

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Rev. D. Crawford's Rebutter
to Rev. J. Davis.

MR. EDITOR,

It appears that Mr. Davis is determined to persist in calling myself and brethren Campbellites. Be it so: I shall not object to his use of that or any other term by which may be developed "the principle within." It would, however, be unjust to permit such conduct to pass the scrutiny of fair and impartial investigation—unjust toward the people traduced, and also towards your readers, to allow the latter to be imposed upon by such misrepresentations. I am, therefore, again seated in self-defence against the insidious attacks of this extraordinary opponent.

He disavows the intention of making false impressions. This may, in part, be true. He tells us in another place that he is "perfectly bewildered." His misrepresentations, and his readiness to justify himself, may be owing, in part, to that bewilderment: still it is hard to be persuaded that he is so far gone, as to make himself believe that he has proved "that Campbellism is not a nonentity," from what he finds in Hayward's Book of Religions. That book contains an article entitled "Disciples of Christ, sometimes called Campbellites or Reformers." He tries to make the impression that this heading positively proves that there is such a thing as Campbellism. But what does it prove? simply, that the people called Disciples of Christ are sometimes called Campbellites. But by whom are they so called? Do they take the name, or acknowledge it when given to them by others? By no means. It is a name their enemies use by way of reproach; to prejudice strangers against them, and almost invariably used for that purpose. Neither Mr. Davis nor any other man has shown us a body of people who call themselves Campbellites. And could such a body be found we would not fellowship them, while we believe that in bearing the name of a man they would dishonor Christ, who is the alone head and husband of the church. If it was sinful in the apostles' day to be called by Paul, and Apollos, and those who said, "I am of Paul and I of Apollos, were carnal, and walked as men," we believe that it is equally sinful in our day to contend for the name and peculiarities of any man, living or dead.

Mr. Davis makes an extract from the article in question, the purport of which is—That every one who sincerely believes all the testimony God has given of his Son, and who is, in consequence, willing to obey the Son in all things, is a fit subject for immersion. And that the sincere believer, in giving himself to Christ in his appointed way, can claim the promises of his Redeemer: while those who do not obey him are not warranted to claim these promises.

This extract he proposes as a test, and virtually exclaims, in true inquisitorial style,—Deny this, or feel my vengeance. Deny your belief in these propositions and "supply me with some other epithet that I can consent to employ," or take the awful consequences of your disobedience. But what is that consequence? Why, it is all the punishment that I can inflict. I will cry out heresy! heresy!! heresy!!! and call you Campbellites, and you shall be Campbellites indeed.

He says that I "boast about creeds." All I said about creeds was to inform your readers, in as few words as practicable, that the people whom he nick-named Campbellites were the only churches on the Island who had no creed, oral or written, but the Word of God. This he knows to be the truth, and does not deny it; but goes on to speak of the excellencies of the Baptists. I cannot see what this has to do with the subject in hand. If the Baptists, with all their excellencies, were better than they really are, it would be a source of unfeigned pleasure, rather than an offence, to me. I consider it the privilege of the Baptists, not merely, to be "as free from thralldom to creeds as any sect," but, in this respect, to be in advance of other sects. What will Mr. Davis say when he hears that men holding the very highest positions in the Baptist denomination, are now, and have been propagating the very sentiments of that article which he holds out as the test. Should he deny this, the proofs are abundant, and will be forthcoming on demand. What will he do with these men? Must they, too, recant or suffer?

In again referring to the law of Moses, he says, "I had supposed that the law of Moses and the law of God were identical." That is, I presume, that God has no law but the law of

Moses. He adds, "And so it is not law alone, nor gospel alone, Sinai, nor Calvary, by which God works for the humbling of men under a sense of their sins, but either, or both, or anything by which he may get at their conscience, and compel them to cry out—What must I do to be saved?"

Mr. Davis is certainly a most singular man. In his first article he charges me with a "serious omission" because I said that, under the gospel, the law of Moses was not necessary to convince the sinner of his sins; but, that this was done by the death of Christ; or, in other words, that the sinner now could be saved without the law of Moses. He then gives his system, in which he says, "The New Testament imposes on every one who is saved a sense of guilt, and ruin, &c.," showing that the law convinced none, but in every case the New Testament did it. Now he says, God does it by the law, or gospel, or any thing else! How could we account for all this if he had not told us of his bewilderment? But if this does form a covering for all his vagaries, he need not expect that under it he will be allowed to make whatever statements he pleases. What does he mean when he says, "But neither in pamphlet nor letter has he shown that, under the gospel, it is unlawful to employ the law for the purposes of conviction?" Both in pamphlet and letter the error of that doctrine has been elaborately shown, and proved by a regular argument, as plain as demonstration. This argument he studiously avoided in both of his articles; and deliberately makes the above assertion. Here, I would ask the candid reader, how am I to treat such a man? or what shall we call such assertions?

