

The Christian Messenger.

A RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL FAMILY NEWSPAPER.

NEW SERIES.
Vol. XXIII., No. 24.

Halifax, Nova Scotia, Wednesday, June 12, 1878.

WHOLE SERIES.
Vol. XLII., No. 24.

Poetry.

For the Christian Messenger.
June.

June with its genial air,
The sight and odor of blossoms fair
The violets and emerald grass,
Dandelion blooms a golden mass,
Pure white heralds of strawberry feasts,
And cherry trees clad like surprised priests.

Down, where the rapid stream,
Pauses under the bridge to dream,
And cool itself in the grateful shade,
By the great planks and girders made,
Er'e it is yellowed by burning glare
Of the noon-day sun with cloudless stare.

Comes the bleating of sheep,
And of lambs that would keep,
With their dams being washed in the river,
Or struggling out with a shake and a shiver.

While distant flocks the chorus increases,
Coming to purge their winter grimed fleeces.

The birds, and morn, and eve,
Fill the sweet air with songs that weave
With chattering shrill note that tells
Where homesteads lie, and with tinkling bells,
And low of impatient kine, and with voices
Of teaming life that in June rejoices.

And grateful hearts arise,
In the great chorus willing to the skies,
Of praise for God's mercies and for life,
And Spring, with radiant beauty rife,
If now so lovely, this I fain would know
What greater beauty sinless earth might shew.

E. S. C.

Religious.

For the Christian Messenger.

Open Letters on Baptism.

REPLY NO. II.

PARADISE N. S.,
May 24th, 1878.

Rev. D. D. Currie.—

DEAR BROTHER,—In your second letter to me in the *Wesleyan* May 18th, you say that the *Toronto Index* and *Christian Visitor* affirm that the meaning of *baptizo*, as given in your Catechism are not correct, and that it has seemed extremely strange to you that respectable Baptist periodicals should make so erroneous an assertion. I understand those papers to say that you do not quote *certain* lexicons correctly, and while you say that "not one statement was made in the Catechism of Baptism without the most positive assurance that its positions, on the points under discussion, were absolutely impregnable;" it has seemed extremely strange to me "that in neither of your letters you have cleared yourself of the charge, or shewn in the slightest degree that the positions are impregnable, beyond the bare assertion that they are so. If the assertion be erroneous, why do you not shew it to be so? You have only to take the ten lexicons you name on pages 12 and 13 of your Catechism, and give under the word *baptizo* (copying carefully from the lexicons) the words given as definitions of its meaning. In my last I said I had seen Grove's Lexicon and that he did not give *sprinkle*; you say he does. Since that I have seen those of Schluesener, Schrevelius, and Hedericus, and neither of these give it; you say they do.

The writer in the *Index* when he said not one of those lexicons (those named in your Catechism) gave *sprinkle* as a definition of *baptizo*, he also said: "I am responsible for this denial, I make it with the definition of said lexicons before my eyes," and concludes, "In behalf of every honest heart, that is now deceived by such statements; in behalf of the integrity of the ordinance involved; in behalf of the authority of Him whom all should love to obey, do we call upon the Pedobaptist ministry to give this matter their earnest and

early attention." If this writer be incorrect why has not some one shewn him to be so? Surely in the Methodist Church there are men enough who are able to test the assertion, yet I do not know that any such attempt has been made. You must be very friendly indeed, if you have been so much wronged that no one will venture a word in your defence. And if you have not been wronged, and what the *Index* says be correct, viz: that you falsify the testimony of every lexicon from which you quote," to which you by your silence appear to plead guilty; and if others knowing this, publish and circulate your Catechism: are not you and they alike chargeable with upholding as true what has been proved to be false?

I hope for your own honour, and that of the denomination to which you belong, that you will lose no more time before you make it clear that the ten you name are lexicographers, and that they give the meaning of *baptizo* which you say they do.

