

numbers and power of the English would prove overwhelming, one of the chiefs said;—"Well, let them come. We are ready for them. But as for you, brother Williams, you are a good man. You have been kind to us many years. Not a hair of your head shall be touched."—Knowles, p. 346.

Mr. Williams, like many other true patriots, died poor. For several years before his death, he was mainly dependent on his children.

He died in the early part of the year 1683, in the 84th year of his age. No record of his last illness, and of the state of his mind, at that time has been furnished. There can be no doubt, however, that he was fully prepared for the event. In a letter addressed to Governor Bradstreet, at Boston, dated May 6, 1682 after referring to recent intelligence from England, he says—"All these are but sublunaries, temporaries, and trivials: Eternity (O eternity!) is our business."—(Knowles, p. 354.) In less than a year from that time he had entered eternity. His body "was buried with all the solemnity the colony was able to show." His spirit rejoiced in perfect purity and freedom.

So little is known of Williams's successors at Providence, and of most of the other pastors of the churches founded in this period, that it is not worth while to trouble you with more lists of names and dates. A few particulars only may be mentioned.

Gregory Dexter, the fourth pastor of the church at Providence, was a native of London, and by trade a printer. Mr. Callender says, in his "Century Sermon," that Mr. Dexter "was the first who taught the art of printing in Boston, in New England. He was never observed to laugh, and seldom to smile. So earnest was he in the ministry, that he could hardly forbear preaching when he came into a house, or met a number of persons in the street."

Obadiah Holmes, whose sufferings at Boston were described in my last letter, was a native of Preston, Lancashire. He emigrated to New England in 1639, became a Baptist in 1650, succeeded Dr. Clark in the pastorate of the First Newport church in 1652, and held that office 30 years.

John Miles, founder of the church at Swansea, was rector of the parish of Ilston, Glamorganshire, whence he was ejected by the Act of Uniformity, in 1662. It is probable that he joined the Baptist church at Swansea immediately after his ejection, and that the severity of the persecution compelled him and his friends to emigrate the following year.

The first pastor of the church at Pennepek was Elias Keach, son of the celebrated Benjamin Keach. The history of his conversion and settlement with that church is very remarkable. Mr. Morgan Edwards, in his history of the Baptists in Pennsylvania, writes thus:—"The first minister they had was the Rev. Elias Keach. He was son of the famous Benjamin Keach, of London: he arrived in this country a wild youth, about the year 1686. On his landing he dressed in black, and wore a band, in order to pass for a minister. The project succeeded to his wishes, and many people resorted to hear the young London divine. He performed well enough till he had advanced pretty far in the sermon; then, stopping short, he looked like a man astonished. The audience concluded he had been seized with a sudden disorder; but on asking what the matter was, received from him a confession of the imposture, with tears in his eyes, and much trembling. Great was his distress, though it ended happily, for from this time he dated his conversion. He heard of Mr. Dungan, [of Coldspring.] To him he repaired, to seek counsel and comfort, and by him he was baptized and ordained. From Coldspring Mr. Keach came to Pennepek, and settled a church there, as before related; and thence travelled through Pennsylvania and the Jerseys, preaching the gospel in the wilderness with great success, inasmuch that he may be considered as the chief apostle of the Baptists in these parts of America." Mr. Keach returned to England in 1692.

I am happy to inform you that we have now reached the close of the "Troublous Period."

Yours truly,
From my Study, MENNO.
Sept. 13, 1858.

For the Christian Messenger.

Letter from the Rev. D. Freeman.

A late number of the *Morning Chronicle* contains a letter from the Rev. John Hunter, addressed to the Provincial Secretary. The writer labours among other things to

show that the Protestant Alliance was not "a fraud and a forgery." To do this, in one part of his letter he alludes to myself, repeats stale charges which were long ago answered, indicates that I at first approved of the principle of his darling society, and quotes the testimony of Professor Knight, before whom I on one occasion stated my views of those principles. From this testimony he endeavours, so far as I am concerned, to establish his cause. But we need only to view in order to estimate his argument. It may be thus presented. The Protestant Alliance was not a "fraud and a forgery." In my case it was not because I did not at first object to its principles. The evidence that I did not object is that of Professor Knight. But the testimony of Professor Knight amounts to this, that he could not exactly understand what I did say. This is the source from which Mr. Hunter draws his conclusion. One cannot help inquiring whether all the other arguments of Mr. Hunter's letter are equally valid; and again whether his spirit is any better than his logic. Such statements are unworthy of a man whose avowed purpose is to ascertain and communicate the truth.

But the logic and the spirit of Mr. Hunter's letter are not its worst features. In that letter we see the genius of Popery in disguise struggling for the mastery. If the writer would show his true character purely as a political partizan, he could not be blamed. Each one has a right to his own political sentiments. But no one ought to be a religious inquisitor, nor to foster a society which contains the germ of Popery. Enough at present. When the bud opens more widely it will display itself more clearly. Already one leaflet of Popery appears in the Rev. Mr. Martin's "Prosecution for blasphemy." Let Baptists open their eyes, and they will see more springing into light.

D. FREEMAN.

Windsor, Sept. 15, 1858.

