

the cross, that there they may learn at once their ruin and their remedy. 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 any thing by means of which he may get at their consciences, and compel them to cry out, "What must I do to be saved?"

Mr. Crawford proceeds here, "Can Mr. Davis see nothing in the death of Christ for our sins to convince us of their awful character? If not, he is to be pitied." Pitied, indeed! I respond. The Lord save us both from so fatal a blindness!

Mr. Crawford quotes a passage from my argument in regard to the work of conviction, and labours immensely to fasten upon me a charge of simple absurdity. Is he then so dull that he cannot perceive my meaning in the passage? or so perverse that he chooses to misrepresent it? Better the former than the latter; but either of them deplorable enough.

Mr. Crawford wants to know when or where he has employed argument, or reproach, or ridicule against the Scriptural style of religious experience. He will scarcely deny that he does argue, if he does nothing more, against what many good people regard as experience of the right kind. Has he forgotten the following passage in his own pamphlet,—"By the way, we will first contrast the preaching of Christ and his apostles with the preaching of the present day. Their theme was, God seeking the sinner; that of the present day, the sinner seeking God. They commanded the sinner to submit to God, and the disciple to strive to enter into the everlasting kingdom. Now the sinner is commanded to strive, wrestle, agonize, &c. &c.; although all his weapons are carnal as long as he is a sinner. They told sinners, that they need not ascend to heaven to bring Christ down from above, nor descend into the deep to bring him from the dead; but that the Gospel brought Christ nigh them: Rom. x. Sinners are now told, that they must ascend to heaven by faith (in human testimony of course) and wrestle and plead with him to come down, and bless them with the pardon of their sins." Out of respect to your room I refrain from transcribing another passage to the same effect, from p. 32 of Mr. Crawford's pamphlet. In both of these passages there is, no doubt, a basis of truth. And yet they also contain misrepresentation, and even caricature; not intended perhaps, but enough to justify the language of which Mr. Crawford complains. I beg to ask, therefore, whether he will repeat that abominable question,—"Does the man feel at perfect liberty to manufacture charges at pleasure?" Or whether, as a little lower down, he will insist upon saying, that either here or any where else in my letter, I "labour to make a false impression?" I may have received false impressions in regard to Mr. Crawford's views, and unwittingly sought to reproduce them. But as to conscious aims to mislead, there is One who knows I am guiltless. I feel, indeed, that I have a right to adopt honest John Bunyan's quaint but forcible language,—

"Some say, _____ if need require,
I'll tell a lie in print—
I scorn it: John such dirt-heap never was,
Since God converted him"

Mr. Crawford tries to vindicate the Scriptural soundness of his views with regard to repentance. I will not go over ground already trodden. I content myself with saying, that, whatever appearance of soundness there may be in Mr. Crawford's statements here, it is all neutralized, as it seems to me, by his avowed and systematic readiness to baptize on the footing of a naked profession, apart from the "bringing forth of fruits meet for repentance." And so again I come to the baptismal heresy, heretofore denounced, reaffirmed and reinforced by Mr. Crawford in his present letter, but against which it is the duty of the friends of a spiritual and Scriptural Christianity resolutely to set themselves. And here I would notice,

1. The main supports of Mr. Crawford's baptismal system.

He finds them, as he imagines, in the following texts, with probably a few others of the like class. Your readers will please to turn to them for themselves. Matt. iii. 6; Mark i. 4: xvi. 15, 16; John iii. 5; Acts ii. 38: xxii. 16; Tit. iii. 5; Heb. x. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 21. Now, I will just look these texts in the face, and see if they really teach Mr. Crawford's doctrine. And I observe in regard to them,

(1.) That they all contain a ritual element.

