

which the following deserves particular notice: "Presented by Mr. Joshua James to the Rev. Thomas Lewis, as a token of much respect, on the occasion of his leaving the ministry of Bethlehem Baptist Chapel, Llanelli, Breconshire; Christmas, 1859." Such is a beautifully printed label pasted inside the cover of ten volumes of the works of Dr. Neander. The donor of this gift has honoured himself by making such a wise selection of books, and has likewise placed Mr. Lewis under lasting obligation to him.

## Correspondence.

### BAPTISTS OF CANADA.

To the Editors of *The Freeman*.

DEAR SIRS,—The letter signed R. A. Fyfe, in your of yesterday, forcibly reminds me how a good man and a D.D. (for he is both) may have a bad memory. I shall not, however, attempt now to be his remembrancer, as there are parties in Canada who can refresh his memory about the things that he forgets or ignores, in his own antecedents as a Baptist brother and in the history of the churches which glory in the name of "Regular Baptist." It so happens that this very day I received a letter, calculated in a high degree to do the needful service, and designed to appear in your columns, under somewhat peculiar circumstances, which I must briefly state. The writer, the Rev. W. H. Landon, is one of the oldest and most useful Baptist ministers in Canada, and being well informed in what he states, he sent the communication first to *The Christian Messenger*, the professed organ of the Canadian Regular Baptists, which is edited by Dr. Fyfe in Toronto, but the editor refused to insert it. Happily we can look to you for better treatment. Vouching, therefore, for Mr. Landon's competency to testify in the case, and fully approving his statements and arguments, I hope you will allow his letter to speak for itself to all good Baptists, whether Open or Strict, in this country, and to the few (if any) Regular brethren in Canada, who support *The Freeman*.

London, Dec. 29, 1859.

Yours faithfully,  
BENJAMIN DAVIES.

To the Editor of *The Christian Messenger*.

DEAR SIR,—In the London *Freeman* of the 2nd Nov. I notice a communication from the Rev. Dr. Fyfe, the substance of which, I learn from a postscript, had appeared in your columns a long time ago. Had not this circumstance escaped my notice, I should have troubled you with these remarks at the time. But though late, as the cause of truth and justice really seems to require that Brother Fyfe should be set right in a few particulars, I trust you will allow a little space in your columns for my communication, and not compel me to "send it 3,000 miles away,"—one of the faults attributed to Mr. Green.

I quite agree with my esteemed brother Fyfe, that "in the abandon of private and confidential intercourse, or in the excitement of public speaking, words may be used which are not to be taken quite literally. But the same allowance cannot be made when men sit down and write what is to be read by 20,000 people," and in the light of this canon, so properly laid down by my brother, I beg to examine the following language contained in the same letter, and emphasized in italics, I suppose, by the author:—"Mr. Green's representations of the New England Baptists are absolutely false, from top to bottom, from centre to circumference."

Of course it was intended that this language should be taken "quite literally." It was not uttered "in the abandon of private and confidential intercourse," nor "in the excitement of public speaking," but the author sat down and deliberately wrote it, "to be read by 20,000 people." But what are the facts?

The representations of Mr. Green, as quoted by Brother Fyfe, at least in so far as they can be reduced to distinct propositions or affirmations, to which the terms true and false can be literally applied, are the following:—

1. The churches are uniformly known as Regular Baptist.
2. They are composed of members who have all been baptized by immersion.
3. The administrator must himself have been so baptized, and be otherwise properly qualified.
4. The members of the churches must confine themselves to communion with each other, i.e., with members of their own church, and other churches of the same faith and order; and
5. Any Baptist who cannot conform to these rules cannot be admitted to the brotherhood and kindly sympathies of these churches.

Now I submit, that, not only are these affirmations contained between the "top and bottom," between "the centre and circumference" of Mr. Green's representations, and are, therefore, and every matter and therein contained, as the lawyers say, denounced and repudiated by Br. Fyfe, as utterly and absolutely false, but also that they contain the whole substance or material of those representations, so far as quoted by him. And what will the Regular Baptists of Canada say to Dr. Fyfe's volunteer repudiation of these representations? Will our brother himself re-affirm his own statements? Will he venture to assert before any public meeting of the body—say an Association or a Convention—that the church at Toronto refuses to be called Regular Baptist? Or that some of the members thereof have not been baptized? Or that others of them have been baptized by deacons, or others than duly ordained elders? Or that the members of that church are allowed to hold communion at the Lord's table with other Christians besides Regular Baptists? Or that persons practising and teaching so would be admitted to the brotherhood and kindly sympathies of that church? I presume he will not.