For the Christian Messenger.

MESSRS. EDITORS,—

The Editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, or the man that writes certain editorials in that paper, has taken some notice of my late letter to you. Had he answered it, I would have replied. But he either does not understand Baptist principles or he is determined to misrepresent them. It is useless to contend with such an opponent. There is so much of the Jesuit in him that it is impossible to keep him within the bounds of fair controversy. He is as slippery as an eel, and will wriggle out of your hands however tightly you may grasp him. Let him go.

He has taken occasion, I observe, to drag into his article a letter written last year to the Editor of the *Freeman*, London, and signed "J. M. C." The insinuations and threats in which the writer deals in this part of his article are dastardly in the extreme. I dare say that "J. M. C." is able to defend himself, should he deem it necessary to do so. I hope that he will not allow himself to be bullied out of his freedom by any man — editor or ex-editor, judge or ex-judge. I will venture to predict that the *Freeman* will hear from him again.

Your columns are not open to political discussion, nor am I in a humour to engage in it. Yet permit me to express my profound regret at the unhappy state of affairs in this little country of ours. It is natural enough that the *outs* should wish to be *in*, and that those who are *in* should desire to remain where they are. But it is greatly to be deplored that any party should seek to accomplish its objects by such methods as are now employed, and that professed zeal for religion, or for any form of it should be used as

"An office-key, a picklock to a place."

Yours truly,

CAUSTIC.

Sept. 16, 1858.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, SEPTEMBER 22, 1858.

"National Religion."

Great efforts are being employed by politicians now, as they have been in all ages, to make use of religion for the purpose of accomplishing their purposes. Parties who have never shewn any appreciation of the glorious truths of the gospel as a revelation of mercy and love from God to their own souls, or as a remedy for the evils existing in the world, are often loud

in demanding some public recognition of the christian religion by the government under which they live.

From the earliest days till now genuine christianity has had to contend against demands for making it a State religion. Wherever this unholy alliance has been formed it has produced untold evils. The life and power of piety has been strangled out of existence by the State sitting astride its neck. Persecution has invariably followed, even in places where it was least likely, as may be seen in the case of Roger Williams, on our first page. Whilst its ministers have become mere political partizans, their flocks have naturally cherished the same spirit, and have mistaken their anxiety to strengthen the power of their own party for religious zeal and concern for the advancement of truth. The same principle which would make use of religion for other than its legitimate purposes does not scruple to place a ban upon it when deemed expedient to do so. We have had fearful exhibitions of the evils resulting from this principle, in the disasters which have afflicted India. Because Hindooism was the recognized religion, it was thought necessary, even by a professedly christian government, to proscribe the Christian religion, and to forbid its promulgation, even amongst its own servants. We have had manifestations of the same spirit nearer home, and from parties from whom we might have expected better things.

Some writers among ourselves have endeavoured to persuade their readers that because we are a *Christian people*, and have a "Christian Legislature" therefore certain demands of a religious character put forth by them are the proper subjects of legislation, forgetting that under the same pretext the worst forms of persecution have existed, and have been defended by the same arguments.

The exclusion of a conscientious Jew from the British Parliament, although repeatedly elected by the city of London, whilst at the same time open Infidels and Libertines were admitted without scruple to take their seats, and to obtain offices of trust and emolument, is another of the precious fruits of this Christian!! Legislation.

It is passing strange that now in the last half of the 19th century so much of error should prevail, even amongst intelligent men, respecting the proper position which christianity should occupy in connection with human government.

With many the pagan idea prevails, that religion must be made a sort of police system, to keep men in subjection; whilst others who know the value of true religion seem to suppose that all means used to bring men generally under its influence are lawful, and therefore conclude that as government is the source of national power, it should sustain the claims of religion, and make them felt by all its subjects.

The declaration propounded by our Lord and Master, that "his kingdom is not of this world," seems to be but very imperfectly understood even now. When men wish to bring religion in to aid their political warfare they only expose the weakness of their cause and shew that they have more regard for the latter than the former. They know well that the heart is more readily influenced than the understanding, and if they can take possession of that they have control of the man. As religious feelings are more influential than all others, they consequently command the action of their people more readily by working on their prejudices on this point, than by fair legitimate argument and the communication of real political knowledge.

These thoughts have been called forth by recent events which have transpired in this Province; and further by some very appropriate illustrations of these principles in an article on "The Church in India," in a late number of the *London Freeman*. We give a few extracts below. The attempt to make the Bible the subject of political strife, is a sad profanation of its proper object, and unworthy of intelligent men. When it is so used it may be understood that some design is entertained besides that of concern for religion. It is well known that the Bible has a place in the hearts of pious Christian men, far above what any code of human laws could ever occupy; and for Baptists, as such to withhold it from general use, or give any sanction to its being so withheld, would be contrary to the nature of things. Any party, therefore, or individual, one who would try to undermine those he conceives to be his opponents by instituting a comparison between his own religion, (or protestantism if you please,) and theirs, may well be suspected of some unworthy motive.