Baptism should seem to be in them all. Baptism, of course, has its place in the Gospel dispensation. It is a part of the framework which our great Head has set up for the purpose of the Gospel. Standing thus in the midst of spiritual realities, and made subservient to

spiritual purposes, there is reflected upon it a spiritual character, while in some sort it partakes of such a character. Still, ritual as it is, it comes under the same category as other ritual observances. It may be ranked, for instance, with the Old Testament sacrifices, and with its circumcisions. In regard to the former of which I would refer your readers to a striking passage at Jer. vii. 21-23; and in regard to the latter, to another passage, not less striking, at Rom. ii. 28, 29. The Jews fell into fatal error in their forgetfulness of the truths contained in these passages. And Christians fall into an error not less fatal, and far less excusable, when they forget, (accommodating Paul's statement to 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, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." And so is the way opened for the further remark, that,

(2.) While the ritual element is certainly present in the passages under consideration, the spiritual element is present likewise, and is in fact the predominant one.

In no one of the passages referred to, nor elsewhere in the New Testament, is the ritual element found alone. It is, just to cite the language of some of them, to illustrate the spirit of all, and to mark the emphasis of the argument therein,—"Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Yet one other I cite, begging your readers to open their New Testaments, and read, in Tit. iii. 4-7, the whole connection.—"Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Let the word rendered here by the term *washing* be translated *laver*, or *bath*, if it be preferred. Let it be granted too, that in the phrase the "washing," a *laver*, or *bath* "of regeneration," the apostle refers to the baptismal rite. Yet let it be observed, how that rite is so associated in the inspired statement with spiritual elements, as to take away all pretence for assigning to it a fundamental place in the great business of salvation. And let it be observed also, that, with all his array of Scripture quotation, Mr. Crawford has failed to shew that, in any of the passages under consideration, baptism is to be regarded as bearing any thing more than an emblematical character; or that it has any direct influence upon the salvation of the soul. And now let me add,

(3.) That while, in these passages, the ritual element is overborne and eclipsed by the spiritual, we find an abundance of other passages, expressly teaching the way of salvation, from which the ritual element wholly is absent.

This I shewed in my former letter, in respect to Paul's epistles to the Romans and Galatians; and Mr. Crawford has not made the slightest attempt to rebut my shewing. I now observe further, that, as in these two epistles, so everywhere else in the New Testament, the work of Christ is uniformly represented as the one only foundation of a sinner's hope, and faith in Christ as that act of the mind which is alone needful to give men an interest in his work. While the ritual, that is, is not overlooked in the rearing of the superstructure of a personal Christianity, the spiritual, and that alone, is ever set forth as that which lies at its basis. For proof of this your readers may turn to the following passages, which are mere samples of what might be adduced:—John iii. 36: vi. 20, 40: xx. 31. Acts ii. 21: x. 43. 1 Cor. xv. 3-8. 2 Cor. v. 17-21. Eph. i.-iii. Phil. iii. 7-11. 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14. 1 Tim. i. 15. Heb. vii. 25: x. 38, 39: xi. xii. 1 Peter i. 1-9: ii. 1-10. Rev. vii. 9, 10, 14. The epistle of James also, with John's first epistle are remarkably to my present purpose. The former, because, while its writer treats of obedience to God as furnishing the only satisfactory evidence of faith in him, yet never once does he mention baptism. The latter, because, while its writer dwells largely upon the evidences of a personal Christianity, yet he too never once adverts specifically to baptism. These facts, both of them utterly incredible, if baptism had occupied the same place in their systems which is assigned to it by Mr. Crawford. And thus my former position on this matter is amply re-enforced;—namely, that the New Testament most distinctly teaches, that men are saved without baptism, before baptism, and never by it.

2. There is the remarkable analogy suggested by Mr. Crawford.

Thus he writes:—"A man may cry against

this [this representation of baptism as a saving ordinance] as heresy, and speculate about the virtue of 'baptismal water.' And he could with equal justice cry out against the bitten Jews looking to the brazen serpent, had he been present, until he and they could ascertain the precise virtue of *serpentine brass*. Or had he been servant to the Syrian leper, he could have enhanced his rage against the prophet until made acquainted with the medicinal properties of *Jordanic water*. Nevertheless, God has blessed his own institutions, and they shall be blest."

