

Christian Messenger.

A REPOSITORY OF RELIGIOUS, POLITICAL AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

"Not slothful in business: fervent in spirit."

NEW SERIES.
Vol. VI....No. 10.

HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 1861.

WHOLE SERIES.
Vol. XXV....No. 10.

Poetry.

The Voices.

I.
There's a voice from the heart of the mountains;
A voice from the wind on the steep;
And a voice from the sacred old fountains;
And a voice from the mighty old deep;
Hark, the chorus of grandeur and glory,
With its burden of Nature's great story!

II.
Now the tempest its trumpet is blowing;
Now the cataract joins in the song;
Now a deep voice is gloriously going
In majesty through the whole throng:
'Tis a chorus of grandeur and glory,
With its burden of Nature's great story!

III.
O, I must not be silent!—Wake, lyre,
Join the triumph that swells in the strain;
Fling abroad all thy jubilant fire;
Be a comrade of mountain and main:
Roll the chorus of grandeur and glory,
With its burden of Nature's great story!

—Ledger.

Religious.

"Roger Williams and the Baptists."

Under our editorial department last week we gave a lengthy extract from the first section of this admirable lecture. Our readers will be prepared, by the perusal of that portion, to appreciate the remainder, from which we now take the liberty of copying, but with some considerable abbreviation. We recommend the book itself to all who are pleased with superior typography, as well as on account of its contents. Baptists have no cause to be ashamed of either. By lending it to others, far and wide, they would correct many erroneous notions which now obtain currency in certain quarters.

It will be remembered that the first section was discussed in the form of replies to the question, *What are the distinguishing tenets of the Baptists?* The author next proposes to consider

The Antiquity of these Tenets, and how they have been treated.—What reception has been given by the world to the views held by this people? Let us see. The Baptists claim a remote antiquity. They believe that their views, held by the apostles and primitive Christians, have been transmitted in a line more or less direct from the early church, being held by a greater or lesser number of God's people under various names, in all generations. If they can establish this, they prove an antiquity running back through ages in which all other forms of apostolic succession have been shivered like walls of glass. The impression that Baptist views are of modern date is very erroneous, as historic fact abundantly demonstrates. Mosheim, the church historian, says, what others have proved, that "before the rise of Luther and Calvin there lay concealed, in almost all the countries of Europe, persons who adhered tenaciously to the principles of the modern Dutch Baptists."

That infant baptism, against which Baptists so heartily protest, as destructive to direct, personal responsibility to God, is not found in the Scriptures, was not mentioned with approval by any of the early Christian fathers, has been candidly admitted by learned Pedobaptists. The *North British Review*, in a very able article, asserts that "Scripture knows nothing of infant baptism," and adds "that not a single trace of it is to be found in the New Testament." Bunsen goes farther, and informs us that "Pedobaptism, in the modern sense, meaning thereby the baptism of new-born infants, with the vicarious promises of parents and sponsors, was utterly unknown to the early church, not only down to the end of the second, but, indeed, to the middle of the third century." Hippolytus, a pupil of Irenaeus, pastor at Portus, at the mouth of the Tiber, shows that in his time, A. D. 220, "child baptism was only practised in some regions as an exception and innovation;" and that he was nearly or

quite ignorant of it seems evident. We must, then, agree with the learned Professor Stuart, who says, "Commands or plain and certain examples in the New Testament relative to it (infant baptism) I do not find."

Chrysostom (A. D. 398) declares, "If sudden death seize us before we are baptized, though we have a thousand good qualities, there is nothing to be expected but hell!" Thus this rite grew up some time in the third century, out of a doctrine from which human nature shrinks with instinctive horror, and which we repudiate as a monstrous libel on the character of God—*infant damnation*. Claudius Salmasius, who filled a professorship at the University of Leyden, says, "An opinion prevailed that no one could be saved without being baptized; and for that reason the custom arose of baptizing infants." This is the historic origin of the rite, and on this it must stand or fall.

