

Finally M. M. Rolier and Bezier embarked on Thursday on board the North Star, and arrived in London the following Sunday in good health.

After having communicated with the French authorities they will leave in an hour from this for Tours via Saint-Malo, and will go to give an account of their extraordinary voyage to the heroic men who have undertaken the dangerous and difficult direction of the affairs of France. M. M. Rolier and Bezier are two charming young men both under thirty years of age. They are full of patriotism and ready again to confront the dangers of their country. Surely no one on the field of battle has encountered such perils as they have encountered, and it is to be hoped for the honor of France that they will be recompensed by some public distinction.

We cannot resist the desire to publish a translation of some verses which was addressed to them by the best poet of Norway, M. James Lie, and we cannot close without addressing to the good and generous Norwegians the thanks of a patriotic heart for the marks of sympathy they have shown so liberally to the two Frenchmen cast upon their soil by the tempest.

The Prussian atrocities can exasperate our heart; but proofs of affection moisten our eyes, and tears are much more potent than anger. Yes indeed! such marks of sympathy as these are some consolation for the selfish indifference of the governments towards our country. And is it not strange that France which has always been so prodigal of her blood for the deliverance of the oppressed and the enslaved, which has unfurled her banner of liberty in both the old and the new world; and which agonizes to day without a single voice being raised to protest against her oppressors;—is it not strange I say, that the only cry of hope and of love, in her behalf should come from a people for whom she has done nothing? that the only hearts that beat to-day with generous impulses towards her are those of them far away under the polar sky!

A. LE MAVUT.

London, Wednesday, Dec 7, 1870.

The Song sung at the Entertainment of 30, Nov. 1870, at CHRISTIANIA.

At this hour over the plains of France steeped in tears, stars the storm. The flames devour her cities and her villages. Behind her tricolored flag, symbol of liberty, she lies stretched out in her grief. Overwhelmed in her calamities she finds her safety in her noble deeds!  
"Nothing now but hope remains, O France, for thy sins! And Hope is the most sovereign power on earth! In her promises she awakens all the energies of a mighty power! It is hope that draws from the remotest corners of their country the warriors who defend it."

These noble hearted youths who have passed over the ocean in mid-air, full of burning courage and patriotic faith, and for whom the sorrowing tempest has been but the hand that guided them, prove that Faith and Hope are the salvation of France.

Vive la France! Long may France live, and long live her tricolored banner which still bears aloft emblazoned on her folds, HOPE for her in her hour of adversity! The banner of three colours will yet be for the nation of France, the rainbow of liberty.

For the Christian Messenger.

REV. MR. CURRIE versus "WENTWORTH."

No. 3.

Our reviewer is horrified at the conclusions to which we drive our readers. Rev. Mr. Currie says: "Are not those witnesses according to Wentworth's showing, dishonest men?" "If Wentworth be truthful, his witnesses are false to themselves, to their ordination vows, to the Church of Christ, and to their God; and therefore they are not competent witnesses." "Inconsistent, illogical, and untruthful men, as Wentworth makes his friends appear, cannot speak with authority." "If Pedobaptist ministers believed the Baptist belief to be true, and yet taught and practiced an antagonistic system, they would be of all men the most disreputable, and the most miserable." ("He (Wentworth) succeeds tolerably well, in the *Visitor*, in making his witnesses appear to assume very inconsistent and absurd positions." In his onslaught on Dr. Cramp, Rev. Mr. Currie says: "If Dr. Cramp's misstatement be true, Wesley's whole life was one of dishonesty, and craftiness, and deceit." If John Wesley could have been guilty of such gross duplicity, as is involved in Dr.

