

am goin to try to do better—I hope you will pray for me, it is very good and kind of you all to come to the jail and hold meetings, and it did us all good—keep on—you are doin more good than you no—we was all better for it—I shall never forgit it—if i do as well as i hope to i shall rit; you again some time i am goin to try to be a christian man, pray for me.

“good by— yours truly,
“JAMES HOLDRIDGE.”

Nellie says she never received a letter she enjoyed so much before; and as Nellie is somewhat of a favourite among the gentlemen, and receives a good many flattering letters in more elegant chirography and better grammar and spelling, that is saying a good deal.

Last week Ned Barrington went with us, and told the prisoners how bad a life he had once lived, and how he could sympathize with them in their efforts to overcome temptation. And Julia, in her energetic, practical way, talked to them of the necessity of earnest and persevering exertion. “You never can have anything in this life,” she said, “without paying the price for it. If you want education, you’ve got to work for it. You ought to see how I work to get mine, and sit up half the night studying, sometimes! If you want the respect of your fellow-beings, you’ve got to earn it. If you want a pleasant home and good clothes you can have them by labour, and patience, and self-denial. But if you want whisky and tobacco and a life of idleness more than these, why, then, you get your whisky and tobacco and idleness, but you don’t get anything else, and you pay a very high price for them. You lose your health, and gradually your mind, and all your better feelings, and the respect of people, and all that makes life worth having. Perhaps those who steal think they get something without paying for it; but they are greatly mistaken; they pay out their manhood and self-respect for it; and you see that makes it come pretty dear.” The prisoners listened eagerly, some with open mouths, the more readily to take the idea; and more than one showed by his expression of countenance that he understood and appreciated her remarks.

When we came away they begged us to come oftener, and watched us through the grating till we were out of sight. Nellie and Julia say that if these meetings do the prisoners half as much good as they do us, we shall feel amply repaid. And the work has indeed done us all good, in the broader thought and wider charity it has inspired. We anticipate these goal-meetings now more than almost any other work we have to do. We have learned to take a personal interest in each prisoner, and those who have been there for a long time seem like old friends. Each of them develops some interesting and valuable trait of character, upon which we cannot but hope a nobler manhood may be erected. Never have any of us received a rude or disrespectful word from one of them; nor do I believe that any of them would do one of us an injury.

Why cannot the same work be attempted in other places, and persevered in till the whole Christian world comes to consider their goal and prison labour as much a part of their daily duty as their church and Sunday-school work? Thus, by practical experience, the community will learn, as it can learn in no other way, not only to be interested in, but to grapple with and successfully solve, the difficult problem of prison reform.—*Christian Union.*

For the Christian Messenger.

The Letter to the Chancellor of the University of Halifax.

Mr. Editor,—

A pamphlet containing criticisms on the University of Halifax, and bearing the signature, “A Professor,” has been widely circulated through the Province, and I observe that many Baptists are commending it, without any qualification and apparently without discrimination. This surprises me. How Baptists can accept several of the fundamental propositions of that pamphlet, I cannot understand. The author of it represents the “Religious Denominations,” who appealed to the Legislature last winter for justice in the matter of the College grants, as sturdy beggars, having no just claims, and blames the Government because it did not not give them an emphatic No. He holds that the Government, in introducing the new University, should have withdrawn from all the Colleges the power of conferring Degrees. He represents

the existing Colleges as *Graduating nuisances*. He would have the public believe that the young Nova Scotian has been able hitherto to get a Degree without any difficulty, but has not found it possible to get any education, —and further that the young Nova Scotian will not find it worth while to spend much time in the process of education. He declares that the wise and right idea is that of a Teaching University, and he would have the Government sweep away all obstructions and create a Teaching University at once.

Now, for which of these utterances is this Professor to be applauded? He may have said some good things; but if we are to follow his prescriptions, we shall be pretty surely brought into a worse condition.

After irrelevant matter and inexcusable personalities are laid aside, the arguments of the pamphlet fall under two heads; first, objections to the “proviso” in the 14th section of the University Act; second, objections to the Curriculum adopted by the Senate. Under the second head, the chief objection is against the requirements in Mathematics, which are declared to be exorbitant and such as no practical educator would adopt. It so happens that these requirements are no greater than those laid on the students of Acadia. Shall we give our assent to a man who condemns, as too high, requirements which have been successfully met by the students of Acadia for many years? If we are opposed to the Halifax University, let us honestly rest our objections on our own grounds, and not carelessly acquiesce in the arguments of others whose evident purpose in opposing that University is to put in its place a Teaching University. Let us not help to accomplish what Baptists have opposed for these forty years. As regards the great educational question on which the people have been divided, the author of that pamphlet is not on our side, and it would be folly for us to accept the leadership of such a guide.

