

The Christian Messenger.

A RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL FAMILY NEWSPAPER.

NEW SERIES.
Vol. XXIII., No. 30.

Halifax, Nova Scotia, Wednesday, July 24, 1878.

WHOLE SERIES.
Vol. XLIII., No. 30.

Poetry.

The Eternal Home.

Alone! To land upon that shore!
With no one sight that we have seen
before—
Things of a different hue,
And sounds all strange and new.
No forms of earth our fancies to arrange,
But to begin alone that mighty change!

Alone! To land alone upon that shore.
Knowing so well we can return no more;
No voice or face of friend,
None with us to attend
Our disembarking on that awful strand,
But to arrive alone in such a land!

Alone? No; God hath been there long
before,
Eternally hath waited on that shore,
The Faithful One, whom we have trust-
ed more,
In trials and in woes,
Than we have trusted those
On whom we leaned most in our earthly
strife.
Oh! we shall trust him more in that new
life!

So not alone we land upon that shore.
'Twill be as though we had been there be-
fore.

We shall meet more we know
Than we can meet below,
And find our rest like some returning
dove—
Our home at once with the Eternal Lovel

Frederick William Faber.

Religious.

For the Christian Messenger

Open Letters on Baptism.

PARADISE N. S.,
July 6th, 1878.

Rev. D. D. Currie, Methodist Minister,

DEAR BROTHER.—Your last letter to me in the *Westleyan* is to hand, and as I fully expected, the question I asked you remains untouched. Throughout the whole of your correspondence you have kept clear of it, and now that you have finished, the only conclusion I can come to is, that you are guilty. Your silence is your condemnation. In your letter to me through the post of May 7th, after acknowledging my letter enquiring about the lexicons, you say:—"It has seemed to me advisable that I should answer your enquiries in a somewhat elaborate way in a series of open letters in the *Westleyan* of Halifax." Those letters are before the public, and I am willing that the public should say whether you have answered my question. The question whether you are guilty, or not, guilty, of falsifying certain lexicons, I therefore leave to the impartial judgement of public opinion; and I should like to see the man who has paid any attention to this correspondence who would pronounce you "NOT GUILTY." As far back as 1870, your definitions were challenged by Rev. D. M. Welton. See his pamphlet "Christian Baptism, a reply &c," page 15; and I do not know that you ever sought to clear yourself of the charge. During the last few weeks I have pressed this question upon you over and over again; notwithstanding all, you will not attempt to justify or clear yourself of this most serious charge of falsehood; and were it not that I wished to keep to the lexicon question I could shew you that in your letters you are open to similar charges. A friend writing to me concerning your correspondence says that it would take fifty columns to expose all the falsehoods contained in your second and third letters. That may be a little extreme, but there is too much room for the statement. Take just one instance in your eleventh letter now before me. You say,—"The sprinkled people, Paul says, were all baptized under the cloud." I have just opened my Bible at 1 Cor. x. 2, and find that he says nothing about sprinkling, but they "were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea," and you have the boldness,—to use no stronger term, to take out "in" and put in "under." And if, as you would have it, it

should be "under the cloud," then you must also say "under the sea." Thus "They were sprinkled under the cloud and under the sea." If you consult Barnes he will give you light on this verse. I would here inform you Bro. Currie, that the cloud was not over the the Israelites when they crossed the Red Sea, but between them and the Egyptians. See Exodus xiv. 19-21. A little attention to the simple statements of the Bible would deliver you from many errors.

Just here I would commend to your especial notice the following extract from the Rev. John Goodison's "charge" to nine young ministers, in today's *Westleyan* (July 6.) He says:—"Our blessed Lord said to his disciples just before his ascension." Go ye and TEACH all nations." You say, he sent them to BAPTIZE all nations. But to the following I ask your attention more particularly, and coming from one of your own ministers, perhaps you may profit by it. "You are not to obtrude upon your pupils your own notions, independent of the teachings of God's Holy Word, but only those which are derivable from that sacred source. Never (he says) was there more need to be careful in handling the word of God than at present." Ponder well those sensible and timely words Bro. C. No living man that I know of, needs that advice more than the author of your Catechism of Baptism, and the letters that have lately appeared in the *Westleyan* over your name; and if by some I am described as a fool, then I may be permitted to speak as a fool, and I will therefore say, that if the nine young ministers to whom the "charge" was given, with the Rev. M. Goodison himself, act upon that sound advice, neither they nor he will ever sprinkle either a child or grown person hereafter.