Cramp's accusation" (quotation?) "the memory of Wesley ought to be allowed, with all possible rapidity, to perish, and every lover of Methodism should blush at the very mention of his name. (*Oh! Jam satis.*)" "Wentworth ought to know that the immersionist policy of trying to sustain his creed by the alleged admissions and confessions of Pedobaptists is decidedly mischievous. When discriminating persons, not yet consecrated to the service of Christ, hear from a Baptist pulpit, or read in a Baptist publication, the statement that the most eminent and pious divines of the Presbyterian Church, and of the Church of England, and of other Pedobaptist churches, have again and again confessed that they teach and practice what they know to be antagonistic to the word of God, what are those persons to think?"

(Sure enough) "Such persons must, if they are disinterested and thoughtful hearers or readers, certainly conceive that either the parties who profess to quote, or the parties said to be quoted from, are, or were, knaves or imbeciles, and in either case the effect must be mischievous. The above deliverances will pass among the more "discriminating" of Rev. Mr. Currie's readers as mere *bancombe*. *Have our authors made the concessions given in our quotations?* That is the question now.—We answer whether our authors are "incompetent," "self-condemning," "inconsistent," "untruthful," "most disreputable," "most miserable," "knaves," or "imbeciles," or not, *they have made the concessions couched in our quotations.* We challenge Rev. Mr. Currie to disprove our answer. That is what he should have done if it had been possible, in his rejoinders.—But it were easier for him to manufacture a string of appellatives to be applied to our authors on the supposition that they did make the concessions alleged. Neither Mr. Currie nor Wentworth is to be held responsible for the inconsistency of Pedobaptist scholars, nor for any evil consequences resulting therefrom. The main issue—the issue between Mr. Currie and Wentworth—is this: *Have they made the concessions quoted by Wentworth?* We maintain that they have. Rev. Mr. C. has not proved the contrary. But we think it does not require a very keen vision to see a difference between inconsistent men and men who are "dishonest," "illogical," "untruthful," "disreputable," "miserable," "knaves," and "imbeciles." But if Rev. Mr. Currie wishes to catalogue our authors under such designations, let him proceed. The gentleman will only raise a laugh at his wild extravagance.

What authors have we summoned to the witness stand? It will be well to give the list. They are the following: Meyer, Olshausen, DeWette, Neander, Mosheim, Schleiermacher, Hahn, Hagenbach, Lobegott Lange, J. P. Lange, Tholuck, Dressler, Baumgarten-Crusius, Corrodi, G. C. Knapp, De Pressense, John Henry Blunt, (in his Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology), Dean Stiffley, Bloomfield, Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Nicholson, Dr. Wall, Doddridge, Whitefield, John Wesley, Adam Clark, Dr. George Campbell, Bishop Taylor, Chalmers, Jacobi, Dr. Edward Beecher, Professor Stuart, Dr. Anthon, Liddell and Scott, Dr. Edward Robinson, Dr. Lyman Coleman, Dr. Schaff, Archbishop Hughes, Dr. Fairbairn, Dr. C. Hodge, Dr. A. A. Hodge, Conybeare and Howson, Dr. Leonard Woods. How many, and which of them, came under the inexorable cross-examination of Rev. Mr. Currie? The following: J. P. Lange, Beecher, Jacobi, Neander, Hagenbach, Knapp and Wesley. The latter is defended, more especially against the wicked misrepresentations of Dr. Cramp. But our critic does not occupy much space in his novel method of cross-examination. He devotes himself principally to the easier, and, to him, the more congenial task of outgelling "Anabaptists." Wentworth, Dr. Cramp, et cetera. Considerable space is taken up by Rev. Mr. Currie, with a discussion of the subject of Baptism from his own vast resources of controversial wisdom, and in this discussion he calls to his aid *Moses, Ezekiel, Isaiah,* and Dr. Timothy Dwight. *Moses* and *Ezekiel* do him the best service on the question of Christian Baptism. When he finds he is making sorry work in discussion, he resorts to his vocabulary of appellatives, and relieves his jaded mind by abusing somebody or something, and anon, he amuses himself with pretty little episodes on Christian charity, designed for the special edification of the "Anabaptists."

