God in every thing.

It is just so with every thing. Who would not laugh at the farmer who expected to raise corn except on the condition that he plant, and hoe, and plant the right seed, and at the right time? That little boy cannot see his top spin round, except on a condition—that he do something to make it go. That little girl, just beginning to talk, cannot learn a single letter, or take a single stitch with her needle, except on condition that she try to learn. No. You cannot rear a single beautiful flower so as to get one single blossom, without a condition.

Now, the greatest good that God ever gave to us, is that eternal life which Christ bought for us by his own blood. No man ever became holy without a condition for him to fulfil. No man ever went to heaven without repentance. Job could not. David could not. Peter, and Paul, and John could not. Not one of that great multitude who are now in heaven, went there without repentance. Christ preached this condition, and so did the apostles; so has every true preacher since. Not one sinner in this house, not one in this place, not one in this world, will ever go to heaven without repentance. If we knew just how many, and who would repent of sin, we should know just how many, and who would go to heaven. All must repent. Christ says, "*Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.*" So Paul says, "*God now commandeth all men every where to repent*" You cannot doubt *who* must repent—all must, every human being that has ever sinned.

A very great question rises up here ; and that is, *What is it to repent ?*

You all know there are two kinds of money—the good, and the counterfeit. And a man might have a house full of the counterfeit, and yet he could not be said to have any money. It would do him no good. So there are two kinds of repentance. One is good, and the other good for nothing. They may not seem very different, just as two pieces of money may look alike, while one is good, and will buy things, and the other is good for nothing ; just as two trees may stand together, and look alike, while one produces good fruit, and the other nothing but leaves. But you want to know what it is to repent. Let me try to tell you.

A man, who is now a minister of the gospel, gave me the following account. I tell it to you in order to show you what repentance is. “ I had one of the kindest and best of fathers ; and when I was a little white headed boy, about six years old, he used to carry me to school before him on his horse, to help me in my little plans, and always tried to make me happy ; and he never seemed so happy himself as when making me happy. When I was six years old, he came home, one day, very sick. My mother too, was sick ; and thus nobody but my two sisters could take care of my father. In a few days he was worse, very sick, and all the physicians in the region were called in to see him. The next Sabbath morning, early, he was evidently much worse. As I went into the room, he stretched out his hand to me and said, ‘ My little boy, I am very sick. I wish you to take that paper on the stand, and run down to Mr. C’s. and get me the medicine written on that paper.’ I took the paper, and went to the apothecary’s shop, as I had often done before. It was about half a mile off ; but when I got there, I found it shut ; and as Mr. C. lived a quarter of a mile farther off, I concluded not to go to find him. I then set out for home. On my way back I contrived what to say. I knew how wicked it was to tell a lie, but one sin always leads to another. On going in to my father, I saw that he was in great pain ; and though pale and weak, I could see great drops of sweat standing on his forehead forced out by the pain. Oh, then I was sorry I had not gone and found the apothecary. At length he said to me, ‘ My son has got the medicine, I hope, for I am in great pain. I hung my head, and muttered, for my conscience smote me. ‘ No, sir, Mr. Carter says he has got none ?’ ‘ Has got none ! Is this possible ?’ He then cast a keen eye upon me, and seeing my head hang, and probably suspecting my falsehood, said, in the mildest, kindest tone, ‘ *My little boy will see his father suffer great pain for the want of that medicine !*’ I went out of the room, and alone, and cried. I was soon called back. My brothers had come, and were standing,—all the children were standing round his bed, and he was committing my poor mother to their care, and giving them his last advice. I was the youngest ; and when he laid his hand on my head, and told me ‘ that in a few hours I should have no father ; that he would in a day or two be buried up ; that I must now make God my father, love him, obey him, and always do right, and *speak the truth*, because the eye of God is always upon me’—it seemed as if I should sink ; and when he laid his hand on my head again, and prayed for the blessing of God the Redeemer to rest upon me, ‘ soon to be a fatherless orphan,’ I

dared not look at him, I felt so guilty. Sobbing, I rushed from his bed side, and thought I wished I could die. They soon told me he could not speak. Oh, how much would I have given to go in and tell him that I had told a lie, and ask him once more to lay his hand on my head and forgive me! I crept in once more, and heard the minister pray for 'the dying man.' Oh, how my heart ached! I snatched my hat, and ran to the apothecary's house, and got the medicine. I ran home with all my might, and ran in, and ran up to my father's bed-side to confess my sin, crying out, 'O here, father'—but I was hushed; and I then saw that he was pale, and that all in the room were weeping. *My dear father was dead!* And the last thing I ever spoke to him was *to tell him a lie!* I sobbed as if my heart would break; for his kindnesses, his tender looks, and my own sin, all rushed upon my mind. And as I gazed upon his cold, pale face, and saw his eyes shut, and his lips closed, could I help thinking of his last words, 'My little boy will see his father suffer great pain for the want of that medicine?' I could not know but he died for the want of it.

"In a day or two, he was put into the ground, and buried up. There were several ministers at the funeral, and each spoke kindly to me, but could not comfort me. Alas! they knew not what a load of sorrow lay on my heart. They could not comfort me. My father was buried, and the children all scattered abroad; for my mother was too feeble to take care of them.

"It was twelve years after this, while in college, that I went alone to the grave of my father. It took me a good while to find it; but there it was, with its humble tombstone; and as I stood over it, I seemed to be back at his bed-side, to see his pale face, and hear his voice. Oh, the thought of that sin and wickedness cut me to the heart. It seemed as worlds would not be too much to give, could I then only have called loud enough to have him hear me ask his forgiveness. But it was too late. He had been in the grave twelve years; and I must live and die, weeping over that ungrateful falsehood. May God forgive me."

Now, I wish to say two or three things about this little boy's repentance.

1. You see that a child may be wicked. He can sin against a father and against God at the same time. God commands us to obey our parents and to speak the truth. This child did neither.

2. You see that a child is not too young to repent of a sin against his father. Some have an idea that a child is too young to repent; but this is a great mistake. If this boy could repent of this one sin, he could of more; and if he could repent of a sin against an earthly father, could he not of those against his heavenly Father?

3. You see what true repentance towards God is. It is to feel sorry and grieved that you have sinned against God, just as this child did, because he had sinned against his dying father. He did not grieve so because he was afraid of being punished, but because his father was so good to him, and he was so wicked against his father. Now, had he felt as sorry for each and all of his sins against God, as he did for this *one* sin against a man, it would have been true repentance.

4. You see that if we loved God as much as we do an earthly parent,

we should repent deeply; because he has done us ten thousand kindnesses, and is doing them every day, and because we have committed ten thousand sins more shameful than this shameful sin of the little boy.

There was a wicked boy once, who would leave his father's home and go to sea. His kind father tried to persuade him not to go; but he was not to be kept away from the sea. The reason was, he thought that he might be wicked when he got away from his father, and there could be nobody to reprove him. His weeping father gave him a Bible as he went away, and begged him to read it. The boy went away, and became very wicked, and very profane. But God saw him. There was a great storm upon the ocean. The ship could not stand against it. She struck upon the rocks in the dark night. It was a time of great distress;—and for a few moments, there was the noise of the captain giving his orders, the howling of the storm, the cries of the poor sailors and passengers, who expected every moment to be drowned. Then this wicked boy wished himself at home. But he had but a few moments; for a great wave came and lifted the ship up high, and then came down upon another rock, and was shivered in a thousand pieces. Every soul on board was drowned but this same wicked boy. By the mercy of God, he was washed and carried by the waves upon a great rock, so that he could creep up, much bruised and almost dead. In the morning, he was seen sitting on the rock with a book in his hand. It was the Bible,—the only thing, except his own life, which had been saved from the wreck. He opened it, and there, on the first leaf, was the hand-writing of his father! He thought of the goodness of that father, and of his own ingratitude, and he wept. Again he opened the book, and on every page was the hand-writing of his heavenly Father; and again he wept at the remembrance of his sins against God. His heart was broken. He was truly penitent; and from that hour to this he has lived as a Christian. He is now the commander of a large ship, and seems to make it his great business to honor Jesus Christ. This was true repentance.

But I must tell you in a few words, why it is necessary for every one to repent of sin.

1. Because all have sinned. I need not try to tell how many times. I might as well try to count the hairs on that little boy's head, who stands at the pew door and gives me all his looks while I am speaking. We all have sinned against our parents, by not obeying them and being kind to them; we have sinned against the Sabbath, by not remembering to keep it holy; against the Bible, by not loving it and not keeping its sayings; against conscience, which stands close to our heart, and, like a sentinel keeping watch, cries out when we sin; against the Holy Spirit, by not doing as he says, when he makes us feel solemn and sinful; and against God himself, whose commandments we break. Oh! our sins are like a cloud. Did you ever see a cloud of dust or sand in a windy day? And could you count the little particles of dust in it—all of them? No, no. But our sins are quite as many.

