

permit, I could tell of more who have been ensnared by communion wine;" and the Rev. Alexander Stewart, of Aberdeen, in his Commentary after speaking of the danger to those who, through grace, have been reformed, to partake of the fruit of fermentation, adds:—"Fermented wine is inappropriate as a symbol, and dangerous in reality, when used at the table of the Lord; but the unfermented juice of the grape is suitable and safe. Whether, then, would Christ use the one or the other? Morally there is no room for hesitation. Besides, His own words are decisive—He used the 'produce of the vine.'"

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

United States Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 12, 1878.

The great *fete* given by the Spanish Minister and Madame Mantilla on the occasion of the marriage of their king, Alphonso, was the most brilliant of any that has been given at the Capital this season; and next in magnificence comes that given by the Japanese Minister and Madame Yashida last week. These people are vastly interesting in themselves. They are both very small and short, and to us their faces look just alike. When she came to this country, Madame Yashida wore the Japanese costume and spoke English not at all; but she soon laid aside her native garb, and now speaks so well that she makes her calls without an interpreter. Her baby was the first Japanese born in America, and it is taught to speak nothing but French. A glance at their home here shows their love of country and their predominant home tastes. The ornaments, furnishings, pictures, and the like, are mostly Japanese. At the entertainment of which I spoke, the air was heavily perfumed, and among other rich curiosities was a bed-spread of quilted silk, embroidered with brilliant figures of birds, flowers, and quaint geometric figures.

The hostess was dressed in thick white silk, embroidered in colors, with flower sprays, which did not seem so appropriate or becoming to her as do some of her toilets of real Japanese silk.

Other entertainments are of daily and nightly occurrence;—brilliant ones, too, for every one will do his and her very best in the way of show and spread and splendor from now till Ash-Wednesday, which puts an abrupt stop to social festivities. Saturday afternoons and Tuesday evenings are now given up to the White House receptions, those on Saturday being called Mrs. Hayes', and those in the evening Mr. Hayes' levees.

Since the Patent Office fire, more than four months ago, the question of fire-proof Government buildings has been very much discussed, but no definite step taken to place them in a non-ignitable condition. Directly after that destructive fire, the President appointed a Commission to examine all our public buildings, which examination, being made, resulted in the publication of the fact that not a single Government building in this city is fire-proof. Several, like the Patent and Post Offices, are externally impervious to heat, but even the Capitol itself is liable to partial destruction by fire, because of the tons upon tons of paper stored therein, which, if ignited, would burn with sufficient heat to melt the roof like lead. It has been the custom, for scores of years, to file away Government papers in wooden cases in the attics of the various Departments. In the Treasury alone there are enough of these cases, if piled six feet high and placed in a row, to reach three miles. A project is now on foot to construct a thoroughly fire-proof building to be used expressly for the safe keeping of all public records not in current use, where they can be arranged for examination and convenient reference when needed.

The models of patents destroyed or involved by the fire last fall numbered 114,000, and before the debris was fairly cooled, the question of restoration was raised and considered. A force of 160 skilled mechanics, helpers and laborers was formed, Congress appropriated \$45,000, and in less than six weeks' time 6,206 models were restored. Ever since then the work has gone on, and there are now over 10,000 models in

sight that can be put into good and useful condition. It is wonderful how much can be made from little. A mass of wheels and bars, all out of shape and melted together, which looks to a novice as much like a sewing-machine as a hay-rake, goes through the workman's hands and comes out bright, beautiful and shapely. Another appropriation will be necessary before even this branch of the work is completed, and years will doubtless elapse before we have our Patent Office back again, all restored; but when it is, it will be far more perfect and splendid than ever,—good out of evil.

MERRILL.

For the Christian Messenger.
Was it a Dream?

At times it appears to me as if it must have been a dream, notwithstanding much of our experience was too real to leave us room for doubt.

