

# The Christian Messenger.

A RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL FAMILY NEWSPAPER.

NEW SERIES.  
Vol. XXIII., No. 28.

Halifax, Nova Scotia, Wednesday, July 10, 1878.

WHOLE SERIES.  
Vol. XLII., No. 28.

## Poetry.

For the Christian Messenger.

### The Green Herb and the Ripened Corn.

Psalm. xxxvii. 2. Job v. 26.

'Tis morn, and self-reliant,  
The Green Herb proudly stands;  
Nor heeds the shining sickle,  
Borne in the reaper's hands;  
Till, by one swift stroke severed,  
It lies low at his feet;  
And soon its verdure withers,  
'Neath noon-tide's scorching heat.

'Tis thus the wicked flourish;  
And dream not of the hour,  
When Justice shall deprive them,  
Of all their boasted power,  
The glittering sword is whetted,  
To lay the rebels low;  
Their haughty hopes shall perish  
'Neath the avenging blow.

'Tis eve, the west'ring sunlight,  
Floods earth, and sea, and sky;  
In golden beauty waving,  
The Ripened Corn stands high,  
Just waiting till the reaper  
With shining blade shall come;  
The precious grain to gather,  
And shout the harvest home.

So with the earnest Christian:  
Life's ling'ring sunset rays,  
Gleam brightly on the fruitage  
Of many well-spent days,  
And soon the last glad summons  
Shall call him hence to stand  
Within the Heavenly Garner,  
Safe with the ransomed band.

June 24th, 1878.

## Religious.

For the Christian Messenger.

### Baptism in the Greek Church.

My Dear Sir,—

A letter appears in the *Wesleyan* of June 22, in which the Rev. D. D. Currie maintains that "the Greek Church baptizes infants by sprinkling."

I compare that statement with Dean Stanley's assertion, that the "original form" of baptism was "complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters";—to which he adds, "to this form the Eastern Church still adheres; and the most illustrious and venerable portion of it, that of the Byzantine Empire, absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid." (Lectures on the Eastern Church, p. 29.)

I compare it also with the following passage from "the Longer Catechism of the Eastern Church":

"What is most essential in the administration of baptism?"

"Trine immersion in water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (Schaff's *Catechism of Christendom*, vol. II. p. 491.)

Mr. Currie refers to several Greek authors, but as he gives no quotations, his affirmations are useless. We want to know, not only what Clement or Origen said, but where they said it—in what connection—and in what words.

One instance seems to be an exception, Mr. Currie says: "Delingius, as quoted in Booth's *Pado-baptism Examined*, says:—"The Greeks at this day practice sprinkling."

Fortunately, Mr. Booth's work is in my library. We turn to vol. II, p. 239, and we find, not Mr. Currie's extract, but the following passage:—"The Greeks retain the rite of immersion to this day, as Jeremiah the Patriarch of Constantinople declares."

We do not say who falsified this quotation; but it is falsified.

In Booth's first volume, p. 194, we meet with the following passage from Delingius: "So long as the apostles lived, as many believe, immersion only was used; to which afterwards, perhaps, they added a kind of pouring, such as the Greek practice at this day, having performed the trine immersion." That is, the children having undergone the trine immersion, ordained by the Church, a supplementary ceremony was invented, a kind of family party, called,

but wrongly, by the same name, (baptism), and mistaken for it by some of the guests (not Greeks) But the pouring, or sprinkling, or whatever other form was observed, was not baptism, nor would it be so considered by any Greek. Baptism, in the Greek Church, is threefold immersion—nothing less.

J. M. C.

July 2, 1878.

For the Christian Messenger  
Open Letters on Baptism.

REPLY NO. VI.

