

brook with you one August afternoon when you were trying to catch a frog. Kerchunk! how scared the frog-folks were when you tumbled in among them!" and the sprite laughed, and the jolly little bell laughed, and Nellie laughed loudest of all.

"And I," cried another, tossing its head and trying to pout, "sat by your side when you were sent from the supper-table because you were naughty and would n't say 'please.'"

"And I," lisped a roly-poly, cunning wee thing, "when you said 'Please—please—please,' and grandma gave you a slice of bread-and-butter, but you couldn't see the butter for the apple-jelly."

"I remember, I remember," said Nellie; "I wish I had some now."

"I was with you, dear one," murmured an Hour, with kind, gentle eyes, and low, pitying voice, "when your poor head ached with a terrible pain, and between your moans, you made a prayer to the good God for help."

"I am the Hour," said a merry, twinkling, bird-like spirit with holly-berries hanging all over it, "that looked on when you played games with your brothers just before you hung up your stocking on Christmas Eve."

"And I saw you take it down the next morning filled almost to bursting with good things to eat," said another, with a face like a doll's plum-pudding, and little black currants for eyes.

"And I—" but at that moment Nellie's arithmetic fell from her lap with a bang! and away fled the Seconds, and Minutes and Hours, up the long, slanting sunbeam, and out of the window.

And when Nellie in a great hurry leaned out to look after them, she saw nothing but the snow, and two street-sparrows picking up crumbs, and chattering noisily to each other.—St. Nicholas for January.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger. From Germany.

(From our own correspondent.)

BERLIN, Dec. 2nd, 1878.

To one who has been absent from this city for some years the general impression upon revisiting it is of a strangely mixed character. The exaggerated inflation that followed the Franco-German war has been succeeded by so total and unlooked for a collapse in social, political, and financial matters, by such mental and moral aberrations, which the German in his overweening self-esteem deemed matters of the past, that he now stands bewildered before the flaws in his social fabric. Gloom pervades the city—a subdued awe, a feeling of incertitude, that strikes the observer at once. Every one appears afraid of what may yet be in store. The hopes that ran so high are damped to extinction. There is depression everywhere. It has been the fashion of late, and with some justice, to complain of the state of social affairs at home; but it is not till one comes here and talks with intelligent Germans that one becomes aware how much we have cause to be resigned to our own depressed state. Beyond all doubt, the disease called Social Democracy is eating into the very vitals of the German Government as at present constituted; and the more intelligent minds are well aware that it is idle to hope that such an evil can be abolished by Act of Parliament. But even these intelligent minds approve of the measure; even with them, "coersion" is the watchword; they hold with Matthew Arnold's dictum of "Force till right is ready." It seems impossible to make a German, of whatever shade of political opinion (except obviously the Social Democrats) understand that it is possible that anarchy cannot be removed by despotism. The Germans worship with a blind devotion a store of force called the State, which they regard as all-powerful; and they seem to think it able to revolutionize a country in the turn of a hand. They run to the State with every grievance, great and small. To argue with them on this point is useless. The faith has been imbibed with their earliest ideas, has been drilled into them at school and in camp. It is quite a characteristic of the nation, this unshaken confidence, this unmes-

ured belief in officialism, notwithstanding the fact that the power they invoke has again and again showed itself incompetent to deal with the circumstances they deplore.

At no time has the Journalistic standard of Germany been high; she always lacked newspapers of leading importance and standing; the reason being, perhaps, that the Germans are not news-lovers, like ourselves, and that no person dreams of taking more than one newspaper, and he often shares that with a neighbor, content to read his news, such as it is, some hours old. But low as the standard was, it was at least a pure and moral one; and this is unhappily no longer the case. The very papers that rail against the organs of the Social Democrats furnish their readers with poison more insidious and as deadly. Indeed, the literature of the Social Democratic press is more noisy than corrupting. The arguments employed are in most cases so shallow, the data so incorrect, that if they had not gained notoriety owing to persecution and suppression, they would probably in the majority of cases, soon have died a natural death. New papers start into being under the mildest of names, which within a few days are confiscated as Socialist; nevertheless, the leaders are very clearly resolved not to be quietly suppressed. Time alone can solve the question what will result from all this ferment. Meanwhile, it is sad to see a great people so lost in false patriotism, culpable indifference, hatred and discontent.