You say that "different editions of lexicons of the same author give different meanings of the word, and that in some instances different copies of the same edition give different meanings." This seems to me to be your only refuge, and I shall be glad for your sake (I shall indeed) if it transpire that the lexicons you quote from, and give the definitions of *baptizo*, which you say they do, are different editions from those which the writer in the *Index* had before him. This may be done very easily. I shall write to the *Index* today, and ask what editions the writer had, and you can either privately or through the *Wesleyan*, name your editions, and we can soon settle the matter. I don't think you can object to this proposal. If, however, it should come to pass that you have falsified those lexicons and they instead of giving *sprinkle* or *pour* as meanings of *baptizo*, give *immerse* or some equivalent word, we then leave what you pronounce "the best Greek lexicons" giving what Baptists hold as the meaning of the word in question, and not what Pedobaptists contend for as its meaning. Take care Brother Currie that you do not pull down your own house on your own head.

You also make the following statements:—"Lexicographers and publishers it appears, strange though it may be, desire to make money out of the sales of their books. . . . Baptists will not patronize those publishers whose lexicons give the offensive words "pour upon," and "sprinkle" as meanings of *baptizo*." "Lexicons therefore have been so changed as to suit the scruples of Baptist preachers, and thus secure a wider market." In reply I beg to say, "That Baptists only shew their good sense in not buying such lexicons as give such meanings of *baptizo*; for no lexicon worth buying would give such meanings to that word, any more than they would *dip*, *immerse*, or plunge as the meanings of *cheo*, to *pour*, or *rantizo*, to *sprinkle*."

2. You seem to have solved the mystery why all Greek lexicons of any note do not give "pour upon" or "sprinkle" as definitions of *baptizo*, namely,—Love of money on the part of the publishers and lexicographers, and "to suit the scruples of Baptist preachers."

3. If they give the above words as meanings of *baptizo*, which, according to you they ought to, then Baptists will not buy their lexicons, so rather than not have a good sale for their books they withhold the true meaning of a certain word, and give it a false meaning to please the Baptists and make money!

4. What a set of rogues you make these men out to be.

5. Would you stand up in an assembly of intelligent men and make that statement?

Alas! Mr. Currie your reasoning is as lame as a little dog I saw the other day which lost one of his legs in a trap; and I am afraid you have got yourself into a trap in which you will lose both yours, and then you will have nothing left to stand upon.

But were you serious when you penned those remarks? Do you really mean to say that publishers, lexicographers and theologians would descend to eat dirt in the fashion you describe them? Brother Currie, listen a moment, I want to tell you something:—You know that all lexicons of any note are against you, and instead of accepting the meaning they give of *baptizo*, you brand both publishers and lexicographers as dishonest men, because they give the honest meaning of that word, and not what you think they ought to give. And here I ween another mystery is solved, namely, why it is you give "sprinkle" as a meaning of "baptizo" in quoting the lexicons: they do not give that meaning, but they ought to, and as they ought to but do not, you do it for them. Is not that pretty nearly correct Bro. C.? You say "The lexicons, though important, are human productions (that's so) and their utterances are to be cautiously received." You might have added "when they define *baptizo*." If, however, we cannot go to the Greek lexicons for the meanings of Greek words then where are we to go? And if they are to be "cautiously received," what meaneth the question on page 12 in your Catechism, "How do you ascertain the classical meaning of the word *baptizo*?" and the answer "By the best lexicons of the Greek language." Do you not perceive that you are getting deeper into the mire the more you try to get out? The greater part of your letter in which you try to shew that Liddell and Scott's lexicon has been tampered with is altogether aside from the subject in hand, which is, whether you have tampered with certain lexicons, and consequently all you say on that subject is pointless, and even if you could prove that it has been, that will not help you in the least. It would be bad enough to tamper with one, but what shall be said of the man who treats ten in that way, and manufactures two of them? All you say, quoting from the Graves-Ditzler debate, to shew that Baptists manipulated Liddell and Scott's lexicon to suit their purpose, is shattered to a thousand fragments by Dr. Graves' reply to Dr. Ditzler (who made the charge) in pages 527-529 of the same work. It is too long to transcribe here, and surely you could not have read that when you wrote letter number two, or if you had, you appear to have ignored, or conveniently forgotten it. So the points drawn therefrom are quite pointless. May I suggest to you the wisdom of not quoting from that debate, for I can quote also, and as Dr. Graves so completely extinguished Dr. Ditzler: so also could my quotations from him extinguish yours from Dr. D.