A party of daring travellers endeavored to cross over to P. E. Island in the mild weather at the first of February. On reaching Pictou, it was reported that the 'Northern Light' was taking a rest in a large cove of ice off Pictou harbor, all waited patiently (?) until word came that she was ready to make another trip to Georgetown. After great vicissitudes we arrived on board, but it was too late to reach our destination that night. The next, we were blocked by drift ice, and continued so until the fourth, when we saw open water ahead. The steamer worked bravely all that day, smashing the ice where it seemed almost impossible; and had nearly worked her way through, when, in the evening, a violent squall arose, bringing in more drift ice, and shattering our hopes of seeing P. E. Island for an indefinite period, unless by some other route.

All, excepting one, decided to "Leave the poor old 'Northern Light,' and pull for the shore," which we reached without any serious accident; an occasional break through the ice, or a frost-bitten ear, merely enlivening the way.

And now all that that party wants to hear, to complete their happiness, is, that the steamer got into Georgetown next day.

ONE OF THE SUFFERERS.

For the Christian Messenger.
Mode of Baptism.

In a late number of the *Wesleyan* appears an extract from a work, entitled *Baptisma*, by Rev. J. L., with the above heading, in which the writer says, "We have in the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost an irrefutable and irresistible argument in favor of *affusion*. The subject admits of positive proof. The demonstration is just as complete as the force of language, and the well authenticated facts of history, by possibility, can make it." We will bring his proofs to the test. He says, "John's baptism was with water, and the baptism of Pentecost was with the Holy Ghost and with fire." J. L. continues, "But this," said the Apostle Peter with wondrous illumination, in undiminished freshness and undiminished power (Peter would feel flattered if he knew J. L. wrote thus of him, but he would not be able to return the compliment) "is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." . . . "The Holy Ghost was poured out—fell on them—was shed down, and therefore was baptism with the Holy Ghost."

Now Rev. J. L. ought to know that Peter did not refer that prophecy to the baptism of the disciples, but to what took place after that event, for Peter says (Acts ii. 33), "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." According to J. L.'s application of the prophesy, all the people were present with the disciples when the Spirit descended, for it was fulfilled in their sight and hearing. The promise was that "I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh," &c. On the day of Pentecost "there were dwelling at Jerusalem devout men out of every nation under Heaven," the gospel is preached, and three thousand are added unto the church; there is the prophesy, and there is the fulfillment. Joel does not refer to the baptism of the disciples with the Spirit, but to His

influence on the people through the disciples.

It seems that J. L. is anxious to make the word 'pour' in that passage correspond with the baptism of the Spirit at Pentecost, but it cannot be done. It is grievous to see men straining the Scripture to make it mean what they wish it to, instead of taking the meaning its author intended.

It is remarkable that we do not find a word about the Spirit being shed, poured, or falling upon the disciples; when it is spoken of, it is called a baptism, and that simply to shew the abundant, overwhelming influences and gifts which they should be the subjects of. This is the meaning given by Dr. George Campbell (Scotland), Dr. Robinson in his Greek Lexicon, Bloomfield, Archbishop Tillotson, Prof. Stuart, Bishop Reynolds, and many others, and the plain, common sense meaning of the word teaches the same, as well as what followed the baptism of the disciples with the Spirit; and I will here say, and that with all gentleness and good will that the man or men who will take hold of that most solemn and blessed event to support the unscriptural doctrine of either infant or adult sprinkling deserves a large amount of pity or of blame, of which, I scarce can say.

We will now see what the account itself says, Acts ii. 2-4, "And suddenly there came a sound from Heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Here we have not a word as to the manner of the descent of the Spirit; all that is said is "they were all filled with the Holy Ghost," and what followed will explain what that means.