I am aware that it may be objected that the question is not concerning the Regular Baptists of Canada, but those of New England. In reply, I observe, first, that I know of no peculiarity in the faith, order, or usages of the churches in the rural districts of New England that distinguishes them from the churches in this country; secondly, if any such existed, our brother would be the last man to draw attention to them, especially if the comparison would operate unfavourably to the latter; and, lastly, Brother Fyfe himself afterwards turns away the attention of his reader from the New England Baptists, and proceeds to give us the "distinctive principle of the Baptists as a body." Nevertheless, it is undoubtedly true that the churches in the great cities in New England, which, for many years, have been presided over by a highly educated and intelligent ministry, are less strict or, at least, less strict in these matters than their brethren in Canada, a pleasing instance of which is seen in the cordiality with which men like Drs. Baron Stowe and Gillette unite at the Lord's table, and even assist in the celebration of the holy supper, in churches like those of the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, Mr. Landells, and others, during their visits in England. And it is also true, that several ministers in Canada, who, under the influence of more comprehensive views, the fruit of more extensive reading and reflection, and a closer observation, personally entertain opinions more in accordance with those of the brethren just mentioned, and of the great body of English Baptists; but in Canada the community is so small that the pressure from the extremes is readily felt to the centre, so that the trammels imposed by usage and general opinion must be submitted to, or a rupture is imminent.

But within the limits of these explanations I take it upon me, Dr. Editor, to assert, in the presence of all your readers, that every one of the foregoing propositions, as contained in Mr. Green's letter, strictly and literally true, with perhaps a single exception. This is: Christians baptized by persons who are not considered monically qualified (such as the Campbellites) are sometimes admitted into regular Baptist churches without rebaptism. Nay, so are these representations of Mr. Green, that I scarcely know of a Regular Baptist church in either the States or Canada which did not resent as injurious any insinuation from without that these matters were lightly regarded by them; and I am, therefore, exceedingly surprised at the vehement "tectotal" disclaimer of Brother Fyfe.

But if Brother Fyfe should object to my criticisms upon the literal

meaning of Mr. Green's words and his own (albeit he has himself clearly shut me up to that course)—if it is the general spirit of the piece, its colouring, and want of candour which entitles it, in his opinion, to the sweeping denunciation of falsehood which he pours upon it—then I fear that in these respects he has rendered himself, to some extent, obnoxious to the same charge.

"It is very easy," he says, "to create prejudice against anything we do not like." "It is thus that a few, who have the means of knowing better, repeat with popular unctious the term 'regularism,' after having made it odious by misrepresentation." "They fix the title," &c. "The old and vulgar fallacy of using nicknames has not quite gone out of use," &c. "Yet claiming to be Baptists, and the defenders, *par excellence*, of the sacred rights of conscience and the liberty have not been backward in adopting this weapon [i.e., the nickname] against those they claim as brethren."

Now the English readers of *The Freeman* would certainly infer from all this that the term "Regular Baptist" is a nickname (whatsoever that may be), and that it was invented and applied by some naughty Baptists, who, nevertheless, still claim the parties they have so deeply injured as brethren; and that the latter consider this name odious and a term of reproach. I ask, Mr. Editor, is this exactly ingenuous? Is it not notorious that this is the favourite appellation, chosen and cherished by the very parties who bear it? Is it not the chief descriptive term in all their chapel-deeds? Does it not head all their church letters missive? In short, is it not woven into all their church correspondence and literature? And I may ask once more, was not the Baptist church at W— recently compelled by the other churches to adopt the title *Regular*, or submit to a very serious alternative?

I regret that a man and a Christian minister so justly estimable as Dr. Fyfe should attempt by insinuation and half-expressed insinuation to cast reproach, to create suspicion, against the trustworthiness of Mr. Green as a witness.

Dr. Fyfe complained of a published letter of Mr. Green's, and charged that its representations were false. If the charge was just, the falsehood was of such a nature that it might easily be made to appear; and this Dr. Fyfe had a perfect right to do. But when he leaves the question which was before the public, and directs his thrusts against the private character of the opposite party—and this not openly, but by dark insinuation that if certain words which Mr. Green had uttered, probably "in the abandon of private and confidential intercourse," were to be produced, they would show that Mr. Green was not to be trusted,—I repeat, when Dr. Fyfe condescended to take this course, he stooped far below that line of fair and honourable controversy which every Christian gentleman ought to prescribe for himself. But the whole circumstance is but another illustration of the importance of the great duty of Christian forbearance, and is well calculated to remind us of the value of that lovely "charity which thinketh no evil, which rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; which hopeth all things, and endureth all things; which vaunteth not itself, and is not puffed up."

I am, Mr. Editor, truly yours,  
W. H. LANDON.