The temptation is strong upon me to point out a few more errors in your Catechism, as well as to refer to several points in your closing letters, but I shall not at present, considering that what I have already called attention to is sufficient to shew that your writings are not in any way to be depended on, they are absolutely, and emphatically untrustworthy, and should be read, if read at all, with the utmost caution. At some future time it is more than likely, I may return to your Catechism, unless in the meantime you are brought to see and forsake your errors.

And now once more to come back to the question of the lexicons. In one of your letters you intimated that different editions of the same lexicon gave different meanings of the word *baptizo*, when I told you that that was your only refuge; and I hoped for your sake that those you quoted from were different editions from those the Editor of the *Bible Index* had before him when he denied your statements. I have asked you to name your editions, so that a comparison might be made; you have not done so. I will therefore now give the Editions which said Editor had before him, and if yours are of a different date, and contain the definitions as given in your Catechism; then for the sake of your own honour, and that of your noble brotherhood, come forward and say so. This is probably the last appeal of this nature I shall make to you and if you still remain silent, I shall leave you to the comfort of a guilty conscience, and your conduct to the impartial decision of those who are competent to judge.

Now to the lexicons, which by the way in your Catechism you speak of as the means whereby we are to ascertain the meaning of *baptizo*, and in your letter of to-day, No. xii. speak of as follows "Let us prove all things, not by the vain teachings of lexicons, &c." Your estimate of their value seems to have gone down considerably since you wrote your Catechism. Are they vain because they do not favour your ideas of what *baptizo* ought to mean? Is it because they do not give "pour" or "sprinkle" as meanings of *baptizo*?

Hoping you would give the editions of the lexicons you name, I wrote, as I told you, to the Editor of the *Index*,

for the editions he had before him. His reply in part, is as follows:—
TORONTO, ONT., May 29, 1878.

Rev. J. Brown.

DEAR SIR,—Yours of the 22nd received this morning. Since your letter came to hand I have examined the following lexicons. Schrevelius, edition 1688, also 1831; Scapula, 1820; Hedericus, 1816; Schluessner, 1819; Suidas, 1705; also 1853; and Grove, 1864. My statement in the *Index* of September is exactly true in regard to all of them. Grove is the only one that defines even *bapto*, sprinkle; but *bapto* is not involved in the matter. Passow, I have not now at command, but I have the definitions given by him which I copied from the dictionary over a year ago when preparing for a discussion with a Congregational minister. *Sprinkle* is not among them. Gases I have never seen, but on the testimony of Dr. Conant who was written to about it, I know that *sprinkle* is not in it.

By the testimony of Dr. Conant, I know that other editions of the books referred to agree with those I have examined. Hedericus, 1722; Scapula, 1579; Schluessner, 1791. . . . No Methodist paper will allow an exposure of Mr. Currie to appear on its pages.

Yours truly,

H. McDIARMID.

P. S. Is it not curious that letters addressed to you in the *Westleyan*, cannot be replied to in the *Westleyan*? Has the Editor positively refused?

H. M.

Yes H. M., 'positively refused,' and you are not the only one that has asked me that question.

I have myself examined the three following: Grove, edition 1835; Schluessner, 1824; and Hedericus, 1821. It will be seen that these editions differ, as to date, from those given above. Now my good friend Currie we are prepared for yours. We are all watching and waiting for you. For the benefit of the reader and at the suggestion of a friend, it may be well just here to give the definitions of *baptizo* as found in these lexicons, and then those manufactured ones given by Mr. C., so that they may be compared, and Mr. C.'s truthfulness tested.

SCHREVELIUS, *Baptizo*, Mergo, abluo, lavo; to baptize, immerse, wash off, bathe. Mr. Currie:—to immerse, to wash, to sprinkle, to moisten, to wet.