J. L. then supposes a person in doubt as to mode, being in the room with the disciples, and witnessing what he calls the tongue of fire, he would at once perceive that pouring is right, and as saying "in relation to mode it is luminous as the flame upon the forehead." If J. L. had a little more light inside his forehead he would not have betrayed such ignorance or carelessness. He tells us there was a luminous flame, and further on, in referring to it, he says "it was fire," he also tells us that the flame was on the forehead. I would remind the good man that there was no flame, nor was it ever, anywhere said the disciples should be baptized with fire, and if J. L. cannot see the difference between fire, and something "like as of fire," his perception must need sharpening. What John meant by the baptism of fire can be understood from Matt. iii. 10-12 compared with Matt. xxv. 41. And it may be remarked here that when Christ spoke of this baptism of the Spirit, he said nothing about fire. Acts i. 5, "For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Act xi. 16, "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that He said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

J. L. says, moreover, that this flame was on the forehead. Luke does not say so, he simply says "it sat upon each of them." Does J. L. locate the flame on that particular spot that it may correspond with the place he puts the water? I should like to see that book *Baptisma*, it must be quite a literary curiosity, if I may judge from this remarkable extract.

By the way, Mr. Editor, if the baptism at Pentecost is "an irrefutable and irresistible argument in favor of affusion" as J. L. informs his readers, and the *Wesleyan* gives it the currency of its columns, thereby, I presume, approving the statement, why do not Pedobaptists practice what they believe, and pour water on the person, instead of just placing on the forehead as much as might be taken up on one or two fingers? When our brethren practice what they believe we shall have a little more faith in the sincerity of their belief. Whether Baptists are right or wrong, and that they are right, very, very few will venture to question, and fewer still can prove them so, they do practice what they believe, at least in the matter of baptism. The testimony of two hundred Pedobaptists now before me, as well as

a long array of evidence from Cyclopedias and Lexicons on my shelf, renders me thus dogmatic. And I will now say that if Pedobaptists believe pouring to be the mode of baptism (an expression that sounds as unnatural as to say "mode of dipping") it is as inconsistent in them to practice sprinkling, as it would be for us to practice pouring who believe in dipping.

J. L. again says, "The baptismal element was applied to the heads of the disciples." This statement is entirely groundless, and that I will at once shew. The promise was that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not with cloven tongues; and when the promise is fulfilled we are told "they were all filled with the Holy Ghost"; there sat on them "cloven tongues like as of fire;" and yet, in the face of such clear, simple statements J. L. says virtually, that the Holy Ghost and the cloven tongues were identical. Nor is this all; his theology is as poor as his reasoning, for while the Scriptures everywhere speak of the Spirit as a person, J. L. calls him an 'element.' It is most sincerely to be hoped that this rev. brother is more careful in his ordinary explanation of Scripture than he is in that particular part under consideration, or both he and all who hear him are most devoutly to be pitied. It is a fact, and the former more than the latter.

He says again, in referring to the ordinance of man's invention (it is I, not he, that call it that), "The service is impressive." (That may be, and so is the taking of the veil in the Romish Church, and as scriptural too.) "There is no disturbing influence." (Then the children that J. L. has sprinkled have been much better behaved than some we have heard of. Besides this, J. L. shews that he does not know much about the onward march of truth, for it is having such a "disturbing influence" on the minds of those who practice infant sprinkling that every year there are great numbers casting it behind them, and joining the Baptist ranks, and 'still they come.' Only in last week's *Messenger*, Feb. 6, is an account of a Methodist minister and eighteen members of his church being baptized and forming themselves into a Baptist church. They will all have to come to that, Mr. Editor, sooner or later, and it is very gratifying to see our Pedobaptist brethren falling into line). He continues, "There is nothing to shock the sensibilities of refined taste, and feminine delicacy of feeling." We have seen this kind of argument before, and it has this appearance, that the man who wrote that sentence has a purer mind than He who commanded His followers to be baptized, for it is clear to any one that if a law is evil so must the lawgiver be, and when a man finds fault with the ordinance of baptism, he finds fault with Him who instituted it.

It would be better for a man, I almost think, to have been born dumb or without reason, than to speak or write of a Divine ordinance as 'indelicate' or 'shocking.' It does not speak much for those who use such arguments, nor for the doctrine they seek thus to defend. No one would think much of a man's wares, if he recommended them by pointing out the real or supposed inferiority of his neighbor's. If he cannot recommend them on their own merits all other arguments will be of little worth.