Now what does all this mean? Mr. Crawford refers to miracles. Does God then work a miracle in baptism? He speaks of the "virtue of serpentine brass," and "the medicinal properties of Jordanic water." Certainly God did associate healing power with the brazen serpent, and with the waters of the Jordan. But has he really associated any such "virtue" or "property" with baptismal waters for the purposes of a spiritual healing, as Mr. Crawford seems to suggest? If he have, let this be proved—surely, in that case, it is capable of proof. It is not obscurely hinted in the New Testament, but explicitly and unequivocally taught. No room was left for scepticism in the case of the physical miracles. Ought there to be any in the case of the spiritual one? Let the evidence then be adduced, and scepticism confounded, and put to shame. But if there be no such evidence—if this working of spiritual miracles through a material agency, be a figment of Mr. Crawford's brain, then his analogy falls wholly prostrate. There remains no ground for his outcry against those who "speculate" about "God's own institutions;" and his solemnity degenerates into farce. 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. If he do not mean to plead for miracle in connection with baptism, then he has written sheer nonsense. But if he do, then he has fallen farther than I had before imagined, and can even now scarcely bring myself to believe—into the slough itself of superstition.

[Conclusion next week.]

Defeat of Lord Derby's Government.

THE DIVISION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

LONDON, Friday April 1st.

The House expected a great speech from Mr. Disraeli, and was not disappointed. At first he was argumentative. He temperately examined the bill, and defended its clauses. The House filled by degrees; the Duke of Cambridge, the Earl of Carlisle, and several other peers came in, and by the time the orator had become more personal and more impassioned, he was the central figure of a scene full of animation and interest. Now he launched his fulminations against his opponents in loud and reverberating tones. Presently the speaker's voice sank into a hissing stage whisper worthy of Mrs. Siddons as Lady Macbeth. When he spoke of the services which Lord Derby's Government had rendered to the State, his voice became tremulous with emotion. He then folded his arms, and spoke in the low compressed tones of one determined to master his emotions and his indignation, like Othello before the Senate. Suddenly, with "start theoretic," our orator pointed his clenched hand at Lord John Russell, and in a loud voice and with impetuous gesture, like some Cicero impeaching a Cataline, declared, upon his responsibility as a man and a Minister, that the noble Lord had by his conduct produced injurious effects upon the public service. All these starts and sudden changes from *forte* to *pianissimo*—these studied modulations, tragedy tones, and varied gestures—were too theatrical to be effective. They lacked the "modesty of nature." The stage was filled by an accomplished actor, who possessed everything but the last art, namely, the art to conceal his art. The Chancellor of the Exchequer touched the delicate topic of a dissolution of Parliament with great tenderness and skill, and after indicating, as his hearers understood, that a dissolution would be the consequence of a hostile vote, he sat down amid cheering, which was all the more enthusiastic, because the admiration of 300 gentlemen, with strong fox hunting voices, had been pent up and restrained out of respect to the orator.

The question is put by the speaker. George, Duke of Cambridge, and a score of peers, are ignominiously turned out of the House. The sand-glass is turned, bells all over the building are stimulated into frantic performances, and members hurry in. Then the Speaker calls "order," the Sergeant-at-Arms shuts the door, and every member who is in the House is caught, and must vote; while every member who is locked out must write to his constituents, and explain the unlucky accident by which he arrived a moment too late for the division. Members fill the gangways near the bar like a flock of bees, and cluster at the bar in a dense mass; while the floor and galleries are thronged to inconvenience. The speaker puts the question—so little understood out of doors—"that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question." The gentlemen with broad chests and fox-hunting voices are appealed to with the usual formula—"You that say aye,

say Aye!" They do not simply say Aye. They shout it, scream it, bellow it, roar it. "You that say no, say No!" If three hundred and thirty lieutenant colonels, with stentorian voices, on a windy day, gave the word of command, "Fire!" the explosive force of the answer to the Speaker's invitation could scarcely have been greater. It would have puzzled the nicest ear to pronounce which side of the House had made most noise. The Speaker—suspecting, perhaps, which was in the majority—said, "I think the Noes have it." The usual response came back in a voice of thunder—"The Ayes have it." "Ayes to the right; Noes to the left. Tellers for the Ayes, Mr. —." The rest of the sentence was lost in the bustle and confusion.