You misrepresent the *Index* and *Visitor* when you ask me if I do not "see that it is very easy for Baptists to say that they have Liddell and Scott, and all the great scholars, and a host of others besides, who give the rendering you (Baptists) need for *baptizo* and not one of whom, 'absolutely not one' gives *sprinkle* or *pour*." That is not what those papers said, and you ought to know it; what they said was, that not one of the lexicons you name in your Catechism gives that meaning. You speak of the Baptist Denomination as issuing a mutilated edition of the English Bible, because they translated the word *baptizo* by *immerse*. If King James' translators had done their duty they would have done the same thing. They knew well the meaning of the word, otherwise why do we find that in the Episcopal prayer book now in use (revised in 1660) that the Priest is to dip the child in the water, and while doing so, saying, I baptize thee &c? Nay, Nay my good brother the Bible Union's translation of that word is a most faithful one, and the translators thereof were unfettered in their work, and therefore did their duty: King James' translators were fettered, and therefore instead of translating the word by *dip* or *immerse*, by which they would have offended the king, or by *sprinkle*, by which they would have offended their conscience:—they transferred the word instead of translating it. The Bible Union translated the word instead

of transferring it. If because of this you pronounce their Bible a mutilated one, I ask you, Is the Septuagint a mutilated edition of the Hebrew Scriptures because the seventy learned Jews translated the Hebrew word *tabal* in 2 Kings v. 14 by "baptizo?" and the English translators by "dip?" And would not the term be more applicable if they had left the word untranslated?

Is the German a mutilated edition because it translates the word *baptizo* by *taufen* which means to dip, or immerse? Will you name an untransliterated edition that translates it by *pour*, or *sprinkle*?

Will the day ever come when the Methodists or any other Pedobaptist Church will issue such an edition?

Would you or any other learned member of the denomination to which you belong if asked to send a translation of Mark, xvi. 16 to the *Wesleyan* or any other religious paper render it "He that believeth and is sprinkled &c," or Rom. 6. 4. by "Buried with him by sprinkling?"

You say that "so far as such a partisan book can, it unchristianises all Christians who are not immersionists." To this I reply:—

1. If a man is a Christian, no man can unchristianize him.
2. We do not hold nor teach that a man becomes a Christian by being baptized, which in your catechism you labour hard to prove we do.
3. We do hold that no person has been baptized who has not been immersed.
4. Whatever consequences may follow persons not being baptized, rests with them, and not with us.

You say we have issued mutilated lexicons adapted to the necessities of our creed. I was about to describe that assertion; take the will for the deed. In the former part of your letter you say that publishers and lexicographers did it to "suit the scruples of Baptist preachers, and thus secure a wider market." Which statement are we to believe? Are the Baptist preachers of the latter part of your letter and the publishers and lexicographers of the former part identical? "Mutilated lexicons," say you "are probably now in every college and academy in the land. Why should not mutilated lexicons that do not favour sprinkling or pouring be as plentiful as mutilated Bibles that teach immersion?" From this then it appears:—

1. That it is probable that in every college and academy in the land there are lexicons that do not favour sprinkling or pouring. Good for both college and academy say I.
2. That Baptists have been dishonest enough to mutilated lexicons and have succeeded in getting such lexicons into said institutions.
3. That the tutors of such institutions must be very verdant not to have made that discovery.
4. That Baptists have a much larger influence over the said institutions than they ever dreamed of.

