

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

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

- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Mis'head/
Généralique (périodiques) de la livraison

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

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

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

THE CHRISTIAN.

Vol. II. } SAINT JOHN, N. B., SEPTEMBER, 1840. } No. 4.

CONDUCTED BY W. W. EATON.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM IRELAND.

THE following interesting communication from Brother HUNTER, will be read with eagerness, we doubt not, by all our readers who were favored with his acquaintance. It is expected that he will continue to write for the *Christian*.

THE CHRISTIAN.

BROTHER EATON,

On returning from a health-seeking ramble among the mountains of Tyrone, I found a foreign package in the Post Office, bearing, most legibly, my present address. On opening it, what was my astonishment and delight to find it containing nothing less than ten numbers of your periodical, "The Christian." Returning to my lodgings, I gave them a hasty perusal, and fell into a pleasant state of mind, which gave birth to the following reflections, whose destiny I herewith commit to your good will and pleasure.

The Christian! Who is he? and in what does he differ from others? I asked the *world*; and it replied, "he is either knave or fool: fool, if believing in the reality of another world, he forfeits the pleasures of this; and knave, if not believing, he seeks to envy what he pretends to abandon."

I asked the varied hosts of *Sectarian religionists*, who boasted of a superadded appellation besides the holy patronymic of their high profession; and they answered, "he is one devoted to his God in infancy by the authority of the sages of our Israel; taught to regard himself a chosen one by virtue of such dedication; whose virtue consists of a Turkish adherence to the traditions of his fathers; and whose boast in life and death is, that he never suffered an honest difference of opinion to pass undenounced, nor ever pled for a positive command of heaven but as a non-essential!"

I turned me to the unerring page, and of the "Book of books" inquired, *Who is the Christian? and in what does he differ from others?* and methought I heard it say, "he is a hapless son of a ruined race—

ruined in fortune, fame, and hope—who felt his being interwoven with the beauties and the glories of creation, but doomed to see them perish in his glance;—who, tempted by the smile of hope, pursued her steps and found the pathway of despair; and who felt the desire of life as strong as the upheavings of volcanic fire, yet conscious of the seeds of death pervading all his frame: one who, thus cut off from every source of hope, or trust, or consolation, turned him in the wilderness of life, and saw a host of Prophets, Apostles, and holy men, pointing him to one who held the keys of Death and Hades in his hand, and telling him to believe his word, follow his footsteps, and stand forth, redeemed and saved—“A Christian!”” Having believed the word and obeyed the mandates of this potent leader, he becomes his in form and fact; he is actuated by his principles, guided by his wishes, and participates in his name, his fate, and his fortune. Hence the Christian differs from all others in many respects.

1. *The Christian differs from all others in his RELATIONSHIP.*

The boast of relationship to the great and illustrious has ever been a ruling passion of the world. To be descended from, or related to kings, princes, or even patented nobility, has been considered as conferring honor and dignity; but how infinitely superior are the claims of the Christian to these distinctions. By nature only equal to the rest of the descendants of Adam, by his alliance to Jesus Christ he is raised to a new relation; which makes him infinitely the superior of the most renowned among men. He is of the family of earth not only, but of Heaven. He has the God of Heaven for his father, the Lord Messiah for his elder brother, and the choicest spirits of the earth for his fraternity. Amid the kings and princes of the land he may, therefore, raise his head, though clothed with rags, and cover them with shame, by declaring his lineage and relationship.

2. *The Christian differs from all others in his NAME.*

It frequently happens that persons and things not only distinct but opposite are confounded, and mistakes created, on account of similarity of names. But the great and distinct patronymic of the Christian preserves him from all confusion, and draws a line of demarcation deep and broad between him and all the fraternity of the world.

I pause not now to inquire when, or by what authority, the distinctive appellation was given. Enough that the name Christian is as appropriate as it is characteristic, and as characteristic as it is noble. To the objection that we have no direct evidence that it was imposed by divine authority, it may be replied, and, I think, conclusively, that it would not have been courteous so to impose it. No man asks for the family name of the son when he knows the father. Besides, whatever is founded in nature, or on the nature of things, is just as much imposed by divine authority as though Gabriel, or the Eternal Spirit, had declared it in so many words. But all the followers of Christ being divinely related to him as their head and husband, it follows that they are his people by divine relationship, and, of course, Christians by divine authority. For whoever establishes a divine relationship between Christ and his people, necessarily establishes an implied name expressive of

that relationship, and which is as necessarily divine as the relationship out of which it rose. But all will grant that the most natural and comprehensive name for the followers of Christ is Christian. Nay, I will go farther, and affirm that no other appellation can possibly supply its place as a patronymic or family name. Tell me not of "*Friend*;" for that is a name expressive of equality, and fraternal relationship cannot by possibility be a family name at all: nor of "*Disciple*," for the same reason. Nor will even the explanatory defence—"supply the ellipses"—mend the matter. Who ever heard of an *elliptical family name*?" The bare statement of it is a sufficient refutation. No, no, Christ shed his blood for his people; he purchased them at the expense of his life; and why should they not wear his name. Under the sacred, but, to the world, odious name, Christians, the early champions of the cross fought, and bled, and conquered; and why should we think lightly of it? It is at once the most natural, appropriate, and comprehensive—the most endeared and endearing name that any man or class of men ever bore. It separates the wearer at once from the world and all its clubs, classes, and associations; and unites him to heaven and all its inhabitants. It is the talisman of truth, the guarantee of honor, and the patent of all true nobility.

3. *The Christian differs from all others in his PRINCIPLES.*

As differ his relationship and name from the world, so differs his principles. It is not enough for him that a rule of action has been consecrated by time or sanctioned by numbers, unless it be right in itself. The opinion of the world he regards as the dust of the balance against the decision of his God. What he commands he would obey though all else opposed; and though the world with unanimous voice pronounced it right, unless revelation sanctioned, he would still dissent. In vain Aristotle might write and Plato reason, in vain Demosthenes plead or Tully persuade; with the words of Christ dwelling richly in his heart, and the consciousness that his eye was upon him, he would be obedient to his God, just to his neighbour, and would dare to be an *honest man*. How different all this from the principles of the men of the world need not be stated. The difference is manifest without being stated.

4. *The Christian differs from all others in his CHARACTER.*

As the love of self and the fear of the world constitute the great principles of action of the world; and the love of God, and the fear of doing wrong, constitute the great principles of action of the Christian; so we may easily imagine the characters founded on these opposite principles would be diverse. The Christian knows that the all-seeing eye is upon him, that he may do no wrong; that he is washed from his old sins; clothed with salvation as with a garment; and that it is expected of him that he shall maintain a character worthy of the august family into which he has entered, and of the renowned companions with which he is surrounded. He is assisted in this noble exertion too, by the most powerful allies. All heaven is on his side. The transcendent motives of fame, honor, and even life itself spur him on to the formation of a character which shall differ from, and in differing, shall

excel every other, whether drawn from fancy or from life. Time and space alike forbid a contrast in minutia; but I only affirm what is already familiar to every student of the New Testament, when I assert, that the annals of the world if culled of all their excellencies could not, if combined, furnish a character comparable to that of the Christian, as sketched by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ.

5. *The Christian differs from all others in his HOPE.*

Some hope that they may be rich in this world's goods; some that they may be successful in their ambitious projects; and other some that their name may live on sculptured column, learned page, or lofty song: but none dare hope for more. This life's horizon spans their whole estate. The hope of the Christian, however, is not so. While he certainly puts a proper estimate upon the affairs of this life; his chief object of hope lies beyond the reach of chilling blasts and changing seasons. He hopes, when time's last sand is run, to hear the voice of him whom all nature must obey, call him to his home on high, to see the death, and to attend the funeral of nature; to see the judge of all the earth, and from his hand receive the diadem of unfading glory and of everlasting life; and, in a word, to participate in all the privileges and felicities of that glorious home of the righteous, which has exhausted the treasures and glories of earth faintly to picture.

6. *The Christian differs from all others in his DESTINY.*

The destiny of the Christian is but the fulfilment of his hope. But how glorious and consummate is that when compared with the destiny of others. The happiest destiny which transgressors can expect, or look for, is utter destruction—to be as though they had not been. Behold them, amid all the wealth, and pomp, and fame, and ambition and bustle, suddenly cut down without hope and without home, or inheritance in the land that is sternal. No matter what they may have been, as far as eternity is concerned, their names come forth blanks among its ennobling, enriching, and ever endearing prizes. On the other side, the Christian, whatever may have been his humble circumstances, or oppressed condition here, will find himself vindicated and rewarded effectually and forever. For God himself has said that they shall mourn no more forever; nor shall they bear the load of contumely beyond the grave, for he has sworn that “he will take away the rebuke of his people from off all the earth.” Happy subjects! Glorious destiny!

Such, then, is the relationship, the name, the principles, the character, the hope, and the destiny, of the Christian; and the avowed object of the periodical which occasioned these reflections, is to mould such characters to Christ by the Gospel. May it be abundantly successful. And may the death and destiny of the Christian be the fate of the conductor and his correspondents.

W. H.

I am recruiting fast since my return to old Ireland—I am now in better health than I have been in for years, although I am not here quite a month. I had a very disagreeable passage from New York to Liverpool, but a glorious one to Derry. On my way from Liverpool to Derry I passed within gun-shot of the Isle of Man, Rathlin, Scotland, the Giant's Causeway, and the Reeks of Magilluddy, the highest moun-

tain in Ireland. I have heard some of our Irish divines. The matter was calmly sectarian; and the manner generally good. We have really some, nay, many very superior speakers. In a few days, or rather to-morrow, I start for Dublin. When, or from what point you shall next hear from me, is therefore uncertain. Next letter I may have more time to go into details. My remembrance to all.

WILLIAM HUNTER.

BAPTISM.—THE ACTION. No. V.

"BAPTISED *in* water, *in* the Holy Spirit, and *in* fire," are expressions, to the ear of those who apply the water to the candidate instead of the candidate to the water; and to those unacquainted with the word of God, rather uncommon. But that these words plainly and literally convey the meaning of the Saviour, and are the obvious rendering of the original, no person, whether critically or only partially acquainted with the Greek language, will dispute. The Greek preposition *en* exactly corresponds with the English and Latin preposition, *in*, and no doubt but the latter are derivations of the former. Every argument that can be adduced to show that *en* sometimes means *with*, *by*, *to*, *at*, &c. can with equal propriety be produced to show that *in* has the same signification in English.