A FRIEND OF ACADIA.

For the Christian Messenger.
University of Halifax.

My dear Sir,—

I have read the communication of Rev. Dr. Cramp published in your last issue, with interest. Like him, I have been gratified with the letters recently published over the signature “A Professor,” dated Halifax, understood to be a well known Professor in Dalhousie College. The “Professor” has made it perfectly clear that there is no longer the vestige of a hope that the “University of Halifax” may be used in furthering the designs of the friends of one central teaching University, and accordingly, those of us—not a few of the Baptists of the Maritime Provinces—who needlessly feared this, will breathe more freely.

The “Professor” is clear, too, on another point. *The success of the “University of Halifax” means death to Dalhousie,* and it can hardly be expected that a gentleman who has voluntarily resigned generous friendships and home comforts in the “land of cakes” to enlighten the natives in Nova Scotia, will surrender his vocation without a struggle; and therefore the New University must be sacrificed to the necessities of Dalhousie!

That Section 15 of the Act “*would make the University of Halifax the subject of inextinguishable laughter wherever out of Nova Scotia it might happen to be known*” is, I presume, capable of mathematical demonstration. There are queer people in the world, you know. Without the “demonstration,” however, most people will continue to regard the section referred to as a very innocent one, making needful provision for the decision of questions in Senate and for the Chairman of such Senate. It is just possible that the “Professor” means not Section 15, of the University Act, but some other section! Perhaps Section 14.

The point made by Dr. Cramp is a good one, if he has been rightly apprehended. No sect or denomination should have undue influence in our public institutions. The Baptists are a large and influential denomination in this Province and thoroughly independent. I believe they have never been accused of truckling to the Roman Catholics or any other body of people; but the fact is they are not fairly or fully represented in the Senate; and the consequences are beginning to appear. I will not stop here to enquire who is to blame that Acadia College supplies but one member of the Senate. It is evident that a mistake has been com-

mitted, and great loss has been sustained thereby, not only, by us as a Denomination, but by higher education generally. What little can be done to repair the error should be done promptly. Let the graduates of Acadia, especially those of them who are Baptists or who remain loyal to their Alma Mater, become enrolled at once as members of Convocation, that when vacancies are to be filled in the Senate the powers given to Convocation in the matter, by the Act, may be exerted to secure wise and judicious appointments. The time limited for enrolment expires on the 1st of April next. Let there be no misapprehension and no shrinking from duty in this matter. Those of us who reside outside of Halifax should be ready to bear our part of the burden and all should unite determined to destroy the undue influence to which attention has been directed.

Yours truly,
A. A. C.

The Christian Messenger.

Halifax, N. S., February 21st, 1877.

“ARISE, AND BE BAPTIZED.”

Some Pedobaptist teachers in their desperation to find some scripture warrant for the substitution of sprinkling for baptism quote this passage, and gravely ask, How else could Paul be baptized in a standing position except by sprinkling? By this miserable sophistry they throw dust in the eyes of their hearers, and prevent them looking at other scripture teachings on the subject, they then come to the conclusion that this fancy of theirs is really a fact, and that Paul and the early Christians were really sprinkled, notwithstanding the testimony of all history to the contrary—and that for thirteen hundred years the church did not authorize the substitution of sprinkling for immersion—and further that the original meaning of the word translated, baptize, being unquestionably immerse or dip. The *Christian Standard* has a sensible article on this passage and offers some instructive suggestions:

“The fact is, the word *anastas*, translated ‘*arise*,’ has the sense not of *arising* and *standing* still, while we become the passive subjects of some action or ceremony, but of *starting up for action*.’ It means to put one’s self in motion to do something. Surely, no one can deny that it is good sense to say ‘*Arise, and be immersed*.’ As to remaining in the house or going out of it, that would depend in no sense upon the word *anastas*, but entirely upon the word *immerse*. If you are commanded to submit to a certain ceremony, of course you must, by implication, legal and logical, do whatever is a necessary condition of full obedience to the command. When Ananias said to Paul, ‘*Arise, and be baptized*,’ he commanded him to do two things. First—to ‘*arise*.’ Second—to ‘*be baptized*.’ If he could not be baptized, from the nature of the action, without going out to the fountain, or to the Pharpar, then the command *baptisai* involved his going out, and Paul would have remained disobedient had he not done so.”

