

shown in the attempt made to find a difference between dip, plunge, and immerse, has long since, and frequently, been exposed and exploded, and it would be a work of supererogation on my part to repeat the argument. If you prefer it, I have no objection to write the argument thus:

(1.) In giving the commission, Christ chose not *baptizo*,—not *cheo*,—but *baptizo*.

(2.) The primary, literal meaning of *baptizo*, according to all the learning of the world, is to dip, plunge or immerse.

(3.) Therefore, in giving the commission, Christ commanded His disciples to dip, plunge, or immerse those whom they baptized.

If you prefer to place the candidate in the font and sprinkle the water upon him until he is entirely immersed, so that he shall be "buried with Christ in baptism," your act will be accepted, notwithstanding "the primary cause of the immersion may be the sprinkled rain."

Your criticism No. 2 states that my argument "is also irreparably defective in saying that the primary meaning of *baptizo* is to immerse, etc." And can it be possible that any one who makes the slightest pretensions to scholarship would venture to contradict the statement? You do not mean to contradict it, do you Mr. Currie? "Yes," you say, "and my authority is Dr. Ditzler on pages 33 and 36 of the Graves, Ditzler Debate, where he (Dr. Ditzler) states that *baptizo* never meant to immerse until several hundred years after it had been in use by Greek writers; and where you will also ascertain that its primary meaning was to sprinkle."

I turn to page 33 of the work to which I am referred to find the words of your authority, which are as follows:—

"We now propose to prove the following facts:—

1. That no lexicon gives immerse or dip as a meaning of *baptizo* in Greek earlier than B. C. 165, i. e., Polybius; next, Diodorus Siculus, B. C. 66-32; next, Strabo, B. C. 54 to A. D. 54; next, Josephus and Plutarch, till A. D. 120."

The above quotation concedes all that the Bible theory of baptism demands. It concedes that *baptizo* meant to immerse as far back as 165 years before Christ, and down to 120 years after Christ. This being the case, it is little odds to us what it may have meant farther back than B. C. 165 or farther forward than A. D. 120. So long as it is conceded (as the above quotation grants) that during the time of Christ and His apostles *baptizo* meant to immerse, you may give it "to sprinkle," or any meaning you please prior to that time. By granting me (as you do by referring me to Dr. Ditzler as quoted above) that when Jesus gave the commission, *baptizo*, the word He used to designate the act to be performed in baptism, meant to immerse, you yourself prick your bubble criticism, for "heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall never pass away."

In your criticism No. 3 you find fault with the statement that "all the learning of the world shows that *baptizo* means to immerse." Indeed, Mr. Currie! And is it not the case? "No," you say, "if you look on pages 12 and 13 of a *Catechism* written by myself (the learned (?) D. D. Currie) you will find quotations from ten lexicons giving 'to sprinkle' as a meaning for *baptizo*." But alas! sir, you have falsified those lexicons, or copied from some one who did. The man is ignorant who will venture the unscholarly assertion that *baptizo* does not mean to immerse; and he is lamentably unscrupulous who will misquote the learned and thus make them say, at any cost, that *baptizo* means "to sprinkle." The learned Prof. Moses Stewart says that "*baptizo* means to dip, plunge, or immerse," and adds that "all lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed on this." The Prof. puts you at the tail of the class, Mr. Currie—among those of no note—and I would suppose that after what has passed between you and Mr. Brown, you would, by this time if never before, be deeply conscious of your humiliating position.

After an examination of your criticism, I repeat my argument with additional emphasis.

(1.) In giving the commission, Christ chose not *baptizo*,—not *cheo*,—but *baptizo*.

(2.) The primary, literal meaning of

*baptizo*, according to all the learning of the world is to immerse, or its equivalent.

(3.) Therefore, in giving the commission, Christ commanded His disciples to immerse those whom they baptized.

And let me also insert for your further consideration the argument in its other form:

(1.) Wherever 'sprinkle' in the New Testament is mentioned, the word used in the Greek is *rantizo*.

(2.) Christ did not use this word in the commission.

(3.) Therefore He did not intend that His disciples should sprinkle upon the people, else he would have used the word *everywhere* used to designate that act.

Again:—

(1.) Wherever "pour" is found in the New Testament the Greek word is *cheo*.

(2.) Christ did not use *cheo* in the commission.

(3.) Therefore He did not intend that His disciples should pour upon the people, else He would have used the word *everywhere* used to designate that act.

SYLLOGISM NO. 2.

(1.) If Christ intended that baptism in the Christian Church should "take the place of circumcision" in the Jewish nation, there would have been some intimation of the change given in the New Testament.

