

struggling desperately for bread has no time for sentiment. If there was an impulse to smooth back the dark hair from the high pale brow, to kiss the quiet lips or lay my tired head near the dear face, it was repressed; for loving thoughts and tender emotions are ill befitting the surroundings of real poverty. With a silent prayer for Christian patience, I resumed my seat, and removing the lamp that its rays might not strike the eyes of the sleeper, went on with my work.

The pleasant part of my task was done, and I had little heart to linger long over the sadder page that followed: The death of my beloved parents; the misfortunes that forced us—Walter and I—to seek a new home in the far West; the prairie-fire that destroyed the work of years; the wasting sickness that consumed our hard-earned savings, and bereft us of three lovely children, were hurried over to the darker days, when, a hopeless cripple with clouded intellect, Walter was no more my support, counselor or guide.

It was past midnight when I laid down my pen and glanced over my truthful narrative. Folding the pages very neatly, I directed the packet to the New York—, and early the following morning, wondering at my own tenacity, and careful that no one observed me, dropped it with trembling hand into the letter-box of the post-office, kept in a little country store more than a mile distant from my isolated home.

For weeks I waited the arrival of the mails with feverish anxiety. Just what I hoped for would be hard to tell; yet twice every week, regardless of weather, I was at the small counter watching with beating heart, and a strange feeling of expectancy, the opening of the slender mail-bag, while the obliging clerk doubtless thought me demented when begging him to look over the half dozen letters for the third time. But when months passed, bringing no reply, my fruitless visits to the office—greatly to the relief of the government official who presided over that unique establishment—were gradually discontinued, and I strove to forget the folly that brought only keen disappointment and humiliation, and seek in other ways for food and clothes for my unfortunate husband and hapless child.

(Continued in our next.)

French Political Terms.

The political parties of France are called, according to their preferences as to the form of government, "Legitimists," "Orleanists," "Imperialists," and "Republicans." "Legitimists" are those who desire to restore the Comte de Chambord, the Bourbon heir, to the throne; "Orleanists," those who seek the restoration of the Comte de Paris, grandson of Louis Philippe, and representative of the house of Orleans; "Imperialists," those who wish to bring back the Empire, with young Napoleon IV.; "Republicans," those who aim to permanently form the Republic. The terms "Right," "Right Centre," "Extreme Right," "Left," "Left Centre," and "Extreme Left," refer to the position, both physical and political which the various parties occupy in the Chamber of Deputies or Senate. The "Right," for instance, consists entirely of Legitimists, and they have their seats together in that part of the chamber to the right of the president's chair. The "Right Centre" comprises in the main the moderate Orleanists, and men who, having no strong dynastic bias, are yet earnest Conservatives, and believe in a constitutional monarchy; and these sit next to the "Right." The "Left Centre" consists of the most moderate and conservative Republicans, including those Orleanists who, like Thiers, Dufaure and Say, believe that a monarchy cannot be practically established, and that the next best thing is a conservative Republic. The "Left" contains the great body of positive and earnest Republicans, led by Gambetta and Jules Simon; and they sit in a body on the left of the president's chair. The "Extreme Right" consists, as may be inferred, of the Legitimists who are extreme in their views of restoring the old Bourbon monarchy, with all that it implies; and these sit at the farthest right in the semi-circle of seats. The "Extreme Left," on the other hand, includes the most radical and violent of the Republicans, and in some cases, Communistic element, led by such men as Louis Blanc and Naquet. The Imperialists have no special local designation, but sit among the "Right Centre."

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger. Old Friends in Cape Breton.

Dear Messenger,—

In my last you found us on Cape Breton soil and enjoying the hospitality of Peter Paint, Sr., and his kind family. Thence, we journeyed along the shore of the strait, leaving Cape Porcupine and Cape George on our left and in the distance, and passing on the nearer coast those frequent and tiny inland bays which contribute so largely towards making the drive between Port Hawkesbury and Port Hood so pleasant. One would be led to inquire whether or not the old Trio who formed the beach line of that part of the strait had not done it in the dark? or else was in great uncertainty where to establish the permanent line. Several little beaches are often seen, separated by beautiful sheets of water, and then, beyond all, as if the plan had been changed, or some mistake had been made, we behold the strong and permanent beach-line, lifting itself successfully against wind and tide and warning all navigators to stand at a distance.