Duelling is becoming a contemptible institution; in France, and childish in the extreme, the principal object of the seconds and combatants being to take special care that nobody is hurt.

German newspapers state, on the authority of letters received from the Russian border, that in the district of Lublin the intolerance of the Russian Government has given the native Roman Catholic population fresh cause for complaint. The Russian authorities tolerate no baptism according to the rites of the church of Rome. The Roman Catholic population are therefore wont to carry their new-born children across the border, in order to have them baptized by Roman Catholic priests at Cracow. The Russian Governor-General having been informed of this, recently caused the parties crossing the frontier to be intercepted and seized by gendarmes, who took the children to the nearest orthodox church, and had them baptized perforce by the Russian pope. The parents, it is added, wishing to invalidate the Russian baptism, carry their children to the nearest well, in order to "wash away" as expeditiously as possible the effects of the sacred rite.

Louis.

For the Christian Messenger.

The Theological Department at Acadia College.

Dear Brother,

I notice in the Messenger of Dec. 4th an article from Rev. Dr. Crawley respecting the Theological Course at Acadia. I am glad to know that the work has been undertaken, and that there is such a fair prospect of its being a success. But I think that the Dr. does an injustice to the young men who in the past have left the Province and sought theological instruction at Newton and elsewhere. It is stated in that article that, "The consideration which draws our students to Newton may be the larger amount of pecuniary aid that it is said may be there obtained." Certainly every one must know that such is not the case.

There are some ten or eleven young men from the provinces now at Newton. But there was no theological instruction given at Acadia when they commenced their course at Newton. I ask then, is it justice to say that these young men were drawn here by the pecuniary aid which they here receive?

If that was their object in coming here, they had better stayed at home; for they require about as much here besides the aid received as it would cost at Acadia if they received no help.

Young men go to Newton because of the superior advantages of that Institution, and young men have many privileges there outside of the Institution which they never can have at Acadia.

Our sympathies are with the work at

Wolfville, and we advise our young men in the future to go there for their theological training. If a theological course had been started there three years ago, I have no doubt but that most of the young men from the provinces now at Newton would have gone to Acadia. But be that as it may, I feel that it is doing an injustice to the young men who have gone to Newton in the past, as well as to those who are there now, to say that they were drawn there by the pecuniary aid which they receive there.

DONALD.

For the Christian Messenger.

An Incident and a Moral.

I stood on the wharf at D— when the steamer left. Just when she drew off, and when only a few feet from the pier, a man, much excited, rushed up, shouting, "Hold on! Stop! How can I get on board? Is there no way? O! it is too late? There's my little girl, my daughter, on board, what will she do?" I looked in the direction indicated. I saw the little girl hysterically sobbing and shouting:—"O stop for my pa! O, pa, come, come! O won't they stop for my pa!" There was agony at separation. How came this? Simply, the father was a moment too late, and there was a separation.

The ship of salvation lies in the dock of Time. I look at her name. It is, "Now-is-the-time." I ask the name of her commander. It is "Capt. Delay-not To-day." I enquire when will she sail? He answers: "Look at the time-table" (the Bible). It says: "Behold, now is the time, the accepted time; and now is the day of salvation." "To-day if ye will hear his voice harden not your hearts." I see her sails are spread, steam up—colors flying—I hear the whistle shriek. "All ready! All aboard." Agents are crying out through the town (world), "Come! we may sail any moment. This is likely your last chance. This is the only ship of the line. All aboard! Passage safe and free! Will you come?"

Father, you have a little child on board. She cries, "Come, Pa! O God, wait for my pa! Jesus, don't sail yet! O, wait for pa! Father! step on board now! You may come too late! Almost saved. Lost! The ship has gone! Gone!"

A man who stood by remarked, "What was he doing? He had time enough. Serves him right. Poor little girl, I pity her." (The gentleman in question was in conversation with another about some common place matter at the time.) His observation was just, though severe. Ah! poor immortal soul! You have time enough.

