

A FEW YEARS AGO, Mr. Fellows ventured to recommend a new combination of Hypophosphites (Fellows' Compound Syrup of Hypophosphites) to the medical profession and the public, based upon the effects he himself experienced from its use; since then it has been employed with marked success in the treatment of various debilitating diseases, and the sale which at first was numbered by single bottles, has now reached large proportions, so that it is impossible to estimate the good results which have followed. Many cases of confirmed Consumption are known to have been cured, in others the physical signs have disappeared, while great improvement has been marked in all. The inventor has yet to be informed of a single instance where Bronchitis, either acute or chronic, has not been successfully treated by it; while in other Lung difficulties, diseases of the Heart, Nervous System, and the Brain, it far surpasses everything hitherto known.

Its freedom from the constipating tendency of many otherwise valuable remedies, makes it obviously adapted to a wide range of diseases.

It is pleasing to note a chemical preparation emanating from a provincial town, prescribed by the leading medical men of the great cities, as in the case with this preparation.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

BAPTISM BY FIRE.

Mr. Editor,—

An article in the *Wesleyan* of Aug. 20th, signed "P." requires no refutation; but I deem it proper to offer a few thoughts with reference to the very serious charge preferred against me, of having, "to make out a case"—of immersion—"woefully perverted Scripture."

By way of introduction it may be stated that P. refers to a debate in which, for having conscientiously made a few peaceful remarks to my congregation on the duty of baptism, I was called to defend the practice of immersion in a public discussion. He is undoubtedly the man who assisted his Brother "J. T." as much as he could, both previously and in the debate; but, aware that his friend needed further aid, published a communication on the subject in the *Wesleyan*. On this I wrote brief strictures, which appeared in *Christian Messenger* of July 12th. In these I did not censoriously charge him with having "woefully perverted Scripture," but quietly pointed out some instances in which he had misapplied it. Instead of attempting to meet these strictures—in this he evinced prudence—he prefers against me this grievous charge with reference to the baptism of fire.

P. doubtless remembers that at the commencement of the debate I read the affirmative position which I maintained, namely, "That the immersion of a believer in water in the name of the Trinity, is scriptural baptism;" and that J. T. acknowledged this to be correct; and that when, from Rev. W. Trotter, who owned that in the Classics baptizo meant to plunge I read his concession: "I do not pretend that baptizo means to sprinkle," J. T. added, "Neither do I." He could not then consistently argue for sprinkling.

His principal argument in favor of pouring was founded on the baptism of the Holy Ghost. In reply, I laid down the self-evident principle, "that the literal meaning of a word is not to be learned from its figurative use;" and asked, "who could ascertain what was the literal action in circumcision from the figurative use of the word?" (See Rom. ii. 28, 29.) My opponent did not attempt to controvert the correctness of the principle; but expressed astonishment and contempt, as did also P., that I should speak of the term baptism, when applied to the Holy Ghost and fire, as figurative. I immediately adduced the authority of that very eminent linguist, William Greenfield. No attempt was then made to meet this; but P. still insists that "it was a literal baptism." Such of his adherents as are not versed in language may suppose that he is correct; but every person acquainted with philology knows that he is not. Obviously on a point of this kind the concurrent views and testimony of learned Greek Lexicographers should be regarded as decisive. I have now before me the Lexicons of Storkins,

Parkhurst, and Greenfield—all Pedobaptists. Parkhurst, in accordance with Storkins, says, "In a figurative sense, To baptize with the Holy Ghost," and cites Matth. iii. 11 Mark i. 8. &c. Greenfield, defines it, "Metaphorically, to overwhelm one with any thing, to bestow liberally, imbue largely." Matth. iii. 11. Mar. i. 8. Luke iii. 16.

My opponents obviously imagine that what is expressed in figurative language must be of little consequence. (Hence the addition of "only" to my words.) But on this point, as well as the other, they are widely astray. In the account of our Lord's being baptized by John in Jordan, the word is used in its literal sense; but when it relates to His overwhelming sufferings—a matter of infinite moment—it is used figuratively. It is so defined in all my Lexicons. Parkhurst's definition is, "Figuratively, To be immersed or plunged in a flood or sea, as it were of grievous afflictions and sufferings." Matth. xx. 22, 23, &c.

