

I pass the close mouth in the West Port, where they now live, and are keeping their hoary old caddie and cart, I get a courtesy from Kirsty, and see her look after me, and turn to the women beside her, and I know exactly what she is saying to them about "Dr. Brown." And when I meet old Sandie, with his ancient and long-legged friend, driving the druff from the distillery for his swine, I see his gray eye brighten and glisten, and he looks up and gives his manly and cordial nod and goes on his way, and I know that he is saying to himself, "God bless him! he saved My Kirsty's life;" and he runs back in his mind all those twenty past years, and lays out his heart on all he remembers, and that does him good and me too, and nobody any ill.—Therefore, give your gratitude to your doctor and remember him like honest Sandie; it will not lose its reward, and it costs you nothing; it is one of those poor things you can give and never be a bit the poorer but all the richer.—*John Brown.*

For the Christian Messenger.

The Bible Society and the word Baptizo.

DEAR BROTHER,—

In the course of a sermon preached on behalf of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in the Methodist Chapel, Wolfville, on the 16th inst., the Rev. J. Storrs took occasion to advert to the origin and use of technical terms. He observed that those terms were usually borrowed from the countries in which the art or profession originated, and transplanted into the languages of the countries into which those arts or professions were introduced. He stated that at one time of his life he had spent many years in examining the works of the Latin fathers, and had found that they did not translate the words relating to baptism by equivalent Latin words, but transferred them into that language, as technical or ecclesiastical terms. He remarked also that in the Anglo-Saxon version the word *baptizo* was translated, when translated, by a word signifying to *cleanse*. He inferred that the conduct of the Bible Society, in directing translators to follow the example of the English Authorised version, and not to translate into foreign languages the words relating to baptism, is strictly correct, and that the said Society should not be regarded as sectarian in issuing such directions. His object in making those observations was well understood here.

Two or three questions present themselves for consideration.

First:—What are the facts of the case? The early Latin fathers did translate the word *baptizo*. That word had not then been admitted into the Latin language, although the noun, *baptismus*, had found a place there. They generally rendered it by the word *tingo*, sometimes by the word *mergo*, both which words, as is well known, mean to dip, plunge, immerse. It is a curious fact that Tertullian (who died about A. D. 220) wrote a treatise on baptism ("De Baptismo"), in which the verb *baptizo* does not once occur; it is always *tingo* or *mergo*. The Greek verb began to be Latinised about the middle of the third century, and after that time was brought into general use; but *tingo* and *mergo* are found in the writings of Latin fathers down to the fifth century, as might be easily proved by quotations from Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine.

Again: in admitting *baptizo* into their language, how did the Latins understand it? There is but one answer to that question. The expressions used by the writers and the uniform practice of the Latin church at that time point to immersion, and to immersion only. Nor were they satisfied with one immersion: the candidate was immersed three times. Tertullian alludes to that practice. It is expressly enjoined in the *Sacramentarium* of Gregory the Great, who lived in the latter end of the sixth century; the words are—"Deinde baptizet sacerdos sub trina immersione."—"Then let the priest baptize with a trine immersion."

In the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, probably published in the eighth century, the word *fullian*, to full, to cleanse, is commonly used, having no reference to the mode of administering the ordinance, but to its supposed spiritual effects. Sometimes, however, the word *dyppan* is employed, answering to our modern word *dip*. The transference of the word *baptizo* was of later date.

But the Anglo-Saxon was a limb of the Gothic, and in the Gothic version, executed in the fourth century, the word *baptizo* is translated by *duppan*, to dip. Luther and other Reformers who translated the New Testament into the languages derived from the Gothic, viz. the German, Dutch, Swedish and Danish, adopted the same principle, and uniformly translated *baptizo* by word signifying to dip.

In other European versions—the Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and French, the Latin was followed, the word *baptizo* being admitted into those languages. But it has been shewn that when the Latin word *baptizo* was introduced it conveyed the idea of immersion.