(2.) But the New Testament is silent upon any such change.

(3.) Therefore, no such change was intended by Christ.

Your criticism on this argument is that "the minor premise has not been proved," i. e., that the New Testament is silent upon the theory that circumcision was changed into baptism. You erroneously state that Paul calls baptism—and not merely baptism with water, but the higher, the real baptism, circumcision." My good sir, your interpretation, as shown by this statement, is as unsound as your reasoning, and both alike are "irreparably defective." This passage teaches that spiritual "circumcision" and "baptism are two different acts, and they are very clearly defined. The circumcision of the text is "without hands"—the work of God's Spirit upon the heart, for it is called "the circumcision of the heart made without hands," by the circumcision of Christ," of which the carnal circumcision was a type; while the "burial with Him in baptism" is the outward profession that the thus regenerated man makes of his faith in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. This regeneration, wrought "without hands," Paul calls circumcision, while he calls the baptism a burial and resurrection with Christ. I would refer you to the comment of the founder of your denomination—John Wesley—on this passage, and also to the following words from Dr. Adam Clarke—the ablest expositor of Scripture of whom you, as a people, can boast:

"Buried," etc., alluding to the immersion practiced in the case of adults, when the person appeared to be buried under the water, as Christ was buried in the heart of the earth; his rising again the third day and their emerging from the water was an emblem of the resurrection of the body and a total change of life." Com. in loco.

I here repeat that the New Testament is silent upon the theory that Jewish circumcision was changed into Christian baptism and refer you and all who may read this reply to your letter to a careful study of pages 151-153 of my "Bible Baptism," especially to the scriptures there referred to in support of the argument.

Why did you not attempt a criticism on the following syllogism, given on the same page with the one in question, and given as a proof of the correctness of the "minor premise (2)" which you foolishly attempt to deny?

(1.) If "circumcision was done away" to make room for baptism, it would have been "done away" when baptism was introduced.

(2.) But Paul circumcised Timothy more than twenty years after the introduction of baptism (see Acts xvi. 3) therefore

(3.) Baptism did not "take the place of circumcision," both were continued; the former as an initiatory rite into the Christian Church, to be given to all who would profess a personal faith in Jesus, "both men and women"; the latter as a mark of Jewish nationality to be given to males only. (Compare Acts viii. 12 and Genesis xvii. 10.) The argument remains unshaken and cannot be gainsayed.

I now come to the pleasing duty, Mr. C., to give you credit for something, i. e., the first attempt at constructing a syllogism in support of infant baptism that I have ever read; but alas for the conclusion of said syllogism! Its major (1) premise is built upon a supposition that exists only in the imagination of such controversialists as yourself, namely, a Christian Church prior to the time of Christ.

Your syllogism reads as follows:—

(1.) If Christ had intended that infants in the Christian Church should not be received into its fold as in the former dispensation, and by the proper mode of baptism, there would have been

some intimation of the change given in the New Testament.

(2.) But the New Testament is silent upon any such change.

(3.) Therefore, no such change was intended by Christ.

Your first premise rests upon the supposition that there existed a Christian Church "in the former dispensation." Please take the trouble to compare this with the following, taken from page 20 of your *Catechism*:

"Was John's baptism performed under the Christian dispensation?"

No. The Christian dispensation was not inaugurated when John preached and baptized. This dispensation did not commence until after Christ had died and risen again."

In your *Catechism* you labor hard to show that "the Christian dispensation was not inaugurated when John preached and baptized," and the major premise of your syllogism rests upon the supposition that there existed a Christian Church "in the former dispensation," and that "infants were received into its fold." (Currie versus Currie.) "Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel!" If Christ recognized a Christian Church "in the former dispensation," what did He mean by saying "Upon this rock I will build my Church," &c. Matt. xvi. 18. Whatever societies or assemblies existed "in the former dispensation," it is very evident, from the above and other scriptures, that Christ did not recognize any one of them as His Church, for the erection of His Church, the Christian Church, was yet in the future. "I will build my Church," and the foundation upon which it was to be built was Peter's confession, namely, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

Will you not amuse us, Mr. C., with another syllogism in support of infant baptism?

SYLLOGISM NO. 3.

(1.) Paul taught the Ephesian Church "all the counsel of God."

(2.) Paul said nothing about infant baptism.

(3.) Therefore infant baptism is no part of "all the counsel of God."