Those who maintain that the believers were to be baptized "with fire," can hardly imagine that the term fire is there to be taken in a literal sense.

We come now to the question, Did the "fire" (Matth. iii. 11.) relate to the believers, or to the unbelievers? If my opponents suppose that I referred to the latter in order to furnish an argument in favor of immersion, they labor, as in many other cases, under a gross mistake. I had no occasion to urge any such argument. In response to the request of J. T. to shew one plain instance of immersion in the New Testament: out of many that might have been cited, I referred him to Acts viii. 38, 39; and asked him to tell me, by what other preposition and verb in Greek it could have been more certainly expressed that the Ethiopian was immersed. Both he and his assistant P. have prudently declined attempting it. How then, could any man venture to affirm, that "Dr. Tupper had been trying for two hours to make out an instance of Christian baptism by immersion on record in the Scriptures;" and "had failed;" and therefore "to make out a case, if not by water, by fire. . . woefully perverted Scripture?"

My judgement with reference to the "fire" mentioned in Matth. iii. 11, was deliberately formed many years ago, without any reference to the ordinance of baptism; and it was casually mentioned while I was commenting on the text. I am aware that critics differ on this point. It may be alleged, that according to my view the language is quite elliptical. But similar cases occur elsewhere. Thus in Ps. lxxviii. 34, it is written, "When He slew them [some] then they [others] sought Him. So in Isa. xxxvii. 36. "When they [the living] arose early in the morning, behold, they [those slain by the angel] were all dead corpses." The statement in Acts ii. 3, "And there appeared unto them eleven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them," is urged in opposition to my view. But Luke does not say, nor intimate, that the Apostles were baptized with fire; but describes the tongues that appeared to them, as resembling flames "cloven," or parted, "like as of fire."

It is well-known that the term fire is often used in Scripture as an emblem of wrath and punishment. Our Lord speaks of the wicked as being "cast into the fire"—and "cast into hell fire." (Mar. ix. 43-48.) In Matth. iii. 10, by the "tree which bringeth forth good fruit" being "cast into the fire," is evidently denoted the final doom of the ungodly; and in verse 12th "burning up the shaft with unquenchable fire," obviously denotes the same thing. Is it not most natural and consistent to understand the word "fire" in the intermediate verse, the 11th in the same sense. It is also worthy of consideration, that in the predictions of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, where no previous mention is made of unbelievers, the Evangelists do not mention the fire. (See Mar. i. 8. John i. 33. Acts i. 5.) Moreover, in other instances—besides Acts ii. 3, already noticed—of the record of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, there is no mention made of fire. See Acts x. 44. 45. xi. 15, 16.)

I do not attach infallibility to men. To shew, however, that my view was not adapted "to make out a case," and that it is not singular, I will add a few extracts from eminently learned Pedobaptists.

Dr. Barnes, in his note on Matth. iii. 11, says, "A part of his hearers He, [Christ] would baptize with the Holy Ghost, but the wicked with fire and vengeance. Fire is a symbol of vengeance; see Isa. v. 26, lxiv. 2. lxi. 24."

Dr. Lange, in his Note on the text, says,

"He shall baptize, or immerse, you in the Holy Ghost and in fire. He will either entirely immerse you in the Holy Ghost as penitents, or, if impenitent, he will overwhelm you with the fire of judgment, and at last with hell fire."

Rev. Dr. David Brown, in his Note on this text, in the Portable Commentary, says, "The fire, which in another verse is called 'unquenchable,' can be no other than future torment, whose 'smoke ascendeth up for ever and ever,' and which by the Judge Himself is styled 'everlasting punishment.' (Matth. xxv. 46.) What a strength, too, of just indignation is in that word [ver. 10.] cast, plunged into the fire!"

Professor Edward Robinson, the learned Editor of Calmet's Bible Dictionary under the word Baptism, says, "The question respecting the baptism by fire in Matth. iii. 11, and Luke iii. 16, must be determined by a simple reference to the succeeding verse in each case. (Compare also Matth. iii. 10.) After reciting the words of John, he adds, 'Here the wheat are evidently those who receive Christ as the Messiah, and embrace his doctrine; these he will baptize with the Holy Ghost, i. e. he will impart to them spiritual gifts, and the teachings and consolations of the Holy Spirit; while the chaff are as evidently those who reject Christ and his doctrine, and live in sin: these he will baptize with fire unquenchable; they shall go away into everlasting punishment.'"