REV. D. D. CURRIE, METHODIST MINISTER, MONCTON, N. B.—

MY DEAR BROTHER.—Your letters No. vii. viii. ix. are before me, and while occupying about six columns, you have, as I expected you would, kept very clear of the question of falsification. The question is "Have you falsified the lexicons?" and that is the question you profess to answer, but do not. I shall therefore finish this letter briefly. Your attempt by writing on other matters to draw me away from the question will prove in vain, and as I said in my last, if it were the question of baptism I should be happy to discuss it with you as fully as you please (that is with you, not Dr. Ditzler), but as it is not, I shall stand at my post and not be tempted away from it. You may write on other matters as much and as long as you please, but I shall not follow you, but watch you closely till you finish, to get your reply to my question about the lexicons; as you promised in your letter to me of May 7th, to give "as frankly as possible, a comprehensive reply to the letter sent" to you. And now as I want to address a few lines to the Editor of the *Wesleyan* you will I am sure excuse me saying more to you at present, and allow me to remain.

Yours, &c.,

J. BROWN.

Paradise, June, 18, 1877.

P. S. Don't lose sight of the postscript in my last. Hurry along with the editions of your lexicons, I'm getting dreadfully impatient. I have names and dates all waiting. Do come along now, you would not like to be in my place, would you? having to wait so long. But I suppose I must be patient.

For the Christian Messenger.

Open Letter to the Editor of the *Wesleyan*.

REV. A. W. NICOLSON.

MY DEAR SIR,—You still fail to see how the *Witness* gave the Presbyterian brother and myself liberty and fair play. I will try once more to show you. While we were discussing the subject of baptism in that paper, it gave both the fullest liberty to say all we wished; that was liberty; and when the Editor wished the discussion to be discontinued on both sides: shewing no favour to either by inserting one side only, that was fair play. Do you see now, Bro. Nicolson? Your excuse for inserting only one side because of a "previous arrangement" with you, is thinner than that for not inserting my reply to Mr. Currie. I wonder if I had made a "previous arrangement" whether mine would have also appeared. I had thought that a "previous arrangement" on your part with what is just, upright, and straight forward, without any arrangement of mine, would have been sufficient. If you cannot see through it now, I must give you up: with tearless eyes I say it, I give you up. But you know what justice and fair play is well enough, and the truth of the matter I presume is, you don't want Mr. Currie's falsehoods to be exposed in your paper, nor your readers to see what can be said in defence of believer's baptism as opposed to your views. Your considerateness in giving Mr. Currie large space because you are "anxious to get Mr. Brown off the gridiron" is very touching, I only wish I had the capacity for appreciating your kindness. It is so very consider-

ate of you, it is; I hope you won't burn your fingers in your kind endeavour, and when you have got me off, of your charity do try to get our dear friend and brother Currie off too.

You say you must be excused "for doubting still whether the *Messenger* or *Visitor* would publish Mr. Currie's letter under any circumstances." You only doubt it, you are not sure; but suppose you knew they would not, that would not justify you in the slightest. Three wrongs would not make a right. If however you wish Mr. Currie's letter to appear in a Baptist publication, you know how to accomplish it. You have read I presume the June number of the *Bible Index* (which I guess you wish had never been born) as you give a quotation from it in the *Wesleyan* of June 15th. The Editor says:—"If Mr. Currie will give the question which we have raised, some attention at once, we will then be ready to print his general attack on immersion in our paper, provided that he will secure a place for our reply in the *Wesleyan*." There you are Bro. N., a fine opportunity is now offered you. In September last, ten months ago! an offer was made to Mr. Currie or any of his ministerial brethren to explain his conduct with reference to the lexicons; yet in the June number the Editor says, "Not one has yet undertaken to explain." He again asks "Is there a *Methodist* paper in America possessed of sufficient courage to allow an exposure of Mr. Currie's spurious definitions to appear in its columns?" "We tried" he continues "to get the *Christian Guardian* of this city (Toronto) to tell us whether Mr. Currie quoted the lexicons correctly or not, but we failed, and we still expect to fail in this."