You seem to question the minor premise (2) of the above by stating that "Paul said a great many things in his preaching to the Ephesians that are not in his Epistles." Here you admit that Paul said nothing about infant baptism in his Epistles to the Ephesians to whom he preached "all the counsel of God," but you take for granted that he may have said something about the theory sometime "in his preaching," although it has not been recorded. You are very welcome Sir to all the comfort and support that can be extracted from such a foundation for a tottering theory, in defence of which you have spilt much ink; but as a Baptist I prefer to build upon what is "written." And if it be less objectionable to you I am willing to write my argument as follows:—

(1.) Paul taught the Ephesian Church "all the counsel of God."

(2.) There is not a word recorded in all his teachings in support of infant baptism.

(3.) Therefore infant baptism is no part of "all the counsel of God."

SYLLOGISM NO. 4.

(1.) The ordinance of baptism is a positive command.

(2.) The baptism of infants is nowhere commanded in the Word of God.

(3.) Therefore the baptism of infants is not of God. You think this syllogism defective, because it "argues as if the command (to be baptized) was given to adults, or adult believers." Most certainly I do. And I shall here add that the command to be baptized was given to no other than "adults or adult believers." If you had taken the trouble to turn up the passages to which the first premise of the syllogism refers you, you would find the following words, "Can any one forbid water that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we, and He commanded them to be baptized," Acts x. 47, 48. Were not "these" "adults or adult believers?" I have also referred to the commission to show how beautifully the Master's command and the servants' conduct harmonized. He commanded them to disciple; baptize, teach—they "went everywhere preaching the word," and they that gladly received the word were baptized, "and many of the Corinthians also hearing, believed and were baptized," Acts ii. 41; viii. 12; ix. 18; x. 47, 48 and xviii. 8.

By carefully examining the above and other scriptures your conscience must tell you, notwithstanding what you may write to the contrary, that—

(1.) The ordinance of baptism is a positive command.

(2.) Infant baptism is nowhere commanded.

(3.) Therefore, infant baptism is not of God.

In your "closing words" there is another example of your characteristic inconsistency. There you say that one of the grounds upon which you baptize infants is "because they are saved," but on page 31 of your remarkable *Catechism* you say that "infants ought to be baptized because of the importance of baptism." In John iii. 5 it is said "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," and you add that "those parents who do not suffer little children thus to come to Christ, and those teachers who forbid them thus to come, assume

the awful responsibility of rejecting the only possible period in which all can be born of water, and sanctioning a system the tendency of which is to send the great majority unbaptized into eternity." (Currie versus Currie again.) If this teaches baptism "because they are saved," language has no meaning.

In conclusion, dear sir, allow me to tell you in all kindness that you are doing yourself and the holy office you assume to fill, a very great injury by the recklessness of your assertions. Many of your own brethren are losing confidence in you and becoming ashamed of your conduct, and none of them will venture an attempt to help you out of the grave difficulties that your misrepresentations and false quotations have gathered thick around your troubled head. I would advise you not to write any more on the subject of baptism until you shall have extricated yourself out of the *lexicon trouble*. That being done, if you have time and inclination to criticise any more of my syllogisms, I shall read your criticisms, and if worth while I shall reply. Meanwhile,

I remain,  
Yours, &c.  
D. G. McDONALD.

To the Editor of the Christian Messenger.

Dear Brother,—

The writer of the Circular Letter of the Eastern Association published in your last issue, declares that there are but three strong churches in that Association; viz.: Amheist, Truro, and North Sydney, meaning by that those "able and willing to support pastors and contribute liberally to the benevolent objects of the denomination." Taking this definition of the word I think I may ask to have the church here considered strong. Our resident membership is about fifty, and we have during the past year raised and appropriated the following amounts:—

Pastor's salary.....\$600 00  
Debt on church..... 300 00  
Re-building Acadia College. 254 00  
Organ..... 130 00  
Foreign Missions..... 20 00  
Fence around church..... 20 00  
Platform chairs..... 15 00  
Sabbath School papers..... 6 00

Total.....\$1345 00

If any one church in the denomination has done better than that during the past year, it would encourage us to hear from it.

Yours fraternally,  
F. O. WEEKS.

Antigonish, Aug. 17, 1878.

N.B.—Antigonish has only 58 resident members.—Ed. C. M.]

To the Editor of the Christian Messenger.

My Dear Sir,—

I observe that the Treasurer of the Central Association, in presenting his account of moneys received, is careful to mention what churches do not send anything; and among them the First Horton Church (Wolfville) stands prominent, having sent, for Home Mission, French Mission, and other objects, nothing!—And so, Wolfville appears with a long array of blanks!