Dr. Lechler, the distinguished commentator on Acts in Lange, says, in *loco*, “The most probable supposition is, that this word, *anastas*, is merely intended to depict Saul’s rapid transition from a state in which he was occupied with his internal experience, and in which he was only a recipient, to a personal and energetic course of action. He was probably baptized in one of the rivers of Syria, which Naaman had extolled in his day, the Abana or Pharpar.’ Evidently, this eminent scholar saw nothing in *anasta*, to confine Paul to the house of Judas, or to change immersion into sprinkling.”

Conybeare and Howson, in their life of Paul, also understand that he was baptized in one of these rivers. They say, he (Paul) was baptized, and the ‘*rivers of Damascus*’ became more to him than ‘*all the waters of Judah*’ had been. His body was strengthened with food; and his soul was made strong to ‘*suffer great things*’ for the name of Jesus, and to bear that Name ‘*before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel*.’ No city afforded greater facilities for immersion than did Damascus. Prof. J. Leslie Porter says, “While one looks from the brow of Lebanon over that matchless scene of verdure, he cannot but acknowledge the truth and appropriateness of Naaman’s proud exclamation, ‘*Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel?*’ (11. Kings, v. 12.) By means of

these (large canals fed from these rivers), not only is there an unlimited supply of water conveyed to the innumerable fountains of the great city, but the whole surrounding plain is irrigated.” But it was not necessary for Paul to go out to the river. Prof. Leslie, in describing the private houses, says, “The entrance is always through a narrow, winding passage to the *outer court*, where the master has the reception-room.” Another winding passage leads to the principal part of the house. Here is a spacious court with tessellated pavement, basin in the centre, *jets d’eau* around it, orange, lemon and citron trees, flowering shrubs, jessamines and vines trailed over trellis-work for shade.” The rooms all open into this court, and thither, of course, Ananias could have readily led Paul to his baptism. It was in fact more convenient to conduct him to the fountain of the court, than to bring the water to him in his room, and there sprinkle him.”

Every sensible person must see and admit that the poor subterfuge above referred to has no foundation in fact and is no argument. Let every believer in Christ see in this a command to himself to follow his Lord.

“MORAL STATUS OF CHILDREN.”

Judge Marshall has brought out, and laid on our table for notice, another pamphlet, entitled “*Scriptural answer to a pamphlet by Rev. A. Sutherland, on the Moral Status of Children; and their relation to Christ and his church*.” It appears that Mr. Sutherland is a minister of the Methodist Church, of some prominence in Ontario, and has written with the endeavor to show that children are born Christians, perhaps to prove that they are fit subjects for baptism, but as we have not seen the pamphlet reviewed by the Judge, we are not certain of this being his object. Mr. S. says: “We hold that to every child is imparted a principle of spiritual life;—not in the sense of regeneration, as technically understood; but rather in the sense of a good implanted;—not inherited;—which it is the province of Christian nurture under the Divine Spirit’s guidance and help to develop and strengthen. In a word, through the atonement, the suspended *contact* of the Divine Spirit, with the human soul is restored, and this begins with the first dawning of the soul’s existence.”

Judge Marshall rejects this doctrine, as unscriptural in theory and argument. It is evident that the matter of Infant Baptism is an important part of Mr. Sutherland’s book, for the Judge says he agrees with Mr. S. “as to Baptismal Regeneration, that the act of water baptism does not of itself, or invariably, convey or include spiritual regeneration; but as he gracefully describes it, “it is a beautiful and expressive symbol of the Holy Spirit’s work.”

Mr. Sutherland further says of Baptism, “it is a declaration of our belief that our children have been redeemed by Christ, and belong to Him.”

The Judge very properly remarks upon this, “They belong to Him no further or in any other way than all the rest of mankind.” He might have said on this, as he does of much that he controverts—it is altogether unsustained by the Sacred Scriptures. He ably propounds the doctrine of man’s entire degeneracy, and the need of a new birth to become children of God and obtain salvation. The difficulty of reconciling the doctrine of human depravity and the salvation of children who die in infancy, the Judge presents in a very acceptable form.