In passing let me ask you, dear sir, why this solemn silence, if Mr. Currie is innocent? In the language of the *Index* I will ask you an honest question, Have you any idea of the grandeur of the man who dares to testify even to his own hurt? Besides are you not yourself convinced and satisfied that Mr. Currie has falsified those lexicons? If you are, and you still defend, and shield, and shelter him as if he had not; instead of coming out nobly and manfully and stating the truth of the case, then your conduct is in perfect keeping with the doctrine of falling from grace, and that very low too, and you aid and abet him in his falsifications. You say in the last issue June 15th, "It is lamentable that so much time and valuable space must be given up to this water question." Why my good sir it is your own doing, did you not yourself tell your readers some time ago (*Wesleyan* May 4.) that there was a call for something on the question, and that a series of articles would shortly appear? and did you not advise the *Visitor* and *Messenger* to provide double supplies of heavy ammunition because of a tremendous bombardment that was sending its first monitory breathings through the air? And now you try to throw the fault, if fault it be, on to me, and speak of it as "lamentable." Yes Bro. N. it is lamentable that so much time and space should be given up to propagate such errors, false doctrines, and falsehoods as you sustain Mr. Currie in doing. May both you and he live long enough to see your errors and repent. You also say "there is no possible method of sustaining the reputation of our ministers for integrity and common sense, but by meeting, and thoroughly mastering these assailants." Oh yes there is, and that a very simple one too, it is only for some one to write over his own name the definitions of the word *baptizo* as given by Mr. Currie, and from the same editions as he copied them from, provided that such editions exist. That is surely a simple thing to do. Can not you sir as a learned man throw some light on the matter? Have you no means of discovering the truth of this business? Is there no Methodist minister in Nova Scotia, nor Canada who has access to the lexicons in question? or are they so disinterested that they do not care to investigate it? Is the question whether Mr. Currie has quoted falsely or not, of such little con-

sequence that no one of his many brethren cares to look into it? When will the man who cares more for truth than denominational prejudice lift his voice and say, "Mr. Currie has falsified the lexicons?" I ask you dear sir one or two more questions:—Has Mr. Currie proven himself innocent of the charge laid against him? If he has, name the copy or copies of the *Wesleyan* where it is to be found. If he has not, why is it? You imply that Mr. Currie's second and third letters were answers to the charge made, and ask some one to send those letters to the Editor of the *Index* (which I may inform you in passing were in his hands before your request was made); will you let us know in what part of those letters he answers the questions put to him? You know sir, you know well, that he has not as yet touched the question, while you make it appear to your readers as if he had answered it, and I venture to say that as yet no one who has read Mr. C.'s letters in the *Wesleyan* could say he has, but I strongly fear that every reader, and they are not few, is before this, convinced, that the charge made against Mr. Currie by the *Bible Index* of Toronto, has not yet been denied by him, but that he is guilty. I would rather far, and I say it most sincerely, that Mr. C. could have cleared himself at once. I have not the slightest desire to expose a minister of the gospel before the public, no, the Lord knows it, I would rather shield him if consistent with righteousness, but when a case of falsehood so distinct as this in hand, and when it is proved so clearly, and yet the author thereof stands to his falsehoods, and is aided and abetted by a man in such a position as you occupy, it makes me all the more determined to expose it. Lying books no less than "lying lips are an abomination unto the Lord, but they that deal truly are his delight," and that Mr. Currie's book comes under that head is sadly, sadly apparent.

It was my purpose to point out a number of errors and perversions in Mr. C.'s book in addition to those which have already appeared but for the present I shall refrain, considering that what has already come to light is sufficient to shew that the book is not to be depended on, besides, being little less disagreeable to me to expose them than for him to read them. Yet if needs be I am prepared to go on and prove beyond question or doubt that Catechism contains falsehood, misrepresentation and terrible perversion of the Word of God. Its circulation will no doubt continue in spite of the exposures made, but certainly those who circulate it and teach from its pages if they know of its errors are profoundly to be pitied.

Yours, &c.,

J. BROWN.

P. S. I will attend to your letter to me in last *Wesleyan* (June 15th) next time, as I want to see your second letter before I reply. I may then answer both at once.

Open Letter to the Editor of the *Wesleyan*.