We say *in* the mountain, *in* the garden, *in* the ship. What would be said of the man who would interpret our language to mean *to* or *at* the mountain, garden, and ship, because *sometimes* it had that meaning! Would we not answer—we take words in their plain, obvious, literal meaning, when the context will bear us out?—that we never go for a second nor a *tenth* meaning of a word, when the first will possibly make sense.

Those who would raise doubts in the mind on the meaning of baptism say to us that it is not certain that the Saviour, the Eunuch, or any other person was immersed; and why—because the prepositions *en* and *eis* sometimes have other meanings than *in* and *into*; and should it happen that of ninety nine cases in a hundred, these words should have a literal meaning, yet, if the hundredth should mean *at* or *to*, it would be impossible to prove immersion in water, fire, or the Holy Spirit! Such, in substance, is the reasoning of Paido-Baptists.

For the benefit of those wholly unacquainted with the Greek language we would just observe, that many Greek words, particularly the prepositions, have appended to them in all Lexicons, several definitions. There is, however, a primary meaning, and all the other definitions are nearly related to this. An *honest* translator will *always* take the *first meaning*, if, with the connexion it will express the sentiment in the original. He never departs from this rule when he can succeed in giving the sense of the original. How, then, does this rule bear on the present discussion? Entirely in our favor; for it is asserted without fear of successful contradiction, that *en* and *eis* in the original, as often

express all that we attach to *in* and *into*, as these words do in the English language !

An ingenious Lawyer would make out a case against the primary meaning of our own English *in*, &c. as well as those who advocate sprinkling, prove that *en* may sometimes mean *at*, *to*, &c. Let us try a case. A. is accused with stealing a horse *in* the City of St. John. The individual on whom the owner of the horse depends for proof, about to leave the country, appears before a Magistrate and gives in his deposition, that he saw A. steal the horse *in* the City of Saint John. The case is then a clear one ; but A's counsel, in defence, says, "*Gentlemen of the Jury*, you have heard that this deposition testifies that my client stole a horse *in* this city. The opposite counsel has asserted that the case is extremely plain ; but it will be necessary for him to make it appear—1st, That my client was actually within this village at the time the alleged theft was committed ; and—2d, He must prove that taking another's property means stealing. But I shall not dwell here—for unless it can be made to appear by the deposition that my client was really within the city at the time that the offence charged in the indictment was committed, the opposite counsel will fail in the most important count in the indictment. He has, then, to make it appear that my client was *in* St. John. All the evidence there is of this fact is contained in one little word, made up of two small letters, viz. *i-n* ; and that word used in various senses ! Now, *Gentlemen*, it is a fact that *in* sometimes signifies within ; but it is a fact equally clear that it often means something else. We sometimes speak of one man as being *in* the company of another. In this case we only mean he was *with* another man—in this case *in* means only *with*. If we say a man is *in* a war, we mean he is *at* war. Then it signifies *at* ; and *at* means *by the side of*. So the deposition that says *in* St. John, may mean only *by the side of* St. John ! That cannot surely mean within St. John which is *out of* it ! Again we say a man is *in* liquor ; when in fact we mean that liquor is *in him*. Now, a man cannot be *in* that which is *in* himself ; but he must be *outside* of that which is in him. Therefore, *in* sometimes means *outside*. Consequently I have as much authority from the deposition before the court to say that my client was *outside* of St. John as the opposite counsel has that he was *within* the City. But that you may not rest on a few examples, I will produce others. I have examples in abundance. We often say that a man is *in* anger, *in* love, *in* pain, &c. Now it is apparent to every person, that we mean that anger, love, and pain, are *in* the man. It is an axiom, too, that no man can be *in* that which is *in* him ! It is also an axiom that that within which any thing is, is *out of* that which is in it : therefore, *in* signifies *out of*. I have now shown, and that too from the deposition before you, that my client was not *within*, but really *out of* Saint John at the time the alleged offence was committed ; and therefore claim, as we have a right to do, a verdict of NOT GUILTY !!!"

Reader, what would you think of such a quibble ? Would you not think it a bad cause that called for such miserable sophistry to sustain it ? Well, to this do all the querists about the prepositions used in con

struction with baptism descend, in order to sustain the sprinkling "mode" of baptism! Instead of taking the plain, obvious meaning of *bapto*, *baptizo*, *en*, *eis*, &c. a figurative meaning is sought for, and this becomes the standard; and all the plain portions of the oracles of God are made to bend to an imaginary, or at best, a figurative meaning of the word. On the other hand, those very men, when untrammelled with a system, tell us that, in order to obtain certain and correct views of the word of God, we must find the meaning of words when they are used plainly and obviously, and thus take that which is certain to explain that which is in any way obscure. No plainer cases can be found than the observances of the Jews under law, where a man's life was suspended on the exact performance of certain acts; and there no person can question but that *bapto* always meant to dip. The use of the word *baptizo* is equally plain in the case of Naaman the Syrian: "then went he down and dipped [*ebaptisato*] himself in Jordan." But even with this plain case, some of our (reputed) great men say that his "body does not seem to be leprous all over!" and "we need not suppose him to have gone all over into the water," &c. I care not whether his leprosy covered *one tenth* of his body: the book says he *dipped himself* in Jordan. Now, if *himself* means his head, hands, or feet, then perhaps this was all that he dipped; but so long as *himself* means his whole person—so long is it certain that Naaman was completely submerged in Jordan.

But why dwell on so plain a subject! If the language used in connexion with baptism does not favor the idea of immersion, then, indeed, it never can be proved that any man ever did, or ever will, either enter heaven, hades, or hell!

What would be said of the man who should assert that Daniel was not cast *into* the Lion's den, but near to it; that the three Hebrew children were only cast *to*, or *near to*, or *unto* the fiery furnace—but not into it. That Jonah was only cast *to* the sea, and that he was *near* the great fish but not *in* it—that the swine were not drowned in the sea, but near to it—that the Saviour never was *in* Jerusalem, but *by*, *near to*, or *at* the city—that Jesus was not laid *in* the tomb, but only *near by*, &c.—that he came not *out* of it but only from its side—that no person ever will go into heaven or hell but merely to those places. What would be said to such sophists? Your answer to such men, reader, is ours to all quibblers about the prepositions used in connexion with baptism. John literally baptized not (*meta* nor *pros*,) with, but (*en*) in water; and just so certain the Lord Jesus baptized in the Holy Spirit, for the house was filled where the disciples were assembled, and Jerusalem, or rather its inhabitants who would not obey the Gospel, were literally immersed in flames, and perished. We go for a plain uniform translation, and therefore we say baptized not *with* water, but *in* water, *in Spirit*, and *in fire*. Show a good reason from the word of God to the contrary who can!

EDITOR.

REMARKS ON ROMANS SEVENTH AND EIGHTH CHAPS.

(Continued from page 71.)

THE sentiments which some contend are contained in these portions of God's word are dangerous from several considerations. A "professor of religion," reads a few verses, and, according to the erroneous manner of interpreting the word of God verse by verse, as though it were a book of maxims, concludes that Paul was writing a sketch of his christian experience. He naturally concludes that it would be presumptuous for him to aspire higher than the Apostle Paul in Christian attainments. "That is my experience exactly—Paul was sold under sin, and so am I. He carried about a body of sin, praying, who shall deliver me from this body of sin and death, and that is just my state of mind." He will go no farther. If Paul is saved he thinks he will be, and there he remains.

Now, if it should be (which to our mind is an indisputable fact) that Paul was writing about an awakened, unpardoned sinner, will not that person thus living and dying, stand before God unpardoned? Awful consideration! The importance, then, of the subject is our apology for taking up so much space in the *Christian* for its discussion.

Read, ponder, and examine closely the following sensible remarks from the pen of DR. CLARKE:

"1. The strong expressions in this clause have led many to conclude, that the *apostle* himself in his *regenerated state*, is indisputably the person intended. That all that is said in this chapter, of the *carnal man, sold under sin*, did apply to *Saul of Tarsus*, no man can doubt: that what is here said can ever be, with propriety, applied to *Paul the apostle*, who can believe? Of the former all is natural; of the latter, all here said would be monstrous, and absurd, if not blasphemous.

"2. But it is supposed that the words must be understood as implying a *regenerate man*, because the apostle says, ver. 22, *I delight in the law of God*; and in this verse, *I myself, with the mind, serve the law of God*. These things, say the objector, cannot be spoken of a wicked Jew, but of a *regenerate man*, such as the apostle then was. But when we find that the former verse speaks of a man who is *brought into captivity to the law of sin and death*; surely there is no part of the regenerate state of the apostle to which the words can possibly apply. Had he been in captivity to the law of sin and death, *after his conversion to Christianity*, what did he gain by that conversion? *Nothing* for his personal holiness. He had found no salvation under an inefficient law; and he was left in thralldom under an equally inefficient Gospel. The very genius of Christianity demonstrates that nothing like this can, with any propriety, be spoken of a *genuine Christian*.

"3. But, it is further supposed, that these things cannot be spoken of a proud or wicked Jew; yet we learn the contrary from the infallible testimony of the word of God. Of this people, in their *fallen and iniquitous state*, God says by his prophet, *They seek me daily, and delight to know my way as a nation that did RIGHTEOUSNESS, and FORSOOK not the ORDINANCES of their God: they ask me of the ordinance of JUSTICE,*

and TAKE DELIGHT in approaching to God. Isa. lviii. 2. Can any thing be stronger than this? And yet, at that time, they were most dreadfully carnal, and sold under sin, as the rest of that chapter proves. It is a most notorious fact, that how little soever the life of a Jew was conformed to the law of his God, he notwithstanding professed the highest esteem for it, and gloried in it; and the apostle says nothing stronger of them in this chapter, than their conduct and profession verify to the present day. They are still delighting in the law of God, after the inward man; with their mind, serving the law of God; asking for the ordinances of justice, seeking God daily, and taking delight in approaching to God; they even glory, and greatly exult and glory in the Divine original and excellency of their LAW; and all this while they are most abominably carnal, sold under sin, and brought into the most degrading captivity to the law of sin and death. If then all that the apostle states of the person in question be true of the Jews, through the whole period of their history, even to the present time;—if they do, in all their professions and their religious services, which they zealously maintain, confess, and conscientiously too, that the law is holy, and the commandment holy, just and good; and yet, with their flesh serve the law of sin; the same certainly may be said with equal propriety of a Jewish penitent, deeply convinced of his lost estate, and the total insufficiency of his legal observances to deliver him from his body of sin and death. And, consequently, all this may be said of Paul the Jew, while going about to establish his own righteousness, his own plan of justification; he had not as yet submitted to the righteousness of God, the divine plan of redemption by Jesus Christ.

