

made no reply. But immediately he gave the door a second blow which shivered it in pieces, and the next moment he stood before me.

"Who art thou?" I asked in terror and in anger. "My name is *Disease*," he answered, and struck me a heavy blow with his mace, which filled me with excruciating pain.

I seized him and attempted to remove him by force, but he struck me a second blow more terrible than the first, when my agony became insupportable, and I fell at his feet faint and panting.

I now betook myself to entreaty. Pointing to a bag of gold which lay in a corner of the room, I offered him that if he would depart, but he laughed me in the face, and gave me a third blow.

Next I crawled to the strong vault where I kept my treasures, and showed him a huge pile of bags, all filled with gold, but he answered sternly, "Di-ease cannot be bribed. I go elsewhere, but I leave my work behind; and with that he struck me another dreadful blow, and departed.

I called together all the physicians in the region, but none of them could help me, for the blows of the mace had left their work behind.

Now, how changed were my prospects! My body was so full of pain that I could no longer enjoy anything. I saw through the window my elegant gardens, and fruit-yards, and parks, but all seemed hung with a pall of black. The coach-man brought to the door my carriage, glittering all over with gold, but I sent it away in disgust. The servant loaded my table with the choicest viands and wines, but I could not taste a mouthful.

Then I saw that there was one thing that gold could not buy.

THE SECOND THING THAT CANNOT BE BRIBED—THE MAN ON A PALE HORSE.

As I lay in this wretched and helpless condition, I heard again the prancing of a horse's hoofs. A grim and terrible figure, seated on a pale horse, rode up to the window and knocked upon it. Thinking that he was about to leap through the window, I screamed aloud from terror. But he forbore, and said, "I shall call for thee soon," I told him that I had millions of gold within, and entreated him to take it instead of me, but he called out in a voice of thunder, which shook the palace, "*Death cannot be bribed*," and galloped off.

"Alas," I said, in the agony of despair, while my frame quivered all over like an aspen leaf, "here is another thing that gold cannot buy."

THE THIRD THING THAT CANNOT BE BRIBED—THE SERPENT.

I had hardly uttered these words, when a huge black serpent glided in through the open door, and began to wreath his folds, cold as death, around my body. When he had reached my bosom he gave me a blow with his fangs, and cried out, "*My name is Guilt*." How dreadful was the pang of his venomous tooth? Though my body was racked with pain from the blows of the man on the black horse, this seemed to me as nothing in comparison with the sting of that dreadful serpent. I did not offer him gold, for I knew that it would be in vain. I called aloud for my servants, and they entered, but instantly fled in dismay.

Then he struck me another blow with his fangs, and said, "There is but one whose voice I obey."

"Whose voice?"

"The voice of the Son of God."

"And will He help me?"

"Thou hast thy Bible—ask that."

I took my Bible and attempted to pray, but my heart seemed as hard as a millstone, and, besides this, the serpent *Guilt* so stunned my ears with his upbraidings, that my voice was drowned in his. He reproached me with my ingratitude, my abuse of God's mercies, my contempt of his Gospel, my idolatry of mammon, my pride and sensuality; and added, "There is one more whom gold cannot bribe—the Judge of all the earth, into whose presence *Death* will soon carry you. Hark! do you not hear the prancing of his horse's hoofs?"

THE MAN ON THE PALE HORSE REAPPEARS WITH THE GUIDE.

I looked and saw him again at my window. In his hand he held a hour-glass, from which the last sands were running; and behind him I saw my old guide who had led me to the ravine of gold. I now understood that this was the demon *Mammon*, the same who had met me in the temple, and promised to meet me again at the end. With a look of malicious joy he pointed his finger at me, and exclaimed, "When he dieth he shall carry nothing away."

As he spoke these words the last sand ran out; the man with the pale horse sprang through the window; darkness and horror came over me; and I awoke—thankful that it was but a dream.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Reply to Rev. J. Davis.

MR. EDITOR,—

In the *Christian Messenger* of the 26th ult., I saw an article under the caption "*Campbellism in Prince Edward Island*" from the pen of the Rev. J. Davis, of Charlottetown. As your columns have been generously offered, I hasten to notice the attack made by that gentleman upon myself and brethren.

