

"or rather upon a particle of the Christian faith which you and your class magnify into quite undue proportions." I need only say in reply to this, that those who know anything of Baptists, know that no denomination on this terrestrial ball magnifies it less than they; and it is because you, Bro. N., and your denomination, with most Pedobaptists of other churches, have magnified it "into quite undue proportions," that Baptists are under the necessity of saying and writing so much to bring it back to its own proper and right position as laid down in the Scriptures, from which it has been so ruthlessly wrested.

Extract 6. "When did you imbibe this passion for Baptistic controversy?—this hallucination as to the ignorance or obstinacy of all churches save your own, and your special mission for their recovery." I imbibed it, sir, since I came to Nova Scotia, and principally when reading in the *Wesleyan*, and *Wesleyan* publications, the deplorably weak arguments in favour of infant sprinkling, and against believers' baptism, and the glaring perversions of truth and misrepresentations of Baptists contained therein. But I must not enlarge, as my purpose is mainly to give extracts from your letter.

Extract 7. You, I suppose have reached the final stage of belief peculiar to your class, in imagining that you have descended direct from Christ and the Apostles. . . My dear sir, you have mistaken your calling. Christ sent you to preach the gospel to sinners" (of which "earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints" is a part, Bro. Nicolson) "while you are captivated with the delusion that the Christian churches are in danger of perishing through ignorance, and that you have essential knowledge which mankind did not possess before you were born." A piece of fine composition that, Bro. N., and which proves that you are still in the state described near the beginning of this letter.

After giving an extract from my letter about the origin and doom of infant sprinkling, which is true every word, (its origin being on precisely the same principles which you, the Editor of the *Wesleyan*, hold, viz., that under no possible circumstances must it be omitted, because of some superstitiously supposed spiritual benefits connected with it,) you say:—

Extract 8. "There are men who would characterise that language as the utterance of either a fool or a fanatic," generously adding, "I will give no such judgment." Thank you, gentle sir; but as I am by some supposed to be of the class described, I may be pardoned if I cannot see the difference between your giving such judgment yourself and getting some one else to give it for you. And if you should ever again feel disposed to call a man by such names because he tells a truth that bites, and not liking to do so openly, may you not lack the shelter of other men behind whose backs you may hide, but let it be men of substance sufficiently opaque that you will not be seen through them. I should have felt no more hurt if you had stood before the "men" you have in your mind and spoken out plainly. So you have full liberty to pound away, Bro. N., as hard and long as you like. It is nothing new for Baptists to get a little rough usage, indeed they have become quite used to it (sort of callous like); so while it may please you, it certainly does not hurt us, and if you, sir, and ten thousand more were to assail us and the truth we hold, and bring all your forces to crush us, it would be all in vain, and we would say to you:—

"Hammer away ye hostile bands Your hammers break, but the truth still stands."

"Truth, crushed to earth will rise again." "The Lord of Hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge." And although the truth we hold on this question has been suffering a long eclipse; it, like all other truths that have been crushed to the earth, will as surely rise to its primitive glory as that the sun which to-night will be lost in the darkness, will rise to-morrow to his mid-day brightness. To fight against truth Brother Nicolson is a mark of the highest folly, and those who do so must sooner or later suffer a most inglorious defeat. Brother N. be thou not among them.

Extract 9. "Yours is the highest Baptist caste. The shadow of an unbeliever falling upon your skirts is contamination; and with you, to be strictly logical,—to be thoroughly consistent,—the bulk of Christians are unbelievers—nothing more." This needs no note nor comment: a few moments will shew why you wrote it, and more of

the same nature, which I need not now quote. I hope however the above extracts will satisfy you, as I presume they are sufficient to shew the readers of the *Messenger*, the nature and spirit of your letter, and the evident disturbed state of your mind.

Well, to go on with my story; when I read your epistle I began to wonder what in the world I had said or done, or what there was in my letter to you that I should deserve all this; and why you took my lesson on fair-play (for which I charged you nothing) with such ill grace; and I why you flourished the birch rod so fiercely over my unfortunate head; and why with such dexterous skill you glided off into the communion question, and again belaboured me so mercilessly, and lashed me for forsaking the principles of Mr. Spurgeon, whom some one who knew better than I, informed you was my tutor (this being the first time I knew it), and so on; when all of a sudden I thought I could smell a red herring! "Explain yourself, sir," did I hear you say Bro. N.? Certainly, anything to oblige you. I suppose you know that in England, fox-hunting is indulged in; well, sometimes some joker will roast a red herring, and tying it to a string drag it over hill and valley for miles, and the scent of fox and red herring being somewhat alike, he succeeds in drawing off hounds and hunters in chase of the herring while the fox gets clear away.