4. It must be allowed that, whatever was the experience of so eminent a man, Christian, and apostle, as St. Paul, it must be a very proper standard of Christianity. And if we are to take what is here said, as his experience as a Christian, it would be presumption in us to expect to go higher; for, he certainly had pushed the principles of his religion to their utmost consequences. But his whole life, and the account which he immediately gives of himself in the succeeding chapter, prove, that he, as a Christian, and an apostle, had a widely different experience; an experience which amply justifies that superiority, which he attributes to the Christian religion over the Jewish; and demonstrates that it not only is well calculated to perfect all preceding dispensations; but that it affords salvation to the uttermost, to all those who flee for refuge to the hope that it sets before them. Besides, there is nothing spoken here of the state of a conscientious Jew, or of St. Paul in his Jewish state; that is not true of every genuine penitent; even before, and, it may be, long before he has believed in Christ, to the saving of his soul. The assertion, that “every Christian, howsoever advanced in the divine life, will, and must feel all this inward conflict,” &c. is as untrue as it is dangerous. That many, called Christians, and probably sincere, do feel all this, may be readily granted; and such we must consider to be in the same state with Saul of Tarsus, previously to his conversion: but that they must continue thus, is no where intimated in the Gospel of Christ. We must take

heed how we make *our experience*, which is the result of our *unbelief* and *unfaithfulness*, the *standard* for the people of God: and lower down *Christiauity* to our most reprehensible and *dwarfish* state: at the same time, we should not be discouraged at what we thus feel, but apply to God, through Christ, as Paul did; and then we shall soon be able, with him, to declare, to the eternal glory of *God's grace*, that *the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, has made us free from the law of sin and death.* This is the inheritance of God's children; and their salvation is of me, saith the Lord.

"Reader, do not plead for Baal; try, fully try, the efficiency of the blood of the covenant; and be not content with less salvation than God has provided for thee. Thou art not straitened in God, be not straitened in thy own bowels."

True, Doctor—very true. Would to the Lord that Calvinists and Arminians would come to the Lord Jesus Christ as did the Apostle, and then they would learn that the Christian character is exhibited to us in the former part of the eighth chapter, and not in the seventh. Of the Christian we learn, that he is not under condemnation—"that the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made him free from the law of sin and death." How it is possible for an honest man, in the enjoyment of his reason, to read these two chapters, and for a moment remain in doubt whether in the former he has the Christian's or the awakened sinner's character under discussion, is to us astonishing! How natural and rational, too, for him first to give a description of *one* character of a Jew seeking salvation by the Law of Moses, and then give us the christian character in contrast.

Let all who have such an "experience" as the character named in the latter part of the chapter under consideration, take the good advice of Dr. Clarke—his own brethren in particular, viz. "Apply to God through Christ as he (Paul) did." And how was that? He cried—"Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" The Lord instructed him to "go to Damascus, and there it should be told him what to do." If Paul was speaking of the workings of his own mind in the seventh chapter of Romans, it must be during the time that he saw nothing, neither did eat or drink. But let us not forget the important question before us. Ananias, by the direction of the Lord, finds Saul praying, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" The first thing he told him to do, seeing he was penitent, was, "And now why tarriest thou, arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Thus he "applied to God through Christ," and we hear nothing of his doubts and fears subsequently. He knew in whom he trusted. None enjoy this confidence who do not follow the same path. All who trust in themselves, or the word of man, can expect nothing but doubts and fears; while those who put their trust in Jehovah, by obeying his word, are like Mount Zion, which can never be removed. Since writing the above, I have glanced at a lecture by Mr. C. G. Finney, (a Presbyterian minister of the new school,) on the same subject, who concludes a very good discourse in the following plain language:

"You see, from this subject, the true position of many church mem-

bers. They are all the while struggling under the law. They approve of the law, both in its precept and penalty, they feel condemned, and desire relief. But still they are unhappy. They have no spirit of prayer, no communion with God, no evidence of adoption. They only refer to the 7th chapter of Romans as their evidence. Such an one will say, "that is my experience exactly." Let me tell you, that if this is ALL your experience, you are yet in the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity—you feel that you are in the bonds of guilt, and you are overcome by iniquity, and surely you know that it is bitter as gall. Now, do not cheat your soul by supposing that, with such an experience as this, you can go and sit down by the side of the apostle Paul. You are yet carnal, sold under sin, and unless you embrace the Gospel, you will be damned."—EDITOR.

ADDRESS TO MOTHERS.

CHAPTER III.—MATERNAL AUTHORITY—*Continued.*

UPON the subject of obedience there are a few other suggestions of importance to be made.

First, then, there is a very great diversity in the natural dispositions of children. Some are very tender in their feelings, and easily governed by affection. Others are naturally independent and self-willed. Sometimes a child gets its passions excited, and its will determined, and it cannot be subdued but by a very great effort. Almost every faithful mother is acquainted with such contests, and she knows that they often form a crisis in the character of the child. If the child then obtains the victory, it is almost impossible for the mother afterwards to regain her authority. The child feels he is the victor, and the mother the vanquished; and it is with very great difficulty that he will be compelled to renounce his independence. If, on the other hand, the mother conquers, and the child is subdued, he feels that the question is settled, and he has but little disposition to resume hostilities with one who has proved herself superior. I have known many such contests, severe and protracted, which were exceedingly painful to a parent's feelings. But when once entered upon, they must be continued till the child is subdued. It is not safe, on any account, for the parent to give up, and retire vanquished.

The following instance of such a contest occurred a few years since. A gentleman sitting by his fire-side one evening, with his family around him, took the spelling book, and called upon one of his little sons to come and read. John was about four years old. He knew all the letters of the alphabet perfectly, but happened at that moment to be in rather a sullen humour, and was not at all disposed to gratify his father. Very reluctantly he came as he was bid, but when his father pointed to the first letter of the alphabet, and said "What letter is that, John?" he could get no answer. John looked upon the book, sulky and silent.

"My son," said the father, pleasantly, "you know the letter A."

"I cannot say A," said John.

"You must," said the father, in a serious and decided tone. "What letter is that?"

John refused to answer. The contest was now fairly commenced. John was wilful, and determined that he would not read. His father knew that it would be ruinous to his son to allow him to conquer. He felt that he must, at all hazards, subdue him. He took him into another room, and punished him. He then returned, and again showed John the letter. But John still refused to name it. The father again retired with his son, and punished him more severely. But it was unavailing. The stubborn child still refused to name the letter, and when told that it was A, declared that he could not say A. Again the father inflicted punishment as severely as he dared to do it, and still the child, with his whole frame in agitation, refused to yield. The father was suffering from most intense solicitude. He regretted exceedingly that he had been drawn into the contest. He had already punished his child with a severity which he feared to exceed. And yet the wilful sufferer stood before him sobbing and trembling, but apparently as unyielding as a rock. I have often heard that parent mention the acuteness of his feelings at that moment. His heart was bleeding at the pain which he had been compelled to inflict upon his son. He knew that the question was now to be settled, who should be master. And after his son had withstood so long and so much, he greatly feared the result. The mother sat by, suffering, of course, most acutely, but perfectly satisfied that it was their duty to subdue the child, and that in such a trying hour a mother's feelings must not interfere. With a heavy heart, the father again took the hand of his son, to lead him out of the room for further punishment. But to his inconceivable joy, the child shrunk from enduring any more suffering, and cried, "Father, I'll tell the letter." The father, with feelings not easily conceived, took the book, and pointed to the letter.

"A," said John, distinctly and fully.

"And what is that?" said the father, pointing to the next letter.

"B," said John.

"And what is that?"

"C," he continued.

"And what is that?" pointing again to the first letter.

"A," said the now humbled child.

"Now carry the book to your mother, and tell her what the letter is."

"What letter is that, my son?" said the mother.

"A," said John. He was evidently perfectly subdued. The rest of the children were sitting by, and they saw the contest, and they saw where was the victory; and John learnt a lesson which he never forgot; he learned never again to wage such an unequal warfare; he learned that it was the safest and happiest course for him to obey.

But perhaps some one says it was cruel to punish the child so severely. Cruel! It was mercy and love. It would indeed have been cruel had the father in that hour been unfaithful and shrunk from his painful duty. The passions he was then, with so much self-sacrifice, striving to subdue, if left unchecked, would, in all probability, have been a curse to their possessor, and have made him a curse to his friends. It is far from improbable, that had he then conquered, all future efforts to subdue him would have been in vain, and that he would have broken away from all

restraint. Cruelty! O may our children be preserved from the tender mercies of those who so regard such real and self-denying kindness.

It is always best, if possible, to avoid such collisions. Many children are taught implicit obedience, without ever entering into such a contest with their parents. And it is certainly preferable to govern a child by the mild procedure of ordinary discipline, than to enter into such a formidable conflict, where great severity is often required. Wisdom therefore teaches us to guard against giving a child an opportunity of summoning all its energies to disobedey. Those are peculiar occasions, and peculiar moods of mind, which generally elicit this strength of rebellious feeling. A little foresight will often enable us, without any surrender of authority, to calm the rising feeling, instead of exciting it to its utmost strength. We may sometimes by judicious management check the rebellion in its first appearance, before it has gained sufficient strength to call all our power into exercise to put it down.

