

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Mr. EDITOR,—

Many things occur in this eventful age to claim the attention of every christian engaged in the interesting study of "God in history."

One of the new things of the present year is a proposition made by an eminent Baptist minister in Virginia, U. S., to enquire into the practicability of a union between the Baptists and the Disciples in that State.

The proposition is made by Rev. Dr. W. F. Broadus of Charlottesville, and published in the Religious Herald of Richmond. Rev. Dr. J. B. Jeter and Rev. A. E. Dickenson, Editors and proprietors of the Herald favor the movement, and offer to do all in their power to accomplish the desired end. Dr. Broadus, after stating his impression that the time had come when an effort should be made to unite the two bodies, says: "Would not the parties agree to select some ten men on each side, to meet in convention, and have a friendly talk, with a view to consider the question of re-union? Such convention could, of course, have no ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The deliberation, however, might help the parties to re-unite, or else convince all hands that re-union is impracticable."

Rev. James W. Goss of the Disciples responds to Dr. Broadus in a friendly letter which closes as follows: "Should your effort to unite these hosts of the Almighty, and to turn their united artillery upon the foes of Bible truth, succeed, then indeed will your sun set with a lustre that will leave a joyous brilliancy upon the walls of Zion."

The matter has so far progressed that 15 men, from each side, have been selected to meet for friendly conference on the subject in the city of Richmond, on Tuesday, the 24th April next. All who know the government of both churches are aware that this convention can do no more than consider the practicability of a re-union, and report their deliberation, to their respective churches. Still the two men hope that good will result, and they call upon their brethren to continue with them in earnest supplication to God, that his blessing may attend "this effort, that it may promote his glory, and the peace and prosperity of his people." Both men are said to possess, in an eminent degree, the confidence and esteem of their brethren, and the hope is cherished that the hand of God is in it. Should they fail to accomplish the desired end for some time to come, it is confidently believed to be a move in the right direction; and that it cannot be wrong for christian men to meet, and talk on the subject, and plead together with God, in union with the prayer of Jesus, that his people may be one. And should it so turn out that the two bodies, actuated by the love of God, and a sincere desire to labor together to save souls from death, should unite, on the truth as it is in Jesus; it would be regarded as a glorious triumph of divine love over the exclusive selfishness of human nature.

The pleasing interviews held with many of our Baptist brethren in these provinces, "of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep," convince me that such a union would rejoice their hearts.

I ask no pardon for mentioning in this connexion the name of the venerable Edward Manning. I made his acquaintance near the close of his earthly pilgrimage. He urged me on one occasion to preach in his meeting house. I did so. He was in the pulpit,—the last time, I think, he ever sat there. The text was, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." When the discourse was finished he rose and spoke, as Edward Manning would speak, on the glory, and uncreated blessedness of the Lamb of God.

At the time a timid youth, laboring under many discouragements to persuade men to be reconciled to God, the gentle majesty of Elder Manning's look, and the peculiar manner in which he bade me God speed, made too deep an impression on my heart ever to be forgotten. I continued to visit him till his death, and always with unabated interest. He seldom failed to utter words like the following: "We are one, your people and ours must work together, &c. &c." Such were the whole-hearted sentiments of this veteran of the cross, about to lay his armor by.

And dwell with Christ at home. and such, I feel, assured, are the sentiments of many a christian among both parties. With a sincere desire for such a union of God's people, as will meet his approval on earth, and be consummated in everlasting rest.

I remain yours fraternally,

D. CRAWFORD. New Glasgow, P. E. I., March 30th, 1866.

For the Christian Messenger.

Reply to Hiram Wallace.

Friend "Hiram" what aileth thee? Thou has written a lengthy notice of my article entitled, "Campbellite baptism vs. Christian baptism. Thy thoughts come forth strangely and discordantly. First, thou hast said that no Campbellite baptism is in the world, and that thou art no Campbellite, and then thou takest to thyself my article, just as though thou wert one; then thou hast no more right to be aggrieved than a Presbyterian or Episcopalian. Secondly, thou fillest very largely thy article with flings and my style of writing, spirit, &c.; just as though such flings and thrusts constitute argument. I am not aware that either the vileness or purity of my spirit, or a coarseness or elegance in my manner of writing is any argument either for or against an abstract question in theology. But I am aware that a class of persons indignant at a position maintained, and for want of argument to prove an unwarrantableness for such maintenance, usually assail the defenders thereof with calumny and abuse. Of this thou art verily guilty.