After stating that the inhabitants of the Island had been familiarized with the teachings of Campbellism in oral form, he goes on to say, "But now we have them distinctly put before us through the press." Here I would just ask, What is Campbellism in reality? This is a question that has been often asked, but, up to this date, has never been answered. No living man can tell what it is, simply because it has no existence. But, who are called Campbellites on Prince Edward Island? Why, the only churches on the Island who have no creed, oral or written, but the Word of God,—who are determined to know nothing in the church, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified—these are the Campbellites.

If a man preach the gospel exactly as Jesus Christ sent it to every creature;—exactly as the apostles preached it with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, he is nick-named a Campbellite by those who wish to destroy his influence. Mr. Davis certainly knows that we do most cordially repudiate all such names. Why then employ a term so offensive, if not to vent the feelings of his heart towards a people who have never injured him in any way? To show the value he attaches to this weapon, it is used four times within thirty lines from the top of his communication. And he still desires to treat me with due respect! But to the pamphlet.—After pronouncing it so fallacious and deceitful, that every genuine lover of the New Testament must eschew and abhor it, he proceeds to enumerate its errors.

The first "grave error" he complains of is this—"that Mr. Crawford seems to make little or nothing of man's hostility to God." He then goes on, multiplying quotations from the pamphlet, until he completely falsifies his own assertions; after which he wanders about, making desultory statements about David, Job, and others, till he finds himself at the second charge, viz.: "A serious omission." He says that I "will have it that, under the gospel, we have no right to employ the law of God for the purposes of conviction." Had he said the law of Moses, he would have stated the case fairly, but he is very careful not to mention the name of Moses. In the pamphlet I have shown, that the law of Moses was not preached in this dispensation to prepare sinners for the gospel of Christ. The gospel declares that Jesus died for our sins according to the scriptures. When the sinner believes with all his heart that Jesus died for his sins, he believes, and feels, that he is a sinner, and that too, in a more direct way, than to go to Moses or anywhere else for the information. I will cite a few passages from the pamphlet—"If the sinner believes the gospel it convinces him of his sins, by leading him to behold Christ dying for his sins." It also unites his heart to Christ." And "If we believe that the Son of God died for our sins, we must be convinced of their enormity to require such a sacrifice. The law which we have broken must be holy, just, and good, when one so honorable put himself under it, and died to prove its justice and truth. If the sinner's enmity is not destroyed by the love of God in Christ Jesus it must eternally remain." Again, "Just before he left the earth, to sit on his Father's throne, standing with his disciples about him, he gave them the most solemn charge, not to wait for sinners to come to them, but to go to sinners with the messages of love. 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.' Nothing was said here about the law: the gospel alone was to be preached. If men believed and obeyed the gospel, they would be saved; if not, they must perish. It reveals the only sacrifice for sin."

The subject is so clearly treated in the pamphlet, as to make it apparent to the understanding of every unprejudiced reader, how sinners are convinced of sin by the death of Christ, without the law of Moses. But should Mr. Davis still demur, it can be easily settled. Did Jesus send his apostles to preach the law of Moses to every creature? Did the apostles preach the law to unconverted sinners? The Holy Spirit came to convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. Did the Holy Spirit take the things of Moses, in order to do this? To all of which, I unhesitatingly answer no. I will again state the argument in the pamphlet, against the sinner, in this dispensation, being brought to Christ by the law of Moses. Jesus and his apostles preached all the truth on the subject of a sinner's salvation. They never preached that doctrine—therefore it is untrue.

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. But let us give due attention, as we are drawing near the Theology of Mr. Davis. He tells us that "the law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith," then leads us "slow and steadily" to the precepts of his marvelous system. After an emphatic oh no! he says, "The New Testament goes not about to make salvation easy, after Mr. Crawford's fashion." Then comes out the whole affair.

"Upon the conscience of every one who is saved it imposes, with more or less weight, a sense of guilt, and depravity, and ruin, making salvation a solemn necessity and preparing the spirit to welcome the tidings of mercy through a crucified and risen Saviour."

Here then is his system in outline, (we will not say repulsive outline.) We see then:—
1st. Every one who is saved, or all the saved.
2nd. The New Testament imposing on the saved, with more or less weight, a sense of guilt, depravity and ruin.