He says:

“That children, who die before the age of responsibility are saved, as he asserts, is doubtless true; but instead of saying that they have been born with the *contact*, and under the influence of the Holy Spirit; or that this regenerating change takes place, in and by water baptism, it may rather be supposed, or concluded, that it is accomplished by the Divine Spirit, at, or immediately before death; and this sanctifies and prepares the soul for the heavenly paradise. There is nothing in Scripture opposed to this view, and it seems highly probable and will remove many difficulties and objections on the subject. Why may it not be so as to children, just previous to, or at the moment of death? This conclusion would remove many difficulties Mr. Sutherland may have had on the subject; and he could far better support it, in harmony with Scripture, than the theory he has advanced.”

Judge Marshall in treating on the need of “*home religious instruction and training*” says:

“Religious teachers should explicitly and earnestly exhort both parents and

children to refrain from indulging in those ensnaring and contaminating amusements, the romance,—cards and dice,—the ball-room,—the vain and foolish masquerade carnival,—the theatre; and the numerous modes of sensual gratification, by which such multitudes of young and old, of both sexes, are withheld from serious reflection, and religious exercises, and are more and more led astray; and many of them, as to the eternal world, finally ruined.”

Whilst we differ from Mr. Sutherland and his reviewer on the qualification for, and the design of baptism and as to the proper subjects and mode, we fully endorse their views as to the need for religious training and the blessings that follow to children themselves and to their parents, to the church and the world from avoiding the evils spoken of. By bringing them to Jesus, by instruction and prayer at the earliest dawn of intelligence, we effectually obey his injunction: Suffer the little children to come unto me, &c., and thus secure their “*Moral Status*” with their new birth unto righteousness.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE WEEK.

- Feb. 19. Death of Bernard Barton, Poet.....1849
- “ Death of Rev. Jos. Crandal.1858
- “ Death of Sir Chas. Napier.1860
- “ 20. Death of Joseph Hume, M. P., *Economiser* of the House of Commons.....1855
- “ 21. Death of Parkhurst, Lexicographer.....1797
- “ Death of Rev. Robt. Hall.1831
- “ 22. Death of Rev. Sydney Smith.....1845
- “ 23. Death of Sir Josh. Reynolds.1792
- “ 24. Battle of Pravia: Francis I, of France, taken prisoner.1525
- “ Death of Kant, Philosopher.1804
- “ 25. Death of Emperor Charlemagne.....814
- “ Death of Sir Christopher Wren.....1723
- “ Death of Dr. Andrew Reed.1862

LOOKING BACK.

In 1874 some Christians in Herzegovina had a dispute about tithes. They were threatened with imprisonment and fled to Montenegro. They were asked to return. In attempting to do so they were attacked by Turkish troops and some of them were killed. Their homes were attacked and they suffered many outrages. Turks and Christians charged each other with foul play. The European cabinets sent agents to advise with the rebels with a view to peace. These efforts failed. The Christians complained of heavy taxes, corrupt courts, and general ill-usage. In September, 1875, the Porte promised redress of grievances. All promises were disbelieved and the rebellion went on. Servia and Montenegro gave help. Germany, Russia and Austria informally committed the matter to the Count Andrassy, hence his “*Note*”—religious liberty, &c., and a commission, half Turks and half Christians, to carry out its proposals. Fanaticism spread, and the German and French Consuls were murdered. The fire burned even in Constantinople. The Sultan was dethroned; and his successor shared the same fate. Some assassinations followed. The Andrassy Note failed. On the eleventh of May, Germany, Austria and Russia requested England to unite with them to help make peace. France and Italy came in and agreed with the three powers, but England declined. Then followed the revelation of the appalling outrages and horrors which aroused the sympathy of the world—sickening scenes of fire and slaughter. Mr. Gladstone came to the front and added fuel to the flame of righteous anger; and then the English Government began to come into line with public opinion. Lord Derby called on the Porte to punish the murderers, even after the Porte had tried to deceive the English Government in the matter.

Servia and Montenegro joined in the war; and in October Russia put in an *ultimatum*. The Powers and Her Majesty’s government had discussions and disagreements which were terminated by the Porte offering six months armistice. This was accepted by England, including a Conference. Diplomacy changed colours quite frequently. The good intentions and the half threatenings declared at different times by the Czar, and the ill grace with which the Prime Minister of England swung into accord with the nation, made all things appear perilous. On the 20th of November, Lord Salisbury left London for Constantinople. He visited Paris, Berlin, Vienna and Rome on his way. He found the Russian Ambassador remarkably yielding. Now came the proclamation of the new constitution of Turkey.