Then thou hast written about my propositions; fashions those in which I censured Campbellite baptism. And still very fully agreeing with them. Admitting that thou dost have in baptism a design beyond the acknowledgement of Christ, that thy fraternity do teach and administer baptism as a term of pardon; surely thou oughtest not to fault me for expressing in terms and words of my choice, what thou dost contest in words and terms of thy choice, thou dost teach. Thou dost fling too at the whole Baptist body on account of their use of baptism and the profession they require in order thereto. Surely thou dost not presume to be able to prove from scripture that they are wrong on that question. Look carefully at their Articles, the exponents of their faith, but honestly and frankly before the world. Compare those articles with the scriptures they cite. And then before thou dost challenge theological controversy, for integrity's sake, for the sake of being above suspicion, as well as for christianity's, publish in brief explicit and tangible form thy denominational creed to the world. Nor think to charm by either citing thy progress in numbers as proof of thy gospel, nor putting on paper thy kindness to Baptists. For know thou that if thy adherents were as numerous as the antediluvians it would argue nothing favorable for thee; nor will thy pen and ink expressions of inclination to cultivate fraternal feelings, in this case, avail thee much when it is remembered that in June last, at the time of the Annual Convocation of the Western Baptist Association at Milton, thy pulpit was the only dissenting one in the vicinity to which our ministers were not cordially invited.

Thou hast asked me to show from scripture that persons receiving christian baptism, were required to profess, first, a renewal by the Holy Spirit. Certainly, thou art not sincere in denying that the scriptures furnish proof of such profession. Nor wilt thou make a play upon words. If thou dost not read thus "every person about to be baptized shall profess to be regenerated by the Holy Spirit," still if thou dost find therein, that all persons baptized by the Apostles did in some way profess this change, and that it was their invariable practice to baptize none who did not either by words or some other exercise profess this renewal, thou oughtest to be satisfied, and not attempt to ignore such precedents; such invulnerable facts.

As early as the ministry of John a profession consisting not merely in words but real acts was demanded as evidence of an inner change, before he would administer to applicants that sacred ordinance. Matt. xiii. 8.

Our Saviour who gave the commission to baptize, does not attach to it the first importance. He nowhere states it to be a term of pardon. He gave it too not at the commencement but at the close of his personal ministry. And throughout his personal ministry of about three years he constantly labored for men's good, calling their attention to heavenly things, he exhorts them to prepare for that future. He declares the corruption of man's nature, and the necessity of pardon, yet he never urges baptism as a term thereof. Nor did he ever administer that ordinance to an individual, but discourses to them of love, repentance, faith, the influence, necessity and effects of the Holy Spirit, &c. Rest, for a little, upon his instruction to Nicodemus. He teaches him the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, to constitute a meetness for heaven, but says nothing about baptism being essential to either pardon or justification. Surely Christ knew what to teach.

The great Apostle Paul too, full of love, and zeal and wisdom, labored for prishing men, yet in writing to the church at Corinth he thanked God, that he had baptized very few of them. Christ, he declares, sent him, "not to baptize," but to preach the gospel, 1 Cor. i. 17. Surely if baptism made men better, if it secured for them pardon, or justification, he would rather have sorrowed that he had baptized so few, and he would have constantly been persuading men to be baptized, telling them, it was a term of pardon or salvation.

Again respecting this question thou hast asked me, was it at the day of Pentecost candidates were required to show their regeneration by the holy spirit prior to baptism? Certainly thou hast either never read the whole account of the remarkable occurrences of that season, or else thy zeal hath made thee mad or thou wouldst never attempt to confront so great an amount of evidence as is then arrayed against thee. Whether all the words used by the converts in their appeal to the Apostles is recorded, or not, I do not know. It is however evident from the narration that all they said on the occasion is

not recorded. This we do know, however, that the converts by actions as well as words so fully avowed their regeneration, by the Spirit, that the Apostles understood it. And when the lookers on said, "these men are drunken," Peter tells them these men are not full of wine, but filled with the Spirit. Joel's prophecy has come to pass in their case, respecting the influence and effects of the Spirit.

