

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

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

(Concluded.)

But Mr. Davis cites a number of passages to prove a negative, viz.: that baptism is not connected with salvation. While it is abundantly proved that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he labors to prove that men are always saved without baptism; and seems to think himself a victor, because he finds a number of passages that mention salvation without "mentioning" baptism. In my last I showed that when our Lord sent the gospel to every creature, he mentioned baptism as a condition of salvation—that the apostles preached the same, and that every case of conversion recorded in the Acts of the Apostles had baptism in it. Likewise, that when the apostles refer to the conversion of Christians, they speak of baptism into Christ. Still Mr. Davis tries to prove that men were invariably saved without it. Now, should he succeed in his attempt, what would be the result? Why, to set aside all this testimony, and array the New Testament against itself! But, his logic is no better than his theology. Let us try his rule in other cases. A bold skeptic stands forward to prove that a man is always saved without faith. No matter, though a multitude of passages give faith in connection with salvation; yet he can make good his case, by finding many passages that mention salvation without "mentioning" faith, and triumphantly quotes the following:—Matt. xi. 28, 29; Acts ii. 21, 38; iii. 19; Rom. v. 9, 10, 21; viii. 1, 2, 24; Tit. iii. 5, 7; Heb. iii. 14; v. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 21. What rational man would allow this skeptic to boast of victory when he had proved, not that these passages said that a man could or ever was saved without faith, but, merely, that faith was not "mentioned" in them—that nothing is predicated of faith in these passages. His claim to victory would be the same as that of Mr. Davis.

Should another skeptic assert that men are not saved by the death of Christ, and offer to silence all objections by passages that mention salvation without "mentioning" the death of Christ. Though his error may be greater than that of Mr. Davis, his proof in its support is precisely the same.

"The letters of James and John," he says, "are remarkably to his present purpose." And why? Because, when they treat of Christian duties, they never mention baptism. When I said in the pamphlet that baptism was not mentioned among Christian duties, he called it "sheer heresy;" now it is "remarkably to his present purpose." What he denounced as "sheer heresy" he now tells us "amply reinforces his former position!"

I mentioned the cases of the bitten Jews and Syrian leper, hoping to induce him to give up that unscriptural and foolish phrase—"baptismal water"; but all to no purpose. It seems dearer to him than ever. Will he not see that, in "Positive Institutions" the virtue does not lie in the elements or materials used, but in Him who appointed these institutions? and that whatever he has promised the obedient he is able to perform. If he promised to save the bitten Jews, who looked to the brazen serpent, he would do it. If he intimated, by his prophet, to the leper that he would be healed, by dipping seven times in the Jordan, he would make good his promise. And if he has promised, by his beloved Son, that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, it will be even so. Yes, it has been proved ten thousand times; and never has and never can be disproved. Heaven and earth shall pass away; but the word of God's Son shall never pass away.

Mr. Davis says again—"No room was left for skepticism in the case of the physical miracles. Ought there to be any in the case of the spiritual? Let the evidences then be adduced, and skepticism confounded, and put to shame." How is skepticism to be put to shame? In my last, I proved my position.—1st. By the faithfulness of him who has promised. 2nd. By the inspired testimony of his apostles. 3rd. By the testimony, ancient and modern, of all who made the trial. 4th. By the experience of Christians. These proofs he does not touch; but asks for proofs of my position! then talks of putting skepticism to shame!! Who can forbear thinking of those who saw the Saviour's physical miracles, and still asked "what dost thou work?" We have, alas! but too abundant proof, that skepticism is utterly insusceptible of shame.

Again he says—"If he had been trying to

prop up the horrible fable of transubstantiation I could have understood his appeal to the analogy of miracles. But as it is, I am perfectly bewildered." Of course, propping up this horrible fable, and exhibiting the truth as it is in Jesus, being exactly opposite, the effects of each on a man who opposes both will be entirely different. But, who is responsible for his bewilderment? Will no kind friend advise him to suspend his animadversions, until he ascertains his "whereabouts," or does he reject such advice, determined to dash on, regardless of consequences? "A wise man foreseeth the evil, and hideth himself; but the simple pass on, and are punished." He asks if I plead for miracle in connection with baptism? I plead for the truth of the Saviour's promise, neither more or less.

He next gives us an analogy of Mr. Crawford's baptismal theories, and those which obtained among the ancient fathers. This analogy comes to us with the high distinction of being *his own*. But let us look at his quotations from Neander. What is the principal point in these errors. It is this—that they "speculated about the virtue of baptismal water." This I have never done, believing, as I do, that water used for baptism is just the same as other water, and, that none but an errorist or simpleton will puzzle himself and others about the efficacy of baptismal water. Let the reader take these facts into account, and he will not be slow to determine who has fallen into the pit so eagerly prepared by Mr. Davis.