Paradise July 1, 1878.

MY DEAR SIR,—Your two letters addressed to me are at hand, to which, in part, I beg leave to reply. In your first (*Wesleyan* June 15th.) you take me to task most roundly, and use the cat-o-nine-tails most lustily on my poor back till I am in a maze to know what dreadful thing I have done to deserve such severe chastisement. If I were the animal which you seem to think me, it would be a case for the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Before I am through however, it may be seen why I am the object of such severe castigation, and what I have done to deserve such a whipping.

At the end of your first letter you say, "Perhaps you can persuade the *Messenger* to copy my letters, since you blame me for not inserting yours." If you could shew the cases to be parallel, there would be some reason in what you say; and if I did persuade the *Messenger* to copy them, you may depend upon it

it would tell terribly against both you and Mr. Currie, as will be seen by and by, for it is pretty evident that both you and he are strenuously endeavouring to evade the question in hand. I will however, if it be any gratification to you, give a few extracts and afterwards we may see why you whip me so vigorously, assuring you dear sir, that if the *Messenger* inserted both your letters, and that from the light which I hope to throw upon them, you would wish most heartily it had not, but I will have some mercy and give only a small part, and if necessary I may make some further extracts another time.

Extract 1. "Your name, some months ago, came to the surface, through persistent letter-writing in the *Messenger*, and again by a reckless newspaper encounter with one of the first thinkers in the Province. Up to that time we poor Provincialists were in utter ignorance of your existence. Since that time, few who had eyes for denominational weekly literature have been permitted to wink you ought of sight."

This suggests to me that, dear sir, you are in a state of what is sometimes described as "high dudgeon." Drive on.

Extract 2. "The North and South had a dreadful war over their John Brown; we by the Eastern seaboard are now in the midst of ours." I thought it was over Rev. D. D. Currie and the lexicons. However, I can only say that if you dispose of your John Brown as they did of theirs, you may take my word for it that of this one as of that it may be said, or sung if preferred, "And his soul goes marching on."

Extract 3. "This energy of letter writing now going on directed to you, is due to something more than your mere name, character, abilities, or sentiments." That is so, Mr. N., that is so, THAT IS SO, and among other things, it is due to the fact that the Rev. D. D. Currie a minister of the Gospel, has falsified certain Greek lexicons, and both he and you seek to draw off attention from that fact by launching out into a variety of other topics. This will become clearer before I finish.

Extract 4. "Behind you there is a brotherhood, pious and sincere, in the majority of instances inoffensive and charitable. . . . You are in danger of imagining you have reached importance, whereas you are but a mere figurehead." Brother Nicholson, Brother Nicholson! "Friend I thank thee for that word," as Shakespeare would say, and I will tell you that I would rather be the "mere figurehead" of the Baptist brotherhood you describe, than the whole hull of a denomination that upholds the unscriptural dogma of infant sprinkling, calling it an ordinance of God, and connecting therewith some, as yet, unexplained and unexplainable benefits, and in some cases eternal life itself; or endorses by its circulation of the Rev. D. D. Currie's Catechism, the doctrine that "baptism is the true door of the kingdom of heaven," and that "by affusion the purification of both the bodies and the souls of men is accomplished" (See Catechism pages 119 & 92) besides a number of glaring falsehoods, and perversions of the Word of God, and daring misrepresentations of a brotherhood which you speak so highly of, my unfortunate self excepted. And I here sir, charge you, most calmly and most solemnly, and all who with you patronize and circulate that Catechism knowing as you do by this time, something of its contents, not a tithe of which has been to my knowledge, as yet made known, with upholding, sustaining and defending what you know, or ought to know, is not true, and in opposition to the commonest principles of our religion. I tell you again sir; that Catechism is a tremendous mistake, and I venture to predict that sooner or later it will prove more damaging to your denomination than you have as yet dreamed of.

Extract 5. "Brother Currie is engaged upon your creed," (and you might have added "in raising a great dust to blind the public eye from the charge of falsehoods brought against him,")