

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Eastern New Brunswick Baptist Association.

MR. EDITOR,—

Perhaps a few words from this north country would be acceptable to some of your readers. We found at Moncton as we entered the cars a goodly number of Ministers and Delegates going northward to the Association. We were only a short time at Shediac, and were on our way in the Steamer for Miramichi. We had pleasant companions and the season was one of profit. Stopping at Richibucto we were informed that the boat would not proceed till morning. We went on shore and were kindly entertained by some friends of other years, with whom we were pleased to renew our acquaintance and fellowship. A religious meeting was appointed in the Temperance Hall, and well attended; an interesting address from Bro. Hopper on the life of Mannassah, was listened to with deep feeling. A number of addresses followed, and we all felt it good to be there. The next day we steamed on to our place of destination. The sail up the river is delightful, calling at Chatham we were taken into custody by Rev. E. Hickson and Brother John Harding who seemed overjoyed to meet those who had started for the Association. Places had been provided for the visitors. Persons of all denominations opened their houses for our reception, and we felt we were, "one in Christ." Their hospitality abounded, may their peace and love much more abound. The Session thus far has been one of unity and love.

The various objects of interest have received special attention.

Brother Edwards, Moderator.

Brother E. C. Cady, Clerk.

Brother R. F. Rattray, Assistant Clerk.

Brother John Harding, Treasurer.

The Association commenced with a religious Conference. It was a delightful season, a time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. Bro James Tozer, the oldest minister in the Association, referred to his former labors in this section of the country. He alluded in a touching manner to Bro. S. Robinson, whom he first met in the Association at Fredericton with his Brethren, all of whom with the exception of the speaker had passed away. Preaching in the evening by Brother Hopper. On Friday the Association Sermon was preached by Dr. Spurgeon. It was a clear logical discourse delivered in a masterly manner with great unction and power. You will hear more of it at a future time.

The subject of Education was taken up in the afternoon. The report on the Visitor was well supported. Some suggestions offered that would apply well to your valuable paper also—such as ministers writing oftener—taking a deeper interest in its circulation, and endeavouring to have it well supported. The report on Temperance was also adopted, but as the Temperance bodies had requested a Public Meeting for Monday evening, the discussion was deferred and the report laid over as a text for the speakers, on that important occasion.

A Missionary Meeting was held on Friday evening, addresses by Revs. E. C. Cady, G. W. M. Carey, Jas. Tozer, Archibald, Charlton, and Bro. May. It was a success. Other brethren held a religious service at Douglas town in Temperance Hall. Bro. Rattray, preached to an attentive congregation, exhortations were given by Brethren Coleman and others present.

The Circular Letter is one of value, I hope you will copy it in due time into the Messenger. It refers to "Our Mission" as a denomination, —as Baptists. There are services appointed in a number of places of worship in this and all the region round for Lord's day, and we hope it will be a day of God's power and grace. There are about sixteen Ministers present. They all seem to be interested in the Mission field, and will doubtless do more on their return for the support of the Missionary cause. Truly the harvest is great, the laborers are few. May we all pray the Lord of the harvest to raise up and send forth faithful labourers into the Vineyard.

ONE FROM THE EAST.

Newcastle, Sept. 22nd, 1866.

THOUGHT, LIGHT.—In order that man may read man's books, he must first be educated to read man's language. So, in order to read God's books of inspiration, prophecy and nature, we require the teachings of the Holy Spirit to assist us in acquiring God's language: until then we are ignorant, and cannot read.

For the Christian Messenger.

Notes on a recent Tract.

DEAR BROTHER,—

A small pamphlet was published last summer, bearing the following lengthy title:—"Puseyism and Semi-Popery of the Rev. J. M. Cramp, D. D., President of Acadia College, N. S.; being a reply to the literary character of a Catechism recently published by that gentleman on Christian Baptism. In a letter addressed to the learned author, by the Rev. D. F. Hutchinson, Minister of St. Paul's Church, Bridgewater, N. S., Author of the 'Essay on the Lord's day,' 'Biblical Chart,' 'Discourse on Christian Baptism,' 'God's own Church,' 'Rhetorical Catechism,' 'Class-Book of Rhetoric,' and 'Astronomical Philosophy.'"

A considerable portion of the pamphlet consists of positive assertions contradictory to statements made in the Catechism. Where I say "Yes," Mr. H. says "No," and vice versa. Now, as I have yet to learn that argument may be superseded by mere contradiction, my first impression was that I need not trouble myself to reply. Reviewing the pamphlet a second time, however, I noticed some particulars to which it may be worth while to call the attention of your readers.

1. At page 5. Mr. H. says, "You contend that the verb means immersion, and nothing but immersion." He is referring to the word *bapto*. This is one of the numerous instances of misrepresentation with which the tract abounds. Mr. H. continually applies to one word what is said about another word. I argue from the meaning of *baptizo*, and he answers, or attempts to answer, by adducing the meanings of *bapto*.