SCAPULA, *Baptizo*, Mergo, sere immergo; to immerse, or immerge. Item tingo; ut quae tingendi, aut abluendi gratia aquae immergimus; also to immerse, as we immerse things for the sake of dyeing, or washing them in water.

HEDERICUS, *Baptizo*, Mergo, immergo, aqua obruo; to immerse, immerge, overwhelm in water.

Mr. C. says these last two give the same as SCHREVELIUS.

SCHLUESNER, *Baptizo*, Immergo ac intingo, in aquam mergo. To immerge and dip in, to immerse in water.

Mr. C. 1. To immerse in water; 2. To wash, or sprinkle, or cleanse with water; 3. To baptize; 4. To pour out largely. Mr. C. speaks of Schluessner as of the highest authority. Mark well therefore the definitions given by him, and see what becomes of sprinkling or pouring; and then mark the manufactured definitions given by Mr. C.

COLE and DWIGHT never made lexicons. But no matter, somebody has made them for them, and Mr. C. puts them in among the best Greek lexicographers; giving COLE's definitions to baptize, to wash, to sprinkle; and DWIGHT's, to tinge, stain, dye, or colour. (O Truth and Justice, what rare jewels ye are in a certain corner of this fair Canada of ours!)

SUIDAS, *Baptizo*, Mergo, immergo, tingo, intingo, modofacio, lavo, abluo, purgo. To immerse, to immerge, to dip, to dip in, to wet, or moisten, soak, drench, to wash or bathe, wash away, purge, or cleanse.

Mr. C. To immerse, to moisten, to sprinkle, to wash, to cleanse.

GROVE, *Baptizo*. To dip, immerse, immerge, plunge; to wash, cleanse, purify; to baptize; to depress, humble, overwhelm. (Grove does not give his definitions in Latin like the others.)

Mr. C. To dip, plunge, immerse, wash, wet, moisten, stain, sprinkle, steep, imbue, dye, colour.

GASES and PASSOW. I am not prepared to give the definitions of these as I cannot find them in any books in my possession: "The Editor of the *Index* however has those of PASSOW, and he says "sprinkle" is not among the definitions; and on the authority of Dr. Conant that meaning is not given by GASES. GASES is a very rare lexicon.

Mr. C. however says Passow defines *baptizo* by, To immerse, to wash; to sprinkle; and GASES, To wet or moisten, to wash, to draw water.

Now reader, I have laid the case before you, you can compare the definitions of *baptizo* as given by the authors themselves, and those of Mr. Currie. You will now be able to judge whether the charge of his falsifying those lexicons be true or false. And when you remember that now for eight years this charge has been standing against him, and revived again in an unmistakable manner of late, and he not having in any way whatever attempted to shew that his definitions are correctly quoted but with all possible care has avoided the question with reference thereto, I presume you are in a fair position to give an unhesitating verdict.

And now to return to you Brother C., as I don't want you to feel I have neglected you: You will not find, the world over, one standard Greek lexicon that gives either pour or sprinkle as the primary and literal meaning of *baptizo*. If you can or any of your brethren, then give the lexicon and the edition.

Your statement that Baptists mutilated Liddell and Scott's lexicon is entirely without foundation, and utterly false. This lexicon is admitted by all whose opinion is of any value to be one of the best, if not the best, in existence, notwithstanding Dr. Dizler's valiant endeavour to belittle it. He and you after him, have sought to make it appear that Baptists manipulated it to suit their own ends by taking out "to pour upon," which was one definition of *baptizo* given in an early edition of that lexicon. You will find in the Graves-Ditzler Debate a full and clear refutation of your statements. See pages 316-317. I will give a brief quotation. "The superiority of Liddell and Scott's lexicon consists in this: when they give a definition, they give the name of a writer as authority for using a word in a given sense, they at the same time append a quotation from his works containing the word as thus used. Professor Drisler, of Columbia College, New York, brought out an American edition of this great lexicon. In the meantime, scholars in England, and on the continent examined this definition of *baptizo* and the authority quoted for it, and remonstrated with Liddell and Scott for inserting it, and called their attention to the fact that the authority cited did not at all sustain such a definition. Convinced of the fact, they struck it out of their second edition, as a definition unsupported by any Greek authority. Professor Drisler, therefore in the spirit of a true scholar published a card informing the people that his second edition would be conformed to the second English edition, and "to pour upon" was struck out of his next edition." In this matter Pro. Drisler "disclaims any denominational influence in the matter. Professor Duncan wrote to know why the American did not conform to the English edition. He was informed that it would be made to do so. Thus the question we (Graves & Ditzler) are discussing has been for ever settled by Pedobaptists themselves. The scholars of England, and Germany, and America have thus decided that "to sprinkle" or "to pour upon" is in no sense, a definition of *baptizo*." "Thirty years have passed, and the lexicon has gone through six editions, and all the Pedobaptist scholars, of the civilized world have not been able to find any sufficient authority in the whole domain of Greek literature, to justify them to give "pour upon," much less "to sprinkle upon" as a proper meaning of *baptizo*."