## CORRECTION OF ERRORS.

To the Editors of *The Freeman*.

SIRS,—I have before me your paper of Nov. 23rd, and I wish to notice some statements by your New England correspondent, dated, "Boston, Nov. 1, 1859."

If I assume, as I would wish to do, that your correspondent is a just, sincere, and honest man, he must certainly have received his information at second-hand, and must also have been shamefully imposed upon by those who gave it—so much do his statements vary (partly by omission and partly by expression) from the truth.

The last paragraph of his letter speaks as follows of the Rev. Theodore Parker:—"During the time of the Revival of 1847-8 [1857-8], while Mr. Parker was in his vigour and strength, a prayer-meeting was held to pray for him, and many good men prayed that God would convert him, or remove him from the platform where he was an instrument of so much evil. Shortly after this meeting his speaking faculty gave way."

The meeting above alluded to was held on the afternoon of Saturday, March 6th, 1858, in the vestry of Park-street Church (of which the Rev. A. L. Stone is pastor), and was attended by about forty persons. When your readers have read the following petitions offered at this meeting (which were given to me by a gentleman who was present, and who wrote them down there, in the meeting), they will be able to judge whether those were "good men" who uttered them—whether the meeting was a "prayer-meeting" or a curse-meeting—and whether Christian love or sectarian spite was the moving impulse of it. The following were among the forms of petition and imprecation there used:—

"O Lord, if this man is a subject of grace, convert him, and bring him into the kingdom of thy dear Son. But if he is beyond the reach of the saving influence of the Gospel, remove him out of the way, and let his influence die with him."

"O Lord, send confusion and distraction into his study this afternoon, and prevent his finishing his preparations for his labours to-morrow. Or, if he shall attempt to desecrate thy holy day by attempting to speak to the people, meet him there, Lord, and confound him, so that he shall not be able to speak."

"Lord, we know that we cannot argue him down, and the more we say against him, the more will the people flock after him, and the more will they love and revere him. O Lord, what shall be done for Boston, if thou dost not take this and some other matters in hand?"

"O Lord, if this man will still persist in speaking in public, induce the people to leave him, and to come up and fill this house instead of that."

The "exhortations" which alternated with these prayers were of the same character. One man urged his brethren to "pray that God will put a hook in this man's jaws, so that he may not be able to speak."

It thus appears that these "good men," instead of committing merely the moderate outrage upon decency and Christian charity which your correspondent attributes to them, prayed that God would take away the life, or, if not the life, the reason, or, if not the reason, the power of speech, of one who is "loved and revered" by those who best know him, and whose preaching was attended by a congregation twice as large as that of the Park Street Church. If your correspondent calls these good men, and calls their petitions praying for Mr. Parker, we should greatly differ in opinion upon both points. To me, the expressions above quoted seem even worse than curses uttered in the ordinary form. The men who gave vent to their malice in this manner would probably admit that the age of miracles (meaning beneficent miracles, like those recorded in the Gospels) is past! Yet they still pray for miracles of spite and vengeance! What sort of God do they worship at Park Street Church?

The last sentence of your correspondent's paragraph is this:—"The prayers evidently troubled Mr. Parker at the time, as one or two sermons preached and published about that time show."

Here again—assuming your correspondent to be a just, sincere, and honest man—he has been imposed on by some one at once mendacious and malignant.

Mr. Parker certainly did use this specimen of the sort of religion then getting "revived" at Park-street, as an illustration of the difference between a religion of hate and a religion of love; between sectarianism and Christianity. He did use it, more than once, to show how grossly the religion taught by Jesus is misrepresented and distorted by some who assume to teach in his name. But to say that he was "troubled" by these cursings in the sense which your correspondent insinuates

—to say that he was troubled in any other way than with concern for the spiritual state of the persons who thus poured malignity to be one element even of their piety—is like saying that a minister was troubled by the petition of a drunkard, God would damn his soul, and that he "showed" this by preaching against drunkenness and profaneness.

In another part of his letter your correspondent says of Parker, Mr. Garrison, and Mr. Pillsbury—again showing some malicious and slanderous person:—"Christians shrink from them on account of their persevering attacks on the church, and from the irreverent language they use in speaking of God or the Bible." Here is a group of men, reverence these persons, and all the more because they serve Christianity by exposing the corruptions taught and practised by the church. If any persons properly called Christians shrink from them, it is because they have been made calumnious reports like the above. These men have never exceeded in reverence for God, for goodness, and for the church, and any expressions of irreverence which they may have found to refer, not to the character of that book, but to false theories respecting it current among the American Christians, the chief of which is that it authorises slavery. They are the Bible that it opposes slaveholding as thoroughly as any other sin. The clergy reply to them; it justifies slaveholding, and they rejoin, We think not; but if it does, so much worse for the Bible! Will any English Christian deny this position? Is not this to defend and to honour the Bible instead of assailing it?

