

"It's not young Mr. Dixon's bringing up, then," observed the widow, "that makes him extravagant."
 It's not exactly that he's extravagant," said the housekeeper; "but young people don't think enough, sometimes about the future. I am not the woman to take liberties; but I first came into the family as his nurse, and in one place or another I've been with them ever since. I don't say but that, sometimes, when he's ordering out bottles of his best port wine for such of the bedridden old pauper-men as would be better in the workhouse by half, or when he's sending out dinner (soup, and jelly, and slices off the best end of a lion of veal, yesterday, and almost half a fowl, the day before) to snuffy old cronies, that are no better than they should be,—I don't say but that, now and then, I observe, 'Sir, you'll not be able to afford all this when you're married, and have a family of own to think about.' 'That's a good reason,' said he, the last time I named it,—'that's a good reason why I should do it now. Beside,' said he, 'Nurse (for he sometimes forgets, and calls me Nurse still,) don't intend to marry. I'm very comfortable as I am. I don't want a lady here.'
 "Ah," said the widow, shaking her head, "they're so confident young men are; but his time will come, Mrs. Anderson, his time will come."
 Mrs. Anderson passed her cup for more tea.
To be Continued.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Prince Edward Island Association, and the "Articles" again.

PART I.

Dear Brother,—

Your readers will recall my letter, as published in your issue of Aug. 5, on the religious sentiments of our Island Association. I now proceed to deal with remarks and inquiries elicited by that letter.

§1. NO OBJECTION WILL BE TAKEN.

In your editorial on the above letter there occur these words:—"If our brethren in Prince Edward Island prefer to express their views of religious doctrine by saying,

'The religious sentiments of our body may be described as those held by the so-called Calvinistic Baptists,'

their brethren in Nova Scotia, we presume, will not have a word to say against their doing so."

Your good-natured prophecy has not been justified by facts. Your readers have had a sample of the feeling awakened in regard to this matter. The excellent and patriarchal Dr. Tupper is so deeply moved on the occasion, that he even "affectionately intreats" his Island brethren to adopt the "Nova Scotia Articles" at the next session of their Association. A private communication from a brother in the Nova Scotia Western Association contains these words:—"We are all thrown back by brother Davis's letter in the *Messenger*; and the cry everywhere is, 'Where are we? and what shall we do?' Why, if we Islanders had expressly renounced and denounced the truths set forth in the "Nova Scotia Articles," scarcely could our brethren have manifested more dismay or alarm. It seems that there are some who attach to the said "Articles" a greater value, and even reverence, than could have been previously imagined. My analogy taken from the story of Hezekiah and the brazen serpent turns out to be not wholly unjust. It were high time, therefore, that brethren should be reminded, that these greatly prized "Articles" are not the Word of God, but the work of man, and are liable to be treated accordingly. In all which you will find my apology for farther addressing you, as I now do, in regard to the said "Articles," and the controversy which has been raised concerning them.

§2. THE "ARTICLES" NOT A RESTRAINT HERETOFORE UPON BROTHER DAVIS.

In your editorial referred to as above you state, speaking of my treatment of the "Articles," that you "do not presume that he [J. D.] has heretofore felt any restraint in this respect."

I beg to remark, in reply, that I have never liked them, and am well pleased with the opportunity now afforded of not even seeming henceforth to be bound by them.

§3. THE "ARTICLES" NOT REGARDED AS HAVING ANY "BINDING FORCE."

In your editorial as above you say, with respect to the "Articles," that you "do not regard them as having any binding force, except so far as they are in agreement with the Divine Word."

Let me ask here, Have "these "Articles" then any "binding force" at all? If they derive their whole sanction from the "Divine Word," why not go direct to that Word for our "binding force," without permitting any human formulary to interpose in any way, or to any extent, between us, and that Word?

Brother Theodore Porter, (the "N. S. Delegate," as I presume)* in your issue of Sept. 2, has a whole paragraph to the effect of your remark, as above cited. Among other things he reminds me of instances in which Island churches had been constituted without express reference to the "Articles," and had yet been admitted into the Eastern Nova Scotia Association. Perhaps brother Porter will remember, too, that the said churches were not so received without a vigorous protest on the part of some brethren, accompanied by an attempt to enforce in future a nearer conformity to what was represented as Nova Scotia usage in this matter;—a protest, and an attempt illustrative of the working of that overweening attachment to the "Articles" to which I have before had occasion to advert. If, however, brother Porter has really no more regard for the "Articles" than he seems to profess in the paragraph at which I here glance, it ought to be no difficult thing for him to tread in the steps of his Island brethren, and break his *Nehushtan* to pieces.