I have not used the language which Mr. H. ascribes to me. I have said (p. 34 of Catechism) that *bapto* "not only signifies to dip or immerse, but also to dye, and stain—meanings which *baptizo* never bears." I know, as well as Mr. H. that the secondary meaning of the word *bapto* leads to various uses of it, of which he has given some examples, borrowed without acknowledgment from Dr. Carson. But that does not affect the question as it regards *baptizo*. And it is proper to remark that the meaning of words is not to be determined by etymology merely, or even by derivation—much less by fancy—but always by usage. I have shown in the Catechism that the usage of the best writers, has sufficiently determined the meaning of *baptizo*.

2. Mr. Hutchinson says (p. 10.) "that verbs ending in *zo* are precisely of the same power and signification with the primitives from which they are formed, and that *zo*, or *izo*, is added only for the sake of euphony"; In applying this remark, to *baptizo*, as derived from *bapto*, he remarks (p. 11.) that "*baptizo* is not quite a *bapto*, but only something approximating to it. In no single case does it signify an increase of the primitive words, but always falls short of what is denoted by it * * * As *bapto* signifies to wet, as I have already proved, so *baptizo* cannot signify my thing more, but something less, which would be to sprinkle." How these statements are to be reconciled, is another question. For my own part I must confess myself unable to conceive how two words can have "precisely the same power and signification," and yet one mean "something less" than the other. Besides, Mr. H. has already affirmed that *bapto* means to sprinkle: if *baptizo* signifies "something less," what is "something less" than sprinkling? Our author has not explained his meaning here. Perhaps I may help him a little. Some years ago I went to a Presbyterian Church in Montreal and heard a worthy minister preach. After the sermon an infant was brought to him. He put his finger in a basin of water, and gently touched the child's forehead. It was neither sprinkling nor pouring, but "something less." Would Mr. H. have us believe that this is the meaning of *baptizo*?

But has Mr. Hutchinson never heard of frequentatives? Does he not know that verbs in *zo* are often of that character? Does he not know, for instance, that *ballo* means to throw, to cast—but that *ballizo* means to throw the leg about, to dance;—that *ripte* also means to throw—but that *riptizo* means to throw to and fro, to toss about;—that *steno* means to groan or sigh—but that *stenizo* means to groan or sigh deeply, often;—that *aitzo* means to ask—but that *aitizo* means to beg;—that *erpo* means to creep—but *erpizo* means to creep slowly, to crawl? Hundreds of additional instances might be forth coming; but the very word now in dispute will be a sufficient illustration. *Baptizo* is derived from *bapto*. Well *bapto* means, according to Liddell and Scott, to dip, and *baptizo* means to dip repeatedly. Here is not "something less," as Mr. H. would have us believe, but something more.

3. I have argued from the uniform practice of the Greek Church. In opposition to this Mr. H. produces some alleged instances of so-called baptism in the Greek Church by sprinkling or pouring. I will adduce some evidence on the other side.

"The Greek christen their children immediately after their birth, or within a few days at least, dipping them in warm water." Hasselquist's Travels, p. 394.

"The Greeks retain the rite of immersion to this day; as Jeremiah the patriarch of Constantinople declares." Deylingius.

"The modern Greek Church defines baptism to be, 'A cleansing, or taking away of original sin, by thrice dipping or plunging into the water'; the priest saying at every dipping, 'In the name of the Father, Amen; and of the Son, Amen; and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.' This thrice dipping, or plunging into the water, this church holds to be as necessary to the form of baptism, as water to the matter." Sir Paul Ricaut's 'Present State of the Greek Church,' p. 163.

"The Greek Church uniformly practises the trine immersion, undoubtedly the most primitive manner." Dr. King's 'Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia,' p. 192.

I am indebted for these quotations to Booth's Pædobaptism Examined, i. 239, 240.

There can be no question that the original form of baptism—the very meaning of the word—was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters; and that, for at least four centuries, any other form was either unknown, or regarded, unless in the case of dangerous illness, as an exception, almost a monstrous case. To this form the Eastern Church still rigidly adheres; and the most illustrious and venerable portion of it, that of the Byzantine Empire [the Greek Church], absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid. The Latin Church, on the other hand, doubtless in deference to the requirements of a northern climate, to the change of manners, to the convenience of custom, has wholly altered the mode, preferring, as it would fairly say, mercy to sacrifice; and (with the two exceptions of the cathedral of Milan, and the sect of the Baptists) a few drops of water are now the Western substitute for the threefold plunge into the rushing rivers, or the wide baptisteries of the East." Dean Stanley's Lectures on the Eastern Church, p. 29.

Before the immersion, the whole party, preceded by the priest and the godfathers, make a solemn procession round the font: this is repeated three times in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Then the priest consecrates the water, and puts a metal cross into it; and afterwards immerses the child three times, again in the three sacred names; and lastly pronounces the baptismal name bestowed on him." Kohl's Russia, p. 251.

How it was that in the cases adverted to by Mr. Hutchinson there was a deviation from the well known practice of the church, and how the parties could justify themselves for such deviation, it is not my business to inquire. But I am strongly inclined to suspect that the narratives adduced by Mr. H. are incomplete.