But it was not so. We had made special collections for the objects mentioned below, and the money had been duly forwarded to the respective Treasurers: thus;—

Infirm Ministers'.....\$19 00  
French Mission..... 22 25  
Home Mission..... 30 00  
Do. (S. School). 30 00  
Do. (S. School). 30 00  
Foreign Mission..... 32 12  
Do. (S. School). 20 00

Total.....\$153 00

I think that in future the Church Letters should contain an account of all the money raised for various objects during the year. Thus, the entire benevolence of each Church would be reported.

Yours truly,  
J. M. C.

Letter from Paris.

(Correspondence of the Christian Messenger.)

No. 18.

HOW TO KEEP COOL. MUSIC WANTED. EXHIBITION FINANCING. ITALIAN EXHIBITS, &c., &c.

HOTEL DU LOUVRE, PARIS, }  
August 9th, 1878. }

The receipts continue to diminish at the Exhibition, though the building be no hotter than elsewhere. In the Champ de Mars, the galleries are positively cool, thanks to the awning, and the fresh air through the slitted floor.

Those desiring a zero temperature ca

take up a position beside an ice making machine and lend a hand to passing the "bricks" to the trucks; there is the underground aquarium, with subterranean attractions that would delight the Duke of Portland himself and the tastering hall, where refrigerated wines, brandies, and liqueurs, can be sipped for nothing. The truth is the Exhibition wants animation. Visitors demand to live there and be amused for a day, not to have to return "done up," to a late table d'hote, and too exhausted to crawl anywhere after the meal. There is no music in the grounds, and only the reckless consent to be stewed in the Trocadero concert hall, and finished by international fiddlers, flute-players, big and little drums, trombones, cymbals, and triangles.

The Jardin d'Acclimation ought to lend its camels to enable visitors to perform the journey between the Trocadero and the Champ de Mars; the poor animals would feel at home in a temperature of 113 degrees; and the traveller about as happy as looking at the wool-carding machines, or the contents of the cases in the drug section. In the Italian department are ladders, or fire escapes, that have been constructed on the principle of Irish miles—lengthening as they go. Only think of the man, who has to run and up and down these steps, to illustrate the working of the machines for the public; Banting has overlooked this element in his perfect cure; the French do not employ these escapes; they would deprive their firemen of displaying heroism. The Belgians prefer the spiral descent rope, where an unfortunate runs the chance of being dealt with, as if on a turn-spit before a blazing fire.

The Italian section is devoted to artistic rather than to industrial exhibits. Its facade in the alley of Nations, is ornamented with the busts of Dante, Titian &c.; Victor Emanuel, Garibaldi, the King and Queen; but Cavour is not visible. There is a wooden bust of Napoleon I, an apparatus by which the head can be expanded to the size of Borthold's *Liberte*, in the park or as diminutive as Hugo's *Napoleon le Petit*. Next wonder is Michela's stereographing machine, of six reporter's power; it is even doomed by the phonograph. The specimens of furniture, sculptured and inlaid, are both rich and beautiful: France produces nothing equal to them; black marble and ebony encrusted tables are very numerous: there is a piano in wooden mosaic work for 10,000 francs; but Erard has plain instruments at 50,000 francs. The gems in the way of salon furniture, are the small presses inlaid with ivory or lapis-lazuli. In the application of fine art to industry, the best are the imitations; the new and original are very poor. This remark does not apply to the artistic glass work of Venice; there are cups formed by two layers of melted glass, having the decoration between them. No wonder Nero ordered the death of Consul Petronius, who refused to give up a kindred vase. The irritated or rainbow hues, in some of the glass can be matched by Austrian manufacturers. Venice has the monopoly of this colored glass for Abyssinia and Caffaria, where it is bought as heads, or to serve as money; there are glass tissues, made up as colored cravats and selling at 30 sous each; one of these and a paper collar, can be understood in the dog days. The lower classes in Italy, as in other countries, have but limited taste; their household pottery is vulgar; not only taste for, but the very sentiment of art is absent. Of general industry little is to be said, yet in the fourteenth century Italy exported quantities of tissues in wool, cotton, linen, and silk. She wants coal, but trusts to yet employing sunshine as a motive power. In silks and Tuscan straw hats, much business is transacted, and Venice seems to have rediscovered her art of making lace, as well as of glass. The country is naturally rich, but her agricultural products are few; capital is wanted, and would be supplied, only it would be at once taxed heavily. There are excellent specimens of wheat, preserved fruits, and well known wines; agriculture as backward all the same though the Etruscans were fair cultivators; they were ingenious too, as they invented hand-mills and trumpets; their descendants inherit some of their qualities—the love of music for example, as the Etruscans