2. None will forsake sin till they have repented. You might stop a man from stealing by killing him or shutting him up in prison. But this would not stop his *wishing* to steal; and that wishing, in the sight of God, is sin. One of these children might have his tongue cut out so that,

he could not talk, and so that he could never again tell a lie ; but if he *thought* a lie in his heart, this would be sin ; and-cutting out his tongue would not stop his sinning. The Indians, some years ago, tried to stop their people from sinning ; and so they gave them strong *emetics*, in order to have them throw up their sins ; but they did no good. The sin was in the heart, and not in the stomach. One of these Indians, who had thus taken emetics, went to Pittsburgh, and bought a barrel of rum to sell to other Indians. On his way back, he called and heard the Moravian missionaries preach the gospel. " He was so convinced of his sinfulness and misery, that he resolved to alter his manner of life. He accordingly returned the barrel of rum to the trader at Pittsburgh, declaring that he would neither drink nor sell any more spiritous liquors, for it was against his conscience. He, therefore, begged him to take it back, adding, that, if he refused, he would pour it into the Ohio. The trader, as well as the white people who were present, was amazed, and assured him, that this was the first barrel of rum he had ever seen returned by an Indian : but he, at the same time, took it back, without further objection."

Nothing but repentance would ever have led this Indian to do this. And this, and nothing but this, will make any one leave off sin.

3. None will serve God unless they have first repented of sin. Christ says that no man can serve two masters. Suppose a child has a large apple in each hand, and, without laying down either, she goes and tries to take up two large oranges. Could she do it? No. Because her hands are already full. Just so, when the heart is full of sin, you cannot have the love of God in it. If you would stop sinning, my dear children, you must repent of sin. If you would serve God, have him for your Father and Friend, you must repent. You all can do it. You all have been sorry when you have grieved your parents, and you can be sorry when you have offended and grieved your blessed Redeemer. Oh ! if you will not, you will grow up sinners, live sinners, die sinners, and be sinners, accursed by God for ever and ever. Amen.

TO THE BAPTIST MINISTERS OF NEW BRUNSWICK AND NOVA SCOTIA—No. 6.

GENTLEMEN—In our last it was, I think, made apparent that one grand principle in your theology is destitute of divine authority, if not directly opposed to the oracles of God ! " Justification by faith alone " is taught neither by patriarchs, prophets, nor apostles. It is an oracle neither of reason nor of revelation. No state, condition, or relation, political, moral or religious, is entered into or enjoyed by faith alone, or by any other " alone " principle. It is true that by subscribing to justification by faith alone, you are honored with a name and a place in the " evangelical alliance ; " you take your rank as one of the evangelical sects ; yet you do so at the expense of the most obvious teaching of the apostles, and by trampling beneath your feet the only really consistent article in your confession of faith ; namely, " We believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, in which he hath given us our only rule of faith and practice ! " Is it not most surprising, gen-

lemen, that you will continue to proclaim that the sinner is justified by faith alone, for which you have no proof save your own reasonings, while at the same time you say, "It is the chief glory of the Baptist Denomination that they will not consent to any doctrine or ordinance or discipline but such as is strictly and explicitly scriptural, and the credit of the denomination stands staked upon this matter, not only in this province, but wherever it is found. The Bible and the Bible only is the rule of Faith and Practice amongst us." Now, my dear sirs, if your name and many of your "essential doctrines" are not most obvious violations of these professions—of these published protestations then have my eyes and my ears deceived me—then have I done you manifest injustice! Until I hear farther from you in defence of justification by faith alone, my previous remarks, on that point, must suffice. I come now to the examination of another important doctrinal and practical point. Notwithstanding the peculiar position which your views of baptism have given you to other denominations your theoretical and practical sentiments in connexion with this subject are the root of the differences between you and the apostles as teachers of Christianity. In your controversies with the Pelelo-baptists you have had but two chapters—the "subjects and mode of baptism." Ever since the baptists have become a popular denomination they have opposed theoretically—the doctrine of baptism, in water, in order to the enjoyment of remission of sins. I say since they became popular; for the time was when some of the greatest and best advocated the same views that we do in reference to the design of baptism. The "learned" and excellent Dr. Gale—than whom few have done more for the cause of believer's immersion—more than a century since argued most conclusively against infant baptism, on the ground that it never could have been designed for them, as it was commanded "for remission of sins." But since you have obtained a place among the "orthodox denominations" of protestant christendom, you have lost sight not only of the doctrine of the apostle Peter on this subject, but also of some of your most eminent teachers! Before I attempt to demonstrate from the New Testament, the fact that the Apostles taught and practised immersion in order to remission of sins, I will endeavor to put it out of your power to misapprehend my meaning, or for any one else to misunderstand me. If I should be tediously minute—or, in your estimation, unnecessarily prolix, my only apology will be the frequent misrepresentations of what are the real views which we promulge. Whether these have been caused by our want of definiteness, or the perverseness of others—or both—I cannot now decide. But while I attempt to show your aberrations from the apostles' doctrine on the design of immersion, I wish that every one who may condescend to read these letters, may fully understand what they mean when they charge us with teaching and practising baptismal regeneration—making baptism conversion, &c. In future those who will read and can think, shall be without excuse when they sin against us and the cause of truth by such charges or insinuations, providing I *can* make myself understood!!

1. And first I would express my conviction in reference to the state and condition of a sinner, in contrast with that of a disciple of Christ. One is "of the world" while of the others it is said, "they are not of-

the world, even as I am not of the world ;” one is “ born of the flesh,” the other “ is born again—born of the spirit ;” Moses terms the creation of the world, and especially man, the “ generations of all things.” When men come under the government of the Lord Messiah, they are re-created—“ created anew in Christ Jesus”—“ regenerated ;” sinners are in “ darkness ;” under the Messiah, they are illuminated—they are “ light in the Lord ;” in one they are “ condemned,” but as servants of the Lord they are “ justified ;” sinners are said to be “ unclean,” “ unholy ;” the great change effected by the faith and obedience of the gospel is called “ sanctification ;” sinners, are “ aliens”—the saints are “ adopted ;” those are “ far off,” these are “ brought nigh” by the blood of Christ ; in one state they are “ enemies,” in the other, they are “ reconciled ;” those are “ the lost,” these are the saved ;” one party is “ in sin,” the other has obtained “ remission of sins.” In short, the church of God is called—in contrast with Judaism, false philosophy, all human institutions, and national establishments—“ a holy nation,” “ a royal priesthood,” “ a peculiar people,” “ a spiritual house,” &c.

2. Now, I suppose that you will all admit that the contrasts represent opposite states : in one the sinner is lost and under condemnation, in the other he is in the enjoyment of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. No one acquainted with the word of God, supposes that these various applications used in reference either to saint or sinner, represent various conditions of sin or holiness ; but applied to either party express their relative condition. Thus the unpardoned are under condemnation—enemies, unholy, unclean ; while the pardoned are justified, reconciled, saints, sanctified. These then are relative terms, all expressive of two states ; one *out* of Christ, and the other *in him* : or of a sinner in the kingdom of Satan, and the opposite term of a disciple of Jesus—a citizen of the kingdom of God’s beloved Son.

3. If these positions are admitted—and as a whole, I know not who denies them—we have before us a clear field.* We can now narrow the controversy to a single point ; for if it can be clearly shewn what is necessary on the part of a sinner in order to remission of sins, we can see at once the means of regeneration, justification, reconciliation, sanctification, and the enjoyment of present salvation. And so in reference to any other qualification. To set the question in relation to the above positions entirely at rest, we need only ask what is the cause of condemnation, of alienation, enmity, unholiness ? I am confident that we shall perfectly agree as to the answer : it is sin—the violation of God’s law ; the want of conformity to the Divine will is the cause. I say again, if then we can ascertain Heaven’s plan of remission of sin, we shall have learned how men are born again—regenerated—created anew in Christ Jesus ; how they become disciples of Christ. If they are justified by faith alone ; then by faith alone are they regenerated, reconciled, and made the children of God. But if faith, repentance and immersion, are necessary on the part of a sinner—as a medium through which the benefits of Christ’s death flow into the soul—then is a change of heart, a change of life, and a change of state all necessary in order to regeneration.

* If any of our readers question these positions, they would confer a favour by stating their reasons.

4 Unfeigned faith, genuine repentance and reformation, effect a change of heart and a change of life: the Baptists and other sects have called this change regeneration. In that they have greatly erred; for if a "change of heart" and regeneration are identical, then have we myriads regenerated—born again—and at the same time in their sins; not partakers of the Holy Spirit! To shew how unscriptural this position is, I need but to say: the thousands on the day of Pentecost when they cried out "what must we do?" evinced a "change of heart;" but the Apostle's answer to them disclosed their state to be that of the unpardoned—as destitute of the Holy Spirit. Saul of Tarsus was a penitent believer from the hour that the Lord spoke to him; but Ananias, the devout disciple of Damascus, addressed him as unpardoned, as in his sins, when he exhorted him not to delay, but to "Arise and to be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord." We are, therefore compelled, gentlemen, to take the position, in opposition to your views of justification by faith alone—that immersion in water of a penitent believer, into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is necessary in order to the full enjoyment of the remission of sins.