According to the lexicons named in your Catechism, as the best, the definitions of which I have given above, neither "to sprinkle," nor "pour," is given as a meaning of *baptizo*. Do you not think now Bro. C. that you had better do as Pedobaptists in the States are doing with regard to this matter. Among several letters received since this correspondence began, I quote the following from some brother unknown to me, writing from Massachusetts. He says "It is a good deal surprising that our Methodist brethren in Nova Scotia, attempt the defence of their practice by an appeal to the lexical meaning of *baptizo*. Here, attempts in that direction are about given over by all Greek scholars." Bro. C. as a Greek scholar. "Go and do thou likewise"

When our Methodist brethren in the States as well as in Nova Scotia advance a little further they will give up all attempts to justify what they ought to know by this time, cannot be justified on any grounds whatever, lexical or otherwise.

By the way I perceive by Rev. Mr. Lathern's new work, that he has Grove's lexicon; now if he, finding your quotation from Grove to be correct (which has been denied) why does not he come to your rescue? Doubtless many other of your ministers have lexicons in their possession by which they can test your definitions; yet not one, not one, has come forward in your defence. What does all this silence mean? What does it mean?

And now a few parting words, and they shall be faithful and I hope true. It may seem to some as if I have very hard feelings toward you; it is not so, (I have too much pity for you for that) but against the way you have dealt with the lexicons and the Bible, I must say I have very strong feelings indeed. Nor does the evil stop with you, for others, following your Catechism have been sowing the seeds of error and falsehood contained therein. I could tell you of a Methodist Minister who has been earnestly engaged in lecturing on baptism, who I find from notes taken by a friend, has followed you almost as closely as you have followed Dr. Dizler. In addition to this you have made some of your own friends, I mean Methodists, thoroughly ashamed by your conduct, this is no guess, for you must know that the odium must in some measure rest upon your brethren. I wish it, however, to be clearly understood that whatever I have said has reference only to you, and those who knowing the nature of your Catechism, still publish and circulate it.

Will you tell me Brother Currie whether the doctrine of falling from grace was invented for the benefit of such as may wish for a time to descend to such conduct as you have been pursuing? It is a very convenient doctrine indeed for one who may take a fancy to write such a book as yours, (for I cannot see how a man in a state of grace could write it); a book sir, that I would not be the author of for a kingdom and a crown. I need not repeat previous descriptions of it, but it is monstrously erroneous and misleading. And to crown all, you invoke the blessing of God upon it! If you invoke the blessing of the father of subtility, of error, of falsehood, the chance of obtaining it is strongly in your favour; but to ask the blessing of God upon it is little less than very blasphemy. Do you not know that lying books no less than lying lips are an abomination to the Lord as I have already informed your friend and brother the Editor of the *Westleyan*?

Your are a prominent minister in a denomination of great power, energy, and success: your influence is great; what you say is therefore considered of more value and trustworthiness than that of ordinary men: you have most sadly abused the confidence reposed in you; you have stated things which are absolutely false, both as regards the lexicons, and the Bible itself; and coming from you, have doubtless been believed by the majority of your readers.

If the doctrines you hold cannot be sustained without resorting to