And when infant baptism did appear, there was a sect maintaining the doctrines of the apostles that stood forth to oppose it. Passing over the Montanists and the Novatians, many of whom are Baptists, we come to the Donatists, consisting of scattered sects and parties, who opposed the corruptions that came sweeping in upon the church in the third century, and who were consolidated under the leadership of Donatus, called *the Great*, and became a powerful denomination. Among their leading principles was an opposition to the union of church and state, the coercion of conscience, and infant baptism and membership. They also held the word of God as their supreme law, and rejected all traditions of men. Augustine and the Catholics held that men should be coerced into religion. The declaration of Petilian, the Donatist bishop was, "Christ persecutes no one; he was for inviting, not forcing, men to the faith. . . . Christ, in dying for men has given Christians the example to die, but not to kill." So numerous was this sect, and so powerful did it become in Africa, that the Emperor Constantine (A. D. 348) sent two ambassadors, men of high rank, Paul and Marcarius, to treat with them, and induce them to give up what were called their heresies—to be "reconciled to an impure communion." But the Donatists replied, "*Quid est imperatori cum ecclesia?*" They refused even to treat with potentates and powers in spiritual matters, adopting as their motto, according to Optatus, "*Quid Christianis cum regibus, aut quid episcopis cum palatio.*"

And the principles avowed by this sect were held by multitudes of others; indeed, they were the principles of the early church. Christianity was probably introduced into Wales about sixty years after the ascension of Christ, and the views of the Welsh Christians from that time to A. D. 600 were the fundamental doctrines of the Baptists. The first monarch ever baptized was Lucius, king of the Welsh, and he was immersed, and the whole country was pervaded by these sentiments. During the reign of Diocletian, the tide of persecution rolled over the mountains, and the valleys were lighted up with the fires of hatred and fanaticism. But the churches withstood the tide, and the storm, having spent its fury, retired, and left the people to cultivate their fields and worship God in peace. The tenets of the Baptists prevailed until A. D. 600, when Austin, having subverted England, went into Wales to convert the inhabitants to papacy. The Christians proposed to meet him in council, and an assembly of the elders convened. The haughty legate proposed to them, as the first step, that they adopt infant baptism. But this proposition they rejected without debate, declaring that "they would keep the ordinances as they had received them from the apostolic age." Austin, failing in his design, urged the Saxons to fall upon the Welsh, and in the dreadful persecutions which ensued, thousands lost their lives because they would not adopt infant baptism.—One authority says that twelve hundred ministers and delegates were massacred at the council which assembled in Herefordshire. "The vale of Carleon," says a Welsh author, "is our valley of Piedmont, where the ordinances of the gospel have been administered to this day, in their primitive mode, without being adulterated by the corrupt church of Rome."

A French historian gives the creed of the Don-

atists, when he charges them with holding the following things: "First, for purity of church members, by asserting that none ought to be admitted into the church but such as are visibly true believers and real saints; secondly, for purity of church discipline; thirdly, for the independence of each church; and fourthly, they baptized again those whose first baptism they had reason to doubt."

According to the best sources of information, the Waldenses sprang from this ancient sect. It was merely a change of name; the principles remained the same. Neander asserts that with the Donatists is to be found the "the true historical origin of the Waldenses." One sect developed the other—the same in doctrines, but with another designation.

But were the Waldenses Baptists? That they all were is not affirmed. There were several sects of them, and some of these sects departed as widely from the truth as some sects who now practise immersion differ from the Baptists. But that the purest and most godly of them did hold these tenets is abundantly proved.

In a treatise on "Antichrist, Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, and the Sacraments," published A. D. 1120, written by one of the most illustrious of the sect, we find the views of that strange people thus put forth: "He [Antichrist] arrived at maturity when men whose hearts were set upon the world multiplied in the church, and, by the union of church and state, got the power of both in their hands." On another subject it is added, "He teaches to baptize children into the faith, and attributes to this the work of regenerating, thus confounding the work of the Holy Spirit in regenerating with the external of baptism; and on this foundation bestows orders, and indeed grounds all his Christianity."

Limborch, says, "The Waldenses appear to have been plain men, unskilful and inexperienced, and if their opinions and customs were to be examined without prejudice, it would appear that among all the modern sects of Christians, they bear the greatest resemblance to the Mennonites, or modern Dutch Baptists." Thus we find, in a direct line from the days of the apostles, a sect known by different names, differing in minor points, but holding to the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and now styled Baptists; represented in history by Donatus, Peter Waldo, Menno Simons, John Milton, John Huss, John Bunyan, Roger Williams, and a host of others, as great, as good, and as self-sacrificing. We feel that this is an apostolic succession of principles. We trace our way back, outside of the Romish church, through Menno Simons, Peter de Bruys, Jerome the Bohemian, to the disciples of our Lord himself.