5. We need, gentlemen, to consider but one other grand preliminary, and then we shall fully understand each other. I think in this we shall fully agree. According to my faith, it is one thing to "merit," "purchase," or procure blessings, and another and a very different thing to enjoy them. The means of procurement are all of God. In the means of enjoyment it has pleased Heaven to make the sinner a co-operant. The work of Christ for man's salvation is a "finished work." By his life, death, resurrection and intercession, he has provided the gospel feast; the acts which he requires the sinner to perform, whether intellectual, moral or physical, are merely the absolutely necessary steps in order to the enjoyment of this feast. Believing in him that spread the feast—believing that it is free for all—believing in its sufficiency—does not put the sinner in possession of it. Neither does the joy that takes possession of his soul in anticipation of the privilege, prove him a partaker. His regrets on account of the manner in which he has formerly treated the King, neither procures the feast nor makes him a partaker, though they may be necessary in order to its enjoyment. His coming to the table, and even eating the "dainties of the board" do not procure the feast, and yet it is essentially necessary that this last step be taken. Though all these steps be requisite, the feast is a free unmerited gift. It was procured at great price—it is proffered freely "without money and without price." But none can enjoy it but those who come in the exact way the King has prescribed.

Though my views have been called Arminian, Socinian, &c., I never believed that men, whether saints or sinners, ever merited any thing by any of their actions. If any of my fellow-laborers have seemed to hold different views, a more careful, unprejudiced hearing would have satisfied the most orthodox. We do not believe, then, that any one by hearing the gospel, believing, repenting, being baptized; by prayers, almsgiving, or by any of the ordinances of God—merit any thing: all these are consistent duties—after all we are but unprofitable servants. Salvation is the free gift of God; but he has made some of these steps

necessary in order to the enjoyment of pardon, and others in order to our growth in grace and knowledge. On these points we certainly do not differ. It is true your teaching on these points has been awfully obscure. None of you, previous to a partial acquaintance with the Apostolic gospel, have I ever heard say a word as to what was necessary to procure pardon, as separated from what God requires of us for our enjoyment of the divine favor. Clear views on this subject would long since have settled all the differences between Calvinists and Arminians. But to return. We, I trust, are agreed that no human being ever did any thing to procure the divine favor. The glorious mission of the Lord Messiah has accomplished the work. What shall we do that we may enjoy this great salvation? You answer in the words of Paul to the Philippian jailer, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," and there you make a dead halt, contending that justification—that is a deliverance from condemnation—is by *faith alone*. Paul, however, continued his address to the jailer, preaching "the word of the Lord to him, and to all that were in his house." The result proves that he had something more than faith to announce, for the jailer and his family were immersed the same hour of the night. Hence, by an induction of all the places in the New Testament where conversions are recorded we feel ourselves compelled by the authority of the apostles to say to the enquirer not only, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," but "Repent and be baptised in his name for remission of sins."

7. You teach that pardon is procured and enjoyed at the altar—that is by faith only in the sacrificial lamb; we contend that pardon is procured at the altar, but fully enjoyed only by him that comes to the *laver*. "He saves us in the laver* or bath† of regeneration by the renewing of the Holy Spirit;" and thus our "hearts are sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." This view of the subject makes baptism the consummating act in the series in order to the full enjoyment of remission. By faith and repentance the intellectual and moral man is devoted to the Lord, and then by immersion the whole man—body, soul and spirit—are consecrated to the service of him who died for our salvation. This is the full surrender, and hence the *promise* of remission of sins and the Holy Spirit are made only to those who not only believe, but are immersed into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Let any one who affirms to the contrary, furnish the testimony and it shall have publicity!

8. My dear sirs, we agree theoretically in the position that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the final arbiter in religious controversy. The question, then, is not what the Lord may do with those who honestly mistake immersion, and substitute for it pouring, or sprinkling, or a certain feeling called the baptism of the spirit. The honest and sincere, whether Heathen, Mahomedan, Papist, or Protestant, are in the hands of one who knows all hearts—the "Judge of the earth will do right." "It is accepted according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not." It is not then "what shall this man do?" or what shall become of the other; neither under peculiar circumstances what the Lord may do! His power is infinite. But the question before us is, what!

* Wesley.

† Macknight.

has the Lord *promised* to do? Who, since Jesus was crowned Lord of all in the heavens, can claim the promise of pardon? Who, according to the testimony of Christ and his apostles, are his disciples? If any man will be my disciple, said the Saviour, he must deny himself, take up his cross and follow me. Since Jesus died and rose again, who deny themselves, take up their cross, and follow him? State the question as we may, can we, on the authority of God's word, promise any one pardon and salvation who does not obey Jesus Christ? And has he not commanded baptism? How, then, dare you, on your own authority, teach the sinner that he is pardoned and regenerated, before he obeys the only command to which these promises are appended? Do you not assume a fearful responsibility? But you do not believe that baptism was ordained by heaven as the act in which the sinner is to expect the remission of his sins. If you did you would announce it. And why not believe this doctrine? Is there an article of the christian faith taught more definitely, more explicitly? That faith and repentance are necessary in order to the enjoyment of pardon is not more explicitly taught in the gospel than that immersion was proclaimed and practised in order to remission of sins! These may be called mere assumptions. "To the law and to the testimony."

9. "We appeal then to the apostles and evangelists of Jesus Christ. What, then, do they propose as the design of New Testament baptism? We say *New Testament* baptism, because we have in that book "THE BAPTISM OF JOHN," and the baptism ordained by Jesus Christ. Although not one, or identical, they may materially unfold and illustrate each other. They both came from heaven; they both immersed believing and penitent persons; and were alike indicative of divine wisdom and benevolence.

"The Harbinger was sent 'to prepare a people for the Lord.' He designed to enlighten and purify them. Hence he was both a preacher of faith and reformation, and proclaimed 'the baptism of repentance for remission of sins.' It would, then, appear that from the very annunciation of John's baptism, that its design was of a transcendantly important and interesting character.

"The form of expression is exceedingly familiar, and intelligible, and were it not for an imaginary incongruity between the means and the end, or the thing done, and the alleged purpose or result, no one could for a moment doubt that the design of baptism was for the remission of sins.

"The preposition (*eis*) *for* in this connexion of means and designs is often so translated, and might have been hundreds of times much better so translated in the common version of the New Testament, than by *into*, or *unto*, or *to*. Here are a few examples, selected out of many such in the common version:—Matt. v. 13, 'It is good *for* nothing.' 'Take no thought *for* to-morrow.' vi. 34. 'Do it *for* a testimony unto them.' viii. 4. '*For* a testimony against them.' x. 18. 'Shed *for* many *for* remission of sins.' xxvi. 21. 'Told *for* a memorial of him.' xxvi. 13. 'Gave them *for* the potter's field, *for* to bury strangers in.' xxvii. 7, 10. Do not these indicate the design or the end for which a thing is given or done? Did not the Messiah shed his blood *for* the remission of sins. Was not the money given *for* the potter's field? Was it not *for* the burial of strangers?

“As Luke writes ‘the Gospel’ and the ‘Acts of Apostles,’ we shall give a few examples from him also:—‘For the fall and rising of many in Israel.’ ‘For a sign which shall be spoken against.’ Luke ii. 34. ‘For therefore’ [for this purpose] I am sent.’ iv. 43. ‘Take nothing for your journey.’ ix. 3. ‘Buy meat for all this people.’ ix. 13. ‘He is not fit for the kingdom of God.’ ix. 62. ‘Goods laid up for many years.’ xii. 19. ‘It is not fit for the land or for the dunghill.’ xiv. 35. ‘Be baptized for the remission of sins.’ Acts ii. 38. ‘Gave it to him for a possession.’ vii. 5. ‘Nourished him for her own son.’ vii. 21. ‘Came here for that intent.’ ix. 21. ‘Are come up for a memorial.’ x. 4. ‘For the work I have appointed.’ xiii. 2. ‘That thou shouldst be for salvation.’ xiii. 47. ‘For the work which they fulfilled.’ xvi. 26. These are but a few examples from Luke: in every instance the original preposition is *eis*. Its meaning cannot be misunderstood. The form of expression is the most common in language, and especially in the simple and sacred style of the apostles and evangelists. From the few examples given, any one may see with what little reason and evidence any one can intimate that the form of the expression does not indicate the design of the action. Indeed if this preposition does not intimate design, we might well ask, what other word in the language could suggest such an idea?