§4. THE "ARTICLES" CONVENIENT SUMMARIES.

Again, in your leader as above, you speak of the "Articles" in these terms:—"We value them as convenient summaries of Christian doctrine, and generally of what is held and believed by those with whom we hold fraternal fellowship." Dr. Tupper, in your issue of Sept. 30, argues this point at length.

Suppose I grant all that you and the venerable doctor thus urge; what then? Because a thing is useful for certain purposes, does it follow that it is also useful for certain other purposes, for which, rather, it may prove to be wholly unfit? Is not this lame logic? And farther, might not these "Articles" prove just as convenient if employed solely for the purpose of supplying information as to our views as Baptists, without being exalted into something like a symbol of union, and a term of fellowship, either in our Churches or Associations?—and thus possibly becoming a stumbling-block for a scrupulous conscience, such as perhaps mine is? And here, by the way, is the most that our brethren have to say on behalf of the said "Articles." It is urged that they are convenient for this purpose, or for that. Be it so, I reply. Yet, I beg to add, if this be all, why lay so much stress upon them as some of my brethren do? And especially, why thrust them in where they may prove to be most inconvenient?

§5. EVEN ISLAND BAPTISTS HAVE THEIR CREED.

To revert once more to your editorial of Aug. 5. You quote the Sixth Article of our Island Associational Constitution, as rehearsed above. You then proceed,—“Our brother will not surely contend that such a statement will be more adapted than our Articles to send our brethren and our churches immediately to the Word of God.” Brother Porter, "Common Sense," in your issue of Aug. 26, and brother M. P. Freeman, in your issue of the 21st ult., seem to suggest views here similar to your own. I reply, that I do really mean to maintain here what you and these brethren appear to think I scarcely can maintain. Here indeed lies the reason for the adoption of the formula as above given. We wish to indicate our theological standpoint. We could not do so by saying, that we are an Association of New Testament churches; since that, as things are, would be saying nothing, and would land us nowhere. We therefore just say that we interpret the utterances of Scripture generally in a Calvinistic sense. The effect of which is, not to send any one to John Calvin, to learn our doctrinal creed from him; but rather to the New Testament, Calvin's teacher and ours, in a certain broad sense, that they may compare both his views and ours with the teachings of the Holy Book, and deal with them as they may find them. Thus far, and only thus far, and for the reasons here suggested, we are definite. But this surely is a very different thing from referring men to a document like the "Nova Scotia Articles," professing our faith in them rather than in New Testament teachings, and seeming to build upon Newton Brown rather than upon "apostles and prophets," and their Lord and ours. And why do we employ the expression, "so-called Calvinistic Baptists?" Is it not that we may thus assert our liberty; and let all know whom it may concern, that while we stand in general agreement with our brethren of the Calvinistic school, it is by the intelligent assent of free men, and not by the indolent acquiescence of such as are afraid to think for

§6. A SINGULAR SUPPOSITION.

This is presented by "Common Sense" in these words:—"A church might object to Calvinistic, and choose Fullerite as more definitive of the opinions held. [by them.] Would such a church be welcome to the P. E. I. Association? I suppose not; nor unless they could adopt the chosen phrase."

This surely is passing strange. Does not this writer know, that, in matters of doctrine, Fuller and Calvin stood upon nearly the same platform? inasmuch that the former on one occasion thus expressed himself;—"I do not believe every thing that Calvin taught, nor any thing because he taught it; but I reckon strict Calvinism to be my own system." Thus,—of course I speak here for myself rather than for my brethren,—if a church were to come to our Island Association, saying, "We do not know much about John Calvin. We know more about Andrew Fuller, and we agree generally with him in his religious sentiments. Can you not receive us on a statement like this?"—does "Common Sense" really dream, that such a church must be rejected by the Association? We break away from all human creeds; and are we going to tie ourselves up to phrases? I trow not.

§7. BRETHREN SCANDALIZED.

Thus writes brother Porter;—"Brother Davis may speak his own sentiments when he says, 'Neither are we Baptists in the sense of the Articles of the Faith and Practice of the Baptist Churches in Nova Scotia;' but I am unwilling to believe he herein represents the Island Association. For this language not only implies that they reject the 'Articles' as a definition of their faith, but also that some of the views expressed therein are not accepted." And thus again Dr. Tupper;—"Having laboured much on P. E. Island, and formed a pleasing Christian acquaintance with many valued brethren there, united with the Baptist Associations of Nova Scotia, I have read, with surprise and grief, a statement made by my esteemed brother Davis, in which, after speaking of the new Association as distinct from certain denominations, he says, 'Neither are we Baptists in the sense of the Articles of the Faith and Practice of the Baptist Churches of Nova Scotia.' Is not this tantamount to a declaration of non-fellowship with us? Wherefore this drawing apart?"