3rd. Making salvation a solemn necessity.
4th. Preparing the spirit to welcome the tidings of mercy through a crucified and risen Saviour. To make it further manifest, that with Mr. Davis, salvation precedes a sense of guilt, and a welcoming of the tidings of mercy through a crucified and risen Saviour, he positively affirms that, "where this sense is not found, salvation has not been experienced."

The passages he quotes have not the slightest relevancy, as they refer to the lost—to the wicked, &c., but his system has nothing to do with the lost; but with the saved. On the saved it imposes a sense of guilt, &c. But just here I would beg leave to enquire—What has Mr. Davis done with the law, in his system? "The New Testament," he says, "imposes upon every one who is saved a sense of guilt." If so, what does the law do? Are the New Testament, and the law, as mentioned in Galatians and Romans, synonymous, with Mr. Davis? If they are not, is he not guilty of "a serious omission"? For the law is not necessary to convince of sin, if the New Testament does it. Will he take the other horn of the dilemma, and make the law and the New Testament convertible terms? and read thus? The New Testament was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, &c. Wherefore then serveth the New Testament? It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come, &c. I had not known sin, but by the New Testament. Ye are not under the New Testament, but under grace. But here comes another difficulty. On every one who is saved the New Testament imposes a sense of guilt, &c. Pray from what are they saved? It cannot be from guilt, for it imposes, with more or less weight, a sense of guilt. While they are under a load of guilt, it is impossible to be saved or delivered from it.

Mr. Davis prefers another charge, which, however, does not seem to stand in the category of capital crimes—*To wit*: That I am directing a great amount of "argument and reproach—not to say ridicule, against a scriptural style of religious experience." When or where have I ever done so? Does the man feel at perfect liberty to manufacture charges at pleasure? He next passes on to what he calls "a false definition," viz.: calling Repentance a *heartfelt determination to turn from sin to God*. Here, again, he labors to make a false impression. I have shown that sorrow for sin, and reformation are closely allied to repentance—that godly sorrow leads to repentance, and repentance leads to reformation, or a new life.

That your readers may have some idea of the position taken by the pamphlet, I will here make two extracts. After the question, "What do the scriptures teach by the word Repentance i. e. repentance into life? there is the following:—
"Some understand it to mean a sorrow for sin, others a reformation, or a new life; but although both sorrow for sin and reformation are closely allied to repentance; yet, the more I study the scriptures, the stronger are my convictions, that neither express the import of the word repentance; nor yet the two combined. Godly sorrow leads to repentance, and repentance leads to reformation. The scriptures plainly show that Faith and Repentance are acts of the mind. I understand the first to be a *heartfelt belief of the gospel*—the second, a *heartfelt determination to turn from sin to God*. Those whom Peter told at Pentecost to "repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus, &c.," gladly received his word. If he meant sorrow for sin they did not obey him, for they were made glad. If he meant to go and reform their lives and be baptized they did not obey him, for they did not wait to reform, but were immediately baptized, as soon as they gladly received his word. But if Peter meant this: make a solemn resolution to turn with all your heart to God, and be baptized in the name of Jesus, &c., they that gladly received his word obeyed there and then, by making that resolution, and being baptized. If they were baptized without that resolution, they did not obey from the heart the form of doctrine delivered. Again, when the question is asked, if repentance without reformation is not unavailing there is the following:—"Most assuredly, without holiness no man shall see the Lord. We have all, by repeated transgressions, formed our characters as sinners; and we must, by a continued obedience to the Lord Jesus Christ, reform our characters or never see God. The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ: i. e., the favor of God, and the true or real intent of all his law came to all men by his Son. That grace that hath appeared to all men bringing salvation, teaches us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world."—(Tit. ii. 11, 12)

This definition, he says, "has no sanction from the Greek words *metanoao* and *metamelomai*, alike translated in the common version by the word *repent*; the one meaning, according to Groves, *to change the opinion or mind*, and the other, *to be sorry for, regret*." It is worthy of especial notice that *metamelomai*, which only means sorrow for the past, without any change or purpose of amendment, is never used in the scriptures in reference to salvation or in the imperative mood. In such places it is *metanoao* or *metanoeo* that is used; meaning a change of mind, or a purpose of the heart to amend. Its meaning in the New Testament, I verily believe, cannot be better defined than by a *heartfelt*

determination to turn from sin to God. It is by no means so intelligible to command men to change their opinion or mind, as to command them to resolve, or determine to change their life.