Thou citest also the Samaritans. Dost thou mean Simon? If so, we yield thee the palm. It is evident that the Holy Spirit had not regenerated him. Though it is said of him that he believed and was baptized. But after all his faith and his baptism, Peter, tells him, he was still in the gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity. No pardon arose from his baptism. Take heed, lest thou make men Simonites. Of the others baptized on that occasion, it is certain that spiritual renovation was first experienced by them. This they evinced. It is said, Philip preached Christ unto them, and unclean spirits came out of them. Thou referest also to Saul of Tarsus. What dost thou think to prove there? Or dost thou design to help me to argument against thee? Surely his case doth go to prove a subjugation to divine power and influence, both manifest and understood prior to baptism. Saul was thoroughly a changed man. A renewed man. He was thoroughly under divine influence, he was filled with the Spirit, all prior to baptism. Acts ix. 17. I could increase the number of scripture proofs in this question, but it would make my letter more lengthy than I wish to have it. I think I have briefly shown that the administrators of christian baptism in the Apostolic age, required the candidates to avow their inner change, prior to baptism. I have shown too that those cases to which thou dost refer for proofs to the contrary, all go to strengthen my position, and also to prove that pardon is not dependent upon baptism. Thou sayest that I would have those re-baptized who have been baptized as the Eunuch was. Thou knowest that I said no such thing. But that I insisted upon christian baptism prior to church membership, thou hast written and all that our editor has written on thy behalf. I find no scriptural reason to change my position. None of the planks on which I stand are moved, nor would I give my vote to acknowledge the baptism of Campbellism or Disciplesism, as you may choose to call it, not even through the dread of being called "Anabaptist," or any other name persons please to use, so long as I am in company with Paul, and have truth for my defence.

In narratives, such as the gospel by the four Evangelists, and the Acts of the Apostles we do not get a full detail of every occurrence. But the Apostles' letters to the churches are exponents of christian truth. They discourse theologically. They define, systematize and enforce christianity. In all those letters the work of the Spirit has great prominence. Renewing, cleansing, strengthening, teaching, &c. Justification in them is associated with faith, instead of baptism as thou intimatest, and as I have heard thy men preach. And that faith which is the precursor of, and with which justification is connected, is declared in those Epistles to be the fruit of the Holy Spirit. See 1 Cor. xiii. 9. Eph. ii. 8. Gal. v. 22. On this account justification is sometimes referred directly to the Spirit, as in 1 Cor. v. 11.

Thy statement, that "I go too far when I say 'thy church teaches, and the candidate professes to believe, that salvation cannot be obtained prior to, nor elsewhere than in baptism," is fully contradicted by thy own admission of pardon being realized by baptism. My statement too, while sustained by thy own admission is also supported by the authorities thou citest. Thy preachers I have heard. And where it necessary I could give their names, and state the time and place, when and where I listened to them. And name some persons who with me heard the same things. Thou hast asked me, tauntingly for an exposition of thy jaded text, in which occurs the clause, "remission of sins." Thou hast signified that I might say the translation is wrong. And then thou hast attempted to draw in Drs. Conant and Hackett, to bear up thy bottomless theory, and intimidate me from an investigation of it. I have great respect for the learning and piety of those men. (I have not however seen the translation to which thou has referred.) But the scriptures are alone an infallible guide. And to me as well as to others, Christ says, "Search the scriptures." Now reading this text just as it stands in the authorized version; it seems to teach what no other text teaches: It is thy hobby text. And yet from thy presumption that I will say the translation is wrong, I conclude that thou art aware that the preposition "eis," which is translated "for," and "in order to," is capable of very many renderings, and is properly enough, rendered, "on account of," and "in consequence of" which would cause them to be baptized, because their sins had already been forgiven, or remitted in connection with repentance. I will however pass from this translation, which is justified by both the general tenor of scripture and the power of the Greek preposition "eis" and read the authorized translation with only a change of construction; Repent, for the remission of sins, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of the Jesus Christ? Now if thou art not satisfied with my exposition of this text, I will give thee Peter's own exposition of it. Thou wilt find, in his first general epistle 3, 21. He there says, "baptism is not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God." Surely Peter's exposition of his own views must be taken in preference to thy explanation of them.

* We are sorry to find Brother Goucher under such misapprehension; we will not suppose he desires to misrepresent our strictures on his letter.—Ed. C. M.