I too am beyond measure surprised, not to say grieved also, that brethren should so far misunderstand me here. Can they not see, that the expression which so greatly scandalizes them is only a strong form for the avowal, that we Island Baptists are not Baptists in the sense of any human exposition of Baptist sentiment, but simply in a New Testament sense? Does it follow from this, as brother Porter puts it, that any "of the views expressed [in the 'Nova Scotia Articles'] are not accepted" by us? Assuredly not. I mean just this,—and I think my Island brethren herein concur with me,—that, as a member of our Association, I choose rather to avow my faith in New Testament teachings than in the teachings of Newton Brown, or of any other uninspired writer. I trust that, with this explanation I may venture to say, without bringing their orthodoxy into suspicion, that neither is Dr. Tupper nor brother Porter a Baptist "in the sense of the Nova Scotia Articles."

Yours, &c.,
 J. DAVIS.

For the Christian Messenger.

"Always Confident."

The whole creation is said to groan; and the unregenerate man who has no fear of God before his eyes—"born to trouble as the sparks fly upward"—is a groaning man in the midst of the groaning creation, painfully alive to the consequences of sin in his own person and circumstances, and in the condition of things around him, apart from any sense of sin according to God.

Then there is the groaning of the burdened conscience, which results from a certain true knowledge of God, conscience having been set in the presence of the unbending claims of his holiness, without the apprehension of how his grace "reigns through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ." That which is needed by a soul in this condition, when sin has been laid on the conscience by the Spirit of God, is to see that the work done by Christ on behalf of a sinner is so divinely sufficient an answer for his sin, as that, in believing, he shall have "no more conscience of sin." "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren," testified the first

* We think it undesirable, and improper, in a newspaper discussion—whether religious or political—to guess at the proper name of an anonymous writer and then to proceed to discuss the matter as if it were an admitted fact. ED. C. M.]

themselves—content that others, no more inspired than they are, should think and speak for them.

§6. A SINGULAR SUPPOSITION. This is presented by "Common Sense" in these words:—"A church might object to Calvinistic, and choose Fullerite as more definitive of the opinions held. [by them.] Would such a church be welcome to the P. E. I. Association? I suppose not; nor unless they could adopt the chosen phrase."

This surely is passing strange. Does not this writer know, that, in matters of doctrine, Fuller and Calvin stood upon nearly the same platform? inasmuch that the former on one occasion thus expressed himself;—"I do not believe every thing that Calvin taught, nor any thing because he taught it; but I reckon strict Calvinism to be my own system." Thus,—of course I speak here for myself rather than for my brethren,—if a church were to come to our Island Association, saying, "We do not know much about John Calvin. We know more about Andrew Fuller, and we agree generally with him in his religious sentiments. Can you not receive us on a statement like this?"—does "Common Sense" really dream, that such a church must be rejected by the Association? We break away from all human creeds; and are we going to tie ourselves up to phrases? I trow not.

§7. BRETHREN SCANDALIZED.

Thus writes brother Porter;—"Brother Davis may speak his own sentiments when he says, 'Neither are we Baptists in the sense of the Articles of the Faith and Practice of the Baptist Churches in Nova Scotia;' but I am unwilling to believe he herein represents the Island Association. For this language not only implies that they reject the 'Articles' as a definition of their faith, but also that some of the views expressed therein are not accepted." And thus again Dr. Tupper;—"Having laboured much on P. E. Island, and formed a pleasing Christian acquaintance with many valued brethren there, united with the Baptist Associations of Nova Scotia, I have read, with surprise and grief, a statement made by my esteemed brother Davis, in which, after speaking of the new Association as distinct from certain denominations, he says, 'Neither are we Baptists in the sense of the Articles of the Faith and Practice of the Baptist Churches of Nova Scotia.' Is not this tantamount to a declaration of non-fellowship with us? Wherefore this drawing apart?"

