

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

The French Mission.

TO THE BAPTIST CHURCHES OF NOVA SCOTIA.

Dear Brethren,—

The French Mission Board wishes to present, for your prayerful consideration, the claims of this Mission.

For sixteen years the Baptists of Nova Scotia have been engaged in this work. During the first six years of its labors but little apparent success was enjoyed, many of its friends were discouraged, and its enemies rejoiced; but believing that the "commission" of our risen Saviour extended to this people, we continued our efforts, relying upon the promise of God, which to us has been most gloriously fulfilled; so that for the last 10 years, notwithstanding the very great difficulties to be overcome, we have enjoyed a steady visible increase. The last especially has been a year of great success. We rejoice in a precious ingathering of souls. Many have been converted and our Missionary has baptized 20 believers. As we advance the field is opening before us. Our Missionary has lately found a new access of great promise. His last monthly report is very encouraging. The field is white to the harvest, and very extensive. In our Province there are more than 20,000 of these very interesting people, about 9,000 of whom are in the Counties of Digby and Yarmouth, where we at present are expending all our efforts. We have hitherto been only able to employ one missionary, and we ask, what is one among so many. God has not only by promise, but by promises fulfilled, encouraged us to enlarge our operations.

We have now two mission premises, one in Tusket Village, and another at Saulnierville. The first is occupied by our missionary. It cost about \$2400.00, and is free of debt. The last is in a forward state for the reception of a mission family, and will cost when finished about \$1800.00; for this we owe, and must by some means meet our liabilities during the coming year. The current expenses of our mission will also be \$1200.00, and we have \$250.00 on hand, which leaves \$1150 to be provided.

At the last session of the Western Baptist Association of Nova Scotia, pledges to the amount of \$700.00 were obtained, and a resolve made, by brethren there, to present the claims of our mission to their respective churches. We hope our brethren and sisters may be greatly assisted in carrying out this resolve. We acknowledge the goodness of God in stimulating you heretofore to respond so generously and promptly to our appeals for aid, and to you we tender our thanks. During the last year we were greatly cheered in our labors by a donation of \$100.00 from a "Friend of Missions" in Cornwallis, and at our meeting in August, Bro. Joseph Shaw encouraged us by generously offering to advance the necessary funds, and to superintend the fitting up of the premises at Saulnierville forthwith.

May we not hope, dear brethren and sisters, that stimulated by these noble examples, and encouraged by the success of the past, and the promises of the future, you will each in your churches adopt such measures as shall enable us to move forward in this good work; and very soon to put another missionary in the field.

We are, dear brethren and sisters, on behalf of the Board,

Yours in Christ Jesus, J. H. SAUNDERS, President. B. B. MOSKÉ, Secretary.

For the Christian Messenger.

Fairchild on Baptism.

(Concluded)

But what becomes of Schleusner's "profundo" or "pouring forth" as one of the meanings of baptizo? Why simply and certainly this,—that, if he has no better authority for such signification of baptizo than Matt. iii. 11, he is obviously mistaken, and had he not been warped by his views of baptism, would have never given "pour forth" as one definition of the word. But, reader, do not fail to observe that the lexicographer above triumphantly quoted by Fairchild does not presume to say that baptizo means to sprinkle, in classical or scriptural usage. He only intimates—what, however, he does not sustain or prove that baptizo sometimes figuratively means to pour forth abundantly or copiously. "Largiter profundo" are his terms. What then becomes of sprinkling even as deducible

from the baptism by the Spirit? Read the passage, Matt. iii. 11, thus: "He shall sprinkle you with the Holy Spirit and fire," and observe how ridiculously the insertion of the word sprinkle, belittles the entire meaning. And yet, Fairchild has the fool-hardiness to affirm that according to Paul "sprinkling is baptism." See page 25 of his book. Thus does he appear to contradict himself on page 18. I am aware how he and others of his creed attempt to reconcile such conflicting statements, and now proceed to notice that attempt. Fairchild and his fellow-Pedo-Baptists would fain have us distinguish between the classical or secular and New Testament use of baptizo. Admitting, as scholarship and Christian candor compel them to do, that baptizo means to immerse, in profane Greek authors, they would maintain and have others believe that the word means to pour and sprinkle in the New Testament. Now "when our Lord Jesus Christ in his great commission said baptizing them 'I suppose he used the word in its primary, proper acceptation, and that his meaning was immersing them.' Positive precepts are always definite. They not only prescribe what is to be done, but how it is to be done. Law-givers, too, it is to be remembered, always use words in their ordinary acceptation. Historians do the same." Now says Chalmers, the champion of the Free Church of Scotland, "The Bible is our Great Statute-Book and Directory." Christ is our sacred Law-giver, and through his Spirit is our sacred historian. Where then, in His Word, are we to expect such diversity and obscurity as one word conveying the entirely different meanings of immerse, pour, and sprinkle, would produce? Not to speak further of this which in itself ought to be conclusive, we may simply remark that "a language would be poor indeed that could not find appropriate separate terms for these diverse acts," and that the Greek language has no paucity of words, but such a profusion as to express almost every shade of meaning.