As an illustration, let us suppose that James and Mary are playing together in the evening, and James gets vexed and strikes his sister. He has done this without any provocation, and ought to be punished, and ask his sister's forgiveness. But the mother has perceived that during the whole day James has manifested a very unpleasant disposition. He has been irritable and unyielding. She sees that he is now excited and angry. Every parent knows that such variations of feeling are not uncommon. One day a child is pleasant and affectionate; the next, every thing seems to go wrong; little things vex, and the whole disposition seems to be soured. The mother perceives that her son is in this frame of mind; he has done wrong, and ought to ask his sister's forgiveness; but she knows that in this excited and unamiable frame of mind he will be strongly tempted to resist her authority. Unreasonably vexed as he is, it would be one of the hardest acts of submission for him to ask the forgiveness of his sister. If the mother tell him to do so, the temptation to refuse is so strong, that in all probability he will decline obeying. She must then punish him. And here comes the contest, which must be continued, if it is commenced, till the child submits. Now, how is this contest to be avoided? By overlooking the fault? Most certainly not. She rises, takes James by the hand, and says, "My son, you have been doing very wrong; you are ill-humoured, and must not stay with us any longer, I will carry you to bed." She accordingly leads him to his chamber.

Just before leaving him for the night, she tells him in a kind but sorrowful tone, how much she is displeased, and how much God must be displeased with his conduct. As usual, she hears him say his prayers, or kneels by the bed side, and prays that God will forgive him. She then leaves him to his own reflections and to sleep.

He is thus punished for his fault: and as he lies in his bed, and hears his brothers and sisters happy below stairs, he feels how much better and wiser it is to be a good boy. In the morning he awakes. Night has given repose to his excited feelings. He thinks how unhappy his yesterday's misconduct made him, and resolves to be more upon his guard for the future. All his rebellious feelings are quelled by the soothing influence of sleep; his passions are not aroused; the mother can now operate upon

his mind without any fear of having a contest with a determined and stubborn will.

When the children come down in the morning, she calls James and Mary before her. Taking the hand of each, she mildly says, "My son, you made us all unhappy last night by striking your little sister; I hope you are sorry for what you did." "Yes, mother, I am," says James; being led easily now to the feelings of penitence and submission, to which, during the moments of irritation and excitement, he could not, at least without great difficulty, have been driven. Thus, by judicious management, the desired object is attained, and perfectly attained, while the contest is avoided. The fault is not overlooked, and James is humbled. But had the mother, regardless of the child's peculiar state of feeling, commanded him immediately to ask forgiveness of his sister, it would, in all probability have led to a scene acutely painful to both mother and son; and the final effect of the discipline would perhaps have been less beneficial upon the mind of the child. But cases will sometimes occur when it is not possible thus to waive the strife; when such an emergency rises, it is the duty of the parent boldly and resolutely to meet it: if from false feeling you then shrink, you are unfaithful to the sacred trust which God has committed to your care. Is it kindness for a mother to let her child die, rather than to compel it to take the bitter prescription which is to restore it to health and strength? And is it kindness to let those passions conquer, which, unsubdued, will be, for time and for eternity, a scourge to their possessor? If there be any cruelty in the world which is truly terrific, it is the cruelty of a falsely indulgent and unfaithful parent. Let it be particularly understood, however, that all we here inculcate is firmness in the discharge of parental duty, in those cases where such collisions between parents and children are unavoidable; they can, however, in most cases, be avoided. If, for instance, a child disobeys you, you can simply punish it for the act of disobedience, and there let the difficulty end; it is not necessary that you should always require that the thing at first commanded should be done. You direct a little girl to give a book to her sister, she refuses, and you may take two distinct courses to maintain your violated authority; you may go and take the book yourself, and give it to the sister, and then inflict such a punishment upon the disobedient one as the offence deserves; or, you may insist upon obedience, and to enforce it, enter upon a contest which may be long and painful; now whichever of these plans you adopt, be firm and decided in the execution of it.

In the above remarks allusion has been made to the variations of feeling to which children are subject; no one who has had any thing to do with education can have failed to observe this; almost every individual is conscious of seasons when he seems to be afflicted with a kind of morbid sensitiveness; our spirits often rise and fall with bodily health; and he has gained a great victory over his body, and a great triumph of mind, who can invariably preserve the same calm and cheerful spirit, undisturbed by harassing cares or the irritations of a diseased frame. The nervous systems of some individuals is so delicately constructed, that an east wind or a damp day will completely unhinge the mind. When we see some of

the wisest and best of men oppressed with these infirmities, we must learn forbearance and sympathy with children. At such times a judicious mother, knowing that the irritability is as much a bodily as a mental infirmity, will do all in her power to calm and to soothe: she will avoid every thing calculated to jar the feelings, and will endeavour, by suitable amusements or repose, to lull these feelings asleep. By this method she will save the child much unhappiness, and will promote an amiable and sweet disposition. Probably many children have had their feelings permanently soured, by utter disregard of these variations of mind; the disposition of a child is of too delicate a texture to be handled with a rough and careless grasp; its affectionate and gentle feelings should be elicited by maternal sympathy and love, and we should endeavour to assuage its occasional irritability, by calling away the mind from objects of unpleasant excitement, and alluring it to cheering contemplations.

It is clear that there is a striking difference in the natural dispositions of children, but nothing can be more evident, than that a good disposition may be soured by mismanagement, and that a child of naturally unamiable feelings may, by judicious culture, become mild and affectionate. The cultivation of the disposition is an important part of education, hence the necessity of studying the moods and the feelings of the child, and of varying the discipline to meet these changes: cases will undoubtedly arise when the parent will find it difficult to judge what is duty; such cases will, however, be unfrequent. The obvious general policy is, when a child is in this excited state, to remove him as much as possible from the power of temptation, and if he commits a fault which it is necessary to notice, let the punishment be of such a kind as is calculated to soothe him. For instance, give him a comfortable seat by the fire, and say that he must not leave the chair for half an hour; place in his hand some pleasing book, or some plaything, which will amuse him. In this way let the punishment be adapted to the peculiarity of the moral disorder.

This is not the mockery of punishment which it may seem, the child feels it to be real, and it is of a nature to operate beneficially. Some faults, however, he may commit, which, under the circumstances of the case, it may be expedient to notice; he may speak peevishly to his sister, the mother does not appear to notice it, she, however, sees the importance of immediately allaying this peevish spirit, and she endeavors to plan some amusement which will promote good humour; perhaps she lays down her work, and joins the children in their amusements, till, through her happy influence, cheerfulness and good humour are restored, "Here, Henry," perhaps she says, "I should like to have you take your slate, and sit down in your chair, and see if you can draw some animal so correctly that I can tell what it is. And Maria, you may take your slate and chair, and sit by his side, and do the same." The children are quite animated with their new play; they are soon busily at work, and whispering together, that their mother may not hear what animals they are drawing; by this simple artifice the little cloud of irritated feeling which was rising is entirely dispelled. Had the mother, on the other hand, punished the child for

the incidental peevishness of remark, the mind would not have been so speedily or so pleasantly brought into its desired state. Or had the mother taken no notice of the occurrence, the disposition of the child would have been injured by the allowed increase of the ill humour, and in all probability, a quarrel might soon have ensued. Constant watchfulness on the part of the mother will soon enable her to foresee many dangers, and prevent many difficulties.

Never punish when the child has not intentionally done wrong. Children are often very unjustly punished; things which are really wrong are overlooked, and again punishment is inflicted on account of some accident when the child is entirely innocent; such a course of procedure not only destroys in the mind of the child the distinction between accident and crime, but is in itself absolutely iniquitous. The parent has all the power, and she may be the most relentless tyrant, and the child can have no redress; there is no oppression more cruel than that often thus exercised by passionate parents over their children. It is not unfrequently the case that a mother who does not intend to be guilty of injustice, neglects to make a proper distinction between faults and accidents; a child is playing about the room, and accidentally tears its clothes, or breaks a window with a ball; the mother, vexed with the trouble it will cause her, hastily punishes the poor child. A child may be careless, and so criminally careless as to deserve punishment; in that case it ought not to be punished for the accident, but for the carelessness, which is a fault. This injustice is far more extensively practised than is generally imagined. The most common cause of unjust punishment is confounding the accidental consequences of an act, with the real guilt which a child incurred while performing that act. We are all too much inclined to estimate guilt by consequences. A child who has been permitted to climb upon the chairs, and take things from the table, accidentally pushes off some valuable article. The mother severely punishes the child. Now, where did this child do wrong? You never taught him that he must not climb upon the table. Of course, in that there was no disobedience, and he was not conscious of doing any thing improper. If merely a book had fallen, probably no notice would have been taken of it; but the simple fact that one thing fell instead of another, cannot alter the nature of the offence. If it had been the most valuable watch which had fallen, and thus been entirely ruined, if it had occurred purely through accident, the child deserves no punishment. Perhaps some one says, there is no need of arguing a point which is so clear; but is it not clear that such acts of injustice are very frequent? And is not almost every mother conscious that she is not sufficiently guarded upon this point? A mother must have great control over her own feelings—a calmness and composure of spirit, not easily disturbed,—or she will be occasionally provoked to acts of injustice, by the misfortunes of which her children are the innocent cause.

Does any one ask what would be done in such cases as the one referred to? The answer is plain. Children ought to be taught not to do what will expose property to injury; and then if they do what is

thus prohibited, consider them guilty, whether injury results or not. If the child, in the above-named case, had been so taught, this would have been an act of direct disobedience. And a faithful mother would probably pursue some such course as this: without any manifestation of anger, she would calmly and seriously say to her son,

"My son, I have often told you that you must not climb upon the table. You have disobeyed me."

"But, mother," says the son, "I did not mean to do any harm."

"I presume you did not, my son; I do not accuse you of doing harm, but of having disobeyed me. The injury was accidental, but the disobedience was deliberate, and very wrong. I am very sorry to punish you, but I must do it; it is my duty."

She would then punish him either by the infliction of pain, or by depriving him for a time of some of his usual privileges or enjoyments. The punishment, however, would be inflicted for the *disobedience*, and not for the *accident* which attended the disobedience. The child could not but feel that he was justly condemned.

But the question still remains, what is to be done, upon the original supposition, that the child had never been taught that it was wrong to climb upon the table, or to throw his ball about the room? In that case, the mother has manifestly no right to blame the child. The fault is hers, in not having previously taught him the impropriety of such conduct. All she can now do, is to improve the occasion, to show him the danger of such amusements, and forbid them in future.