Life, whether long or short, is the hour that God has given to escape from hell and fly to heaven. Time enough! God says so. Conscience says so. Angels, men, and devils say so. All heaven, earth and hell say so!

But you delay! A little longer. To-morrow! Not now! The cares of life, the deceitfulness of riches, the sights and sounds of pleasure get between your soul and its salvation. Hark! hear you that call? Come! Come now! The whistle! The last call! Lines cast off! She leaves! You cry now, "I waited! I am left! I am lost! A member of my family on board. O God, we shall never meet again!"

G. H. G.

Shelburne.

For the Christian Messenger.

Open Letters on Baptism.

NO. XIII.

REV. D. D. CURRIE:—

Dear Sir,—I now call your attention to a few more points in your Catechism; and when I shall finish I shall only have noticed a comparatively small part of the very many errors, &c., contained in it.

Page 42. Here you tell us that, "They (Philip and the Eunuch) came to a certain water in the desert, and the Eunuch wanted to be baptized, for he had just been reading about baptism—'so shall he sprinkle many nations.'" You say just before, after quoting "sprinkle many nations," "Philip began at the same Scripture (Acts viii. 35), and preached unto him Jesus." Here you state what you have no authority for whatever. You teach that the Eunuch was reading about one who was to

"sprinkle many nations." Where did you learn that? "What is written, how readest thou?" In Acts viii. 35 we read, "The place of the Scripture which he read was this, He was led as a sheep to the slaughter," &c. Verse 32 reads, "Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same Scripture," &c. True, he might have been reading what went before, but you have no authority to go beyond what the Bible says. Mr. Lathern (Baptisma, page 53) is a little more careful. He says of the Eunuch, "He had before him, &c., He shall sprinkle many nations." He does not say he was reading it. But here comes in your evil behaviour; the Bible says Philip began at one Scripture, and you say he began at another. You deny a clear, positive, and distinct statement of Scripture for the purpose of sustaining your theory of sprinkling. And you repeat and reiterate your groundless statements; for you say again, "He had been reading and speaking about sprinkling." And again, "But if the thing done by Philip were sprinkling, as the prophet had foretold, and about which they had been reading and speaking," &c. In this latter statement you manifest remarkable carelessness. What prophet foretold that "the thing done by Philip" should be sprinkling? Not Ezekiel, so don't go to him, for he would order you away. And if the prophet foretold it why do you say "if"? And where do you read that Philip had been reading about sprinkling? You have no proof whatever that Philip sprinkled the Eunuch; nor that the prophet had foretold sprinkling; nor that either the Eunuch or Philip had been reading or speaking about it. No proof whatever, and yet you write with such certainty as if you had been sitting in the chariot with them. We should all seek to be wise up to what is written, but you appear to be wise above and beyond what is written.

But even supposing the Eunuch was reading where you say, then unless he was reading the English version, (and perhaps in your next edition you will argue for that), he read nothing about sprinkling. If he was reading the Hebrew Scripture, then he read what in English dress would be something like this: "Ken yazzeh goen rabeem," &c. Yazzeh is the word which is translated 'sprinkle' in our version, but it will not bear that meaning. It comes from 'nazzah' which verb, when in the Hiphil conjugation, means "to cause to leap or exult"; and Parkhurst in his Hebrew lexicon refers to Isa. lii. 15, the passage in question, as an illustration of that meaning. Mr. Lathern, in Baptisma, page 53, says, "The Hebrew word, according to eminent Oriental scholars, and this settles the case, signifies "to sprinkle." The scholars, however, are not named, nor their reasons given for thus translating it, with the exception of Dr. Clarke, and all that Mr. L. gives from him is: "Does it not refer to the conjugation of the Gentile nations?" It would seem as if the Dr. was afraid to say it did, and had some fears lest it did not. I may be pardoned for preferring the opinion of the seventy learned Jewish scholars who translated the Hebrew into Greek, to that of Dr. Clarke, and who as is well known translated the Hebrew nazzeh, by the Greek thaumasontai; not by rantisontai, which they would have done had they understood the word to mean sprinkle. If Mr. L. has more faith in Dr. Clarke than in the translators of the Septuagint, so let it be.