We must abstain from further remark, or we shall be compelled to abridge the extracts which we here intended to introduce:—

"If India is to be Christianised, it is not to be by its Government, as a government. Bishops and chaplains supported by Government taxation, cathedrals and churches built by it, we hold to be so many acts of treachery against Christianity; and in the same category we must place grants to schools, if they be really made in aid of conversion of the natives to our faith.

"How, then, shall we sum up the duties of professedly *Christian* governors in India? Whether the said governors be really Christians, or not, is not a point for us to determine, and we assume that they would resent the supposition that they were not. It seems then as clear as it well can be, that they must insist upon the difference being thoroughly understood between their official and their personal duties. We do not believe that there is any serious difficulty in making this difference understood by the acute natives of India, different as their own habits may have been from ours. Without its being acted upon, we must hold it to be utterly impossible for any honest Christian to hold civil or military offices in India. We question whether the soldiers under HAVLOCK'S or HEDLEY V. CAR'S command had clearer ideas on this subject than Hindoos before they were taught them, yet they easily comprehended the lesson. So will men—even illiterate and heathen men—everywhere. They well know what Colonel Wheeler did as a servant of Government, and what he did merely as a Christian man.

"Laying this basis, then, we would proclaim absolute neutrality on the part of the Government in regard to religion—*absolute neutrality of Governmental action*; at the same time proclaiming as distinctly that all our servants, from a private soldier to a general, from the humblest police officer to the Governor-General, were perfectly free in their individual capacity to teach their religion to others, and to convert the natives, or the natives to convert them, as they pleased or as they could. On the one hand, no threat nor bribe, no inducement of reward or favour, should be tolerated on the part of the Government official, whether Christian or native, much less any system of favour adopted by the Government itself towards any class of its subjects in India in regard to religion. Even archbishops and bishops, however, are now prepared, in words at least, to assent to this. On the other hand, the holding of any office under Government must not be permitted to deprive a Christian of his right to teach his faith, nor to deprive a heathen or Mohammedan of it either. The natives will easily perceive the simplicity and excellence of such principles. Let them be proclaimed and carried out in *good faith* towards both sides, and we might safely vouch for the result. Let every Government rupee be withdrawn from Christian as well as idol temples, let all religious appointments and arrangements in respect to the Episcopal Church be made on the voluntary principle, as well as all trusts for Mohammedan and idolatrous purposes given up; and we may be sure enough that the new policy would be instantly understood and heartily commended.

"It is impossible not to feel the absurdity of terming any government India is ever likely to have, on this side the Millennium, a *Christian* Government, if by that term is meant a government composed of persons *really* Christians; and on any other supposition there is no claim to that title. A corporation can have no religion, as it is but too well known to have no conscience! We have, however, to reason with these rulers and about them, as professedly Christian men, and in political courtesy perhaps we must term it, to treat them as Christians. On this assumption, then, duty seems almost too simple to need so many words. Our counsel to them might be summed up in but a few sentences:—Degrade not your religion, and yourselves, too, in the eyes of the heathen, by acting as if you were ashamed of it;—fulfil your official duties worthy of it;—know no man in Government service and appointments after his religion;—and, *unofficially*, do what lies in your power, as every Christian should do, to diffuse the incalculable blessings of the kingdom of CHRIST.

"We here acknowledge that Government, as such, can make hypocrites only: that genuine converts must be made by the coercion of truth and the bribery of Christian love and kindness. The more distinctly we demand of Government to patronise or to discourage neither heathenism nor Christianity, the more earnestly must we appeal to the Christians of England to do that which alone can render our prolonged Government in India possible or worth retaining. The Christians of England must Christianise India; in the name of the LORD they can do it; and they are bound either to protest against our occupation of the country as despots, or to use the door opened to them by a despotism which must protect Christians as well as idolaters while the former are seeking to convert the latter. A whole regiment of Episcopal clergymen distributed over India at the cost of India, would produce the same effect as the present avaricious foisting of the Protestant clergymen on Irish revenues; it would exasperate and prolong the reign of superstition. But, an innumerable company of faithful preachers of the Gospel, who should go forth with manifest self-denial, taking nothing of the Gentiles, must and would before long produce a very different result."

THE Rev. R. McLearn, Chairman of the Home Missionary Board, desires us to intimate that the Rev. S. N. Bentley has resumed the office of Secretary of the Home Missionary Society. All Correspondence concerning that body should therefore be directed to him.

PROGRESS
Perhaps that press regard to developen Almost w great mas tutions an from the a large m liarities overran duced a man race founded old feudal vested in proprieto power ov who are b which the professed overloade superstiti corrupt a Rome, ha petuate t The so church is considere ritual, an ted' to t Priesthood rance of pletely n Still, the may eye Many inevitable have, dur high deg within ou pious an thought no mean late Emp ther of t was one the Briti cordially sanction Russia. superstiti for the au compelled judgment the obno ingly sup deny rel The p cond, in light of the goo since th determin body of with ver gards t liberty, the subs boon. periodic the intro realm. cannot t proachin more at vine wot soul with v lying in death, shout o wards n We v our este another cerning we do favors. His d dance o we feel encour the sym Christi in the therefo would. adopt pray fe SOME Witness Truete the ma made i discour over th His sta ance o name. for him