A drive of five or six hours brings us to Port Hood, the capital of the County of Inverness. Here we received a hearty welcome from our old and esteemed friend, Jas. McDonnell, Esq., formerly school inspector for the county, and successor in government office of the late and justly lamented Lewis Treman, Esq. Never was there a kinder man than "dear Mr. Treman," as he is still generally styled by those who knew him best, and seldom, if ever, one more humble-minded and unassuming. Happy the memories that engage one as he contemplates seasons spent in the society and home of this dear servant of God, now gone to his reward.

Those seasons were recalled and partially re-enjoyed, while, for an hour or two, we tarried and rested in the hospitable and comfortable home of Mr. McDonnell.

An hour or two more on the road and we arrive at beautiful Mabou, whose hills and vales and streams may safely challenge for loveliness any scenery on this side of old Atlantic. Here we find ourselves surrounded by old and dear friends of former days. The flight of time had made marked changes and had left some vacancies. But the warm greetings and Christian hospitality experienced forcibly reminded us of other days and other friends.

Names might be given and scenes described, but suffice it to say our visit in Mabou was pleasant and profitable. One Sabbath was spent with the little Baptist church and congregation there located. It was a happy season to many. The Word of life was preached, and the ordinance of believers' baptism was administered to three heads of families. A large and attentive congregation witnessed the act and heard the scriptural authority for the same read, both at the water's side and in the house of God.

Mabou is an interesting field for Baptist labor, and would soon yield a large harvest if true and faithful effort could be made. In the opinion of most, if not all, the Baptists in Mabou and Margaree, as also of a number of our brethren in the ministry, the Baptist cause in all that region has received great injury from the strange and inconsistent conduct (to use no harder terms) of some of those who have of late professed to preach the gospel in those and adjacent places, and those, too, who up to the present time retain membership in the denomination and position in the ministry. Baptist churches have need to be more careful whom they ordain to the work of the gospel ministry. "Let them first be proved;" and this will require time and thorough acquaintance. We have need to observe with strictest care the injunction, "Lay hands suddenly on no man."

Baptists have need, too, to beware whom they admit to their pulpits and employ as pastors, even though those seeking employment have been publicly and regularly set apart to the work of the ministry. They need more than educational advantages and fluency of utterance, they need genuine piety and Christian consistency as well.

From Mabou we pass on to Margaree,

north-east, where some four years of our lives were spent very happily. Here we remained two weeks; not chiefly for the sake of visiting old friends, much as we enjoyed this, but that we might aid in strengthening and comforting God's children and in exhorting sinners to flee to Christ.

It is vain for us to attempt a description of our pleasant visit to this dear people. Time and space would fail us to tell of old friends met and old friends missed, of kindnesses shown by old and young, by our own denomination and by all others; of the deep and sober earnestness with which the people heard the Word of Truth; of the earnest, pressing invitations to return to this old field to live and labor as before. Enough to say that on all sides we received the clearest proofs of Christian affection and manly respect. No good minister of Jesus Christ will faithfully do his duty to the people of Margaree without being made to feel that his labors are appreciated and his necessities recognized and acknowledged.

Here, too, we had the privilege of leading down into the baptismal grave three professed followers of Christ. Others still stand on the banks of the Baptist Jordan, looking wistfully into its waters. And some of them, we believe, will never feel fully at rest on the question of baptism till they have, like our Divine Exemplar, gone down into those waters and been "Buried with Him in baptism."

The Margaree and Mabou churches are still destitute of pastoral labor and are greatly in need. They present a wide and very interesting field for Baptist labor. Margaree has a mission property which with very little outlay would be a comfortable home for a minister—very near to the house of worship and central to the community.

Mabou is upwards of thirty miles distant, and would expect a monthly visit. But the road is good and the scenery pleasant between the two localities.

With a small subsidy from the Home Mission this field would give a very comfortable support to a minister. Bro. Stubbart, of Deerfield, and Bro. Layton, of Great Village, have both recently visited these people with good results. But a permanent pastor is needed. Who will go?

Yours very truly, J. F. KEMPTON.

Parrsboro', Nov. 28th, 1878.

For the Christian Messenger.

That Evasive Challenge.