But now brother Currie as you have made this discovery, do you not think it is your duty to write to the tutors of these institutions and tell them what a trick the Baptists have played them?

Have they found their way into Methodist colleges and academies? Then I should hope as you have made the matter public through the recognized organ of that body that they will very soon be extirpated, or you could suggest to the various tutors and students that as their lexicons are in a mutilated condition by not having *sprinkle* as a meaning of *baptizo*, they write it on the margin, or scratch out *immerse* and write *sprinkle* in its place. The thing is very simply done, and should be attended to at once.

You tell me that "so long as the Baptist denomination accepts and approves mutilating tactics in this theological controversy, you, (that is I) am not likely to be delivered from the thralldom of doctrinal error."

"Mutilating tactics"! Is it the author of a Catechism of Baptism that thus writes, if so then he should be the last man in the world to present the

charge. Mutual recrimination is most unpleasant, but I have charges of this very nature against you my erring brother, not however, of mutilating lexicons merely which are human, but the word of God which is divine; and had it not been for this correspondence some of your work would have been brought to light before this: charges which should you live to the age of Methu-elah you would not be able to refute or gainsay.

To your Catechism I refer. And as regards the "doctrinal error" of believers' immersion, I would that no greater error ever afflicted the church than that; a lesser never did; and as to the thralldom never was a man more content therein, or feel more gloriously free than

Yours &c.,
J. BROWN.

For the Christian Messenger.

Our Foreign Missions.

No. 5. CASTE.

As the celebrated institution of *caste* exists among the Telugus, as in all other parts of Hindostan, and as such frequent reference to it is necessarily made in missionary letters from that country, it seems desirable to devote a portion of this series to a consideration of it.

I do not attempt a full explanation of it, as that would be next to impossible for anyone to give, but a Hindoo, if indeed even he could explain all its intricacies. Being a religious as well as social distinction, and closely interwoven with the whole life of the people, it is very difficult to reach a clear understanding of it. It has been called "a labyrinthine maze, which baffles research, and bewilders with its convolutions."

Perhaps the following definition may be approximately correct. Caste is the fixed, unalterable separation of the people into various distinct grades, or classes, one above the other; the most unmixed, exclusive, and tyrannical aristocracy on earth at the top, and the poor despised down-trodden outcasts at the bottom. It does not depend on respectability, education, wealth, or anything of the kind, but is irreversibly fixed by one's birth.

It is peculiar to the Hindoo nation, —Burmese, Siamese, and other Oriental races having no such system.

It is a very ancient institution. Though it may not have existed in full force at the time the Vedas were written, yet it must have originated very early, as the Institutes of Menu are full of references to it; and the earliest historic accounts show that it was then in operation.

It appears that originally the Hindoo people were divided into the following four great classes.

1. The *Brahmin* caste. The members of this first and highest grade were believed to have sprung from the head of Brahma, the Creator; and therefore they occupied the most exalted place in the State. The affairs of religion, the best educational advantages, all the highest offices, and influential positions were in their hands. They alone had a right to read the holy Vedas and Shaster, and interpret them to the lower classes. The priests are usually of this caste. The Brahmins are generally the most intellectual and learned, and also the proudest and most intollerant of the people. They are the Pharaohs of India.

2. The *Kshatrya* caste. This was the class to which warriors and kings and rulers usually belonged. They were supposed to have originated from the arms of Brahma. It might seem strange that their kings were of the second caste; but it was greater to be a Brahmin than to be a king. The Brahmins have more influence than all the rajahs and maha-rajahs in India. In fact men in the highest political positions are completely in the hands of the subtle Brahmins. The rajah of Pittapur, near Cocanada, was disposed to sell a piece of land to Bro. McLaurin, a very suitable and desirable place for mission premises, but the Brahmins heard of it, and brought such pressure to bear upon the rajah that he dare not