When a man is convinced of his sins by the death of Christ for his sins, and, believing the promises of the gospel, resolves with all his heart to turn from his sins to God, he has repentance. When he, by the grace of God, carries out this resolution he brings forth fruits meet for repentance, or walks in newness of life.

As Mr. Davis brings nothing resembling an argument against this definition of repentance, I pass on to his last sentence on that head, which reads thus:—"Mr. Crawford's whole argument here goes to substitute baptism for repentance, and to give to the former a significance and value which the New Testament nowhere assigns to an outward observance." To this charge I plead *not guilty*.

Mr. Davis comes at length to Baptism. Here I must give him credit for being more faithful in quoting from the pamphlet than he has heretofore been. But he comes to the conclusion of the whole matter—"As sure as Jesus Christ was the Son of God he would save all that came to him by faith, repentance, and baptism." This is the sentence Mr. Davis holds up as the quintessence of error. He appears to ask, without a scruple or a blush, "Is this, or is it not heresy?" My heart sickens at the thought of a man, professing to carry a message of mercy from Jesus Christ to a dying world, daring to intimate that the Son of God would, by any means, break his promise. Charity would prompt me to impute it to an error rather than to the head than of the heart. I really think, after all, if this were a point at issue, Mr. Davis would hardly take the negative. Can it be possible that he would deny that Jesus Christ would save him who came to him by faith, repentance, and baptism?

Farther on he says, "The New Testament most distinctly teaches that men are saved without baptism, before baptism, and never by it;" and instead of proving his assertion, cites 1 Peter iii. 21, a passage that as fairly contradicts it as it is possible for words to do. He attempts to explain it away by saying, "it is the good conscience and not the baptismal water that saves." Well, is the good conscience obtained by the resurrection of Jesus Christ without baptism, before baptism, and never by it? The word of God does not say the like figure whereunto baptismal water doth also now save us, but it does say the like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us; and the man who can thus tamper with the truth of God may as well speculate about baptismal water as anything else. It would be a tedious and unsatisfactory labor to follow Mr. Davis in all he says about the epistles to the Romans and Galatians. Let it suffice to say that he does not find a solitary hint in favor of his assertion—nor can he. No: should he turn, and twist, and writhe with all the desperation of disappointed ambition he cannot get the New Testament to say that ever a man was saved, since the death of Christ, before baptism, or without it. It will not say that salvation was promised without it; nor will it say that any saved person was commanded to be baptized. Hence, all he says upon the subject, together with his unmeaning harping about *Campbellism* only proves that, he finds it anything but pleasant to "kick against the goads."

In order to be distinctly understood, I would here say, that I have no idea of anything possessing virtue to take away sin but "the death of Christ,"—"the blood of his cross." Nor do I believe any one fit for baptism until he have such a view of the cross as to change his heart from the love of sin, to love and confide in the Lord Jesus Christ, and resolve, with all his heart, to turn from his sins to the service of God. But the following question is the cause of the present discussion. Has Jesus left a plain way for anxious sinners to come to his death? I have taken the affirmative, and endeavored, by tongue and pen, to prove it clearly from the Scriptures, for which I am charged by Mr. Davis with the propagation of the most deadly error; for it is evident that the very gist of the pamphlet's heresy is what he terms *RELIGION MADE EASY*.

No subject can be more important to sinful man than to know how to come to Christ for salvation. When the Saviour was on earth men knew where to find him. They came pleading at his feet, and were saved from their sins. Before he left the earth, he assured his apostles that he had all power in earth and heaven, and gave them a message to the whole family of man—one that would hold good in every place till the end of the world. "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." But he told them to tarry at Jerusalem till they were endued with power from on high. He then ascended and sat down on the right hand of God. No message could be more plain and positive.

The apostles wait some 10 days in Jerusalem in earnest and united prayer. The Holy Spirit descends, and qualifies them for their work. For the first time, they preach that gospel Jesus gave them, with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. A number of unsaved sinners, hearing of the death, burial, resurrection and glorification of Christ, were pierced to the heart, and cried out men and brethren, what shall we do? To these convicted sinners Peter said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sin, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." And to show us that the same gospel was to be preached at all times he adds: "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added to