This is just what you appear to be doing Mr. Editor, and when the day after reading your letter in the *Wesleyan* from which the above extracts are taken I received the following letter from you, I immediately found that my olfactory organs had not betrayed me, and that it was a most decided case of red herring; and I could also see most clearly why I am the object upon which you lay the whip so industriously. The letter which I now append will of course be familiar to you, and finding it to be no breach of honour to publish it, even as you published mine to Mr. Currie with a reply, I can freely insert it.—

Wesleyan Office, Halifax.

June 14th, 1878.

REV. JOHN BROWN.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have written the first of two letters this week, in the *Wesleyan* in reply to yours to me in last week's *Messenger*. You will see I have made certain statements as to your position in relation to close-communion and other matters. If you are prepared to deny any of my statements, I shall be glad to insert your letter in the *Wesleyan*. This would be but fair play. I will also apologise if my inferences as to your principles are too strongly drawn. My opinion is the opinion of many others, and we shall only be too glad if you can, in the name of your wing of the Baptist Church, shew we are wrong. Only, please come to the point or points direct.

I am, Dear Sir,
Yours truly,
A. W. NICOLSON.

There is the herring sir, there is the roasted red herring sir, as plain as the nose on your face. Is this the first time you ever attempted this sort of thing Bro. N. I fancy it must be; it does not look like the work of a practiced hand. Alas for it, you have betrayed yourself at last. Will you allow me to call your special attention to one part of this letter? It is this "You will see I have made certain statements as to your position in relation to close-communion and other matters. If you are prepared to deny any of my statements, I shall be glad to insert your letter in the *Wesleyan*. This would be fair play. Now I would ask if "this would be fair play" why was it not fair play to insert my reply to "certain statements made by Mr. Currie in the *Wesleyan*?" Are not the cases precisely parallel? It seems to me sir that you will deal fairly or otherwise as best suits your purpose. If by acting fairly by inserting my replies to Mr. Currie in the *Wesleyan* you see the danger of an exposure of the errors, falsifications, &c., of one of your prominent men, then you will not do so. On the other hand, if when exposures are made in the *Messenger*, you by acting fairly think you might succeed in drawing me off from the question at issue to something else, then you will act fairly. And as you are anxious that I should "come to the point or points direct," why is it that after all the time and labor I have spent on Mr. C. that he cannot be brought to the point or points, direct? You need not take the trouble to answer if you don't like to.

And now sir from the light that the above letters throw on your letter in the *Wesleyan*, which (N. B.) reached me the very next mail after the *Wesleyan* itself—I come to the following conclusions:

1. That your letter must have got in-

to the wrong envelope, being intended for some Rev. John Green, or other:

2. That if intended for me you must have thought I was born on the day after the thirty-first of March.

3. That you can see Mr. Currie is in a difficulty which requires your help to get him out of.

4. That drawing a red herring across the track is not the way to do it.

5. That in your letter in the *Wesleyan* of June 15th you say some very hard and severe things which you do not really mean, in order to prepare the way for, and with the intention of writing, the above letter.

6. That by saying those hard things and making statements which it would be quite easy to refute, (and which I would under other circumstances, but I don't care to chase a r—d h—g), and then right on the back of it,—your letter reaching me the day after the *Wesleyan*; making me the offer to reply in said paper, you seek to tempt me off the track to discuss the communion and other matters, with the hope that the lexicon question might get shelved.

7. That this subtil endeavour on your part to lead me away from the question in hand is to me at least, an admission on your part that Mr. Currie's case has become desperate, and well nigh hopeless.

8. That Solomon was right when he said "Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird."

9. That Burns was also right when he said "The best laid plans of mice and men, gang aft agley."

And as to what your opinion and that of many others concerning my views of communion may be, you and they are perfectly welcome to such opinion; and as you are so very anxious to have my views on communion, I shall be most happy to give them on condition that you will first prevail on Mr. Currie to answer my question, whether he has falsified the lexicons or not. I shall not however accept your kind offer to insert it in the *Wesleyan*; if you should think fit to copy them (which you will not)—all well; Meanwhile I will give you one of my views on the close-communion question, which is this, that all this outcry against close-communion and on behalf of open-communion amounts to just this—"Endorse our sprinkling." I may say more by and by perhaps on this subject, whether Mr. C. reply to my question or not, but at present I think it best to have the lexicon business finished first.