Secondly:—Is the inference correct? The Greek word *baptizo* became a Latin word. Does it follow, as the preacher argued, that the same course ought to be pursued with other languages? Should we, in translating the New Testament for heathen nations, introduce the word *baptizo* into their languages, without translating it,—or should we make use of such words in these languages as we honestly believe to convey the true meaning of the Greek term?

The Bible Society says to all missionaries, "Do not translate that word. It is a technical, ecclesiastical word, and must be admitted into all languages." Did not the Society know when it established that rule, that he who introduces a new word gives the meaning at the same time, so that, whatever meaning he attaches to it is recognized ever after? Did not the Society know, if missionaries, having obeyed their law, should use the word *baptizo* in the act of sprinkling infants, they would teach the people by those acts that *baptizo* means to sprinkle? Ought they not to perceive that they, the Bible Society, would thus virtually patronise such use and interpretation? Can they deny that this their policy is sectarian, and that it is, besides, a tyrannical interference with the rights and liberties of Christian men?

When the word *baptizo* was introduced into the English language, immersion was the general practice. Every one understood the meaning of the word. But the practice of the major part of Christendom (the Greek and Eastern Churches excepted) is now changed, and the word *baptizo* is still used, though the ceremony is performed by sprinkling or pouring. Consequently, the word *baptizo* conveys no definite meaning. We Baptists maintain that it has a meaning, and that the meaning should appear in every version of the New Testament. If the translator is honestly of opinion that the Greek word *baptizo* means to immerse—or to pour—or to sprinkle—or to wet—let him be at liberty to translate accordingly. That is all we ask. Surely that is not sectarian!

Thirdly:—Where shall we stop? If *baptizo* is to be retained because it is now an ecclesiastical word, are there not other words that have an equal claim to adoption. This has been a favourite device of obstructive parties in all ages. When a new translation of the Bible was projected in the reign of Henry VIII., the notorious Bishop Gardiner presented a list of one hundred and two Latin words, that "for their genuine and native meaning, and for the majesty of the matter in them contained," might be retained in the English translation, or be fitly Englished with the least alteration (Anderson's History of the English Bible, ii. 151.) His object was to make the book as unintelligible as he could. In fact, these ecclesiastical words are often great hindrances to a right understanding of the Scriptures. Take the word "bishop," for instance. The "bishop" of the New Testament was the pastor of a "church," or, as Tyndale always rendered the word, of a "congregation;" there were several bishops in the church at Philippi. But now the "bishop" is the ecclesiastical governor of a province, having other ministers under him, and in England he is a "lord bishop." Would it not be wise to substitute some other word, and thus prevent the misunderstanding of the divine record?

The Rheinish New Testament, (Roman Catholic) abound with ecclesiastical words, retained under the pretext of reverence, the result being that the book is rendered obscure, and therefore uninviting. "The entrance of thy word giveth light." But in order to this there must be faithful translation.

Yours truly,

J. M. CRAMP.

Acadia College, Dec. 27th 1866.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, JANUARY 2, 1867.

1867.

To our numerous readers every where we tender our Christian greetings on the commencement of the New Year. The beginning of another cycle of existence should give us a fresh impulse to exertion and devotion to the cause of our Divine Master.

Years pass away, but the labor performed in them is not lost. Its fruit will certainly appear. In all labor there is profit, and we are assured that no act of service in the name of our Master is forgotten by him. We are on the threshold of the year of our Lord 1867,

and it is now the suitable time to consider and resolve what is to be the character of the record it shall bear. Whether it shall be of a round of defective service, similar to that which has characterized the past, or whether it shall be the beginning of a higher life—a new phase of existence, more in accordance with the great object of life.

Our experience of the past places us on a vantage ground above all that we have heretofore enjoyed. It is therefore demanded of us that we recognize our responsibility, and, with greater consecration of our life and our means, that we gird up our loins for the journey and all its conflicts.