I too am beyond measure surprised, not to say grieved also, that brethren should so far misunderstand me here. Can they not see, that the expression which so greatly scandalizes them is only a strong form for the avowal, that we Island Baptists are not Baptists in the sense of any human exposition of Baptist sentiment, but simply in a New Testament sense? Does it follow from this, as brother Porter puts it, that any "of the views expressed [in the 'Nova Scotia Articles'] are not accepted" by us? Assuredly not. I mean just this,—and I think my Island brethren herein concur with me,—that, as a member of our Association, I choose rather to avow my faith in New Testament teachings than in the teachings of Newton Brown, or of any other uninspired writer. I trust that, with this explanation I may venture to say, without bringing their orthodoxy into suspicion, that neither is Dr. Tupper nor brother Porter a Baptist "in the sense of the Nova Scotia Articles."

Yours, &c.,
 J. DAVIS.

For the Christian Messenger.

"Always Confident."

The whole creation is said to groan; and the unregenerate man who has no fear of God before his eyes—"born to trouble as the sparks fly upward"—is a groaning man in the midst of the groaning creation, painfully alive to the consequences of sin in his own person and circumstances, and in the condition of things around him, apart from any sense of sin according to God.

Then there is the groaning of the burdened conscience, which results from a certain true knowledge of God, conscience having been set in the presence of the unbending claims of his holiness, without the apprehension of how his grace "reigns through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ." That which is needed by a soul in this condition, when sin has been laid on the conscience by the Spirit of God, is to see that the work done by Christ on behalf of a sinner is so divinely sufficient an answer for his sin, as that, in believing, he shall have "no more conscience of sin." "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren," testified the first

proclaimers of the gospel of God, "that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." (Acts xiii. 38, 39.)

Again, there may be an unhappy groaning even when our sins are no longer felt about, as if in question between ourselves and God. Although conscience be at rest as to sins, the heart, alas! is too often not at rest as to circumstances, but fretted about them, through practical unbelief in regard to that of which faith stands assured, that all things are working together for our good. Here it is a Christian indeed that is groaning, but his groaning is altogether another thing from that which is properly the groaning of a Christian.

There is a groaning that has not its occasion either in entire or partial ignorance of God, nor yet in mistrust of Him, as had severally the groaning we have been considering.

The soul is at large with God, and the measure of this character of groaning will ever be in direct proportion to our living unto Him. It is described in 2 Cor. v. "We know" says the apostle, and he is but speaking the language of faith, saying that which every Christian is entitled to say, and not merely an apostle—"we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;" and then he adds, "For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven."

For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

It is a groaning after that which—revealed to faith as God's ultimate purpose concerning us—we have the earnest of already. For, let us mark, the apostle goes on to say, "Now he that hath wrought us for the self same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord, (for we walk by faith, not by sight,) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord."

God has put his hand to the work. Having done so, He will turn the vessel out of hand, in his own due time, to the praise of his glory. In this assurance the Christian is seen to be full of confidence and hope; burdened indeed, and groaning being burdened; willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord; yet having as his earnestly longed for expectation, not the being absent from the body, but the being clothed upon with his house which is from heaven, that mortality should be swallowed up of life. In other words, he waits the changing of his body of humiliation, and its being fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body by Christ himself at His coming. (Phil. iii. 20, 21.) As he has borne the image of the earthy, so shall he then bear the image of the heavenly. (1 Cor. xv. 49.)

"Always confident!" Such a posture of soul supposes, of necessity, the absence of all doubt and uncertainty as to acceptance with God. How, then, it might be asked, does the Apostle here speak, and that as the consequence of being always confident, of labouring, that "whether present or absent, we may be accepted of Him." It is evident that what he has in view is well-pleasingness in the ways of one already "in Christ," and who, moreover, knows that he is in Christ "accepted in the Beloved," since he is able to say, "He that hath wrought us." A life unto Christ has for its motive the love of Christ, not the terror of the law. "The love of Christ, constraineth us." The Son of man, who at a future hour will sit upon the great white throne is the Jesus who has loved me, and given himself for me. He, from before whom the earth and the heavens will flee away, is the Christ in whom I am. Such is the assured ground of Christian Confidence.

F. N.

For the Christian Messenger.

IN MEMORIAM.

MISS CHARLOTTE W. CURRY.

Died of Apoplexy at Union Square, West Cornwallis, Sept. 4 aged sixty-five years. In the days of her youth she sought the Saviour, and being of a remarkably mild and amiable disposition, she was greatly beloved, she had naturally a very delicate constitution and suffered a great deal; and, for that reason, she never looked forward to a long life but seemed to have death ever in view. She was a warm hearted zealous, earnest Christian, the cause of God lay near her heart and she was never so happy as