If the child be very young, the mother will find it necessary occasionally to allude to the accident, that the lesson may be impressed upon the mind. If she did not do this, the occurrence might soon pass from its memory, and, in a few days, he might again, through entire forgetfulness, be engaged in his forbidden sports.

Allowance must also be made for the ignorance of a child. You have, perhaps, a little daughter, eighteen months old, who often amuses herself in tearing to pieces some old newspaper, which you give her. It is, to her, quite an interesting experiment. Some day, you happen to have your attention particularly occupied for a length of time, and at last raise your eyes, to see what keeps her so quiet upon the floor. Behold, she has a very valuable book in her hand, which she has almost entirely ruined, and your first impulse is to punish her, or at least, severely to reprove her for the injury. But has she really been doing anything deserving of censure? Certainly not. How can she know that it is proper for her to tear one piece of paper, but wrong for her to tear another? She has been as innocently employed as she ever was in her life. The only proper thing to be done, in such a case, is to endeavour to teach the child that a book must be handled with care, and must not be torn. But how can she be taught this without punishing her? She may be taught by the serious tone of your voice, and the sad expression of your countenance, that she has been doing something which you regret. In this way she may be easily taught the difference between a book and a newspaper.

A little boy, about two years old, was in the habit of amusing himself,

by scribbling upon paper with a pencil. His father came into the room one day, and found that the little fellow had exceedingly defaced a new book. The marks of his pencil were all over it. Perfectly unconscious of the mischief he was doing, the child continued his employment as the father entered. In many cases the parent, in irritation would have roughly taken the book away, and inflicted a severe blow upon the cheek of the child; and I thought I perceived that this was the first emotion in the mind of this parent, though he was of an unusually calm and collected spirit. If it was, however, he immediately saw its impropriety, for approaching his child, he said in a perfectly mild and pleasant tone,

“Oh! my son, my son, you are spoiling the book.”

The child looked up in amazement.

“That is a book, my son, you must not scribble upon that. See here,” turning over the leaves, “you will spoil father’s book. Here is some paper for you. You may write upon this, but you never must write in the book.”

The father then took the book, injured as it was, and laid it aside, without any exhibition of excited feeling. Now, how manifestly is this the proper course to pursue, in such a case, and yet how few children are there, who, in such circumstances, would have escaped undeserved punishment!

These illustrations are sufficient to show the importance of making allowance for ignorance and for accidents. And they also show how frequently children suffer when they are not to blame. If a child is punished when innocent, as well as when guilty, the distinction between right and wrong is obliterated from his mind. Hence it becomes an important rule in family government, never to punish when the child has not intentionally done wrong.

Never think that your child is too young to obey. We are ingenious in framing excuses for neglecting our duty with our children. At one time they are too young; again they are too sick. Some parents always find an excuse, of one kind or another, for letting their children have their own way. A child may, at a very early age, be taught obedience. We can easily teach a kitten, or a little dog, that it must not touch the meat which is placed before the fire, that it must leave the room when ordered, and a thousand other acts of ready obedience. A Frenchman has recently collected a large number of canary birds for a show. He has taught them such implicit obedience to his voice, as to march them in platoons across the room, and direct them to the ready performance of many simple manoeuvres. Now, can it be admitted, that a child, fifteen months or two years of age, is inferior in understanding to a canary bird? And must the excuse be made for such a child, that he does not know enough to be taught obedience? A very judicious mother, who has brought up a large family of children, all of whom are now in situations of respectability and usefulness, remarked that it was her practice to obey her children for the first year of their life, but ever after she expected them to obey her. She, of course, did not mean by this remark, that the moment the child was one year of

age, a sudden and total change took place in her management. During the early months of its infancy, she considered it to be her duty to do every thing in her power to make the child comfortable and happy. She would endeavor to anticipate all its wants. She would be obedient to the wishes of the child. But by the time the child was one year of age, she considered it old enough to be brought under the salutary regulations of a well-disciplined family. I am aware that many parents will say this is altogether too early a period to commence the government of a child, and others equally numerous, perhaps, will say that it is too late;—that a beginning should be made at a much earlier period. In fact, the principle, which really ought to guide, in such a case, is this, that the authority of the mother ought to be established over the child, as soon as it is able to understand a command or prohibition, expressed by looks and gestures. This is at a much earlier period than most parents imagine. Let the mother who doubts it, try the experiment, and see how easily she can teach her child that he must not touch the tongs or poker; or that when sitting in her lap, at table, he must not touch the cups and saucers. A child may be taught obedience in such things then, as well as at any period of its life. And how much trouble does a mother save herself by having her child thus early taught to obey. How much pain and sorrow does she save her child by accustoming it, in its most tender years, to habits of prompt obedience.

Guard against too much severity. By pursuing a steady course of efficient government, severity will very seldom be found necessary. If, when punishment is inflicted, it is done with composure and with solemnity, occasions for punishment will be very unfrequent. Let a mother ever be affectionate and mild with her children. Let her sympathize with them in their little sports. Let her gain their confidence by her assiduous efforts to make them happy. And let her feel, when they have done wrong, not irritated, but sad, and punish them in sorrow, but not in anger. Fear is a useful and a necessary principle in family government. God makes use of it in governing his creatures. But it is ruinous to the disposition of a child to control him exclusively by this motive. How unhappy must be that family, where the parent always sits with a face deformed with scowls, and where the voice is always heard in tones of severity and command. Such parents we do see. Their children fear them. They are always under restraint in their presence; and home becomes to them an irksome prison, instead of the happy retreat of peace and joy. But where the mother greets her children with smiles, and rewards their efforts to please her with caresses, and addresses them in tones of mildness and affection, she is touching those chords in the human heart, which vibrate in sweet harmony; she is calling into action the noblest and the loveliest principles of our nature. And thus does she prepare the way for every painful act of discipline to come with effectual power upon the heart. The children know that she does not love to punish. In all cases in which it can be done, children should thus be governed by kindness. But when kindness fails, and disobedience ensues, let not the mother hesitate for a moment to fall back upon her last resort, and punish as se-

verely as is necessary. A few such cases will teach almost any child how much better it is to be obedient than disobedient.

By being thus consistent and decided in government, and commencing with the infancy of each child, in all ordinary cases, great severity may be avoided. And it is never proper for a parent to be harsh, and unfeeling, and forbidding, in her intercourse with her children. The most efficient family government may be almost entirely administered by affection, if it be distinctly understood that disobedience cannot pass unpunished. I cannot but pity those unhappy children who dare not come to their parents in confidence and love, who are continually fearing stern looks and harsh words, and who are consequently ever desirous to get away from home, that they may enjoy themselves. Every effort should be made to make home the most desirable place; to gather around it associations of delight; and thus to form, in the mind of your child an attachment for peaceful and pure enjoyments. This will most strongly fortify his mind against vice. And when he leaves the paternal roof, he will ever look back with fond recollections to its joys, and with gratitude to those who made it the abode of so much happiness. In future years, too, when your children become the heads of families, they will transmit to their children the principles which you have implanted. Thus may the influence of your instructions extend to thousands yet unborn.

How little do we think of the tremendous responsibilities which are resting upon us; and of the wide influence, either for good or for evil, which we are exerting! We are setting in operation a train of causes which will go down through all coming time. Long after we have gone to our eternal home, our words and our actions will be aiding in the formation of character. We cannot then arrest the causes which our lives have set in progress, and they will go on elevating immortals to virtue and to heaven, or urging them onwards in passion, and sin, and woe.

From the Christian Messenger.

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

LETTER 2.

DEAR SIR,—The object of my last letter was to prove, that the faith which the Scriptures require, to qualify for baptism, is inseparably connected with holy feeling—such as love, peace, joy, &c. or what is commonly called Christian experience. In this, I would examine the place assigned to baptism in the word of God, and in what sense remission and washing away of sins are applied to it, with the duty of ministers and churches in receiving persons to that ordinance.

Baptism is a divine institution, pertaining to the kingdom of Messiah, the Gospel dispensation. John received it from heaven, and administered it to the Jews, who, on his proclaiming that the kingdom was at hand, confessed their sins. Jesus gave sanction to it by his example; and after his resurrection, when all power in heaven and in earth was committed to him, he continued and extended it to believers of all nations. The principal design of it appears to be, as a solemn and practical profession of the Christian religion. Such was the baptism of which Paul, when addressing himself to the churches of Galatia, thus speaks: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." The allusion is to the putting on of apparel

—as when one who enters into the service of a Prince, puts on his distinguishing attire; and the design of the sacred writer is, to remind those of them who had before professed the Jewish religion, that by a solemn act of their own, they had put off Moses, and put on Christ. It was their oath of allegiance to the King of Zion—that by which they avowed the Lord to be their God. Hence a rejection of it involved a rejection of the counsel of God. Luke vii. 30. Their rejection of the sign was justly construed as a rejection of the thing signified—as, when a rebel refuses to take the oath of allegiance, it is construed as a refusal of submission and subjection to his rightful prince.

Whatever may be said of baptism as it is now received and practiced by us, or of those who practice it, it was originally appointed to be, the boundary of visible Christianity. This is a principle which, if properly acted upon, would go far to prevent the confounding the church and the world, and which, consequently, would tend more than any thing of the kind to counteract ecclesiastical degeneracy and corruption. Had the Christian Church, in all ages, admitted none to baptism, from whomsoever descended, but those who professed to repent and believe the Gospel; a stream of corruption, which has actually deluged it with *Anti-Christianism*, would have been diverted at the spring head. The Church, indeed, might have been corrupted from other causes, but the carnal descendants of godly people could not have claimed a place in Christ's visible kingdom. The church could not have become national, embracing, as its children, all who are born in what is called, a Christian country, without any personal religion. The doctrine of believers' baptism, exerts a great influence on many who were never baptized by immersion, particularly among the thinking and respectable part of the community. I have known many instances of the kind—persons prevented from that duty from a fear of the reproach of the irreligious. An ordinance which thus operates possesses a mark of its pertaining to a kingdom which is not of this world, and into which it is hard for a rich man to enter.