All the departments of human life are progressing. In the scientific world every step taken adds fresh stimulus to enquiry and interest to research into the depths of the unknown. Literature is also adding volume to volume, and making fresh combinations of thought to gratify and instruct the people. All this however unless it is leavened with Christian truth is progress backward, and it is for those who have felt the vitalizing power of the gospel of Jesus, to awake and maintain the honor of Christ in the face of all the influences of formality and infidelity which abound. Christianity has been considered by many, and is still with vast multitudes, only a system of negatives. Abstinence from the common forms of evil and an orderly attendance on the ordinances of public worship—make up in the estimation of thousands the whole of Christian life. The disciple of Christ is too little accustomed to add the testimony of his lips to that of his life. A readiness to avow the foundation of our hopes, and a firm adherence to the views of truth on which we stand, the principles of conduct given in the Word of God, are perhaps more required now than ever before. These are times in which indecision is unfaithfulness, and when Christians must not suppose that religion will take care of itself without their labors and prayers. Unless a Christian cares for the church and for the interests of his Lord and Master he may not expect that it will be a source of blessing to him. Error is the offspring of unfaithfulness; and a disinclination to own our Saviour is the first step into the vortex of worldliness; and when this is taken, folly and vice will soon appear to lead us on to ruin and destruction.

It was not our intention, when we began, to give our readers a homily, or say aught that would be incompatible with the joyous salutations of the season, but merely to offer a suggestion to our respected friends, concerning the higher happiness we wish them to enjoy during the year. May Heaven's richest blessings rest upon them, in their basket and their store, and may grace, mercy, and peace be multiplied to all, is our fervent prayer.

Church Ritualism in New York.

In Great Britain the fantastic vagaries of Ritualism are charged on the fact that an established Church exists there, but this we think is a great mistake.—In the United States there is the same tendency among certain Episcopalians as in the Church in England. In New York city there have been recent developments in matters of ecclesiastical millinery and genuflections in their public worship which may well lead church people to doubt if they are entitled to the appellation Protestant. The *Episcopalian* gives the following description of the exhibition at the high church chapel of St. Albans, in that city:—

"At the hour of morning prayer a boy of about twelve years of age emerged from the vestry room, clad in a surplice, and followed by a clergyman with a surplice, and the rector of the parish, who walked with clasped hands and downcast eyes. Both these clergymen wore red stoles—the latter the alb, with the stole crossed in front. The assistant commenced the service from one of the stalls outside of the chancel. When he came to the Litany, however, he left his former position, and knelt upon a stool, facing the "altar," and just outside of the chancel rails, from which place he concluded morning prayer. He then gave out the psalm, while the rector and the boy retired to the vestry room, and the sexton tolled the bell—probably to announce the commencement of ante-communion service. In a few minutes the boy again emerged, bearing a light. On entering the chancel, he made a low bow before the "altar," and proceeded to light two tall candles, one on each side. Having done this, he made another low bow and retired. Soon after the priest again appeared, this time with the full chasuble, and preceded, as before, by his youthful attendant. On arriving before the "altar" the priest turned and entered the chancel and made obeisance before the "holy place," in which movement he was exactly imitated by the boy. He then commenced the ante-communion service. The Epistle was read at one side of the "altar," and the Gospel at another. The whole, as also morning prayer, was interspersed with numerous evolutions and bowings of the head.

The boy was despatched to the credence table, from which he brought the sacred vessels

containing the bread and wine. Wine and water were poured into the cup, before the congregation, water was poured from a silver vessel over the hands of the priest, and the larger vessels were returned to the credence table.

During the consecration of the elements, as the priest took the bread and wine into his hands he made a low bow before each—almost touching his forehead to the ground. As he began the administration of the same, he turned towards the people and lifted the paten above his head. As he delivered the bread he made the sign of the cross before each recipient, and when he arrived immediately in front of the "altar" he turned round again, and holding the paten above his head, presented it towards the "sanctum sanctorum." Thus he did with the cup. Each time he approached the "altar" there was the same elevation of the consecrated elements.