The difficulties of immersion afford another strong imaginary ground for assigning other meanings than that of immerse to baptizo. And here, if I could have patience to quote, or my readers to peruse the quotation, I should feel strongly disposed to extract a couple of pages from Dr. Fairchild under the heading: "Curious Experiment in Baptistism." It is a gross caricature of a scene enacted according to Dr. F. by a worthy Baptist minister of his acquaintance, who had resolved on one occasion to make trial of the speed with which he could put forty-three candidates under water. "On this singular experiment" Fairchild proceeds to make two observations—which are too contemptible to quote. I have only to say that if the scene described on page 71 of Fairchild's book really occurred—which is much to be doubted—the Baptists claim no actual relationship to such a minister or such a desecration of so sacred an ordinance; also that the difficulties in connection with the immersion of three thousand converts on the day of Pentecost are wholly assumed or fabricated by Pedo-Baptist writers, and have been a thousand times sufficiently explained away to satisfy every unprejudiced mind.

Dr. F. spends much unnecessary time in spinning out thread-bare arguments respecting John's Baptism and that of Christ. As to the former, are Fairchild and the readers of his little book aware that John Calvin, on page 481, Volume 2, of his Institutes, there does admit in the fullest sense that John's Baptism was Christian Baptism? Such is a fact, capable of being easily verified. As to Fairchild's trite attempt to make out Christ's baptism as corresponding to the consecration of Jewish priests, we would only quote against him Paul, Heb. vii. 14. "It is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood. Let me add while on this point that Fairchild's conclusion on page 66 of his book is that "those who talk of following Christ in his baptism know not what they say;" but on page 49 he remarks that "we are not to pattern after John's baptism, but after that of Christ!" Wonderful consistency of statement!

On page 55, Dr. F. says, quoting Mark i. 4, "John did baptize in the wilderness;" the meaning according to our Baptist brethren is "John did plunge them into the sands of the wilderness!" "And when it is said that he was baptizing in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, we are to understand that he was dipping the people into or under a town!" Now "when John baptized in the wilderness, he baptized in the river Jordan, which flowed through the wilderness. The phrase, beyond Jordan, means on the East side of the river, which was beyond to the inhabitants of Judæa. Bethabara beyond Jordan was a fording-place on that side.—Whether, therefore, John baptized in the wil-

derness or beyond Jordan, it was still in the river of Jordan that he baptized."

Dr. F. like many other Pedo-Baptists, would fain make much capital out of certain Greek prepositions in favor of sprinkling. He would have his readers believe that the preposition Eis has in secular-Greek the primary meaning, not of into, but of to, and in the New Testament the ordinary meaning of to or towards; that the Greek en in like manner signifies and should be rendered with, rather than in. But I have two standard Greek and English Lexicons before me, and I find in one of them this statement, with which the other Dictionary entirely harmonizes. "Eis has the primary idea of motion into any place or thing. Its antithesis (or opposite) is expressed by ek, out of. En conveys the primary idea of rest in any place or thing; or also in contact with, on, at, by. Compared with eis and ek, it stands between the two, eis implying motion into, en the being or remaining in, and ek motion out of." These are not Baptist lexicographers. Again I look into the New Testament usage of these prepositions. I take up the Gospel of Matthew. "In that Gospel the Greek preposition en occurs 292 times. It is translated in our English version as follows:—by in 211 times; by by 23 times; by with, 15 times, &c., &c. You observe that the translation by the English word in is adopted in an overwhelming majority of instances. In fact, that is its natural meaning, and it is only to be departed from when necessity requires." Thus much for in. You may perceive how little necessity or authority there is, therefore, to read "I baptize you with water" or "baptize with the Holy Ghost." In each case, as Dr. George Campbell, a learned and candid Presbyterian, and William Tyndale the martyr, have already rendered it, it should read "baptize or immerse you in water, and in the Holy Spirit." These statements challenge successful contradiction. So also in regard to eis, in an overwhelming majority of instances in the New Testament as in profane Greek literature, that preposition should be translated into. Not only in connection with baptism, but in such passages as the following where eis occurs I should like to know how any other translation would convey the full or correct sense. When the passage in Matthew reads: "these shall go away into everlasting punishment," or another, "John was not yet cast into prison," I should like to ask Dr. Fairchild and all others of like belief, whether we are to suppose or infer that John was cast only upon the threshold of the prison, and impenitent unbelievers only into or near the borders of hell? Let these instances abundantly suffice to show the weakness of the Pedo-Baptist preposition argument against immersion. Truly if resort must be had to such quibbles as these, there must underlie such attempts a "bad cause," as a man remarked in my hearing not long since, although not a member of any church.

Two or three more references to Ecclesiastical history shall close our comments on Dr. Fairchild for the present.