He alleges that I "labor immensely to fasten upon him a charge of simple absurdity," just because I gave his system in his own words, and exhibited it in its natural order. I am pleased to think he had sufficient discernment to see its absurdity; and enough candour virtually to acknowledge it. But he asks, "Is he then so dull as not to perceive my meaning in the passage?" Yes; he is so dull that he cannot perceive a man's meaning—when that man writes one thing, and means something else.

What Mr. Davis says in his rejoinder about my "ridiculing a scriptural style of religious experience," only proves that, in his former article, he did manufacture that charge; as it is impossible for him to prove that I ever did so in the pamphlet or out of it. Whether he always feels at liberty to manufacture charges or not; it is evident he felt at liberty to manufacture that charge, and still feels at liberty to justify the deed.

It is gratifying, under all the circumstances of the case, to see how little opposition he now offers to what has been said on Repentance. His only objection now is this,—The soundness of my statements, it seems to him, is neutralized by my readiness to baptize on the footing of a naked profession. It may relieve his mind to be assured that I never baptize "on the footing of a naked profession." But whatever symptoms of moderation we see in Mr. Davis, he seems to lose them all when he approaches the subject of baptism. If he talks rationally on other points, he displays a lack of power or disposition to do so on this subject. Instead of calmly discussing the subject in scriptural language, we may expect to hear him raving about "Baptismal water," "Baptismal heresy," "Baptismal justification," or "Mr. Crawford's Baptismal system." If he were to be reasoned with, I would again inform him that Mr. Crawford has no system, much less a baptismal system. He is perfectly satisfied with the Christian system, revealed in the New Testament, and rejoices in its triumph, and in that alone.

In his first article Mr. Davis seemed quite interested in a harangue, in which he substituted baptism for circumcision. As he seemed to draw much enjoyment from the affair, and I could not see any bearing it had on our subject, I of course left him to the undisturbed possession of all the entertainment he might reap from it. With this, it appears, he is dissatisfied; and complains that I "did not attempt to rebut his showing;" and he is again working away at the same thing, with an avidity worthy of a better cause. He does acknowledge that baptism has a place in the gospel dispensation, and allows it to take rank with the Old Testament sacrifice, and its circumcision. Speaking of Jewish error he says, "and Christians fall into an error not less fatal, and far less excusable, when they forget (accommodating Paul's statement for the purposes of my present argument) that he is not a (christian) who is one outwardly; neither is that (baptism) which is outward in the flesh; but he is (a christian) who is one inwardly, and (baptism) is that of the heart," &c.

Here, then, I must ask, even should he call them abominable questions, What has baptism to do with circumcision? Did he ever see baptism in the flesh, or baptism of the heart performed? How are they done? Who authorized him to accommodate Paul's statement for the purposes of his present argument! Is he so bewildered as not to know that his accommodating license will enable a man to prove by the scriptures any assertion ever made by saint or sinner?

He has much to say about the spiritual element, which I must pass unanswered; just because it is unanswerable. Such metaphysical nonsense may, for aught I know, be very interesting to his mind; but I must confess my inability to appreciate its worth. After a tour in these mysteries, he states, if I understand him, two propositions. 1st. "The work of Christ is the only foundation of a sinner's hope." 2nd. "Faith in Christ is that act of the mind which is alone needful to give a man an interest in his work." The first proposition is true; but what shall we say of the second? If nothing is required of a man but faith, his actions may be what he pleases. He has no need of repentance or obedience of any kind. But what saith the Scripture? It says that a man is justified by faith,—it does not say by faith alone. It says a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law,—it does not say he is justified without the obedience of the gospel. No: Jesus Christ gives the Holy Spirit to them that obey him. Being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to them that obey him. Mr. Davis speaks in another place of James being very favourable to him. Will he then hear what James has to say to him! "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead. For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." So much for faith alone. It will require one still deeper skilled in metaphysics than Mr. Davis to show how much greater virtue there is in believing Christ than in obeying him.

[Conclusion next week.]

For the Christian Messenger.

New Zealand, as a Mission-field.

EXTENT.

The group of Islands which constitute the Colony of New Zealand is situated in the South Pacific Ocean, between 34 and 48 degrees south latitude, and between 160 and 179 degrees east longitude. They consist of two large Islands. The extreme length from North to South Cape exceeds 1,000 miles, breadth from about 300 to 100 and 120, is the average. The two larger Islands are separated by Cook's Straits. The Northern contains an area of 31,174,000 acres, the middle 46,126,800, and Stewart's 1,000,000. The two former have alone been colonized. The country is capable of accommodating at least 25,000,000 persons. We need not speak of its natural capability, which is all that can be desired. It is the very antipodes of Nova Scotia. It lies 1,200 miles east of Australia. A chain of lofty mountains runs along the middle Island from north to south, their summits towering, in some instances, to an almost incredible height, some of them 14,000 feet. A chain of lakes is also connected with this mountain.—Lake Tago is the largest, being 36 miles long and 25 wide. Copper, silver, gold, iron, coal, sulphur, magnesia, lead-ore, tin-ore, nickel, with others, have been discovered. The coast-line is very extensive—not less than three thousand miles, with excellent and abundant harbours, affording every facility for ships of the largest burthen, with myriads of Islands contiguous, some of them the most fruitful in the world.