Dear Editor,—

The baptismal controversy in which Revds. John Brown and D. D. Currie have for some months past been immersed, has undoubtedly excited public interest beyond the ordinary degree. We are not at all surprised at this, seeing that upon the points at issue hang not only the honor and veracity of a recognized minister of the gospel, but also the strongest claims alleged by Pædobaptists in favor of their sprinkling theories.

Now, it must be as clear as noon-day to every intelligent and impartial reader that if there ever was a debated question which was capable of a definite, complete and satisfactory decision, that question is at present under discussion by the persons named. Has Mr. Currie, on page 12 of his Catechism, quoted his lexical authorities correctly, or has he not? In the name of common sense cannot Mr. Currie give a categorical reply to this query? There is no need of any discussion on the matter. It is not a debatable question. All Mr. Currie has to do in the premises is to cite his authorities for the assertions he has made. What edition of Schrevelius for instance, gives *sprinkle* as a definition of *baptizo*?

But Mr. Currie challenges a committee to arbitrate in the settlement of the controversy—and evidently a Pædobaptist committee at that! If the challenge was not given in good faith, as most persons suspect, then it was a piece of contemptible trickery. If it was sincerely meant, it was a very silly and unsuccessful dodge. What is a committee wanted for? The reading public constitutes the committee who claim the privilege of deciding for themselves on the merits of the question under discussion, nor will they

relegate to any dozen of men a matter which any body but an idiot can easily understand.

Mr. Currie in suggesting the appointment of such a committee manifests some of the artifice of the Panama dogs. When a Panama dog wishes to cross a river where alligators abound, he goes up the stream a great way and barks with all his might. The alligators, hearing the barking and smacking their chops for a good dinner, go to the place where the dog is standing and wait till he gets into the water to cross the stream. But the dog is artful. When he sees from the number of snouts above water that his enemies have all gathered to the feast, he runs off down the river to another place and crosses before the alligators are aware of the trick that has been played upon them." Perhaps the Moncton controversialist is planning a similar method of escape. Or it may be that he is adopting the second-hand tactics of the editor of the *Wesleyan*, and is endeavoring to carry out the "red herring" process. Let him be assured, however, that neither of these schemes will serve his purpose. The public are too thoroughly awake in this matter to allow of any such dodging. Mr. Currie has publicly affirmed that certain lexicons give the word *sprinkle* among the definitions of *baptizo*. The truthfulness of this affirmation has been publicly denied. Now let Mr. Currie, as publicly either make good his original assertion, or else withdraw it like a man! Nothing less than this will save him from the just contempt of every impartial witness of this discussion.

But has he not replied fully and explicitly? Have not three distinguished Moncton divines attested to the correctness and satisfactoriness of his defense? Yea, verily, and the greater is the pity that three respectable ministers should make laughing-stocks of themselves with the vain hope of getting a fellow-errorist out of self-made difficulty. The method of defining *baptizo*, as pursued by the Moncton ministers is about the most idiotic thing of the kind we recollect to have ever met with in all our researches. By their method, as the *Toronto Bible Index* has fully shown, anybody can prove that *dip* itself means *sprinkle*; that immersion means affusion, that black means white, and that heaven means hell. Let any reader try this absurd method upon any word in the English vocabulary, and he will speedily come to the conclusion that words have no meaning at all, or can be made to mean anything that fancy or folly may suggest. *Baptizo*, say they, sometimes means *lavo*, and *lavo* sometimes means *sprinkle*; therefore *baptizo* sometimes means *sprinkle*. Let the reader, with a copy of Worcester in his hand, examine the following simple words—bury, sprinkle, drink, merely as examples:

Bury, third definition, to conceal; conceal, second definition, to dissemble. Therefore, *bury* means to *dissemble*.

Drink, fifth definition, means to smoke; smoke, sixth def., means to ridicule to the face. Therefore, *drink* means to *ridicule to the face*.

Sprinkle, second def., to wash; wash fifth def., to overlay with a coat of metal. Therefore, *sprinkle* means to overlay with a coat of metal.

Nothing more nonsensical than this can well be imagined. And yet this is the abortive little scheme involved in the document bearing the signatures of three or four Moncton clergymen, and designed to extricate Mr. Currie from the pit which he digged for himself and into which he has hopelessly fallen.