“Nor is it only casually intimated that the New Testament baptism was ordained for this purpose. It is the *only purpose* for which it was ordained; whether in the hands of John or of the twelve apostles! What could be more plain or intelligible than such forms of expression as the following: ‘John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.’ Mark i. 4. It was not a baptism, but *the baptism of repentance*. It was not *for* remission of sins, but *for the remission of sins*. The fixtures of language could not more safely secure the intention of an institution. It was not *because* your sins *have been remitted*, but it is *for or in order to* the remission of sins.

“Nor is this form of expression peculiar to one evangelist. Luke as well as Mark uses the same formula: ‘And John came into all the country about the Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.’ Luke iii. 3. John’s baptism was as certainly ‘*for the remission of sins*,’ as it was ‘the baptism of repentance.’ The death of the Messiah, or the blood of the New Covenant, was not more certainly *for remission of sins*, so far as the expression goes, than was the baptism of John for the remission of sins. Indeed they are not merely similar, but are *identical* expressions in both cases. It does not however follow that they are *in the same sense* for the remission of sins. But that they are in some sense for the remission of sins, can be denied by no man who either understands the language of the Bible or the language of men. From the apostolic style one might as reasonably conclude that Jesus died *because* man’s sins had been remitted, or because the sin of the world had been taken away, as that men are to be baptized, or that John baptized men, ‘*because* their sins had been remitted.’ To take such freedom with language, with the language of the bible, would be to make the word of God of no effect, or, what is the same thing, of no

certain interpretation; in other words, of no meaning. If goods are laid up for past years—if men buy food for those who never can use it—if men provide money for the expenses of journies already performed, then may it be said that John baptized for sins already remitted; or that his baptism was for those who were already cleansed from their pollutions!

“When the Lord said, ‘[*eis*] *To thi; end was I born, and [eis] for this cause came I into the world,*’ does he not intimate that he had a design in coming into the world? When Stephen said that Pharaoh cast out the children of the Israelites, [*eis*] *to the end they might not live,* does he not mean that their destruction was designed by their exposure? When Stephen, again, says (Acts vii. 5), that God promised Canaan to Abraham ‘*for a possession,*’ that it was his design to invest him with that inheritance? And when it is said by the people of Damascus (Acts ix. 21), that Saul of Tarsus came ‘*for the intent that he might*’ persecute the disciples; and if *eis*, the word always used when baptism and remission of sins are connected, are the words in all these cases containing the sense of ‘*FOR,*’ ‘*in order to,*’ ‘*to the intent that,*’ or ‘*for the intent,*’ shall we hesitate to allow that in connexion with remission of sins, it has the same meaning; or that our translators so understood it? Should any one be so regardless of his reputation, he would be as unsafe, as unworthy to be reasoned with, on any question of religion or morality, whenever he stands committed to its affirmative or negative.

“So far then as the force of the preposition is of any consequence or value to shew a connexion between baptism and remission of sins, it is incontrovertibly indicative of that connexion. But were it translated in every case by *into* or *unto* (versions of the word very common in all writings, sacred and profane), it is as certainly, though not so obviously to all minds, indicative of *such* a connexion. To baptise *into* or *unto* remission, intimates that the subject of that act is about passing into a new state; as entering *into* partnership, or entering into marriage, indicates that it is for such purposes the action, whatever it may be, is performed. Unto what, then, were you baptized (Acts xix. 3), is equivalent to the question, *For* what were you, then, baptized, or *into what* were you, then baptized? In either case the relation of the person baptized is changed.”

In conclusion then of our first argument, we submit the following testimonies of the Word of God:

“1. ‘John did baptize—and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.’ Mark i. 4.

“2. ‘The people of Judea and Jerusalem were baptized by him in Jordan, confessing their sins.’ Mark i. 5.

“3. ‘And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.’ Luke iii. 3.

“4. ‘Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.’ Acts ii. 38.

“5. ‘Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.’ Acts xxii. 16.

“These are oracles as express and explicit as any we can imagine. Any one of them would establish the connexion for which we plead. For if once such a connexion is clearly established, it depends not upon

the repetition of it, but upon the clearness and definiteness of the expression of it.

“ No one is commanded to be baptized *for any thing else*; and no one is ever said to be baptized *for any thing else*, than for the remission of sins. This is an important fact, and worthy of much reflection.”

Other facts and arguments, on this point, must be reserved for another moon. With due respect, your's, faithfully,

W. W. EATON.

GOD'S WORD—ITS INFLUENCE IN THE FORMATION OF CHARACTER.

THE influence of the study of the sacred scriptures upon the intellectual as well as the moral man is truly surprising. Indeed this fact, so apparent to the observing mind, is no mean proof of their divine authenticity. There is a freshness, a vigor, a nervousness of style, perfectly obvious in the written and *virâ voce* productions of those who have spent much time in the study and the practice of the Living Oracles, not to be acquired from any other source. Distinguished political men of Europe and America, have been more indebted to the word of God for their influence and power than to any one source. The productions of John Quincy Adams, of the United States, of Lord Brougham, of Britain, and of M. Lamartine, of France, prove that in early life they were diligent students of God's word. It is true they have not been free from the other influences which have surrounded them, and in the midst of which they have been educated; but the good which they have done for their respective countries and the world, has been directed by the word of God. Their faults and errors have been apparent when they have lost sight of the glorious volume, which is perfect, as a political text book, as well as a code of moral principles and precepts.

The Revolutions of 1789, and 1848, in France, differed in their sanguinary character in exact proportion to the amount of scriptural knowledge possessed by their leaders, during these eras. The latter was comparatively bloodless. Lamartine, the master spirit of 1848, has a fine poetical mind, deeply imbued by scriptural truth; and, were it possible to dispossess that great nation of its military spirit, under the auspices of a few such rains as that of Lamartine, she might mark out for Europe as glorious a career of peace, as she has heretofore of chivalry and war.

Lamartine was born in October, 1791. “ His mother, an accomplished and beautiful woman, was his first tutor. Having become acquainted personally with J. J. Rousseau, she had adopted some of his less fanciful notions respecting education, and applied them to practice in the care of her only son. He was allowed to ramble at will on the hills or among the woods, and to acquire vigor and hardihood of frame by the exposure of his naked feet and arms to all varieties of weather. But while pursuing the maxims of Rousseau, regarding the physical training of youth, Madame de Lamartine's sound sense and fervent christian piety prevented an injurious and too close adherence to the rules of the same writer respecting intellectual and moral tuition. She instilled into the mind of Alphonse so warm a love of religion, that the sentiment tingured

all his future life and thoughts." The manner in which this was effected is best expressed in Lamartine's own words, being the first paragraph of his most interesting narrative of "Travels in the East," during the years 1832 and 1833.

"My mother had received from her mother, on her death bed, a fine Bible of Royaumont, in which she taught me to read when I was a little child. This bible had engravings of sacred subjects in all the pages. There was Sarah; there was Tobit and his angel; there was Joseph or Samuel; and above all, there were those fine patriarchal scenes, where the solemn and primitive manners of the east were mingled with every act of that simple and marvellous life which was led by the early men. When I had correctly recited my lesson, and had read nearly without fault a half page of sacred history, my mother uncovered the engraving, and, holding the book open on her knees, made me contemplate it, while giving me its explanations as my reward. She was endowed by nature with a soul equally pious and affectionate, and with an imagination of the most sensitive and graphic order; all her thoughts were sentiments, all her sentiments were images; her fine, noble, sweet countenance reflected in its beaming physiognomy all that was glowing in her heart, all that was painted in her conceptions; and the silvery tone of her voice, so affectionate, so solemn, and impressive, imparted to her every word an emphasis of such force and interest, and love, as still at this moment, to vibrate in my ear, alas! after six years of silence! The view of these engravings, the explanations and poetical commentaries of my mother, inspired me from my tenderest infancy with scriptural tastes and inclinations; and, from the love of these representations to the desire of seeing the places where the events represented had taken place, there was but one step. I burned, then, from the age of eight years, with an eager wish of visiting those mountains where God descended; those deserts where angels came and pointed out to Hagar the hidden spring from which to reanimate her poor banished infant that was dying of thirst; that heaven where the angels were seen to descend and to ascend on the ladder of Jacob. This longing had never been extinguished in me; I mused continually on journeying to the east, which formed the one great act of my intellectual existence; I was eternally constructing in my thoughts a vast, religious epic, of which their beautiful localities were to form the principal scene; it seemed to me also, as if my spiritual doubts and religious perplexities were there to find their solution and pacification. In a word, I was from this source to find coloring for my poem; for life always presented itself to my intellect as a great poem; while to my heart it breathed of love. GOD, LOVE, and POETRY—these are the three only words I should wish engraved on my monument, should I ever deserve a monument."