We are now prepared to consider the reception Baptist tenets have received in all ages. And the book we open is written in blood, and contains a long record of persecutions. We hear the grating rack, the torturing thumb-screw, and the turning wheel. We see the bonfire, the expiring victim, and the flying exile. From the beginning the unselfish, non-persecuting Baptist element has met only with proscription and persecution. As early as 414 the Council of Carthage decreed, "We will that whosoever denies that little children, by baptism, are freed from perdition, and eternally saved, be accursed." "The first result of the protectorate of the Christian emperors," says Bunsen, "was, that in their codes they converted church ordinances into statute laws. Thus Justinian, in the beginning of the sixth century, ordered new-born babes to be baptized, under a penalty for neglecting it,—a law which still passes for a Christian principle in the code of many a Christian state."

Jerome of Prague and John Huss start up before us in the long line of martyrs. Robinson tells us that the sermons of Huss were full of Anabaptistical errors, and Orchard informs us that Jerome was baptized by immersion.

Huss was crowned with a paper cap, ornamented with flaming devils, on which was painted the sentence, "*A Ringleader of Heretics*," and went to heaven in a mantle of fire, shouting, "Jesus Christ thou Son of the living God, have mercy on me." His ashes were mingled with the waters of the Rhine, and his sacred books burned at the door of the grand church of Con-

stance. Jerome, the Bohemian heretic, the friend of the reformer, hearing of the condemnation of Huss, hurried from Prague to Constance, to cheer the martyr, and was rewarded for his heroism by being condemned to the same fate. When bound to the stake, he cried to his persecutor, "Bring hither thy torch! Had I feared death I might have avoided it." And his body was wrapped in a robe of flame.

Time would fail me even to enumerate those who, for ten centuries, have been condemned for these ideas.

A number of cases are here recited from authentic history of those who have endured cruel sufferings for holding baptist sentiments.

But the author asks why multiply cases like these? They dot the whole tide of time—from the days of Christ the crucified until now. Germany, France, England, Catholic countries and Protestant countries, Asia, Africa, Europe, and America, all have the records of persecution, all have the lists of martyrdom.

It would be impossible to tell how dreadful was the persecution of the Waldenses, how fierce and deadly the rage against that unoffending people.

We might expect that the New World would be an asylum for this proscribed creed, this persecuted sect; that in this country, peopled by refugees from oppression, freedom of conscience and liberty of soul would be advocated and protected; that here, at least, a people whose track was red with the blood of their own martyrs for centuries would find rest. But was it so? No! We find "Bloody Tenet" written on the very first page to which we turn; proscription, intolerance, banishment, the whipping post, and the prison make up the volume.

There were Baptist sentiments here before Williams came; but he developed them, and, by the boldness and energy of his movements, led those of like precious faith to organization and systematic effort. The Puritans were strangers to religious liberty; the first principles of freedom of conscience they were yet to learn. "The great idea of toleration—that 'soul liberty' which was dear to the eccentric Roger Williams," says Cleaveland, "was a principle beyond their reach; and, with one or two memorable exceptions, it was equally unknown to all the men of that day." A Welshman by birth; educated, probably, at Oxford; the protégé of Sir Edward Coke; transplanted early in life from his home in England to this land,—he was just the man, and had received just the training, to stand forth in defence of unwelcome truth. Received here as a "godly minister," but forced to retire before the rising storm to Plymouth, and afterwards pastor in Salem, that venerable old town of strict habits, God made him the agent of calling the attention of the world to the principles for which the Donatists contended and for which the Waldenses bled freely, until the waters of Europe were red, and the snowy mane of the Alps was gory and purple. The history of America, from the arrival of the Mayflower to the declaration of independence, has no exhibition of moral heroism grander than the spectacle presented by Roger Williams, casting himself, for a principle, upon the charity of savages; meeting all the rigors of banishment in midwinter; as he himself says, "sorely tost, for one fourteen weeks, in a bitter winter season, not knowing what bed or bread did mean;" and founding a Commonwealth the law of which should be "Toleration," and the name of which was "PROVIDENCE"—a commonwealth where, in the language of Judge Story, "we read for the first time since Christianity ascended the throne of the Caesars, the declaration that conscience should be free, and men should not be punished for worshipping God in the way they were persuaded he required."

In Massachusetts colony there was no soul liberty. By statute law in 1636, it was enacted that "if any Christian shall openly condemn the baptizing of infants, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the administration of that ordinance, and continuing obstinate therein, he shall be sentenced to be banished." But the severity only brought out the Baptist spirit, and soon the principles for which the minister of the First Church in Salem was ban-