Slowly the concourse separated itself into two lazy streams, one whereof flowed up the House and the other down. Languidly walked the feeble, the faint, the invalid, the aged, who had been brought from sick beds, and had left sick rooms to face the cold damp night that had succeeded a snow storm. Everyone was on the look-out for some indication of the result. The excitement was intense—almost painful. At length two gentlemen push through the crowd at the bar. One, Sir William Jolliffe, comes to the table, whispers the Ayes to the clerk, and then turns to his chief. Poor Sir William, he is disappointed, and can't help showing it. By and by, the two other tellers force their way from behind the Speaker's chair, and whisper to the clerk. He writes, and hands the paper to the opposition whipper-in. The Government are beaten. Then arises an uproarious shout, as the tellers fall back with their faces to the chair until they are about four paces from the table, when they bow and advance up the floor. Hush! Silence for the numbers! "Ayes to the right, 291. Noes to the left, 330." Another cheer!

Partial silence is restored; and then the Speaker puts Lord John Russell's resolution as a substantive motion. Up gets Mr. Wyld, the mapseller, of Charing Cross, who has an amendment in favour of the ballot. Thereupon ensues a scene of noise and confusion which perhaps could not be paralleled out of the House of Commons.

Mr. Clay then rose, and waited in a majestic attitude with his thumb in the highest button-hole of his waistcoat, until the cry of "Oh," which greeted his appearance, had passed over the House as a breeze passes over a corn field. He said—"Sir (interruption, during which the hon. gentleman pauses), I think—(another interruption, made up of cries of 'divide,' and 'oh')—I think—(storm number three in the crescendo scale)." This was not getting on. It was marking time, as the soldiers say. So the hon. gentleman, condescending from his oratorical attitude, and in more hurried tones, moved that the debate be now adjourned. Sir John Shelley next rose, and the lieutenant colonels, with stentorian voices, were now 500 in number. Such a yell of "Oh's" has seldom been heard.

The storm was now at its height. Can Lord John calm it? He tries, for he rises and attempts to address the House. A deaf man would now have been the best reporter. The noble Lord's lips are seen to move, but a little pantomimic figure with much action and *empressment* might as well have risen upon the floor, for anything that could have been heard.

When it was seen that a division could not be avoided, the sand-glass was turned, and the last sand had run out before the crowd of retreating members could escape. Members called out impatiently "Time, time!" and the Speaker was compelled to give the usual signal to Lord Charles Russell to close the outer door. Since the fight at Hougoumont, when the late Sir J. Macdonald and a valiant and stalwart sergeant in the Guards, by main strength pushed back the French and closed the great gates upon them, there has been no such display of gallantry and activity as that evinced by Lord Charles at the Speaker's word of command "to get up and bar the door." Members were hurrying to get out, and others pushing to get in, when the Sergeant-at-Arms seizing the door, cut the crowd in two, keeping out half those who wished to get in, and keeping in half those who wished to get out.

Mr. Wyld's motion is put. "You that say aye say Aye!" A feeble response is heard. "You that say no say No!" Is the House full of bulls of Bashan, that such a roar can be got up? Mr. Wyld, of course, is beaten on a division, and then, when the doors are opened, the crowd again begins to pour into the House. The bells again ring madly, and members push and jostle against each other, in their determination not to be shut out when Lord John's resolution is finally put. When the question is put, the Speaker says, "I think the Ayes have it." Fifty discontented Ministerialists rejoin, "The Noes have it!" The Speaker returns to the charge. "I think the Ayes have it." Matters are growing serious, and the Ministry turn round, and cast deprecating looks upon their supporters. This time only 25 voices rejoin, "The Noes have it!" This is better; but it won't do. If a single voice is heard when the Speaker again puts the question, the House must divide. "I think the Ayes have it." You might have heard a pin drop. Then the pent up feeling of suspense was ended by the Speaker positively asserting, "The Ayes have it." The amendment so much debated, had been solemnly adopted by the House, and then every one looked at the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He proposed, amid significant silence, that the House should adjourn until Monday; and such of the members as were not run over by the extraordinary assemblage of carriages in New Palace Yard went home, deeply meditating, and eagerly conversing on the exciting incidents of the scene they had just witnessed.—*Manchester Guardian*.