We are all more or less influenced by our associates. If we are much in the company of the wise, the good, and the great, it will become manifest in our manners—our words our actions. None are so worthy of these titles as the patriarchs, prophets and apostles of the scriptures. We soon make a companion of a favorite author. The diligent student of God's word soon becomes an associate of the great men of olden times. Whatever may be his profession or employment, he will feel the beneficial in-

fluence of such society. Even in the present life he will prove the value of God's word; but how much more when earth and life have lost their happiness and joys, and we are about to enter the spirit world—a world, to us entirely unknown, a world of doubt, of gloom, of pitchy darkness, even though surrounded by all the light of literature and science; but with the lamp of heaven in our hands and a heartfelt consciousness of acting in conformity with its sacred teachings—a glorious land of rest where “sickness and sorrow, pain and death, are felt and feared no more.”

W. W. E.

BEAUTIFUL EXTRACT.—The Redeemer's birth was mean on earth below; but it was celebrated with hallelujahs by the heavenly host in the air above. He had a poor lodging; but a star lighted visitants to it from distant countries. Never prince had such visitants conducted. He had not the magnificent equipage that other kings have, but he was attended with multitudes of patients seeking and obtaining healing of soul and body. That was more true greatness than if he had been attended with crowds of princes. He made the dumb that attended him sing his praises, and the lame to leap for joy—the deaf to hear his wonder, and the blind to see his glory. He had no guard of soldiers, or magnificent retinue of servants; but as the centurion, that hath both, acknowledged, health and sickness, life and death, and all earthly power obeyed him; and death and the grave durst not refuse to deliver up their prey, when he demanded it. He did not walk upon tapestry; but when he walked on the sea, the waters supported him. All parts of the creation, except sinful man, honored him as their Creator. He kept no treasure; but when he had occasion for money, the sea sent it to him in the mouth of a fish. He had no barns or cornfields; but when he was inclined to make a feast, a few loaves covered a sufficient table for many thousands. None of all the monarchs of the world ever gave such entertainment.

By these, and many such things, the Redeemer's glory shone through his meanness (humiliation) in the several parts of life. Nor was it wholly clouded at his death. He had not, indeed, that fantastic equipage of sorrow that other great persons have on such occasions; but the frame of nature solemnized the death of its Author—heaven and earth were mourners—the sun was clad in black; and if the inhabitants of the earth were unmoved, the earth itself trembled under the awful load. There were few to render the Jewish compliment of rending their garments; but the rocks were not so insensible—they rent their bowels. He had not a grave of his own, but other men's graves opened to him. Death and the grave might be proud of such a tenant in their territories; but he came not there as a subject, but as an invader, a conqueror. It was then the king of terrors lost his sting, and on the third day the Prince of Life triumphed over him, spoiling death and the grave.—*Chris. Cit.*

THE SEA.—To what a degree of calmness and repose that element can descend, which bears the three-decker without feeling its weight, which can gnaw away whole leagues, wear down hills, split rocks, and shatter mountains by the shock of its roaring billows! Nothing is so gentle as that which is powerful.—*Lamartine.*

REVIEW

Of a "Dissertation on the Nature and Administration of Baptism. Part I. By the Rev. WM. SOMMERVILLE, A. M., 'Horton,' Nova Scotia.

A very particular friend of ours in Nova Scotia, who, not without good reason perhaps, estimates highly the learning and talents of Mr. Somerville, handed us, some time since, a pamphlet of 57 pages with the above title. He thought there were facts and arguments in favor of *sprinkling* and *pouring*, and against *immersion*, as the meaning of baptize and baptism, which the Baptists have not, to his knowledge, answered; and he thought they were worthy a careful examination. Were it not for this opinion expressed, it is not probable that a review, by us, would ever have been attempted—at least in this publication. Indeed it is doubtful whether we should have ever read the pamphlet, were it not for the special request of our friend: so many books and pamphlets in defence of sprinkling, or as apologies for it as *one* of the "modes" of baptism, had come under our observation, we were of the opinion that the subject had been exhausted; and for this reason we thought time lost in their perusal. But Mr. S. strikes out a new path! He alike opposes the usual course of immersers and sprinklers in their reasonings on this question. That the action to be performed in obeying a positive institution should be ascertained by the meaning of the word by which it is designated, is in his estimation most absurd!! As neither the manner of observing the Passover, nor the Lord's Supper, can be determined by the meaning of these words, so neither can we learn what action is to be performed in obedience to the command, "be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord," by the meaning of the word baptize! Hear his own words, "In regard to neither [Passover or Lord's Supper] shall we find reason to believe the distinctive name appropriated to it, intended or adapted to afford the information necessary to its due observance according to appointment."* This is the cream of the pamphlet. He blames his brother sprinklers for agreeing with the immersers that baptism can be learned by the meaning of the word baptize. His words are "According to the line of argument adopted by Anabaptists in general, the determination of the *mode* must turn upon the original, and (what is assumed, not very accurately, to be identical,) the proper signification of the term baptize or baptism. The advocates of the *rite of pouring* or *sprinkling*, which [the Anabaptists] deny to be *baptismal*, have, to a considerable extent, acquiesced with them in this."† He stands almost alone in his position, but instead of being fearful of his task, he engages in it like a man conscious of his strength and the goodness of his cause. His style, tone, and manner, seem to say "immersers you are wrong, you have never been baptized—though a small quantity of water, either poured or sprinkled upon you, would have been baptism, yet a complete submersion is emblematical of a curse rather than a blessing, and therefore you are unbaptized; and you sprinklers, you have mistaken the best manner of handling the question—you never should have admitted that the meaning of the only word expressive of an ordinance should be sought in order to ascer-

* Page 6.

† Page 3.

tain the manner of attending to it—the Anabaptists have gained an advantage by this admission—the *design* of a positive institution must determine the manner in which it should be obeyed.” If we correctly understand Mr. S’s. positions and arguments, this is the sum. But the two main pillars of his system, we will give in his own words.

“In the New Testament, in which alone the word baptize and baptism occurs, it is unaccompanied by any explanatory details bearing upon the mode in which baptism is to be administered. The speakers, whose words are recorded by the inspired writers, evidently proceed upon the assumption, that those who heard them, so fully understood what ideas were intended to be communicated by the word in question, that any explanation or particular description of the mode of administering the ordinance indicated by the term baptism, would be superfluous. And the inspired writers also obviously take for granted the intelligibility of their phraseology when speaking of the dispensation of that ordinance. ‘And were baptized of him in Jordan.’ ‘Teach all nations, baptizing them.’ ‘Why baptizest thou them.’ In fact throughout the New Testament, for our knowledge of what constitutes baptism as a divinely instituted rite, if we except incidental allusions not primarily intended to cast light upon the present enquiry, we are to look to the word in its naked individuality.”*

We quote his language to the end of a paragraph, that the reader may have the sentiment which we intend examining, entire. His first pillar then is that baptism “*is unaccompanied by any explanatory details bearing upon the mode in which it is to be administered*”—“we are to look to the word in its naked individuality,” provided we confine ourselves to the New Testament in our examinations! The second pillar of his temple of the sprinkling and pouring modes of baptism leans for support upon the first. It is that “Baptism is not an ordinance peculiar to the New Testament times. It is a *divinely instituted rite of the former dispensation*”

Though these positions could possibly be sustained, we think there would yet be a great work to perform to prove that baptize means to sprinkle, but as this is the assumed ground, and one to in some respects differing from all his brother Presbyterians, who declare that they believe that baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, we will place these assertions in contrast with the word of God, and leave the reader to draw his own conclusions.

1. Is it a fact then, that there is nothing accompanying the *word baptizo, baptizo, &c.* to distinguish it from *raino* (sprinkle), *cheo* (pour)? Are these words used interchangeably in the Old or New Testament Scriptures? The general reader would come to this conclusion by reading Mr. S’s. pamphlet! Indeed, if we understand him, he makes the pouring and sprinkling of the law of Moses baptism, perpetuated under the christian dispensation. In reply to Mr. S’s. assertion that baptism is unaccompanied by any thing to make definite the action meant by the word, we would remark that the words *bapto, baptizo, &c.* are always ‘accompanied’ by a different class of prepositions from those which invariably accompany *raino, cheo, &c.* “We shall illustrate this by taking *raino*, and its compounds, *peri, raino*, and *epi* together, *bapto* and *baptizo*,

with *en* and *eis*, as they are found in common usage. I assert, then, that for some reason *raino* and *epi* agree together, *baptizo* and *en* also agree together. But *raino* and *en*, or *baptizo*, and *epi*, so perfectly disagree, as never to be found construed in amity in any Greek author, sacred or profane. For example; sprinkle the blood upon him—*peri-raino epi* Lev. xiv. 7. Sprinkle upon the house—*peri-ranei epiteen oikian*. Lev. xiv. 51. He shall sprinkle it upon the mercy seat—*ranei epi hilasterion*. Lev. xvi. 14. I will sprinkle upon you clean water—*raino epi humas katharon hudoor*. Eze. xxxvi. 25. In construction, then, with the person upon whom water is sprinkled, the verb *raino* is followed by *epi*; never by *en* or *eis*. *A* sprinkles water, blood, oil, dust, or ashes, upon *B*.; but never sprinkles *B*. in blood, oil, dust &c. . whereas *baptizo* in such cases is followed by *en* or *eis*, never by *epi*. *A*. immerses *B*. not upon, or with, but in water. This is a most convincing fact, that *baptizo* occurring eighty times in the New Testament, is never construed *epi* nor *raino* with *en* or *eis*. *Baptizo* is frequently construed with *en* or *eis*; and *raino* with *epi*; but they never interchange their particles. A shadow does not more naturally accompany an object standing in the sunshine, in this latitude, than does *epi* accompany *raino* and *en baptizo*, in the cases described.