The first of our authors cross-examined is J. P. Lange. Well, and what does he elicit from him? That he taught and prac-

ticed infant baptism! That has as much to do with the matter in dispute as the solution of a problem in Geometry has to do with the question whether the Rev. Mr. Currie is *compos mentis*. He carefully conceals Lange's concessions, and concludes his cross-examination with a species of gasconade, in which he excels. We designed to insert here Lange's concessions, but Mr. Currie has already more than he knows what to do with. Passing by his attempt to throttle Dr. Beecher, we come to poor Jacobi. We quote our critic entire on this case. It is so instructive. Mark how Jacobi is examined by Mr. C., and then how he cross-examines the man, to whose "Theological Works" our reviewer has never had access. Oh! well, friend Currie, you can get along without access to any "Theological Works." You are so clever.

"JACOBI EXAMINED."

"Wentworth puts Rev. Mr. Jacobi, a German clergyman, on the stand. Jacobi taught the doctrine of infant baptism in his pulpit, and baptized the infant children of his people." (What pulpit, and what people?) Wentworth, however, tries to make Jacobi confess that he is a very dishonest man. (Shame on you, Wentworth!) "Jacobi, according to Wentworth's manipulation, appears to be a tolerably fair Baptist" (bating his dishonesty) "and to admit that the Baptist belief is true; although Jacobi's pulpit teaching, and his practice in the house of God, have been radically antagonistic thereto. If it be true, as Wentworth indicates, that Christian ministers may manifest such capriciousness as Jacobi, in Wentworth's hands, appears to do, it were no wonder if infidelity should more and more abound, and that many should learn to look with contempt upon the whole Christian system."

"JACOBI CROSS-EXAMINED."

"Unhappily, we have not access to Jacobi's Theological works. The peculiar way, however, in which Wentworth dismisses his witness is rather suggestive." (It is, indeed.) "Wentworth, after attempting to show, by Jacobi, that infant baptism is an 'innovation,' an 'intruder.'" (Gentle reader, Mr. C. is simply giving our comments, not anything we quoted, or pretended to quote, from Jacobi) "a 'subverter,' and 'wrong,' and 'wicked,' drops the subject with these words: 'Jacobi, in another brief paragraph, attempts a plea for infant baptism. Those who wish to read it can consult Kitzo's works. We have neither patience to copy it, nor space to publish it.'"

"That is just like Wentworth."— (Shame on you, Wentworth!) "He says certain things calculated" (the Yankee says, I calculate to leave town to-morrow) "to put Jacobi in a false position. But, on the other hand, Wentworth has not 'patience to copy one brief paragraph' in Jacobi's defence." (Why did not Rev. Mr. C. copy it? Oh! he has not access, &c.) "Why Wentworth's 'patience' could not bear the strain is obvious." (Very.)—"The one 'brief paragraph' would not demand much time or labor in being copied; but it would probably" (how moderate!) "expose Wentworth's misrepresentation. Then, again, the 'space to publish it' would not be a very serious matter," (no, not at all) "as it was only one 'brief paragraph,' and besides, if it were needful." (but it was not) "the question of 'space' might have been referred to the Publisher of the *Visitor*. We dwell— (we should think so) "upon Wentworth's position in regard to Jacobi," (it is time you cross examined Jacobi) "because it reveals the artifice in which Wentworth indulges. He gives in this instance, as in others, a distorted view of his Pedobaptist witness" (as Rev. Mr. C. can testify, since he has not access, &c.) "but will not permit his witness to speak one word in his own defence, except when it suits his peculiar purpose, and his patience. We would suggest" (now Mr. C. is coming down from the grave to the gay) "that a more excellent way would be, to let an absent clergyman's reputation entirely alone, unless full justice can be awarded him. As Jacobi was virtually wrongfully accused he should have been allowed at least one brief paragraph in his own defence." *Finit.*

Well, he shall have it. But where is the cross-examination? The old story of the tragedy of Hamlet. Rev. Mr. Currie "unhappily" has not "access to Jacobi's Theological Works." Well, Horace has said: *Non cui vis homini contingit adire Corinthum.* But Rev. Mr. Currie can find, we venture to say, Kitzo's Cyclopaedia in the library of his Sabbath school. We quoted from that work the following two

paragraphs from Jacobi's article on Baptism.—And now, Mr. Currie, is this a fabrication?