Your obedient Servant,

CHARLES K. WHIFFLE.

233, Shawmut-avenue, Boston, Dec. 20, 1859.

## THE ITALIAN REFUGEE.

To the Editors of *The Freeman*.

SIRS,—The individual mentioned by E. W., of Camden Town, in his letter of last week, is, in my opinion, a gross impostor. He paid a visit to Rugby in September last, and represented himself as an Italian refugee, of the name of Pietro Pelligrini, of the medical profession, a married man, with a wife and five or six children,—who was anxious to emigrate to Canada, and follow his profession.

He waited upon me with letters from the Revs. B. W. Noel, W. Brock, W. Allen, J. Aldis, etc. The letters of the three former were, I am fully persuaded, the genuine productions of the gentlemen whose names they bore. How they came into his possession I know not; but, so satisfied was I with his credentials and behaviour, that I gave him an introduction to the incumbent of our district church and other gentlemen. With these and others he succeeded so well, that he returned to thank me for the kindness I had done him. A few hours after his second visit I found that I had not only been deceived but had unwittingly aided him in deceiving others.

On making this discovery, information was given to the police, by the Rev. W. Tait, for his apprehension. He was found the same night at one of our first-class inns, where he had made a hearty supper, followed by brandy and water, and cigars. His lodgings for the night were changed from the place to the lock-up—a place, as it seemed to me, to which he was not an utter stranger. The next morning he was committed to the magistrate, on the charge of vagrancy, to the House of Correction for twenty-one days, with hard labour; a part of the money found in his possession being applied for travelling expenses of himself and escort to Warwick.

I am, yours faithfully,

HENRY ANGER.

Rugby, Jan. 2, 1860.

## DEATH OF LORD MACAULAY.

We learn with the deepest regret that England has suffered an irreparable loss by the sudden death of Lord Macaulay, his residence in Kensington, at eight o'clock on Wednesday evening. Although in 1852 he had a serious and protracted illness from declared disease of the heart, the attack was subdued, and till within the last three weeks his health was tolerably good. About a fortnight since he had a second attack, from which, however, he rallied, and his medical advisers considered him out of immediate danger. Up to the end of the week before his death, he continued to amend, but a relapse took place and terminated fatally. Lord Macaulay was never married, and the title dies with him. He was only fifty-nine years of age.

The noble baron was the son of Zachary Macaulay, well known for his exertions, in company with Clarkson and Wilson, in the cause of the abolition of the slave trade. He was born at Rothley Temple, Leicestershire, in 1800. The distinguished historian, after graduating with high honour at Trinity College, Cambridge, was elected to the Craven scholarship in 1821, and became a fellow in the succeeding year. In 1824 he was called to the bar of Lincoln's-inn. As early as 1824 he had given evidence of his literary talent by some poems contributing to various magazines, and in 1826, his essay on Milton, in "Edinburgh Review," drew upon him the attention of the reading public. The leaders of the Whig party, in acknowledgment of his literary superiority, appointed Mr. Macaulay Commissioner of Bankruptcy, and in 1830 he entered Parliament as member for Calne. He afterwards became Secretary to the Board of Control, and entered with great spirit into the discussions on the Reform Bill, defending the policy of the ministry against all opponents. Having acquired an immense Parliamentary celebrity, Mr. Macaulay was returned with John Marshall as member for the newly-enfranchised borough of Leeds. Two years after, to the disappointment of his constituents, the right honourable gentleman accepted an appointment in the Supreme Council of India. He enjoyed that tive post for three years, and, on his return to England, deduced those well-known and magnificent sketches of Lord and Warren Hastings, due, no doubt, to the acquaintance with Indian officers he had acquired in Calcutta. In 1838 Macaulay accepted the office of Secretary at War, and was returned to Parliament for the city of Edinburgh, earlier period of his life, Mr. Macaulay had produced choice ballads; but now he tried his powers on a larger scale, and in 1842 gave to the world his "Lays of Ancient Rome," which had been previously published in "Edinburgh." It is believed that his latest contribution, "Edinburgh" was the second part of his "Essays in Chatham," which appeared in the autumn of 1844, restoration of the Whig party to power in 1846, Mr. Macaulay was appointed paymaster of the forces, with a seat in the Cabinet. In consequence, however, of a serious illness, and the honourable gentleman and his constituents regard to the Maynooth grant, the citizens of Edinburgh elected him at the election in 1847 in favour of Mr. O'Connell, which under ordinary circumstances might have been a matter of regret, must now be accepted as a matter of joy.