To your second letter (*Wesleyan* June 22nd) which deals largely with the communion and other matters, and written in the same spirit and for the same purpose, as the first, and like that, sweetly innocent of the lexicon question—I need not now reply. One or two points however deserve notice. Your first sentence is "Few will understand my reasons in thus addressing you." Likely enough, but I hope by this time a good many will understand your reasons.

You misrepresent me when after making certain strange statements you say "at length you write your 'Open Letters' to both Mr. Currie and myself."

You know well enough that the first "Open Letter" came from Mr. Currie in answer to a letter I sent him privately to which I expected a private answer, and my "Open Letter" to you would not have been written, if you had acted an honourable part. If you felt chafed you have yourself to thank; and if, as you say, "it is really pitiable that so much valuable time and space should be given up to this water question" then let the blame, if blame there be, rest on Mr. Currie, for if he had just answered my question in the way I asked it you would have been spared so much pain as you seem to feel, and the time and space might have been otherwise occupied. You say next "You have succeeded in waking up both of us." Yes, and I am glad of it, and I fancy that by this time you both wish you had remained asleep. You must be either asleep now, or blind, if you cannot see this. You then add "Well do the results correspond with your expectations." This sentiment I heartily endorse. Indeed my highest expectations are realised, and it is you sir that I have to thank for shewing me that my conclusion regarding Mr. C.'s treatment of the lexicons was correct. Bro. N. do the results of your red herring letter correspond with your expectations? And don't you think you had better let the baptismal question alone till you get more light on it?

You say again "You have a special hankering after Methodist converts, and this is the reason that controversy with you is confined almost exclusively

to Methodist polemics." My good Sir, if I desired to make Methodist converts, then to assail Methodist views of baptism would be my last resort to do so. No, I confine myself almost exclusively to Methodist polemics because in your paper, the *Wesleyan*, and in Methodist publications of a similar character I have read the most astonishingly weak and foolish arguments to justify infant sprinkling—I have ever read anywhere; it's a fact, sir. Never, never, have I read such phantasmagorical nonsensicalities as have appeared in various works from some of the writers of your denomination. Such subtleties, perversions, and misrepresentations, so far as I know are pretty much confined to Methodist works on baptism. I would like just now did space permit to give a few specimens. The remarkable Catechism I have frequently referred to, and your letters would provide a large supply. You again say "I have myself, on several occasions, been recalled from distant places to guard the tender lambs from one who was not their shepherd." Why not say from wolves at once? Surely your body is to be congratulated that they possess one at least who is able to protect the Methodist lambs from Baptist wolves. And surely your denomination is to be condoled that the various shepherds have been so badly trained that they cannot protect these "tender lambs." Would you mind publishing a specimen or two of the letters or despatches calling you to the rescue, and you may at the same time just tell us whether you have to bear your own travelling expenses on these missions of mercy and love?

There are many more matters to which I might refer but my space is already more than filled, and besides it being so clear that you have written just to induce me to reply, I don't feel like answering everything you say, or I might fill the *Messenger*. So now having followed you around a little, I will swing back to my old moorings and ask you again, "Has Mr. Currie falsified the lexicons on pages 12 and 13 of his Catechism?" If you cannot, or will not answer, then let some one of your learned brethren do so; surely some of them are in a position to know, and if in a position to know, they are in a position to answer. What means this painfully protracted silence? I have now just opened Grove's Lexicon, Edition 1835 at the word *rantizo*, the definitions given being "to wet, besprinkle, purify." Now if any person were to say that Grove does not give wet, or besprinkle, or purify, as a definition of that word, and that I had falsified that lexicon, would it not be a very simple thing for me or any one else who had a copy of that lexicon to shew that the definitions given by me are precisely the same as those given by Grove? I ask then if the definitions of *baptizo* as given by Mr. Currie be the definitions as given by the lexicons he names, which has been denied over and over again; why is it that neither he nor any one else has spoken one solitary word in justification of his conduct. Why if he has quoted correctly has no one stood up in his defence? For the simple reason dear Sir, that no one has a word to say in his defence. He has falsified the lexicons, and the Bible too, and you and your brethren seeing you cannot defend him, do the next best, or worst thing, namely, so far as that matter is concerned—stand speechless. Yours truly,
Paradise. J. BROWN.

The Christian Messenger.

Halifax, N. S., July 10, 1878.

THE MISSIONARY MAGAZINE for June contains several articles which will interest quite a number of our readers. We copy the following:

THE FIRST KAREN JUBILEE.