I would ask J. L. if I could gain a hearing from him, and all others who speak thus of an ordinance of Christ's appointing, what their idea is of another ordinance, of God's appointing, and which they say infant sprinkling has come in the place of? I should be greatly interested to know the verdict.

Perhaps some J. L. or other told Moses not to circumcise his child, because it was "indelicate" and "shocking" to refined taste, and feminine delicacy and feeling." Be that as it may, Moses nearly lost his life by his neglect, for "it came to pass by the way in the inn, that the Lord met him, and sought to kill him. Then Zipporah (who felt that obedience to God's command was above her own "taste and feeling") took a sharp stone, and cut off the foreskin of her son, and cast it at his feet, and said, Surely a bloody husband art thou to me." Then comes this remarkable addition, "So he let him go." (Exodus iv. 24-26.)

The baptism of believers is as clearly commanded in the New Testament as

the circumcision of Jewish children in Old, and there may be as great danger in neglecting the one as the other. The case of Moses stands out as an awful warning to those who neglect or despise the ordinances of God. If we may put aside one command, we may put aside two, and if two, we may discard half the bible, and if the half, the whole.

And now to finish, just for the present. Baptism means dipping, only dipping, and nothing but dipping, if the testimony of eminent Pedobaptist scholars, Greek Lexicons, Cyclopedias, and the New Testament itself are to be at all depended on. This mode was practised by the Apostles and early church, which I presume no one will deny in the face of the overwhelming testimony of scholars of all denominations. Sprinkling, either of children or grown up people, the Bible does not furnish one solitary instance of, and neither hemispheres can produce the man who can find such instance.

The baptism of believers is an appointment of God, and is most clearly taught in his Word, and Rev. George Müller, quoted in to-day's *Messenger* (Feb. 13), in speaking of immersion as the "only true Scriptural mode" and "believers the only proper subjects for baptism" says:—"That of all revealed truths, not one is more clearly revealed in the Scriptures, not even the doctrine of justification by faith; and the subject has only become obscured by men not having been willing to take the Scriptures alone to decide the point." That, Mr. Editor, is as true a statement as that great and good man ever made.

The sprinkling of children or adults is an appointment of man, and is no where taught in the Word of Truth, and a greater than George Müller has said, "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up," and sprinkling is one, our brethren themselves being judges.

Paradise. J. BROWN.

Donation Proper.

The church and congregation at Paradise, Annapolis Co., met on Thursday evening, Feb. 7th, in the vestry of the Baptist Church for the purpose of making a donation to their pastor, J. Brown. There was a large attendance, the Episcopal and Methodist churches being also represented. There was a good supply of refreshments; singing by the choir; and speeches by Rev. J. Clark, Bridgetown, and Rev. Mr. Bleakney, of Port Williams; and also by the pastor, who expressed his deep gratitude for their kindness, and still more for the kind feelings that prompted it. A very happy evening was spent, every one apparently having fully enjoyed themselves, pastor and all, who was made the richer by sixty eight dollars in cash and ten in value, to which seven in cash has been since added with the promise of "more to follow."

Acknowledgment.

On the evening of the 26th January our friends made us their annual visit. Notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather our dwelling was filled with smiling faces and hearts made happy by doing what they could to lighten our burdens and cheer us on our way. After spending a pleasant social evening, they left with us substantial tokens of their esteem very creditable to themselves and very profitable to us. Every thing was just what was required; it would almost appear that an investigating committee had been looking into our real wants. Surely the Master will abundantly reward them for thus scattering, by increasing their worldly goods, and cheering their hearts with his smile of approval.

A. W. BARSS.

[Our brother omits the name of the place of the above pleasant visit. We presume it was at Guysborough.—Ed. C. M.]

In Memoriam.

ANDREW SANGSTER, ESQR.,

of New Harbor, died Oct. 26th, 1877, aged 63 years. In his last sickness he suffered much, but bore it patiently. He professed religion thirty-one years ago, but never united with the church. He was a Baptist in sentiment, and in view of death was consoled by the gospel. It was not my privilege to see him