I have now written more lengthily than I designed to at the outset. But so many are the ways by which thou, friend "Hiram," dost attempt to escape that I could not with less writing so guard them as to prevent thee. I hope thou wilt be satisfied that my position is scriptural, and ere long become a convert to the good and right way. Any assistance that I can render thee thou shalt cheerfully have, though at present so many are the claims upon my time that I cannot promise to continue to write for thy aid.

I remain your well-wisher,
W. G. GOUCHER.
Yarmouth, April 4th, 1866.

OBITUARY NOTICES

ELIZABETH ANNIE MCGILL,

Youngest daughter of William and Pricilla M. McGill, of Upper Wilmot, died on the 23rd day of March, 1866, aged 7 years and 1 month.

This child was peculiarly beloved, not only in the family circle, but also by her teacher and school mates. On Friday, Feb. 16th, the unfavorable state of the weather detained her from school. Being fond of learning; she that day committed to memory the following verses:—

I am young, but I must die;
In my grave I soon shall lie,
Am I ready now to go,
If the will of God be so?
Lord, prepare me for my end,
To my heart thy Spirit send:
He p me, Jesus, thee to love,
Take my soul to heaven above.
Then I shall with Jesus be,
Then I shall my Saviour see;
Never more to suffer pain,
Never more to sin again.

Bringing up the book, and repeating these lines correctly, she remarked, "Ma, I learnt something, if I could not go to school." Though she was then in perfect health, her mother had a presentiment that the language of these lines would be soon realized. This dear child was taken ill that night, and became much worse by the next evening. On Sabbath morning she expressed a strong desire to go to the baptizing, as her teacher and a number of her school mates, with others, were to be baptized. On the following Tuesday she asked her mother very earnestly to pray for her, that she might go to heaven. Being asked, "Do you want to go and leave me?" she replied, "No, Ma, but I want to go and live with Jesus and the angels." From that time her conversation was chiefly on heaven.

It afforded her much comfort to be visited by her teacher and his pupils, and to have any of them pray with her. Singing afforded her consolation in her distress. Her favorite hymn was that which begins with the words, "I want to be an angel," &c. When her relatives and friends would weep, she would entreat them not to cry, for that she was going to heaven, adding that she wished for them to go there too. She expressed special anxiety for the conversion of such of her relatives as had not professed faith in Christ. Toward the close of her sickness her voice so failed that she could scarcely be understood; but on the Monday evening before her departure she exclaimed distinctly, "I am going to heaven! I am going to heaven!" She asked her young associates to sing a hymn which they had often sung in the Sabbath School, "Who shall sing, if not the children?" As they could not readily turn to it, she said, "You will find it on the 35th page." On being asked if she did not love a lady who had been very attentive and kind to her during her illness, she replied, "I love every body." About two hours before she died, her mother asked her, if she did not think she would soon be released from her pain? She replied, "O yes! I shall soon be with the angels, and be at rest." Shortly after this her happy spirit quietly took its flight.

At the burial of this dear child her teacher and school-mates followed her relatives in the procession; and several hymns which she had selected, were sung. As the Pastor of the Church was specially employed elsewhere, Rev. Abraham Stronach kindly officiated at the funeral, and delivered an appropriate discourse from 2 Kings, iv. 26. "Is it well with thee? Is it well with thy husband? Is it well with the child? And she answered, It is well."—Com by Rev. C. Tupper.

[We regret that we had forgotten a suggestion of the writer of the above, when we gave it into the printer's hand, that it might be a suitable article for our "Youths' Department." We hope our readers who are parents will bear this in mind, and if they think well direct their little ones attention to this brief memoir of a child.—Ed. C. M.]

Mrs. D. HARRIS KILGOUR,

Died, at Centreville, on the afternoon of the 30th ult. Elizabeth, wife of Mr. D. Harris Kilgour, and daughter of Andrew Henderson, Esq., of Truro, in the 36th year of her age. Our departed sister was for 15 years, a member of the Free Christian Baptist Church at Habitant Cornwalls, during these years she gave abundant testimony that her heart had been renewed by the grace of God. Her natural temperament being timid, she was on this account, deprived of that strong christian assurance which which many of God's children are blessed; but her faith was firm and she triumphed at last. She could say of her sick room; "God is here," and when feeling death's cold grasp, she embraced her husband saying, 'I am going home.' A bereaved husband and mourning friends are consoled, knowing that she "sleeps in Jesus." Th