Baptism is not only a solemn profession of the religion of Christ, but it is the first act of obedience required of the young convert. I do not say that it includes all gospel obedience, but it must be admitted that it is not only first on the list of Christian obedience, but is most important, as being associated by Christ in his commission with the condition of our salvation. "*He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.*" That the gospel calls for obedience, is clear from the following Scriptures: 2 Thess. i. c. "*The Lord Jesus Christ shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" Heb. v. 9. "*Being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all that obey him.*" 1 Peter i. 22, "*Seeing that you have purified your hearts in obeying the truth.*"

Christ said, "*If you love me, keep my commandments.*" If the foregoing remarks be just, the importance of believers' baptism must appear in a very different light from that which some have represented it, who consider it of little importance, and even go so far as to disapprove of ministers impressing it as a command of Christ. If it be of little or no importance to bend ourselves to the Lord, in the way of his own prescribing, to confess his name before men—to avow our being dead to the world and alive to Christ—to preserve the church from being one with the world—to obey him who said, "*Repent and be baptized, every one of you*"—and to follow his example, who said, "*Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness*"—then may this excuse be admitted. But if these things are important, then is believers' baptism important, and all attempts to depreciate it, are offensive in the sight of Him who is the Lord and Sovereign of Zion.

I have thus, my dear Sir, distinctly given you my views as to the place and importance assigned to baptism in the holy Scriptures. In your last letter, you charge us with a practice (in requiring too much from persons we baptize) injurious to the souls of men; but I never knew a charge that could be retorted with greater justice. If I have rightly understood your views on what you consider the qualifications for baptism, I must affirm that they are not only unscriptural, but injurious to the souls of men, and the visible kingdom of Christ. Receiving persons, as believers, who never felt the love of God in their hearts, or their ruined state as sinners, and who were never born of the spirit of God into the visible kingdom of Christ, is not only injurious to the persons themselves, but to the true interests of religion in the world.

No error has done more injury to the religion of Jesus, and the true doctrines of the Gospel—or done more to build up the kingdom of Anti-christ, than your favorite theory: putting baptism in the place of regeneration and pardon of sin.

It is well known that, from a very early period, the most extravagant notions prevailed in the church with respect to the efficacy of baptism, and its absolute necessity in order to salvation. The descent of the human mind from the spirit to the letter, from what is vital and intellectual, to what is ritual and external in religion, is the true source of the multifarious errors which have wasted the Church of God. From an erroneous interpretation of the figurative language of some passages in scripture, in which the sign is identified with the thing signified, very similar to the mistake which afterwards led to transubstantiation,—it was universally supposed the baptism was invariably accompanied with supernatural effects, which totally changed the state and character of the candidate, and constituted him a child of God, and heir of the kingdom of heaven. Hence, it was almost constantly denoted by the terms *illumination*, *regeneration*, and the highest operations of the Spirit, and was believed to obtain the plenary remission of all past sins; it was in order to insure that benefit, and at the same time to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, often deferred to the latest period of life. Thus Eusebius informs us, that the Emperor Constantine, "finding his end fast approaching, judged it a fit time for purifying himself from his offences, and cleansing his soul from the guilt of sin which he had contracted—which he believed was to be effected by the power of *mysterious words* and the *ving laver*." "This," said he, addressing the surrounding Bishops, "is the period I so much longed, and hoped, and prayed for, the period of obtaining the salvation of God." Passing, with the utmost rapidity, through the preparatory stages that of a catechumen, he hastened to what he considered the consummation, and as soon as the ceremony completed, than he arrayed himself in white garments, and laid aside his imperial purple, in token of his bidding adieu to all secular concerns. We have, here, a fair specimen of the sentiments which were universally adopted on this subject in ancient times. Justin Martyr, and Tertullian—in short, there is scarcely a writer in the first three centuries, who has not spoken on this subject in the same manner. The Roman Catholic Church teaches, that it is by baptism we are made the children of God. The Lutheran Church teaches the same doctrine, in the Augsburg confession, which was presented to Charles the Fifth, at the Imperial Diet, as the sentiments of that reformed body. The Church of England distinctly teaches in her liturgy, and in language of the strongest assurance—the priest, after baptism, returns thanks. "We thank thee, most merciful Father, that it has pleased thee to regenerate this infant with the Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption."

This is that erroneous doctrine which polluted the pure streams of the Gospel at most at the fountain head. From it sprang that strong hold of the *Man of Sin*, in later baptism, a practice which has gone far in all ages, to make all church and no work. As soon as baptismal regeneration was received, the transition was natural and easy—for when men believed that regeneration and salvation came by baptism, they would see immediately the necessity of having their infants baptized. The only remaining difficulty was the want of faith in the candidate, required in the gospel, when want it was found could be met by substituting the faith of the parent, or what is worse, that of God-fathers and God-mothers, for the faith of the child.

It may be, you deny the charge of confounding baptism and regeneration. If you do, your case reminds me of the story of the woodman, "who was so intent and earnest in pruning the tree, that he cut off the very branch on which he stood." If from your letters you do not believe that pardon and regeneration are obtained in baptism, your system goes to cut off from the gospel tree of life altogether those superlative blessings.

You may inquire, does not the scriptures ascribe remission and washing away of sin, to baptism? No, the word of God in no place ascribes to baptism, separate from repentance, calling on the name of the Lord, or the resurrection of Christ, the remission or washing away of sin.

In Acts 2, when the three thousand cried, "men and brethren what shall we do," Peter did not say, be baptized for the remission of sins,—but *repent* and be baptized for the remission of sins and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. When Ananias was sent unto Saul—Acts xxii. 16—he said "Why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Here we would note that it was promised in Joel ii. 32, that "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Again it is said, 1 Peter iii. 21—"The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us, (not the putting away the filth of the

flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Thus, Sir, remission and washing away of sin are only applied to baptism in their connection with repentance, calling on the name of the Lord and the resurrection of Christ.

In separating what God hath joined together, (the faith and practice of the Gospel) we either destroy the importance of the ordinances of Christ, or we magnify them to a place never assigned them by God.

You may still inquire in what sense does baptism, even in its associated state with repentance, calling on the name of the Lord, and the resurrection of Christ, remit and wash away sin? I would answer, sin is remitted and washed away in baptism in the same sense that Christ's body is eaten and his blood drank in the Lord's Supper. The sign when rightly used leads to the thing signified.

For want of room, I am not able, as I proposed, to notice in this letter, the duty of Ministers and Churches in receiving persons for baptism; but I may notice it in another letter. Wishing you, my dear Sir, all happiness in this world, and eternal life in the world to come, I subscribe myself yours in the hope of the Gospel.

SAMUEL ROBINSON.

St. George, April 27.

EXAMINATION OF MR. ROBINSON'S SECOND LETTER.

MY DEAR SIR—I have attentively examined your letter, now presented to my readers. The second, third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs of which, meet my entire approbation. The doctrine there presented, which you call your “views of the place and importance assigned to baptism,” is the very same for which we are contending! Where then is the difference? I really cannot see, unless it is because we practice what we preach. You say that baptism is “associated by Christ in his commission [I should say the Apostle's commission] with the condition of our salvation.” Here, then, are two concessions which I never before heard made by a Calvinistic Baptist Minister: first, that salvation is *conditional*, and second, that one of its conditions is *baptism*! You go still further, and give us to understand that those who do not obey this part of the Gospel will be punished with an everlasting destruction. One of the objections raised against us by the Baptists is, that we advocate baptism to be a “saving ordinance.” There are but few of my brethren who would make an indiscriminate application of 1 Thess. i. 8, 9, to all the unbaptised; but you have made no exceptions! Are we “uncharitable” in recognizing none as enjoying pardon who are unbaptized? If so, the most intelligent, active, and zealous Baptist Minister in New Brunswick, falls under the same malediction! But after assuring us that “baptism is the first act of obedience,” you not only very properly warn the reader of the danger of disobedience, but also show him that he cannot enjoy “eternal salvation” without this obedience. This is fairly inferred from your quotation of Heb. v. 9. Although in your former letter you advocated purification of the heart by *faith*, and argued that no individual was prepared for the ordinances of the gospel but those whose hearts were purified by faith; but now I am referred to 1 Peter i. 22, for your views of the ordinance, in which it is asserted that the Christians to whom Peter addressed his epistle, “had purified themselves *in obeying the truth*.” Yes! this scripture is quoted and applied to baptism. This is all I ask any one to con-

cede for baptism. Make *one* of the commands of God of equal importance with the *others*, place them in scripture order, and all christians are *one*! *Faith, Repentance, and Baptism*, are indissolubly connected in the word of God for remission of sin, and the enjoyment of the Holy Spirit. What God has joined together, let no man put asunder.

In those paragraphs, then, you have given to us your sentiments! And they are—that baptism is a condition of salvation; necessary to obedience, a prerequisite of eternal salvation, and essential to purity of heart. This is what Baptists caricature as “Campbellism.” I cannot prevent myself from thinking that you were conscious of this; and your subsequent remarks appear to be an effort to say something hard against what you deem my sentiments, lest you should be considered as fallen into like errors. Perhaps these were not your motives; but the article looks strangely that way. After admitting all that any advocate for the Apostolic gospel could ask; you then turn and charge those who believe and practice the same doctrine, with requiring that which is “not only injurious to persons themselves, but to the best interests of religion in the world.”

Having very briefly noticed your admissions; I now proceed to examine the charges preferred. You inform the readers of the “*Messenger*” that the qualifications which we require of an individual for baptism are “unscriptural.” Why did you not quote at least *one* sentence or *part* of one from my letters to prove this assertion! You know this was impossible. Now, sir, you have charged me before the thousands of Baptists in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, who read the *Messenger*, with holding views injurious to the well-being of men and the interests of religion; particularly in the manner of receiving persons to baptism. How you could do this with my letters before you is a mystery to me. Will you again take the trouble to turn to the 260th page of the first volume, and read the following sentence: “I am as desirous, sir, as you possibly can be, to ascertain of a sinner, whether he believes with all his heart and sincerely repents of his sins before he is baptized.” And yet before the community, in a paper that will not correct the slanders sent through the length and breadth of the land, with these facts—this plain declaration of my sentiments under your eye, you will calmly charge me with receiving persons to baptism who have never felt “their ruined state as sinners!” This, sir, is one of the most unkind paragraphs in all your letters. If I could have the privilege of speaking to the same community, I should not utter a complaint; but to be held up before the world as one who would recognize persons as christians without faith and repentance—without feeling themselves “ruined as sinners” is what I never expected from Mr. Robinson. The charge is not true. Were it not that I fear to produce in the minds of many of my friends a spirit of retaliation, I would add more on this point. I hope that your respect for truth and righteousness will cause you to drop a few lines for the *Messenger*, which will be calculated to counteract these charges, which must have been made by you in a moment of excitement, and without proper reflection.