4. Mr. H. says, "Deylingius [it should be Deylingius] as quoted in Booth's Pædobaptism Examined, says, 'The Greeks at this day practice SPRINKLING.' (The Capitals are his)."

This is a case of gross misrepresentation. Deylingius says no such thing. These are his words:—"It is manifest, that while the apostles lived, the ordinance of baptism was administered, not out of a vessel, or a baptistry, which are the marks of later times; but out of rivers and pools; and that, not by sprinkling, but by immersion. . . . So long as the apostles lived, as many believe, immersion only was used; to which afterwards, perhaps, they added a kind of pouring, such as the Greeks practice at this day, having performed the trine immersion." Booth i. 194. That is according to Deylingius, they first dip the infants thrice, and then pour water upon them. That they do dip them, is certain; whether they afterwards pour water on them, for any unexplained purpose, which ceremony Mr. H.'s informants mistook for the baptism proper, may be regarded as a moot point.

5. I give the following extract from Mr. H.'s concluding paragraph, as a literary curiosity:—"I hereby pledge myself to pay one hundred dollars of lawful money to your Missionary, or any other Society connected with your sect which you may select to receive it, if you can find one clear case of immersion in the whole New Testament in connection with Christian baptism. If you can prove that St. Paul, baptized as he was in a sick chamber, Acts ix. 18., was immersed; or that the Jailor of Philippi, baptized as he was in the middle of the night,

and in jail, Acts xiii. 33, received the ordinance by immersion.

If I were disposed to make myself ridiculous I might imitate Mr. H., and offer him five hundred dollars, or any other sum, if he could find one clear case of sprinkling in the whole New Testament, in connection with Christian baptism; or if he could prove that the Apostle Paul was baptized "in a sick chamber," or the Jailor of Philippi "in jail." But I cannot descend to such folly. Our controversies should be conducted with manliness, and in a Christian spirit.

Mr. H. refers to "Dr. Richard Fuller" as an author from whose writings he supposes I have drawn some of my arguments. As I have no work on baptism bearing the name of "Fuller," and have not seen any, his conjectures are unfounded.

In conclusion I will observe that while here and there an eccentric individual who courts notoriety is bold enough to affirm, in the face of criticism and history, that *baptizo* does not mean to immerse, and that immersion is not baptism, the testimony of the truly learned in favour of our practice is becoming more and more emphatic. The following passages are noticeable:—

Speaking of John's baptism, M. De Pressense, the learned opponent of Rénan, says, "If for ablutions he substituted immersion, it was better to represent the gravity of the disease which was to be healed." Speaking of the baptism of our Lord, he remarks, "Scarcely is he plunged in the waters of the stream when a glorious vision completes the illumination of the Baptist." "Jesus Christ, his Life and Times," pp. 244, 250.

"The usual form of the act was immersion, as is plain from the original meaning of the Greek *baptizein* and *baptismos*; from the analogy of John's baptism in the Jordan; from the apostles' comparison of the sacred rite with the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, with the escape of the ark from the flood, with a cleansing and refreshing bath, and with burial and resurrection; finally, from the custom of the ancient church, which prevails in the East to this day." Dr. Philip Schaff's History of the Christian Church, p. 123. Dr. Schaff is Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church, Merceburg, Pennsylvania.

"At first Christian baptism commonly took place in the Jordan; of course, as the church spread more widely, also in private houses. Like that of John, it was by immersion of the whole person, which is the only meaning of the New Testament word. A mere pouring or sprinkling was never thought of. Paul made this immersion a symbol of burial with Christ, and the emerging a sign of resurrection with Him to a new life; baptism is a "bath." Of the Ethiopian's baptism it is said that both he and Philip went down into the water, and so the evangelist baptized him. There was no longer preparation for baptism; only the universal condition of faith in the kingdom of God and its Founder was required. The apostles had no hesitation in admitting multitudes to baptism who knew very little of Christian doctrine, whose faith was but a very undeveloped sentiment, rather a desire than a fixed consciousness. The act of baptism took place by question and answer. The postulant was asked if he renounced Satan and gave himself to Christ? Thence Peter says that, as of old the believing and the unbelieving were separated by the flood, which to the former brought salvation and was a seal of Divine grace, so now is baptism not a cleansing of bodily filth, but the answer of a good conscience toward God. (1 Peter iii. 21.) There is no proof or hint in the New Testament that the apostles baptized infants or ordered them to be baptized." Dollenberger's "First Age of Christianity and the Church." Dr. D. is Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Munich.

Yours truly,

J. M. CRAMP.

Acadia College, Sept. 25, 1866.

THE HEBREW NEW YEAR.—Yesterday and to-day is commemorated by those of the Hebrew persuasion what is generally known as their New Year. These days are the first of the month of Tisbri, 5925, counting from the creation. Preliminary prayer meetings are held in the synagogues prior to the feast, and are continued up to Yom Kipur, the Day of Atonement which takes place on Wednesday, the 18th, and which terminates the ten days of fasting, humiliation and prayer, commencing next Monday.—Montreal Transcript, Sept. 11th.

There is no better way to learn than to teach.

No man's religion ever survives his morals.