Jacobi says: "INFANT BAPTISM WAS established neither by Christ nor the apostles. In all places where we find the necessity of baptism notified, either in a dogmatic or historical point of view, it is evident that it was only meant for those who were capable of comprehending the word preached, and of being converted to Christ by an act of their own will. A pretty sure testimony of its non-existence in the apostolic age may be inferred from 1 Cor. vii. 14, since Paul would certainly have referred to the baptism of children for their holiness (comp. Neander, *Hist. of the Planting, &c.*, p. 206). We omitted the reference here given. "But even in later times, several teachers of the Church, such as Tertullian (De Bapt. 18) and others, reject this custom; indeed, his church, (that of North Africa) adhered longer than others to the primitive regulations. Even when baptism of children was already theoretically derived from the apostles, its practice was nevertheless for a long time confined to a mature age."

In support of the contrary opinion, the advocates in former ages (now hardly any used to appeal to Matt. xix. 14; but their strongest argument in its favor is the regulation of baptizing all the members of a house and family (1 Cor. xvi. 15, Acts xvi. 33; xviii. 8). In none of these instances has it been proved that there were little children among them; but, even supposing that there were, there was no necessity for excluding them in plain words, since such exclusion was understood as a matter of course." (Why, Jacobi, you are a tolerably fair Baptist) "Many circumstances conspired early to introduce the practice of infant baptism." The confusion between the outward and inward conditions of baptism, and the magical effect that was imputed to it; confusion of thought about the visible and invisible Church, condemning all those who did not belong to the former; the doctrine of the natural corruption of man so closely connected with the preceding; and, finally, the desire of distinguishing Christian children from the Jewish and heathen, and of commending them more effectually to the care of the Christian community—all these circumstances, and many more, have contributed to the introduction of infant baptism at a very early period."

There is Jacobi's concession, distinct and decisive. No Baptist writer ever put it stronger. Where is Wentworth's "manipulation?" "the false position?" "misrepresentation?" "distorted view?" "the artifice?" Where has Wentworth "virtually, wrongfully accused" an "absent" clergyman? But now for the one brief paragraph in his own defence.

Says Jacobi:—"But on the other hand, the baptism of children is not at all at variance with the principle of Christian baptism in general" after what we have observed on the separation of regeneration and baptism. For since it cannot be determined *when* the former (regeneration) begins, the real test of its existence lying only in the holiness continued to the end of man's life, the fittest point for baptism is evidently the beginning of life. Nevertheless, the profession of faith is still needed to complete it. Confirmation, or some equivalent observance, is therefore a very important consummation. The *fides infantium* is an absurd assumption, of which the Scriptures know nothing. On the other hand, the baptized child is strongly recommended to the community, and to the Spirit of God dwelling therein, becoming the careful object of the education and holy influences of the Church (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 14). NATURE and EXPERIENCE teach us, therefore, to retain the baptism of children now that it is INTRODUCED." Italics and capitals are ours. There is Jacobi's defence, his entire defence—the one brief paragraph. How does the DEFENCE compare with the CONCESSIONS? Oh! "capricious" Jacobi.—but you are not near so "capricious" as Rev. Mr. Currie is crafty. But our critic's craftiness has come to grief by forcing us to bring Jacobi to the front again.

Now for Neander. Ecce our author in our reviewer's hands.

"NEANDER EXAMINED."

Neander is examined, and made to say: "Since baptism marked the entrance into communion with Christ, it resulted from the nature of the rite that a confession of faith in Jesus as the Redeemer would be made by the person to be baptised . . . We cannot infer the existence of infant baptism from the instances of the baptism of whole families." Wentworth makes

Neander say that, and a great deal more that Mr. Currie does not reproduce.— "Neander is examined, and made to say! But examine our quotations, or the original source, and see to what a pitch of audacity and insolence our reviewer allows himself to be carried."