Another charge is, that we receive persons to baptism "who were never born of the Spirit of God into the visible kingdom of Christ." I plead guilty to this charge! I do not believe that any person is in the visible kingdom of Christ until he is "born of water and the spirit," for the Lord Jesus declared that it was impossible. And have you not declared these to be your sentiments? If you have not, then do you believe that persons may be in the visible kingdom of Christ without "a pure heart," for you have quoted the language of Peter to prove that the disciples purified their hearts in obeying the truth! There is certainly a strange mixture of sentiments in your letter before me. You are at war with yourself—with the Baptist confession of faith, and with all the intelligent Baptist preachers and "laymen" with whom I have conversed!! Without a dissenting voice, they all admit that no person is in the "visible kingdom of Christ" without baptism; and yet this is one of the charges preferred against me as "injurious" to men and "the best interests of religion in the world!" Strange "visible members," truly! According to your own views of baptism, they have neither obeyed the Gospel nor attended to the conditions of salvation; they are exposed to "everlasting destruction;" impure in heart, and destitute of a promise of "eternal salvation!" But for me to say that such persons are not in "the visible kingdom of Christ" is to advocate a doctrine injurious to the well-being of the human family!

But the third charge is, if possible, of a more serious nature. It is found in your seventh paragraph. In this you assert that "putting baptism in the place of regeneration and pardon of sin" is my "favorite theory." Really, sir, it is difficult for me to notice this charge with Christian moderation! The Lord knows I have faults and errors enough in my constitution received by traditions and early impressions with which to contend, without being under the necessity of exculpating myself and brethren from doctrines that never entered into our hearts! This charge is wholly without foundation. It is, however, quite a common one. I heard Mr. Harris make the same assertion in the Baptist Chapel in this city: "There are some people," said he, who make immersion regeneration." *I challenge you, sir, or any man living, to point me to the sentence, either written or uttered by myself or any of my brethren, that ever ascribed to baptism any benefits or saving efficacy, call it regeneration, pardon, or what you please, without Gospel faith and sincere repentance!* Many of your brethren in this city, if not yourself, have seen a work written by Brother Campbell, entitled "Christianity Restored;" in this work is an article on "regeneration." The manner in which the subject is examined, one would suppose, would put it beyond the reach of misunderstanding, be it right or wrong. The order is the following: *Facts*—that is what Father, Son, and Holy Spirit have done. *Testimony*—a well authenticated annunciation of the facts. *Faith*—an implicit confidence in the testimony and a reliance on the facts. *Repentance*—sorrow for sin, produced by this faith. *Reformation*—turning away from these sins; a ceasing to do evil and learning to do well, heartily engaging in the service of God. *Baptism*—for the remission of sins that are past; thus making bap-

tism only one link in the grand chain which binds the soul to God. *Renewing of the Holy Spirit*—a gracious divine influence that fills the soul of all those who are buried with him in baptism; and is the moral or spiritual atmosphere which the regenerated breathe in the kingdom of grace.

This volume I presume you have seen. How then, sir, could you venture to write, to declare to a people to whom you well knew that I should never have the privilege of speaking, that with me "baptism in the place of regeneration and pardon of sin" was a "favorite theory." I repeat what was asserted some time since, that in your letters you have charged me with propagating sentiments which I have never uttered. Is this a crime of small magnitude? Suppose, sir, that I should publish in the *Christian* that "infant damnation" was "your favorite theory." What would you, what would the whole community say of me, especially if I should refuse to correct the slander! Now, sir, I can bring ten arguments from Calvinistic writers to prove that they believe, and advocate infant damnation, for one that they can bring from the pen of any who advocate baptism for remission of sins, that they believe baptism to be pardon or regeneration!

Is the inquiry presented, what then do you believe is regeneration, pardon, &c.? I answer—it is a *change of heart and a change of state*. And to effect this, what Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, have done and taught, faith, repentance, reformation and baptism, are all brought into requisition. Thus, we neither make one nor part of these principles regeneration, but all of them, in the order of God's word. Regeneration is, therefore, not one nor all these abstractedly considered, but the glorious effects produced by the work of Christ as soon as the sinner is brought in subjection to the Lord Messiah.

And I can inform you, sir, what we do not believe. We do not believe that any man who hears the Gospel can be regenerated, born again, obtain pardon, or receive an application of the blood of Christ, without a believing immersion into the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. If you doubt it—if any of our readers question the assertion, the pages of the *Christian* are open for that portion of God's word that asserts it, for the promise that it may or can be so, or for the man who was ever regenerated by the Spirit of God, or in any other way, since the kingdom of Jesus Christ was set up, without baptism. Now, it is hoped that this is plain. If it is truth, the Lord have mercy on our modern teachers! If it is an error, the Lord knows that we are all willing to be taught. Not one of our publications, advocating these sentiments, are unwilling to hear and publish all that our opponents can say to the contrary. It is an important doctrine. The consummating act in regeneration; the act of a sinner, in which he has an application of the great propitiatory sacrifice, is of all others the most important. And, although baptism, in and of itself considered, aside from faith and repentance, and the ordination of Heaven, is of no more consequence than ordinary bathing, yet, in connexion with these things, it becomes the grand criterion of discipleship; or, as you have happily expressed it, the "boundary line of visible christianity;" the line of demarcation between the church and the world.

All that you have written relative to infant baptism and the views taken of the subject by the ancients, is no doubt all true ; but when you endeavor to persuade your readers that the sentiments advocated by us are the same, you do us great injustice. I should think that it would not require a person of very great discernment to see the difference between the baptism of unconscious babes for their regeneration and the remission of their sins, and the intelligent immersion of an adult, having come to the years of understanding—having been begotten by the Spirit of God, through the instrumentality of his word, and who then seeks immersion, fully persuaded by the oracles of God that there he shall find the blood of Christ which cleanseth from all sin. And yet you would endeavor to induce us to believe that the principles are the same !

That infant baptism grew out of a corruption of the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, I have no disposition to dispute. Some early teachers, perhaps Origen and others, who had studied the doctrine of the evil principle in matter—that all matter was essentially bad, invented the doctrine of “original sin”—that is, that children come into the world heirs of wrath—exposed to condemnation in consequence of Adam’s sin. As soon as this doctrine was received, infant baptism was invented to wash away original guilt. That this was the beginning of the practice I have not a doubt. Now, whether infant regeneration was considered necessary from the doctrine of baptism for remission of sins, or from the revival of the old proverb, viz. “the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge ;” which Jeremiah (xxxii.) said they should no longer use under the new covenant, I leave you and the reader to judge. Shall we reject the design of baptism then because men have corrupted it ? By no means. Let us rather disinter the holy doctrine of the cross, and exhibit it as preached with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven.

Relative to your tenth paragraph, I would just observe that I neither make baptism pardon and regeneration, nor cut off these superlative blessings from the Gospel. What would you say if I should charge the Baptists with making faith, or the shedding of a few tears in repentance, regeneration ? Your reply to me shall be mine to you, when the charge of confounding pardon and regeneration with baptism is reiterated.

In the eleventh and thirteenth paragraphs you again admit that baptism, connected with repentance and calling on the name of the Lord, &c. is for remission of sins. This is all I ask. None of us have ever advocated more. But this you know the Baptists do not believe, and your own practice is opposed to it ! Will you, sir, baptize a believing penitent before you think he has obtained pardon ? What with you is the order of the Gospel ? Is it not, 1st, Regeneration by the Spirit ; 2. Repentance ; 3. Faith ; 4. Remission of sins, and—5. Baptism ? This is the order contended for by some high Calvinists, while others, again, make regeneration and forgiveness synonymous. Professor Ryland, (in one of the Baptist Colleges in the U. S.) “makes forgiveness consequent upon repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus

Christ, which are shown to be genuine by their purifying effects." These I suspect are the sentiments generally held by the Baptists in the United States. 1. Repentance; 2. Faith; 3. Forgiveness; 4. Baptism. Already have we given as the order of the New Testament, Faith, Repentance, Baptism, Remission of sins, Holy Spirit, a devout life, and eternal joys.

After all your admissions you then say, "Peter did not say, 'be baptized for remission of sins,' but '*repent* and be baptized for remission of sins,' &c. Really this is hyper-critical. In Luke chap. v. the Saviour said to Simon, "*Launch* out into the deep and *let down* your nets for a draught." Some on the shore might have contended that he did not say "*let down*" your net for a draught, but *launch* out into the deep and let down your net, &c. Now where is the difference. Two distinct acts were to be performed and the promise of the fish Simon had not until he *launched* into the deep and *let down* his net; and nothing is more certain than that Peter on the day of Pentecost, commanded the penitent believers to repent and be baptized, not because they had been regenerated, pardoned, or saved, but *for the remission of sins*.

In conclusion, you have given your views again relative to the remission or washing away of sins in baptism, which is, you say, in the same sense that the body and blood of the Lord Jesus is eaten and drank [drunk] in the Lord's supper. "The sign, when rightly used, leads to the thing signified." Well now, sir, I am as completely in the dark relative to your real views of the design of baptism, and the connexion it has with pardon and regeneration as when you set out. Sometimes you make more of it than even those you would repudiate; again, you would have persons born into the "visible kingdom of Christ," previous to baptism; and again you declare that Peter did not command the people to be baptized for remission of sins, and before the sentence is closed, it is admitted that connected with repentance and calling on the name of the Lord it is for that purpose; and now you say that sinners are freed from their sins in baptism in the same sense that the body and blood of the Lord is received in the Lord's supper! Now, as Protestants, we do not believe that the body or blood of the Lord is received in the supper at all. We are only willing to admit that these things are commemorative emblems of the body and blood of the Saviour. Would you then have baptism merely commemorative of the fact that we believe that our sins *have been* washed away. I really do not know what you mean. "But the sign when rightly used leads to the thing signified," you say. Does the eating the loaf and drinking the cup in a proper manner, lead us to the real body and blood of Christ? I should say it leads us to a remembrance of what he has done and suffered for us; it reminds us that we "have redemption through his blood—the forgiveness of our sins." Allow me to have my own construction of your language, and I freely admit your illustration. But as it stands, it is like modern articles and confessions of faith—they are more intricate and mysterious than the book they would make plainer; and your illustration is more difficult for me to comprehend

can the design of baptism, as developed in the New-Testament. If you mean, in referring to the Lord's supper, that we have, in the elements of bread and wine, the body and blood of the Lord in a figure, and so in being buried in the water of baptism, we have in a figure an application of the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ to cleanse us from all sins that are past—I say if this is what you mean by the allusion, you have expressed my sentiments precisely; for in obedience to him we have our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water."