"P. is quite welcome to enjoy his own opinion with reference to the meaning of the text now considered; but I trust he will not venture to charge all these Pedobaptist authors with having 'woefully perverted the Scripture to make out a case.' If they did not do this, neither did I.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES TUPPER.

Tremont, Aylesford

For the Christian Messenger.

TEACHING BY EXAMPLE.

Compared with other modes and systems of education, teaching by example, as a rule, and by common consent, holds a high place. They who are skilled in didactics, and have secured fame as successful teachers and trainers, illustrate the principles they enunciate by examples multiplied and multifarious. Euclid illustrated his abstruse problems and axioms by examples, winding up with the usual *quod est demonstrandum*. In all the arts and sciences, drawing figures and forms of speech, abound, and the moderns in that respect, have enlarged and improved upon the systems of the ancients, and so facilitated the acquisition of knowledge.

It is not enough, says the caviller that you preach virtue—practise it. Set an example as well. The gainsayer is often clever too at quoting scripture when he thinks it will tend to confuse his opponent. And for this he has an example, if not a warrant. To those who eulogize the teachings of severe moralists—the ready answer has ever been—"by their works ye shall know them."

And so it should be. Whether it be in arts and sciences, or in morals, or in religion, he who is unable to illustrate his views and principles by examples, as teacher or preacher is almost certain to prove a failure. While on the contrary, that man who is ready with examples, various, apt, appropriate, who addresses himself to the eye, the ear, and the other senses in aid of the understanding, who in morals or religion practices what he professes, is most likely to be successful.

I have been led into this train of thought in consequence of certain views and opinions more or less prevalent at the present time in reference to what is usually denominated, acts of charity or beneficence. I occasionally meet with persons, who think or profess to think, that it is unscriptural and wrong to give publicity to acts of beneficence, or suffer it to transpire that any particular individual had given largely of his means to promote a charitable or laudable enterprise. Such things they classify as alms-deeds not to be done in the sight of men, but of God only. And that in the matter of donations, &c. &c., their contention is that the left hand should not be permitted to know what the right hand doeth, &c. All which is holy scripture they say, and say truly, and has no other nor less than the Saviour of mankind, himself, as its author.

In that memorable Sermon on the Mount the Great Teacher propounded principles which none of us can too carefully treasure up, or renew. And he who has no higher object or motive in doing alms-deeds—

alms-deeds acts in the original—than to be seen of men, need expect no higher reward. That is clearly the meaning and the pith of what the Saviour taught. The hypocrites practised after that fashion, and the Saviour warned the disciples to avoid their evil examples. He proceeds further, and cautions his disciples not to imitate them in regard to prayer, the place and manner. But because these hypocrites prayed standing in the synagogues, and in the corners of streets, to be heard of men, are we not to pray publicly as well as privately? It is not the act that is censured in either instance, the giving or the praying—it is clearly the motive. And so also as to the mode of fasting, the same injunctions are repeated.

In the previous chapter, Matth. v. 10, part of the same sermon, Christ enjoins the disciples thus—"Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

Was not Christ's whole life, and were not the lives of his disciples and apostles as well, a vivid illustration of this precept? True, neither he nor they had silver or gold to distribute, but their lives were lives of labour and toil, giving and bestowing openly, publicly and freely, such things as they had. Not only so, but it was ordained that all this should be recorded for our example, that we might go and do likewise.

When they told the Saviour that a certain centurion, a man of another nationality, had built them a Synagogue, because he loved their nation, the elders of the Jews who had been sent with a message to beseech him to come and heal the centurion's servant, Luke vii. 6, Jesus uttered no word of reproach or disapprobation, but went with them. The Elders had declared that "he was worthy" for whom the favour was sought, and they gave the reason.—Jesus confirmed their estimate of this pious benevolent individual, marvelling as he did at the faith he manifested, and turning to the crowd that followed he published it and said, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." This is but one of many instances of teaching by example left on record for imitation. The building of the synagogue is not to be mistaken for an act of merit on the part of the centurion, but an exemplification of the faith, which the Saviour so emphatically commended, and which thus produced its natural and proper fruit.