But, "NEANDER CROSS-EXAMINED."

"Neander thinks there is no positive proof that infant baptism came immediately from Christ himself. Neander could not ascertain definitely the beginning of this practice." (Perhaps Mr. Currie can.) "Whether," he says, "this institution originated from an injunction given by the earlier apostles," or "among the Jewish Christians," or "whether Paul introduced it first among heathen Christians," were still unsolved problems. Neander says: "The evidence arising from *silence* on this topic has therefore the greater weight." Well! that is not only horrible garbling, but wholesale perversion. Now for the evidence. Here is the language of Neander (see his Planting and Training, Ryland's edition, p 102; or Dr. Robinson translation, from the fourth German edition, page 161): "And if we wish to ascertain from whom such an institution was originated, we should say, certainly not immediately from Christ Himself. Was it from the primitive church in Palestine, from an injunction given by the earlier apostles? But among the Jewish Christians circumcision was held as the seal of the covenant, and hence they had so much less occasion to make another dedication of their children. Could it then have been Paul, who first among heathen Christians introduced this alteration by the use of baptism? But this would agree least of all with the peculiar Christian characteristics of this apostle. He who says of himself that Christ sent him not to baptize but to preach the Gospel; he who always kept his eye fixed on one thing—justification faith, and so carefully avoided everything which could give a handle or support to the notion of a justification by outward things (the *sarkika*)—how could he have set up infant baptism against the circumcision that continued to be practised by the Jewish Christians? In this case the dispute carried on by the Judaizing party, on the necessity of circumcision, would easily have given an opportunity of introducing this substitute into the controversy, if it had really existed." Now mark—"The evidence arising from silence on this topic has therefore the greater weight." "The greater weight," Mr. Currie would make Neander say, "in favor of infant baptism," the exact opposite of what Neander says. And compare the rest of Mr. Currie's quotation with Neander's language.—Our critic proceeds in his cross-examination thus: "In 1 Cor. vii. 14, 'we have,' says Neander, 'the fundamental idea' from which infant baptism was developed, and by which it may be 'justified.'" Here is Neander's language: "We find, indeed, in one passage of Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 14, a trace that already the children of Christians were distinguished from the children of heathens, but this is not to be deduced from having partaken of baptism, and this mode of connection with the Church is rather evidence AGAINST THE EXISTENCE of infant baptism." Neander proceeds to prove the non-existence of infant baptism from that very text. Then he says that in a subsequent age the idea of infant baptism was attempted to be founded on that text.

His words are "But in the point of view here taken by Paul, we find (although it testifies against the existence at that time of infant baptism) the fundamental idea from which the practice was afterwards necessarily developed, and by which it must be justified to agree with Paul's sentiments." Let it be noted, that Neander is not founding infant baptism on that text. He is speaking as a historian—declaring what did take place and how it was attempted to justify infant baptism by the text in question. Neander says the text testifies against it. In his Church Hist., vol. I p. 311. He says "Irenaeus is the first Church teacher in whom we find any allusion to infant baptism." There is a single passage in Irenaeus which is regarded as an allusion to the practice in dispute. There is not one word about baptism in it. It is, at most, supposed to contain an allusion to that rite. "But," says Neander, "immediately after Irenaeus, in the last years of the second century, Tertullian appears as a zealous opponent of infant baptism; a proof that the practice had not yet come to be regarded as an apostolic institution." Once more, "We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution."

But, "Neander is examined, and made to say: 'Since baptism marked the entrance into communion with Christ, it resulted from the nature of the rite that a confession of faith in Jesus as the Redeemer would be made by the person to be baptised . . . We cannot infer the existence of infant baptism from the instances of the baptism of whole families.'" Wentworth makes