BY REV. C. H. CARPENTER, BASSEIN, BURMAH.

It may not be out of place to remind the friends of missions in America that the 16th of May, 1878, is the fiftieth anniversary of the baptism of the first Karen disciple baptized by Boardman, —Kothahbyoo, who by his untiring zeal and success until his death, twelve years after, earned the title of "the Karen apostle." This semi-centennial will be observed, it is hoped, by the Karen Christians throughout Burmah. Will not their friends in America unite with them in the earnest prayer that the second half of the first century of their evangelization may witness far greater progress and more glorious ingatherings than the first?

All may not know that Kothahbyoo

was a Bassein Karen, born in the Kyonk-khyoung-galay region in the village of Ootwan. His widow, the second wife, and only surviving son are still living, members of the Baptist church at Kan-kan-pgah. I made it in my way to visit them last year. From them and others well acquainted with Kothahbyoo I learned that the statement made in his memoir by the venerated Dr. Ripley, that he was a robber and a cruel murderer, is a mistaken one. The true version of the story is said to be this:—

When Kothahbyoo was a young man, he lived with an uncle to whom he was much attached. During his absence a band of some thirty dacoits [banditti] surrounded the house, and killed and beheaded his uncle, in order to get his remarkably long hair. When the young man heard of it, he at once pursued them. He fell upon them at night when they were asleep, and killed several of them with their own daks. After this his aunt did not dare to receive him: so he went to live with a Burman priest near Bassein, and there learned to read. Afterwards he became a famous boxer, and went to Ava. In an encounter with three of the king's best boxers, he killed two of them with his fists, and the third ran away. This gave him a great name at the capital, where he remained in the king's employ for a time. He afterwards returned to Lower Burmah, where he became a debtor slave, and was redeemed, as related in his memoir.

One of the facts most distinctly remembered by his native brethren is the length and fervency of his prayers. It was his custom, before entering a village to preach, to stop at a retired spot, and spend an hour or two in earnest prayer. He was almost equally long in leading the devotions of others; and on this account it was difficult to get the younger preachers to follow him in preaching tours. It is hardly doubtful that much of his success was due to his prayerfulness. Would that the Spirit of God would choose and qualify a hundred Kothahbyoos from the young men now in our churches and schools, and send them forth for aggressive work among the heathen Karen and Ka-Khyens, the Shans and Burmans, of this dark land!

We hope to celebrate this semi-centennial on the 16th of next May by a grand mass-meeting of Karens in our new building, which may perhaps be dedicated on that day as "The Kothahbyoo Memorial Hall." We shall endeavor to complete our building fund of Rs. 40,000 before that day, and also raise ample means for the prosecution of the Ka-Khyen mission. These two events—the vigorous commencement of the Ka-Khyen mission by the Bassein Karens, and the equipment of our school with ample permanent buildings without foreign aid—will not be an unworthy commemoration of the first Karen jubilee.

The following notice of Rev. Mr. George and his labors will also have many interested readers:

"PRAY FOR US."—Rev. Mr. George a missionary in Burmah, laboring apart among the Burmese at Zeegong, begs to be remembered in prayer. In a recent letter to the Secretary of the Union, he says, "You are surrounded with warm religious influences, and you must know that even there the flesh is weak. Our only help is perhaps a wife overburdened with sick children and native visitors. I have asked you more than once to urge your church to pray for us here. We are not Americans, and no one thinks of us. The churches in the British Provinces have their own missions to pray for. I hope you will ask your church to pray for us." Mr. George and his wife expected at first to enter the foreign mission service under the auspices of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions in the British Marine Provinces, but decided to connect themselves with the missions of the Union, and were associated for some time with the late Rev. Mr. Crawley. Since Mr. Crawley's death, these earnest and successful laborers have been toiling alone. We bespeak for them the prayers of the brethren.

HOPEFUL.—Rev. Mr. George, to whom reference is made in another paragraph, writes Treasurer Smith as follows: "There are many things which encourage us, and we hope God is with us to direct and control. During a trip of ten days we found fourteen Burmans who seemed to be anxious inquirers. The time will surely come when the Burmans will listen to the gospel. Oh for more men to preach the gospel to the heathen!" There is much coming to light in this our oldest foreign mission-field to inspire the belief that the time is fast drawing near for a more general and cordial reception of the gospel by the Burmans. There has been much and faithful work done for Burmah since the day Dr. Judson entered that country; and, as he frequently and confidently predicted, we may speedily see Burmah turning away from its idolatry, to worship God.