In my reply, I said that, as God had constituted no man a judge of "secret things," it was our duty to believe those things which he has revealed. At the same time, I asked Mr. D. to give a case, or a promise of salvation without baptism, in the New Testament, since the death of Christ. This he cannot do; but he can do something else. Because I will not consent to sit in judgment on the case of those who will not be baptized, he can make an effort to enlist their sympathies in his favor. For this purpose he introduces a piece of nonsense from Neander's history, about the apostles performing in Hades, the rite of baptism on the pious souls of the Old Testament, who had not been baptized. "Why not," he adds, "conceive of some kind arrangement for all the good people in later times, who, unhappily, die without receiving the right kind of baptism?" This question, it seems, is intended to have all the effect of a sneer. But, sneer as it is, it shall be answered. Just because I am perfectly willing to leave all such in the hand of Him who is appointed to be the judge of quick and dead. Is this a crime? But we will look at this subject.—I suppose, by "the pious souls of the Old Testament," was meant the spirits of God's people who lived before the birth of Christ. Now, these saints were not commanded to be baptized, in either earth or Hades; and, consequently, were not disobedient. Is this true of his "good people?" The very descendants of these Old Testament saints "rejected the counsel of God," not being baptized of John. I would therefore ask Mr. D. if "it seems to him," that, in this clumsy effort at a sneer, he has made any one appear as ridiculous as himself? Such conduct may extract a smile from those who despise Mr. Davis and his religion; but every enlightened mind, who feels for the honor of Christ, will regard him as an object of pity.

Those who read the pamphlet, and see how much of it is devoted to "The Grand Foundation of the Church," and then hear Mr. Davis in the conclusion of his rejoinder, intimate, without the least reason, that he has to defend that "fundamental truth" against my attacks, will place their own estimate upon his honesty.

In conclusion, it would be just to say, that the present labor is a work of painful necessity, and not of choice. Had Mr. Davis diffused his sentiments from the pulpit and the press, I would be among the last to appear as his opponent; but when he makes a violent and unprovoked attack on me for no conceivable crime, but holding forth Christ, and him crucified, to a dying world, and directing sinners to him in the very words which the Holy Spirit teacheth—comparing spiritual things with spiritual. I must either appear in defense, or suffer truths, dearer to me than life itself, to be mangled at the mercy of such a man.

When, by the grace of God, I became savingly acquainted with the Redeemer, and saw the beauty and clearness of the plan of salvation—both in its announcements and institutions, I felt almost certain that, in exhibiting to lost sinners, a system so perfectly adapted to the wants and woes of fallen humanity, many of them would be constrained by the love of God in Christ Jesus to abandon their sins, and accept of a full and free salvation. To the praise of

his grace I would say, in this I have not been disappointed. I little thought, at the time, that I should be brought before the public by those who "have turned aside to vain jangling: desiring to be teachers of the law, neither knowing what they say nor whereof they affirm."

While these things are so, it is pleasing to know that many are now coming to Christ in the way of his appointment. Intelligence from various quarters announce that many, like the Corinthians, "hearing, believe, and are baptized." It is also a source of profound gratitude to God, to learn that great and good men are understanding each other better, and laying aside every weight, to labor together in one of the noblest enterprises of any age, I mean "The American Bible Union." This grand effort to give the word of God, as faithfully as it can be translated, to earth's teeming millions, is drawing closer together both ministers and people. May God grant in greater measure to all that love and labor for the truth "the spirit of power and of love and of a sound mind."

Fraternally yours,

D. CRAWFORD.

New Glasgow, P. E. I., May 18th, 1859.

For the Christian Messenger.

Repetition of the Names of Deity in Prayer.

MESSRS. EDITORS,—

I always hold myself in readiness to give an explanation, when requested, of anything that I have said or written. This is done most cheerfully when the request is made in respectful terms, and with evident good feeling, as it has been by your correspondent "A Young Preacher," C. M., May 18.

There are unquestionably instances in which names or titles of the Most High are frequently repeated in prayers recorded in the Scriptures. It is obvious, however, that these repetitions were not made, as in the case to which I referred, for the purpose of filling up vacancies, or continuing a stream of words while thoughts may be collected.

In the Hebrew language emphasis, or intensity, is frequently denoted by repeating a word or phrase. To express it still more strongly in some instances a word is repeated three times, as the French use the word *tres, most*, literally *thrice*.—(Gen. xxii. 17; Ps. lxxvii. 1; Isa. vi. 3.) So peculiar earnestness in prayer is sometimes indicated by reiterated invocations of *JEHOVAH*. We have a plain instance of this in the text cited by your correspondent, (Dan. ix. 19.)—"O LORD, hear; O LORD, forgive; O LORD, hearken, and do; defer not for thine own sake, O my God; for thy city and thy people are called by thy name."

If a son were urgently entreating his father to grant him some special favor, as the forgiveness of a heinous offence, he might very naturally repeat the endearing appellation, "Father, dear father, kind father," &c., with the reasonable hope that it would tend to render his petition successful. Should he, however, employ such repetitions merely for the purpose of avoiding a pause, and prolonging his request, might he not justly apprehend that this course would be offensive to his father, if the object designed were understood? The application can be easily made.