After the benediction the congregation remained in their seats, in accordance with a printed notice in each pew, while the remnant of wine was poured back into the chalice and replaced by the boy upon the credence table. The bread was then placed in a larger vessel and, covered with a cloth, was elevated before the congregation, all of whom rose, and remained standing while the clergy and boy marched in solemn procession into the vestry room, preceded by the priest with the elevated bread.

The *Episcopalian* in a subsequent issue visits Bishop Southgate and his confidants, in the above religious performance with the following severe castigation:

"It is no wonder that when men of knowledge and common sense are confronted with modern ritualism, they turn infidels. Can such suppose that the bearded apists of Rome are sincere in the belief of those absurd doctrines? No, they repudiate the thought for the sake of the human nature and dignity of the persons who practice these rites, and make the doctrinal utterances of sacramentalism. Any man of any strength of mind, and of more than ordinary enlightenment, would prefer casting all religion to the winds, rather than submit mind and conscience, soul and body, to priests and their absurd practices. To see men of splendid physique, dress up like fashionable ladies, and pay supreme attention, or any attention to albs and copes, to chasubles and tunicals; to see them come into the sanctuary like sneaking thieves, and go through the pantomime which is much poorer than the lowest novice in theaters can show; these sights are enough to disgust thoughtful men and women too. We have seen female worshippers removed from such places and clench their hands in indignant gesture. We have heard them say they felt like shieing the prayer books at the heads of the mimics. Every one of sense feels the mockery and smallness of the whole thing."

If the same things were said by those belonging to other denominations it would be pronounced uncharitable in the highest degree. It may be allowed however, that Churchmen may belabor their brethren who claim to be better Churchmen by indulging in such proceedings.

THE RITUALISTIC LEGAL OPINION.

The opinions of Her Majesty's Advocates (Sir R. Phillimore, Q. C.; Sir Fitzroy Kelly, Q. C. (now Lord Chief Baron); Sir W. Bovill, Q. C. (now Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas); Mr. W. M. James, Q. C.; Dr. Deane, Q. C.; Mr. J. D. Coleridge, Q. C.; M. P.; Mr. C. G. Pridcaux, Mr. J. Hannan, and Mr. J. Cutler, Professor of Law, King's College, London, on the case submitted on behalf of the English Church Union in respect of disputed ritual ornaments and usages, have just been made known. These gentlemen seem pretty well agreed that the use of the vestments as prescribed by King Edward's first Prayer-book is legal. They are also nearly agreed that the use of incense is illegal. Most of them also think water ought not to be mixed with the wine. Some think the water bread is illegal, others that it is not, or would be disallowed by the courts. Two only reject the lighted candles on the altar in the day-time. All appear to agree that the singing or chanting of hymns and intonations during the Eucharistic service is unlawful. On the whole, the opinion of the counsel selected by the Ritualists is less favourable than we had expected. It hardly leaves them if they trust it, the confident use of anything, but the "ecclesiastical millinery."—*Freeman.*

THE CATALOGUE OF ACADIA COLLEGE, 1866-7, just published, has been favorably noticed by several of the Halifax papers. We might also be expected to refer to its issue a week or two since. Under the circumstances, however, we prefer copying a notice thereof which appeared in the columns of the *Acadian Recorder* on Friday last, as follows:—

ACADIA COLLEGE—1866-7.

We acknowledge briefly in a previous number a copy of the Calendar of this Institution for the current year. The pamphlet is neatly printed at the *Christian Messenger* office. We glean from it a few ideas which will be interesting to the friends of education generally, and to the admirers of "Acadia" in particular. A list of the Faculty is given on one of the first pages, and the names are certainly of such standing as to warrant the utmost confidence in the educational facilities afforded in the Institution over which they preside; and this is a very important feature. The Professors divide the labors of the Course as follows:

Department of Arts.—Rev. J. M. Cramp, D. D., President, and Professor of Christian Evidence and Moral Science.