CLIMATE.

It has mild winters, moderately cool summers, clear sky, and pure atmosphere; not subjected to hot winds nor droughts; free from long, dreary winters, severe frosts, and damp, easterly winds, which are so injurious to health and comfort; although, in the winter, there are heavy rains for a short time, and, in the spring, high winds and changes of temperature from warm to cold, consequently, there is much less sickness there than in other parts of the world. The average temperature during summer in New Zealand is 66, autumn 59, winter 50, spring 57,—whilst the hottest month is 66, and the coldest 48. Snow is seldom seen, except on the tops of mountains, or on the coldest parts of the South Island, and it falls there only once or twice during the winter and melts in a short time, consequently, the farmer consults his own convenience for planting and sowing his crops, the cattle requiring no feeding. All kinds of fruit and vegetables can be cultivated at little

expense. The seasons are the reverse of ours—midsummer being in December, midwinter in June, spring in Sept'r., and autumn in March.

GOVERNMENT.

The Governor is appointed by the Queen, and a General Assembly, consisting of two Houses, as our own, one elected by the people, the other appointed by Her Majesty. Each of the six Provinces, viz.:—Auckland, New Plymouth, Wellington, Nelson, Canterbury, and Otago, has a local Government, consisting of Superintendent and Provincial Council, both elected by the people, who have power to make laws within the Province.

RELIGION.

The first European colony was established in the archipelago of New Zealand in 1815. A society of English Missionaries founded a station in the Bay of Islands amongst the savage hordes, but they experienced continual vexation from the avidity and jealousy of the native chiefs. The infant colony would have been extinguished had not the Missionaries found the means of securing toleration for their enterprise by engaging in traffic. By this means they succeeded and prospered wonderfully well, and gained a complete ascendancy over the chiefs. The success of the missionaries directed public attention to New Zealand; emigrants flocked there, and finally the British Government established its authority or sovereignty, obtaining grants of territory from the native Chiefs. Since that, whole towns have sprung up, as if by magic. Magnificent ports are opened for commerce. The natives are now peaceable and friendly towards the Europeans; the Chiefs have set the example by adopting the English costume, and associating themselves with all those demonstrations, the object of which is to obtain from the Metropolitan government an extension of right and privilege, similar to those granted to other colonies. Numbers of the natives have become converted to Christianity, many of them can read and write. The New Testament, with some other books have been translated, and printed in the native tongue by the Missionaries, and, like the natives of Canada, some of them own a considerable amount of property, in land, live-stock, buildings, and some of them own small coasting vessels, and supply the markets with large quantities of pigs, potatoes, wheat, corn, maize, sweet potatoes, tobacco, figs, peaches, melons, and other agricultural produce.

SOCIAL STATE.

The New Zealanders differ in many respects from the aborigines of this country. They have a fixed habitation; he resides either in his *pah*, which is a fortified stockade, or in *Kanga Mori*, or native settlement. In times of warfare the whole tribe seeks refuge within the *pah*, which is often erected on the summit of a steep hill or island. The *pah* is surrounded by a strong fence, and the interior is divided by lower fences, into numerous court-yards, which communicate with each other by means of stiles. In each court stands the house and cook house of one or more families; and also the store-house for food. The dwelling house, and frequently the store, is ornamented with grotesque carving, and painted red with ochre. The cook-house is merely a shed, built of posts of wood, placed several inches apart, so as to admit the air. In these houses the domestic operations of cooking are carried on during the wet weather, at other times they move into the open air. Their houses are partly sunk into the ground, and a true native house is always built with a gable roof and portico or verandah. The inner chamber, which extends a long way back, serves as a sleeping apartment. Towards evening it is heated by means of a fire. After the family enters for the night, the door is shut and windows tightly closed, and in this almost suffocating atmosphere they pass the night; when day comes they walk out into the sharp morning air dripping with perspiration. Within the inclosure of the *pah* also stands the burial place of the chiefs, which, being colored red and ornamented with rich carving and a profusion of feathers, are very attractive objects to the stranger. As the natives are, at certain seasons of the year, constantly in their plantations, they erect in them temporary buildings also. Some of their settlements are very extensive and contain a population of from 1,000 to 2,000 souls, others are much smaller and are inhabited merely by a few—it may be a Chief with his family and dependants. But since the introduction of christianity these fortifications are less required, and now whole districts may be seen dwelling at peace in their scattered settlements, without either wall or fence to protect them, so says the late missionary reports, and our informant Mr. G. F. Angus's "Savage Life and Scenes in Australia and New Zealand."