“All this is equally true in the case of *cheo*, to pour. The object on which water or any thing is poured, is designated by *epi*, never by *en*. The thing poured or sprinkled always follows the verb to pour or sprinkle. the person is always preceded by upon. Neither of these facts ever occur in the case of *baptizo*. In that case the person always follows the verb; and the material in which the action is performed, is always preceded by *en*, expressed or understood. Hence the uniform construction is, ‘I immerse *B*. in water;’ in the other case the construction is ‘I pour or sprinkle water upon *B*.’ Not more clearly different are these two constructions in English than they are in Greek. Indeed the object immersed is never governed by a preposition, the object sprinkled is always governed by a preposition. The actions, then, in the original are just as distinct as the words *baptizo*, *cheo*, *raino*, and their respective constructions. Now as *baptizo* has frequently both *en* or *eis* construed with the liquid or material used in the ordinance, and *raino* and *cheo* never; follows it not that these prepositions demonstrate a meaning in these words wholly incompatible with each other, so far as action is concerned?

“It is as impossible either to pour or sprinkle a man into or in a river, as it is to immerse him upon it, or to immerse water upon him. It is, therefore, offering the grossest violence to all the laws of congruous construction to attempt to translate *baptizo* by sprinkle, pour, or purify, or *raino* and *cheo* by immerse, plunge, or overwhelm. The best lexicography, both of the principal and their usual retinue of particles and circumstances, peremptorily forbids such liberties.” And yet with these facts before him, proved and illustrated by Old and New Testament authority, Mr S. most emphatically asserts that “it is unaccompanied by any explanatory details bearing upon the mode in which baptism is to be administered.” “We are left to look upon the word in its naked individuality.”

2. The disciples of Christ were addressed as having been "*buried*" with Christ—"planted in the likeness of his death." These expressions cannot possibly be used in reference to sprinkling or pouring. This point has been so often agitated that it cannot now be necessary to go over it again! Do not these expressions—"accompanying" baptism have a "bearing upon the mode?"

Let any common sense English scholar read the various New Testament accounts of the Saviour's baptism "in Jordan"—his "going down into the water," and coming up therefrom—John's baptizing where there was "much water"—the people always repairing to the water instead of bringing the water to them—the detailed account which we have of the Eunuch's baptism: let him we say be familiar with these facts, and then hear Mr. S. say baptism "is unaccompanied by any explanatory details bearing on the mode," and would he not be in doubt whether a first rate education and the study of theology were not injurious rather than beneficial in the study of God's word? Indeed we are not at all surprised that the unlearned of those whom Mr. S. pleases to call Anabaptists—in his own graphic style—"with a smile of conscious superiority, or the scornful glance due to wilful ignorance or obstinate impiety, rise in triumph over sanctified (!) talent and education, adorned with the fruits of practical piety, when found in opposition, holding aloft in their nervous grasp, a flag inscribed thus—'HE WENT DOWN INTO THE WATER AND CAME UP OUT OF THE WATER.'" This one fact is a sufficient refutation of his first position that baptism "is unaccompanied by any explanatory details bearing upon the mode."

3. Because the words Passover and Lord's Supper do not, in his estimation, convey any definite idea of the manner of attending to these institutions—he therefore argues that we must look to some other source than the meaning of the word baptism for the "mode" of observing it! The cases are not exactly parallel. The words Passover and Lord's Supper are translations—literal versions of their original. It is not so with baptism. What is its English representative? Mr. S. will not venture to render it by *pour* or *sprinkle*, we should judge, by his avoiding entirely the discussion of the literal meaning of the word under consideration. By the way this is a curious feature of his pamphlet—the production of a man of finished education, and so confident of his abilities as Mr. S. It is true his whole book is to oppose immersion as christian baptism, but this he does by endeavoring to prove that as sprinkling and pouring were to convey blessings, and as baptism is the "washing of regeneration," it certainly must be a pouring or a sprinkling; and this appears to him fully confirmed when he considers that all Old Testament immersions were judgments rather than blessings! We shall notice this argument in the sequel. To return.

Are not all the circumstances connected with the Saviour's baptism and also that of the Eunuch as fully and minutely detailed as the observance of the Lord's Supper. The parties came "to Jordan"—to "much water"—to a "certain water"—"they went down into it;" they were baptized; they then came up "from"—"out of" it—are facts as plainly, as circumstantially related, as Paul's account of the observance of the Lord's Supper.

The assertion then of Mr. Sommerville that "it has been admitted that the New Testament supplies not one sentence of direct information upon the subject,"* is most astonishing! Who *has* admitted this? Who can admit it! Surely not we with the facts before us already submitted! The expression is a most singular one. Who could admit that the New Testament is destitute of "direct information" of the meaning of the word baptize! As soon would we turn our attention to the law of Moses for information in relation to the character, mission, death and resurrection of the Messiah, as to the sprinklings of oil, blood, and water, of the Mosaic dispensation for the meaning of christian baptism.

4. We have at present but one other exclamation to record in relation to this singular effort in support of aspersion and affusion. The author admits that the expression of the Saviour "except a man be born of water and spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," relates to baptism. He does more; he introduces that passage among others to prove that baptism was "enjoined in every case" for "*purification*" "*cleansing*," "*sanctification*," &c. Now, it is admitted, that the expressions "born of the spirit," "begotten of God"—"born of water," and the like, are figurative. Things known are used as similitudes to teach us the doctrine of the Lord. What kind of symbol sprinkling a few drops of water, or pouring a handful, upon the head or face of an infant or an adult can be of a birth, is beyond our conception! If John iii. 5, refers to baptism—and we believe it does—it demonstrates to our mind that it was immersion to which the Saviour referred when he said, except a man be born of water, &c. Being buried with Christ in immersion—in the likeness of his burial in the tomb: as Christ's coming forth from the tomb was called a birth—he was the first born from the dead—so the sinner, by faith and repentance, cut off from his former sinful life, is dead to it, and then buried in water into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—he comes forth to walk in newness of life—he is born into the church of God—filled with the Spirit; having before his immersion been begotten by the Holy Spirit's seed—the word of God. Of him it may truly be said, he is born of incorruptible seed, the word of God—born of Water and Spirit!

However ingeniously, Mr. S. may manage the question of the figurative benefits of sprinkling and pouring, and the symbolic and real judgments of immersion; if the admission that baptism is "for remission of sins"—that it is the "washing of regeneration"—the "being born of water"—and necessary to constitute infants and adults members of the visible family of God, is not fatal to infant church membership, and the sprinkling and pouring modes of baptism, I know not what would be fatal to a cause. Here we must pause for the present; but we are not done with the pamphlet yet.

P. S. We have penned the above amidst numerous interruptions, and only a few lines at a time. Our readers must pardon its desultory character and style. We did purpose completing our remarks in one number, but we have not time. Our remarks will be resumed, the Lord-willing, in our next.

W. W. E.

GIVE UP THE BIBLE.

BY A. D. F. RANDOLPH.

Give up the Bible! Shall we make a sacrifice like this?
 Shall we forsake our earthly stay, our guide to heavenly bliss?
 And pluck from life's bewildering maze, where we but wanderers are,
 The light that on our pathway shines—a never fading star?

Give up the Bible! Must we yield to every man the right
 To place himself between our gaze and heaven's eternal light?
 To wrest from us the gift of God, our blessing and our guide,
 For which the just in every age have nobly bled and died?

Give up the Bible! Hark! There comes a voice from every age,
 And thunder tones are breaking now from peasant and from sage:
 They bid us bind it to our hearts, and keep it as they kept,
 E'en though the storm be fiercer now than those which round them swept

Give up the Bible! Can we yield our staff of pilgrimage—
 The truths that in God's living light beam on its every page—
 The records of a Saviour's death—the lessons which he gave—
 The only light that points the way to life beyond the grave?