On page 105 he thus writes: "Baptist writers fondly assert that immersion was practiced in the church at a very early period. But the truth is no authentic account can be produced of its existence during the first two hundred years after Christ." Thus he labors to induce the Christian world to believe that sprinkling was the only Scriptural mode and practice of baptism at first, and that immersion was gradually introduced into (that is, I presume, on the margin of) the Christian church with other innovations and corruptions. Are any so infatuated as to believe Fairchild in such statements? If so, and the Bible will not convince them of the error, let me tell them that Mosheim, Gieseler, Du Pin, Waddington, and Neander—the most eminent historians the church has yet had—none of whom were Baptists—all agree that for about 250 years after Christ, nothing but dipping or immersion was practiced; and for 1300 years generally; also that Bishop Bossuet, a French clergyman, says, "we are able to make it appear, by acts of councils and ancient rituals, that for 1300 years throughout the whole church, as far as possible, baptism was administered by dipping." Calvin's testimony is as follows: "It is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church." Do any of my readers ask for further reliable testimony? It could easily be cited from other than Baptist sources.

On page 131, Dr. F. remarks that "The testimony of (the early Christian Father) Origen completely settles the historical question, and leaves no reasonable doubt but that infant baptism prevailed in the apostolic times!" The exclamations are mine; and well may I with surprise ask Dr. F. if he is not aware that

Origen's "works have suffered so much from interpolations and changes that but little reliance can be placed on them as records of his opinions; the original Greek of a large portion of his writings having been lost, and the Latin translators of Origen having added or altered in a most unwarrantable manner." Also I would like to ask Dr. F. and his disciples, if they are willing to endorse and accept Origen's tenet that "infants are baptized for the remission of sins?" Are they prepared to adopt baptismal regeneration?

Once more, on pages 122, 3 and 4, Dr. Fairchild labors to prove that the Waldenses maintained and practised infant baptism. He also accuses a Baptist historian of "carefully suppressing" testimony on that point. I presume the noble, but persecuted and misrepresented Waldenses ought to be allowed to speak for themselves. Let us then impartially hear them. "In 1540 the Waldenses put forth an expression of their views too plain to be questioned."

A part of that creed or confession of faith was as follows: "By baptism we are received into the holy congregation of God's people, previously possessing and declaring our faith and change of life." One of their number "was arrested, tried by the Inquisition and condemned. The most formidable charge made against him was his denial of baptism of water, administered to children."

Again on the authority of Limborch, a trustworthy historian of the Waldenses, Peter Auerii, about the year 1300, says that the "the baptism of water, made by the church, was of no avail to children, who were so far from consenting to it that they wept when it was administered." We are now prepared for the recorded conclusion of Limborch that "the Waldenses appear to have been plain men, unskilful and inexperienced, and if their opinions and customs were to be examined without prejudice, it would appear that among all the modern sects of Christians, they bear the greatest resemblance to the Mennonites," or modern Dutch Baptists. What will candid readers think of this testimony as compared with the statements in Fairchild's book? Now it is true that the Waldenses, at length wearied out with persecution, did yield up their peculiar tenets, among them their views of believers' baptism, and became gradually for the most part merged in other sects,—but not until towards the seventeenth century. Who then is the more justly chargeable with the suppression of evidence respecting that suffering but long faithful band—Mr. W. Jones, a Baptist historian or Dr. Fairchild? Why has Dr. F. left out of his little book the testimony of the Waldenses themselves, also that of Limborch as quoted above? Christian candor echoes, Why?

I thought I had done with Fairchild's little book, but on again looking over its pages I can scarcely forbear making the following rich extract. It is from page 82, respecting the Ethiopian Eunuch, "I beg pardon of the reader for detaining them so long in the desert. But it seemed necessary, in order to overthrow a main pillar of that mischievous system which makes a mere form of more importance than faith or holiness, and casts out, among heathens and publicans, nine-tenths of the members of Christ's mystical body. May the time soon come when that system, with all its inherent evils, shall be immersed, like lead in the mighty waters, to rise no more for ever!"—a consummation, no doubt, devoutly, or rather undevoutly, wished not only by Dr. F., but also by some others; we hope not many would however be so cruel.

But, to be serious, Dr. F., all through his wonderful little book on baptism, reminds us strikingly of an item of advice once given by a certain client to his lawyer—"No case: abuse the plaintiff." Such seems to have been Dr. F.'s inspiring motto as he sat down to pen his Scripture Baptism. Take for example the sentence last quoted from him. Why is he so troubled about the Baptists, as to indulge the expression of so awful a wish respecting them, if he is not conscious that they have a pretty strong case, and he a very weak one? Again, who among the Baptists exalts "a mere form to more importance than faith or holiness, and casts out among heathens and publicans nine-tenths of the members of Christ's body?"

Must not Fairchild know better than this? Is he not aware that the very views of the Regular or Calvinistic Baptists, again and again promulgated and practised, respecting the mode and subjects of baptism precludes assigning to baptism the efficacy of a saving ordinance?

But why longer notice such misrepresentation and abuse? We bid Dr. Fairchild adieu, and pray that he "may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus," although his baptismal foundation of "hay, wood, and stubble" be ultimately burned