But, sir, I confess that I have extended this examination to an immoderate length. But I do not wish to present a few plain facts relative to the *design* of baptism. Is it or is it not that act in which the believing penitent sinner has the promise of remission of sins? I say yes. All other denominations, in their articles, creeds, and confessions of faith, say the same—many of them in practice oppose it—in fact all do. There is no doctrine advocated, nor any species of irreligion propagated, not even Atheism, Deism, or Universalism, that is opposed with so much zeal and rancour as the plain simple fact that those who believe the Gospel, and are willing and desirous of enjoying the remission of sins, may come into possession of that boon by a believing immersion into the Saviour's death.

Just as certain, then, sir, as the blood of the Lamb of God was shed for the removal of sin, just so certain God has ordained baptism for those who believe and repent as the medium through which the benefits of Christ's death flow into the soul. Now for the proof. Matt. xxvi. 28: "For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, *in* *aphesin* *amartion*," for the remission of sins." This expression both in Greek and English is found in Mark i. 4, Luke iii. 3, showing the design of baptism, and is also found in Acts ii. 38, where Peter declared to those who inquired, "Men and brethren what shall we do, Repent and be baptized, (not because you are pardoned and regenerated, but *in* *aphesin* *amartion*) for the remission of sins." One scriptural argument is as good to those who believe the word of God as a thousand. Now, if you or any man living can get around, over, or under, or remove this proof, you can all that may be presented. The shedding of Messiah's blood, remission of sins, and its application in baptism, stand and fall together. I hope the Baptists will not join the Socinians, and reject the sacrificial death of the Lord, for the sake of opposing the doctrine of the removal of guilt by an application of the blood of Christ in baptism. In search of truth, your's truly, W. W. EATON.

"THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES,"

is the title of a very neatly printed semi-monthly quarto publication, at the price of one dollar a year, from the press of Dow & Jackson, No. 14, Devonshire-street, Boston—and edited by JOSHUA V. HIMES. We have just received the first *ten* numbers, and a letter from the editor, who asks, "What think you of the second coming of the Lord Messiah?" Well, brother Himes, I am not prepared to inform you yet what I think on

the all engrossing theme of your publication. Paul says, "Prove all things and hold fast that which is good." I shall, therefore, neither approve nor condemn the course you are pursuing, or the theory advocated, until I shall have examined it for myself. I condemn no man or his sentiments without a hearing.—ED.

CORRESPONDENCE.

JORDAN, (U. C.) 20th August, 1840.

Dear Brother Eaton—Unexpectedly I have been put in possession of a volume, purporting to be "The Christian, devoted to the restoration of primitive Christianity." I have had but a hasty perusal of its pages, and am much pleased with the work. I am rejoiced to know that such a periodical is being published in British America: it is the only one that I have any knowledge of. I think it should be sustained. I have taken the liberty to address you as a Brother: I presume we have both been made subjects of the one government, having for our King and Governor Him of whom Moses and the Prophets spake—whose Law should go forth from Mount Zion, and Word from Jerusalem: hence we are no longer strangers, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God. The volume I have spoken of, came from Brother James Mitchell, of Norval, U. C., by way of Brother Z. F. Green, who visited him not long since. He has laboured among us in this section a part of the time for the last two summers as an Evangelist. We number now upwards of *one hundred* in the Niagara District. My object in writing this is to become a subscriber.

I remain yours, dear Brother, in the hope of a glorious resurrection.

WILLIAM BRADT.

NICTAUX, (N. S.) 28th August, 1840.

Dear Brother Eaton—Brother Garraty and myself have just returned from Liverpool, on our way home. Our journey has been from Cawwallis to Falmouth, Newport, Chester, LeHave, Port Medway, Liverpool, Milton, Port Matoon, Caledonia, and Brookfield. The second and third numbers of "The Christian" have just come to hand, and I notice that Brethren Cook and Smith, with yourself, intend coming on to attend a number of meetings. Our journey was prosperous; there we baptized but *three*, the prospects are good. Do not forget to call on yourself, and bring Brethren Smith and Cook.

BENJ. HOWARD.

RAWDON, (N. S.) 28th August, 1840.

Brother Eaton—It has been a long time since I have written to you there are a number of subjects on which I wish to speak, and as I am a poor writer, you will have to take a hint on each subject.

I spent about three weeks this summer from home visiting a Church of which I had previously heard, on the shore of the Gulf of the St. Lawrence. I found them numbering something like *twenty*, having two

ers, who preach the word. They break the Loaf each Lord's Day ; they are an excellent people, and as fully in the Reformation as any church I have seen. I tarried with them some days, preached the word, immersed three, and left others searching the good Book. They have a good, but small, meeting house of their own, in which they worship. I had the pleasure of introducing the old Tent Maker's Gospel within the walls of a Methodist Chapel to a large and attentive audience. While with them, the Methodist people acted very genteely indeed.

Brother James Murray, a Scotch Baptist, the first Elder of the Church, emigrated from Scotland to Pictou ; and being alone, with the exception of one sister, found not that religious society which he desired ; he removed from thence to River John, Gulf Shore. Being a man of unblemished character, his exhibitions of truth brought first *two* to a knowledge of God ; those (without ordination) he immersed in the name of the Lord ; that day the four lonely disciples in a strange land, sung a song of Zion, and showed forth their Lord's death, and have continued every Lord's day since. Twenty five years had gone by since these four aliens (not from God, but from their homes), planted the standard of Jesus in river John, till I proclaimed triumphant victory for my Master's army among them. I think they have immersed about forty ; some have fallen asleep, but the greater part remain. Two small Churches have branched out from them—one in Pictou Town, the other up one of the Pictou Rivers, numbering perhaps from six to nine—both also in the Reformation ; they have had the *Christian Gleaner*, and some of Brother Campbell's publications ; you had better introduce them to the notice of our Brethren ; they wish you to send them the last and present year's volumes of *The Christian*.

I have seen in the New Testament a Church that fully pleased me, and no where else. There are yet many things wanting. We are not of the Apostolic order yet. We are in it in part, and in our own order in part ; this makes us the greatest mongrels in the land, and the most inconsistent of all men ; to recommend one thing, and practise its opposite—to condemn a thing, and then enforce it by practise, is self-contradictory, and scandalous to any man wearing the Christian name. There are, however, some among us who live a life of faith in the Son of God ; if they continue to show forth the same diligence to the full assurance of hope to the end, they shall walk with Him in white. Will you get such on Covetousness in some of your numbers soon. I know the Master is old, and his bones strong, but your sword is good ; try him.

JOHN DOYLE.

P. S. I received a letter from my sister at River Philip, in which she states your subscribers there like *The Christian* well. I preached a few discourses there last autumn, on my return home. The Apostolic doctrine made good old John's dead bones jingle among the people. They want me back again, but I cannot go. I must dig or beg. I am a poor beggar.

J. D.

RECEIPTS.—J. J. Uhlman, £5 13s. ; J. Naylor, £1 18s. 10½d. ; B. Howard, £10 ; J. Doyle, £2 13s. 2d. ; Mr. Coggsell, 6s.

HYMN BOOK.

Our Hymn Book is out of the Press, and ready for delivery. It contains 256 pages, and about 300 choice hymns. Price 2s. 6d. Those who order and pay for a dozen shall receive thirteen.

When the prospectus was issued, it was expected that the Churches would order a sufficient number to cover the expense of printing, &c.; but very few came forward. Two or three of us have, therefore, printed it at our own risk; and as it has subjected us to considerable expense, we have set the price rather higher than at first proposed. But even now, although I have spent several weeks in collecting, correcting, revising, &c., if any or all of the Brethren will take them off our hands, and pay the printer, they may have all my labour gratis. A book of the same size, published in the United States, from which a majority of these Hymns were selected, not such good paper, nor as well bound, was there retailed at the same price.

Send on your orders as soon as you can, before the navigation closes. If any desire choice binding, they can have it at a little additional expense. Our Printer is equally good at book binding.

FIRST VOLUME.

A few sets of the first Volume are yet on hand, bound cheaply, and can be afforded to subscribers at 6s. Our Brethren, who desire to get the publication out of debt, had better order a few copies for themselves, and keep the loose numbers to lend to their neighbors, and to give away to those who will make a good use of them. They must, however, order them by some private conveyance, as they can be sent by post only in pamphlet form.

The first number of volume I. has lately been called for, which reminds us that several of our friends have more of this number on hand than of any other. Will such be so kind as to wrap them up, and return them without delay. This number has fallen short about fifty.

Write nothing in your numbers, and be careful not to wrap up any written paper in or about them. One package from Port Medway came to us a short time since, charged *twenty seven shillings and sixpence for postage!* Remember to leave the ends of the package open.

And to this notice let us add, that our correspondents *must* pay their own postage. We pay the postage on the publication.

The "Address to Mothers" is rather lengthy, but it is too good to be abridged. We have got three good lessons before the parents who read *The Christian*. It is hoped that they will study them well. We will give them some more in the course of a few months.

☞ Meetings of several days continuance may be expected, the Lord willing, in the following places:—Cornwallis, the *first* Friday in October, and at Ardois Hill, Newport, the *second*. The other appointments we shall be able to publish in the next number, in time for all our readers to know. I have taken the liberty of putting the appointments a week forward of Brother Howard's arrangements.

Four have been added to the Church in this City since our last number was printed.