Give up the Bible! Force from us whatever rights you may,
 Bring desolation on our homes, and take the loved away—
 Bring woe for joy—rend tender ties—and scatter death abroad,
 But leave us in our wretchedness the sacred word of God!

Give up the Bible! God forbid that we should recreant prove
 To all the sterling deeds of those whose memories we love;
 They kept the Bible, and shall we be faithless to our trust,
 And give our heritage away upon our fathers' dust!

Give up the Bible! NO! And now we send abroad the cry;
 The Bible! By its truths we live, and for them we will die!
 We hold it now, and we would tread the paths the just have trod,
 Nor sacrifice, to man on earth, the Oracles of God!

PREDESTINATION AND PROVIDENCE.—The expression of this Turk (the Bey of Negropont and Athens) had that character which I have recognized in all the Mussulman countenances which I have had occasion to see in Syria and Turkey—nobleness, mildness, and that calm and serene resignation which these men derive from the doctrine of predestination, and which true christians acquire from faith in Providence. There is here the same adoration of the divine will; but the one is pushed to absurdity and error, while the other is the sad and true avowal of that universal and merciful wisdom which presides over the destiny of all that it has designed to create. If an opinion, held from conviction, could be considered a virtue, fatalism, or rather providentism, would be mine! I believe in the ever-acting, and ever present energy, of the will of God—it is the evil in us that alone opposes this divine will in always producing good! Whenever destiny is changed, or injured, or perverted, if we consider well, we shall always recognize that it is through a will of our own, a human will, that it is to say, a corrupt and perverse one; if we would allow the only ever good will to act, we should be always good and always happy ourselves!—evil would not exist! Those dogmas of the Koran are but the Christian doctrine modified, but that modification has not been able to degenerate them. That worship of theirs is full of virtues, and I love this people, because they are a people of prayer!—
Lamartine.

CAMPBELL AND OWEN'S DEBATE.

WE have frequent orders for this work. It is out of print. There have been no copies on sale for ten years. If brother Campbell or some one capable would collect all the facts (?) and arguments of Mr. Owen, and the cream of brother Campbell's replies, and his noble defence of christianity, and publish them in a neat cheap volume, they would at the present time do the world a real service. One of our attentive readers has suggested this thought to us, and it fully accords with my judgment in the case. The work now is too large, and there is much chaff in it; but there is much real thought—some of the finest paragraphs for fact, argument, illustration and style in the English language. Take the following from the Appendix, written by brother Campbell, in which he sums up Mr. Owen's system of scepticism.

W. W. B.

ROBERT OWEN'S SOCIALISM.

BY A. CAMPBELL.

FROM the whole scope of Mr. Owen's discussion, and most unequivocally from his appendix, it appears that his whole scheme of things is predicated upon one fundamental position. This position is: that MAN IS NOT A FREE AGENT. That *no man forms his own character, but that every man's character is formed for him*, is one of his consequences from this position. Another is: *That merit and demerit, praise and blame, reward and punishment, belong not to man, nor, in truth, to any being in the universe.* Such is the soil or life of his whole system.

He declaimed much against metaphysics in his speeches and in his writings—But I now make my appeal to the learned world, and ask: Is there in the whole science of metaphysics more abstruse speculations or questions than those constituting and proceeding from the above positions? If there be such a thing as the *quintessence* of metaphysics—I say, it is the question about *free agency* in all its sublimated ramifications—But this only by the way.

Men of the most gigantic talents have fatigued themselves in writing octavos, quartos, and folios, upon the doctrines of liberty and necessity—From the learned folio of Peter Sterry, down to the unanswerable octavo of President Edwards, there has been written a waggon load of learned lumber on this very question. Before a popular assembly, and to the great majority of readers, the plan of *reductio ad absurdum* appears to us the shortest way of settling these wordy disputes; and, therefore, we generally preferred this argument while on the stage of discussion, whenever Mr. Owen presented these metaphysical dogmas. That there is no moral difference on Mr. Owen's hypothesis between the actions of a machine and those of King Solomon, Sir Isaac Newton, and the Apostle Paul; that a man, a fish, an oyster, a tree, a watch, are equally voluntary agents, alike praiseworthy, alike blameworthy, virtuous, vicious, good, or evil, was repeatedly shown during the discussion. The tree that cools us with its shade, that refreshes us with its fruit, and that kills us by its fall, is neither praiseworthy nor blameworthy. So the patricide, the matricide, the homicide, and the philanthropic, the affectionate, kind and benevolent son, daughter, brother, neighbor, are alike

praiseworthy, alike blameworthy—in truth, neither to be praised nor blamed at all. All the feeling which Mr. Owen professes to have for such evil doers, is *pity*—he may pity the child that kills his father, as he pities the widow which the wickedness of a son has made. He pities, too, the religious man as a deluded being—and, indeed, I cannot see why he may not equally pity every thing that exists, and be as much grieved for the virtues as the vices of men—I think his metaphysics which place the idiot, the madman, the philosopher, and the sage, upon the same footing with each other, and with all things animal, vegetable, and mineral, excludes pity altogether, and divests man of all feelings as well as of all free agency.

Whenever the idea of merit and demerit is exiled from earth, the idea of pity must follow it. No body pities a tree because the wind has torn a branch from it. No body pities the lion who kills himself in pursuit of a lamb, nor the hawk that breaks its head in the pursuit of a chicken. We pity suffering innocence—but take away the idea of innocence, and we destroy all pity. Destroy merit and demerit, and we have no use for the word *innocence*; and then we can have no suffering innocence, and so no pity.

But the idea of a philanthropist is just as inadmissible upon Mr. Owen's principles as that of praise or blame. Now, Mr. Owen professes to be a *philanthropist*, that is, a lover of men. But is love a reasonable or an unreasonable thing? If reasonable, Mr. Owen cannot, upon his own principles, be truly a philanthropist. For what reason can induce him to spend his days in benefitting men more than crows or squirrels, more than in cultivating *hellebore* or *hemlock*? A lump of animated matter, of vegetable matter, whether in the form of a biped, a quadruped, or a tulip, is matter still, and as necessary in its figure, properties, and powers as it is in being material. There is nothing in man, upon his principles, amiable more than in a goose. The goose which furnishes this quill, and on whose coat I slept last night, and on whose carcass I feasted last Christmas, was a benefactor of man, and a philanthropist, upon Mr. Owen's theory, as worthy of praise as himself, because as reasonable and as unreasonable. If the size, figure, and animal qualities of man, prompt Mr. Owen to be a philanthropist, he ought for as good reasons, to devote his life to the care of horses and elephants. If longevity, an erect position, and a peculiar organization, make man worthy of so much love from him, the goose who lives longer, the tree which grows taller, and the crocodile which is as curiously organized as man, equally merit his labors of love. To say that he is a philanthropist because he belongs to the race of men, is to place philanthropy upon the same foundation with those animal affections which pervade most species of quadrupeds and bipeds for their own. This is an unreasonable philanthropy and unworthy of the name. There cannot be a *philosophic philanthropist* upon any principle which divests man of merit and demerit, of praise and blame, of reward and punishment; upon any principle which excludes from the human mind the idea of a God and a future state. Men who deny these may call themselves philanthropists, they may labor for the good of men, but they are no more philanthropists than the bee which makes honey, nor the sheep who yields its fleece. They do not bestow

their labors nor their coats on man through a love for him. Other motives prompt their actions. So Mr. Owen may spend time, money, and personal toils, on what appear to be his philanthropic objects; but these may be demonstrated to proceed from vanity, by a much more convincing logic than can be employed to show that they proceed from the love of man, properly so called.

For my part, if I were compelled to give up the doctrine of immortality, or could be induced to think that man differs from other animals, merely so far as he differs from them in the organization of one hundred and fifty pounds of matter, I would think it just as reasonable and philosophic that I should spend my life in raising and teaching dogs and horses, and improving their circumstances.

The materialist, or philosophic necessarian, who says that the earth is an immense prison, and the laws of nature so many jailors, and all mankind prisoners bound in chains which cannot be dissolved; or, to speak without a figure, who says that the actions of all men are as unavoidable as the ebbing and flowing of the sea, or the waxing and waning of the moon, can never rationally be a reformer. For what could he reform! He could not pretend to reform nature, nor any of its laws. On Mr. Owen's principles the present state of the world is perfectly natural and unavoidable. Nature in the regular operation of cause and effect has issued in his trinity of evils—Religion, matrimony and private property. Now if nature has gone wrong, and man without *free agency* has landed in religion, matrimony, and private property, how unphilosophic is the philosopher of *circumstances*, who would preach up the necessity of a change in society when he cannot change necessity!!