I have shown from Parkhurst that the Hebrew nazzeh when in Hiphil form means "to cause to leap, or exult," and that, is the form of the verb in the passage under consideration. It is also defined "to leap, or spurt out, as blood from a wounded body," the consequence of which is sprinkling, but it is the act of leaping out, or spurting, which is meant, and not sprinkling, which is the consequence; and when it is defined by sprinkle, it must be clear that in such cases the meaning of the act 'to leap,' is transferred to the consequence 'to sprinkle,' in the same way that the word bapto is sometimes defined "to wet" in which case the real meaning of the word "to dip" is transferred to the consequence "to wet," which is the result of dipping.

Geo. R. Noyes, Professor of Hebrew in Harvard University, translates the Hebrew thus: "So shall many nations exult on account of him," &c., which is precisely the meaning of nazzeh as

given by Parkhurst in the Hiphil form. (See above.) Next, if the Eunuch was not reading the Hebrew, he was in all probability reading the Septuagint; for, according to Bailey, "that version was originally made for the Alexandrian library, and it had become the common version, not only in Egypt, through which the Eunuch must have passed on his way to Jerusalem, but it was the common version among the Jews themselves; and Christ and his apostles frequently quoted from it instead of from the original Hebrew." Turning then to the Septuagint we find the words are as follows: "Onto thaumasontai ethnee polla ep autou"; which may be translated, "So shall many nations wonder at him," wonder combined with joy and admiration, as in 2 Thess. i. 10, where the same word occurs, and which reads, "When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired (thaumastheenai, the infinitive form of the verb thaumazo from which thaumasontai comes) in all them that believe," &c. Both the above translations are in harmony with the context, "Behold my servant shall deal prudently, (margin, prosper) he shall be exalted, and exalted, and be very high; . . . So shall many nations wonder of exult on account of him," &c. Or to bring it a little nearer to the English version, and change the verb into the singular, "So shall he cause many nations to wonder or exult on account of him; the kings shall shut their mouths at him: for that which hath not been told them shall they see; and that which they have not heard shall they consider." Take a note of all this, Bro. C., it may help you when you come to the light by and by, and serve to teach you henceforth to "look before you leap." If you had but remembered this old caution in the compilation of your Catechism, you would not have found yourself where you are; although, strange to say, you seem to enjoy yourself in your furnace, as you are determined we shall not come to help you out.

Page 43. "The jailor was baptized by night in the prison" (Acts xvi. 24-34). This is a small error compared with some others, but it is an error nevertheless, and made, as it seems to me, to increase the difficulties of baptism. In verse 28 we read that Paul and Silas were in the prison; in verse 29 we read of the jailor going into the prison, and verse 30 that "he brought them out." And you ought to be able to see that if they were out of the prison they were not in it. Nor is that all, for even if it said they were baptized in the prison, then according to your model way of reasoning I could prove that they were not.

On page 22 of your book you seek to show that "in the river of Jordan" might have been "near to," or even "several miles away," from the river. So do you not see I could on the same ground shew that they were baptized "near to," or even "several miles away," from the prison. It is only just to say so. Nor was he baptized in his house; for after the baptism, verse 34 says, "When he had brought them into his house," &c., so that there is only one other place that I can see where he and his could be baptized, viz., in the prison yard. But even if it said they were baptized in the prison, or in the house, there is no difficulty. The Bible always tells the truth, and it is always wise to believe it. Wherever they were baptized, they were immersed.

P. 47. "It is not anywhere said in God's word that water baptism must come after believing in Christ." That is what you say; now for what the Bible says: The people "were baptized of him (John) in Jordan, confessing their sins. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them . . . bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance" Matt. iii. 6, 7, 8. In Acts xix. 4 we read, "Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus."

In the language of your friend and most able defender, Mr. Geo. W. Thompson, let me ask you, "Who are we to believe, Paul or you?" And I will also ask you can language be plainer than the above passages? shewing as clearly as it can shew that repentance and faith in Christ was demanded by John before he would baptize? And can you not