Our Lord has taught us not to "use vain repetitions, as the heathens do," who "think that they shall be heard for their much speaking;" and it is observable that in the prayer dictated by Him no name or title of Deity is used save that of "Father," and this occurs only once.—(Matth. vi. 7-13.)

The reader will observe, however, that my objection is not against reiterating Divine names when it is done with due reverence, and from real earnestness of desire for the bestowment of the blessings sought; but it is against the use of these sacred words as mere expletives.

Hoping this explanation may be satisfactory to "A Young Preacher," and your readers generally,

I remain, as ever, yours in Christ,

C. TUPPER.

Aylesford, May 26th, 1859.

For the Christian Messenger.

Mission of Rev. John Whidden to Bay of Islands.

To the Home Missionary Board,—

DEAR BRETHREN,

In accordance with your appointment, I left home August 11th for the Bay of Islands. I proceeded to Indian Harbour, where I engaged a passage; but, owing to the inclemency of the weather and head winds, I was detained until Tuesday, 17th, I then left, having preached twice at Indian Harbour and once at the mouth of St. Mary's. I arrived at the Bay of Islands

the same evening. I found the Church in a depressed and scattered state. We had an interesting meeting at Bro. Moser's. I continued to labor in that place three weeks. I visited and prayed with 37 families, preached 16 sermons, baptized 7 willing converts, and left them rejoicing in hope of a blissful immortality. I then returned home, having spent four weeks and three days. Circumstances prevented my returning until May 6th, '59. I left home and proceeded direct to Mary Joseph. I spent the first Sabbath at Liscomb, and the second at the Bay of Islands. I preached and visited the inhabitants: reading and expounding the Scriptures, praying and exhorting publicly and from house to house. I found them in a much better state on my second visit than I did at my former one,—two professed faith in Christ during my stay with them. I committed them to God and returned home, having spent, in all, six weeks in your service. I received in aid of Mission £2.

Yours in the Gospel,

JOHN WHIDDEN.

Antigonish, May 24th, 1859.

For the Christian Messenger.

Nova Scotia Travelling.

MR. EDITOR,

In giving you a sketch of our travels in Nova Scotia it is not now my plan to describe the works of man: but to touch upon the works of Nature. Neither will I choose those parts of our Province which display the wonders of creation in their most striking features of mountain, valley, ocean: but those parts which possess the least interest, especially to the tourist,—our inland wilderness. To the lover of Nature the wild woods possess an unspeakable charm. The tree, the rock, the cascade, the insects, the birds, as they appear in the unfettered liberty of nature, have an interest superior to the wonders of human skill. All these appear throughout the interior of Nova Scotia, from east to west. In travelling the road from Lunenburg to Barrington, about nine miles of which passes through a barren region; that portion is only a sample of thousands of square miles of similar character. Here may be seen the wilderness in every form,—the unbroken forest in full verdure,—there a region of dry trees, where the fire has done its work of devastation, standing like thousands of spars and rigging, and, again, the smooth barren, where every thing is consumed except the small herbage for miles around. In some places the country is dotted with granite rocks scattered here and there in wild confusion, like flocks of sheep, or like extensive towns of white cottages. In other parts the surface is smooth like cultivated fields, where the horse and hounds of the sportsman would be unimpeded in the chase. Here are hills and valleys, with woody slopes,—yonder is a widely extended bog or meadow, with a silver stream meandering through it in every possible direction,—and in the distance is a chain of lakes, dotted with fairy-like islands, and skirted on the farther shore with lofty hills covered with hard-wood.

The day on which we traversed this region was most favorable for enjoying the scenery. It was the twenty-sixth of May,—clouds were succeeded by glimpses of sunshine, so that the time was fitted for observation and meditation. The wilderness was literally "the garden of the Lord." The maple and evergreen trees were putting out fresh buds. The white poplar was unfolding its downy leaves. The catkins of the alder were hanging in golden festoons. The bilberry trees were scattering their white petals on the wind, and the wild cherry was flinging its blossoms like snow balls in the air. The rhodora Canadensis was here and there painting the landscape with bright crimson. The violets, white and blue, decorated the banks of the rivulet, and the starlike anemone peeped up from beneath the withered leaves. And, lest we should forget the civilized world, the strawberry and the dandelion looked up from the wayside and smiled. The whole scene was enlivened by a concert of the feathered songsters, the variety and sweetness of whose notes were inimitable. The soul is thrilled with the music of a well-trained choir or band; from this however, we may turn away with weariness; but never from the wild strains of nature. After witnessing such a scene, who can sympathize with those that cannot enjoy the most insignificant of the works of God. The natural philosopher finds matter for devout contemplation in the trackless desert, much more should the Christian heart be affected by the wonders of creation in the most desolate region of our happy land.

As we approached towards Barrington, we thought we discovered in the features of the