Dr. Richardson, the eminent lexicographer, says in reference to the definition of words, "The great first principle upon which I have proceeded in the department of the dictionary which embraces explanation, is that so clearly evolved and so incontrovertibly demonstrated in the 'Diversions of Purley'; namely, that a word has one meaning, and one only; that from it all usages must spring and be derived; and that in the etymology of each word must be found this single intrinsic meaning, and the cause of the application of those usages." What then is the one, intrinsic meaning of *baptizo*? Plainly it is *immerse*. "All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this," says Prof. Moses Stuart, a first-class Pædobaptist authority.

In fine, Mr. Currie has unquestionably falsified the lexicons referred to by him.

He has had ample time to produce his evidences of truthfulness, or honorably to withdraw his statements; but he has not the means to do the former nor the manliness to do the latter. *And he never will do either.* Never mind, let him rest in peace. Of one thing we feel fully assured, and that is that John Brown has gained a bloodless victory, a complete conquest. A clever Pædobaptist dodge has been thoroughly exposed—that of garbling and falsifying authorities on the baptismal question. If our Methodist friends do not clearly see the artifice of Mr. Currie in his present dilemma it is because they deliberately shut their eyes against the noon-day light of eternal truth.

Nov. 29, 1878.

HONESTAS.

For the Christian Messenger. Open Letters on Baptism.

NO. XI.

REV. D. D. CURRIE:—

Dear Sir,—It was my intention in these letters to keep as close as possible to the plan I had laid down, viz., to expose your perversion of Scripture, and to pay no heed to anything you may say in the *Wesleyan*; but yesterday's paper contains another instance of your unfairness that I cannot forbear calling attention to it. You say that I said in *Christian Messenger*, May 31, 1876, "Baptizo means to dip, only to dip, and nothing but to dip, and can never be made to mean anything else." You then add, "In his (my) pamphlet he says, page 18: 'To that I now add, it never did mean to sprinkle, or to pour; does not now, and never can be, made to mean it.'" You then quote a number of authorities "to prove how absurd my statements are, &c." Now I will quote what immediately precedes your quotation from page 18 which you read, and purposely omitted:—"I assure him (and you) that baptizo in its primary and literal meaning (for that I meant then, *Messenger*, May 31, 1876) and mean now, and is the meaning which must always be looked for in discussing a word) means to dip, only to dip, and nothing but to dip, and never can be made to mean anything else." Such readers of the *Wesleyan* as have my pamphlet have doubtless already discovered the injustice you do me in suppressing what I have quoted above. Did occasion require I could give you a far longer list of authorities to prove my statement than you can produce to the contrary. Dr. Graves says, (Debate p. 320), "Forty standard lexicons give 'to immerse,' 'to dip,' &c., as the primary, true and real meaning of *baptizo*, and he (Dr. Ditzler) has not, and he will not deny it." A goodly array of other authorities might be produced in proof of the same. Further, to prove the "absurdity of my statements" you say that SCHLESINGER, as quoted by me on page 28 of pamphlet does not give "to dip" as a meaning of *baptizo*. What of that? You find *immerse* there, and on page 16 of your Catechism you say immersion is dipping. Why quibble so, Mr. Currie? Why quibble so? I should very much like to analyse your thirty-four authors,—not one of whom has shown that the primary meaning of the word is not to dip or immerse, nor that it ever means *pour* or *sprinkle*; that they say this or that is not sufficient, or that the Lexicons say it even, let the quotation from any standard Greek author be produced containing the word *baptizo* in any of its conjugations where either one of those authors, or any other man, would translate it by *pour* or *sprinkle*, then there will be some weight in the testimony which says it means either.

You quote from Liddell & Scott's lexicon, first edition (not the last and best,) which gives "pour upon" as a meaning of *baptizo*. In the latest edition that meaning is not found, because no authority could be found to justify that meaning being given to the word; and the following from the American publishers of that lexicon, Harper Bros., should forever silence those who say that the Baptists of America manipulated it. "There has never been one word put into the article *baptizo*, in the American Edition, or removed from it, except in accordance with the English Edition." Pamphlet, page 60. The letter from that firm containing this statement could be produced if required, although not in my possession.

In the second edition the words