It is a climax in the eloquence of absurdity which Mr. Owen is aspiring after. He preaches that all things are just as they must be. The uncontrolable laws of nature have issued in the present system of things; and yet he would have us to make things what they ought not to be; that is, he would have us to abolish religion, matrimony, and private property, which his own eternal and unchanging laws of nature, in their necessary and uncontrolable operations have originated and established. On Mr. Owen's theory all things are natural and unavoidable. It is mother nature working by her own laws, and yet he would make us all matricides!!! If Mr. Owen is not stranded here, there is not a shoal in the universe.

From all eternity, according to Mr. Owen's scheme, the particles of matter have been in incessant agitation, working themselves up into ten thousand times ten thousand forms. A few of them at one time produced a Nimrod, a Pharaoh, a Moses, a Cyrus, a Nebuchadnezzar, an Alexander, a Julius Cæsar, a Bonaparte, a Paul, a Robert Owen, and a few such manufacturers of human character. Not one of them could help being born, nor being such characters, nor producing such effects on society. Blind and Omnipotent Nature cast them forth as she does so much lava from the crater of a volcano. She tied them fast in adamantine chains of inexorable fate, and gave them no more liberty to act than the Peak of Teneriffe has to emigrate to New Harmony. Yet strange, surpassing strange, as it is, this singular piece of animated matter called Robert Owen, which required old Nature in her laboratory six thousand

years to produce, would now teach us to rebel and become seditious against the queen of fate; and would have us claim and take the liberty from nature of forming human beings to our own mind, and of changing the powers of nature; in fact, of binding her fast in her own cords, so that we shall abolish religion, matrimony, and private property; put the Old Queen Nature into jail at New Harmony, and never let her out upon a parole of honor, as long as grass grows and water runs.

Mr. Owen is, without knowing it, or intending it, the greatest advocate of *free agency* I have ever known; for he would have the present generation to adopt such arrangements and so to new modify the circumstances that surround them, as to prevent the goddess Nature from having it in her power ever to make another religious animal, another wedding, or to use the words *mine* or *thine*. And yet the chorus of his new music is, that we have no more liberty to act than Gibraltar has to perch itself upon the cupola of the State House of Ohio. Such a philosopher is my good natured friend Robert Owen.

CONFESSIONS OF AN INFIDEL.

THE Confessions of Rousseau, as to his own character, are well known. A more base and presumptuous profligate, on his own showing, perhaps never existed. The following is a *confession* of a very different nature. In it he not only draws out a strong argument in behalf of the Divine character and mission of Christ, but condemns and exposes his brother infidels by eulogizing these Sacred Writings on which they heap every term of contempt and reproach. He is at least as good a judge of writers and writings as Paine. It may seem strange how one who could express himself in the following just and beautiful words, should still have remained an infidel; until we remember that the true seat of infidelity is the *heart*, not the *head*; and that Rousseau felt the power of Rochester's strongest objection to the Bible, "a bad life."

"I will confess to you," says he, "that the majesty of the Scriptures strikes me with admiration, as the purity of the gospel hath its influence on my heart. Peruse the works of our philosophers, with all their pomp of diction; how mean, how contemptible are they, compared with the Scriptures! Is it possible that a book, at once so simple and sublime, should be merely the work of man? Is it possible that the Sacred Personage whose history it contains, should be himself a mere man? Do we find that he assumed the tone of an enthusiast or ambitious sectary? What sweetness, what purity in his manner! What an affecting gracefulness in his delivery? What profound wisdom in his discourses! What presence of mind in his replies! How great the command over his passions! Where is the man, where the philosopher, who could so live and so die, without weakness, and without ostentation? When Plato described his imaginary good man, loaded with all the shame of guilt, yet meriting the highest rewards of virtue, he describes exactly the character of Jesus Christ: the resemblance was so striking, that all the Christian fathers perceived it.

"What prepossession, what blindness must it be, to compare Socrates, the son of Sophroniscus, to Jesus, the son of Mary? What an infinite

disproportion there is between them? Socrates dying without pain or ignominy, easily supported his character to the last; and if his death, however easy, had not crowned his life, it might have been doubted whether Socrates, with all his wisdom, was any thing more than a vain sophist. He invented, it is said, the theory of morals. Others, however, had before put them in practice: he had only to say therefore what they had done, and to reduce their example to precepts. Aristides had been just, before Socrates defined justice: Leonidas had given up his life for his country, before Socrates had declared patriotism to be a duty: the Spartans were a sober people before Socrates recommended sobriety: before he had ever defined virtue, Greece abounded in virtuous men. But where could Jesus learn, among his competitors, that pure and sublime morality, of which he only hath given us both precept and example. The greatest wisdom was made known among the most bigoted fanaticism, and the simplicity of the most heroic virtues did honor to the vilest people upon earth. The death of Socrates, peaceably philosophizing with his friends, appears the most agreeable that could be wished for; that of Jesus, expiring in the midst of agonizing pains, abused, insulted, and accused by a whole nation, is the most horrible that could be feared. Socrates, in receiving the cup of poison, blessed indeed the weeping executioner who administered it; but Jesus, in the midst of excruciating tortures, prayed for his merciless tormentors. Yes, if the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus are those of a God. Shall we suppose the evangelic history a mere fiction? Indeed, my friend, it bears not the mark of fiction; on the contrary, the history of Socrates, which nobody presumes to doubt, is not so well attested as that of Jesus Christ. Such a supposition, in fact, only shifts the difficulty, without obviating it; it is more inconceivable that a number of persons should agree to write such a history, than that only one should furnish the subject of it. The Jewish authors were incapable of the diction, and strangers to the morality contained in the gospel, the marks of whose truth are so striking and inimitable, that the inventor would be a more astonishing character than the hero."

RELIGIOUS MAXIMS.

XIX.

It is an excellent saying of the celebrated Fenelon, "It is only imperfection that complains of what is imperfect." It would be well for those who aim at christian perfection to remember this. Surrounded by those who constantly exhibit defects of character and conduct, if we yield to a complaining and impatient spirit, we shall mar our own peace, without having the satisfaction of benefitting others. When the mind is in a right position, absorbed in God and truly dead to the world, it will not be troubled by these things. Or, if it be otherwise, and we are in fact afflicted, it will be for others, and not for ourselves, and we shall be more disposed to pity than complain—*Upham*.

XX.

No man ever arrives at christian perfection, no man ever *can* arrive at that ennobling state who walks by sight rather than by faith, of whom it

cannot be said, as of the father of the faithful, "he went out, *not knowing whither he went*" Perhaps we may say, it is the highest attainment of the soul, (certainly it is the foundation of the highest or perfect state in all other christian attainments,) that of entire and unwavering confidence in God. O God, we are thine; forever thine. We will not let thee go, until thou bless us. And when thou dost bless us, still we will not let thee go. For without thee, even blessing would be turned into cursing. Therefore will we ever trust in thee.—*Ibid.*

XXI.

Always make it a rule to do every thing, which it is proper and a duty to do, in the best manner and to the best of your ability. An imperfect execution of a thing, when we might have done better, is not only unprofitable, but it is a *vicious* execution; or, in other words is morally wrong. He who aims at perfection in great things, but is willing to be imperfect in little things, will find himself essentially an imperfect man. The perfection of the greater will be no compensation, no excuse, for the imperfection of the less. Such a person wants the essential principle of universal obedience. Consider well, therefore, what God in his providence would have you perform; and if you feel the spirit of those directions, which require us to do all things unto God rather than unto men, you will not do them with a false heart or a feeble hand. And thus in small things, as well as in great, in those which are unseen as well as those which attract notice, it shall be said of you, "Well done good and faithful servant!"—*Ibid.*

"NOTHING IN A NAME."—We heard, not long since, quite an amusing anecdote about *names*. Our sectarian friends, who wear them, affirm that there is "nothing in a name." The case before us was a *practical* illustration of the affirmation.

A few years since there was a *union meeting* some where up in the State of Missouri. The different popular religious parties united together, and had a great meeting. On the third day one of the ablest and prominent preachers was put up to preach on the subject of Christian Union. He expatiated most eloquently upon the subject; of the utility and possibility of it; said that Jesus had prayed for it, and it was practicable. He cited the case of his audience in proof of its practicability. It was true, he said, that they were known by different names, as Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, &c., but he continued, "there's *nothing* in a *name*," that they would not be asked, when they got home to heaven, what they were here, &c. Upon this the audience raised a loud shout, "Glory to God," when an old sister, sitting fronting the stand, cried out, "Glory to *King* BEELZEBUB!!!" Upon this one of the preachers left the stand, and went round to her, and said, "Why, sister, that is the *Devil*!" "NOTHING in *names*—Glory to King Beelzebub," was the reply. She continued shouting, and was finally carried off, shouting, "*nothing* in *names*—Glory to King Beelzebub." It operated as a complete damper on the audience, and had like to have broken up the meeting! It was a *practical* illustration of the affirmation of the preacher, and showed that there is "*something* in a *name*."—*Witness of Truth.*