"Thy money perish with thee," said Peter to Simon Magus,—Acts viii. 20, "because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money." This is evidently the same sentiment reproved by the Saviour in his sermon, but in another of its manifestations. Simon's ulterior motive was to make gain. And the man who gives merely to gain the applause of men, having no other and higher object in view, differs from Simon, as those differ, one making wealth, and the possession of riches, the object of life—the other honour, renown and the praise of men.

In both classes of cases, the actions manifest hearts not right with God.

Now let me pursue my train of thought a step further. If good works are praiseworthy and commendable, why are they to be kept hidden, concealed, and unpublished? Why hide the candle, by putting it under a bushel? Why not rather set it in a candlestick that it may give light to all around?

Did not the Apostle commend in the strongest language, the liberality of the liberal churches and blazon it abroad, as an example to others? Are we not admonished to provoke one another to good works? Not, as the primary object, to be seen of men, but as obeying God who requires it at our hands,—and secondarily as an example to others worthy of imitation, and adapted to benefit mankind.

Then be it borne in mind, that the class of men styled "hypocrites," by Jesus, were in the habit of having a trumpet sounded in advance preparatory to their alms-giving, so that the motive, the preparation and the display were alike reprobated. But I am unable to discover in the Holy Scriptures, any condemnation or reproof administered to those who gave openly and publicly of their means, who contributed to assist weak churches or needy saints, who toiled and travelled when the motive and object were praiseworthy. And here, the case of Zaccheus is eminently illustrative. "And Zaccheus stood and said unto the Lord, Behold! Lord the half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have taken any thing from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold. And Jesus said unto him, this day is salvation come to this house &c."

Now by way application. It is not only desirable, but absolutely indispensable, that the brotherhood should be trained to liberality and good works. We have chapels to build and maintain, Pastors to support, Missionaries at home and abroad to sustain, a College to be upheld, Professors to be paid, and many other charities requiring to be promoted. To do this, the only machinery employed, or to be employed is "the Voluntary System." Why, so far from attempting to conceal noble acts of liberality displayed by brothers or sisters, hold such up, say I, as patterns, examples for others to imitate. Conceal littleness, meanness, covetousness, if you please, but honor to whom honor is due—publish and proclaim the acts of benevolence, provoke one another to deeds, of still higher and more daring liberality, so that all may give, one with another, in proportion to their means, and possessions.

Some good brethren among us are opposed even to the taking up Sunday collections in open plates, because boxes, or bags are better adapted to conceal the amount contributed. I am of an exactly opposite way of thinking, I prefer to teach by example, here. Let the influence of the more benevolent be brought thus as far as possible to bear upon the penurious the stingy and, the contracted classes. Nay, to such extremes is this false sensitiveness carried that deacons, it is said, some of them handing round the plates, or boxes, or bags, rarely if ever contribute more than a cent a sermon, for fear of being classed with those who do alms in the sight of men!"

If the wealthy members of our denomination will only consider this matter seriously and prayerfully, and in its proper light and then give, according as God has blessed them, and thus afford praise-worthy examples for publication and imitation, one could without difficulty raise all the money required, to sustain our charities to endow our College, rear up a Female Academy, and so take the proud place, which as a denomination we are entitled to, and ought to take in this respect.

We don't know the widow's name it is true, but we know that it was a woman, and a widow, that contributed most largely of all those who cast into the Treasury, having regard to their means,—and this the Saviour emphatically commended and published.

Dorcas was a woman "full of good works and alms deeds which she did"—and there was never a word of reproof from Peter, when the widows stood by "weeping and shewing the coats and garments she had made" although he was just then about to restore her back to life.

Under the Mosaic dispensation the offering at the dedication of the tabernacle and the names and particulars were recorded with great minuteness. See Num. vii. beginning at 12 vs. where Nahshon's donation is described, and a princely one it was—as were those also of others there detailed and published ending with that of Ahira in the 88 vs. Turn to the chapter reader, and refresh your memory and contemplate the lofty magnanimity that must have prompted such unheard of beneficence, such royal donations. And why have all these illustrations and instances of benevolence been noted down, and published, but to "teach by example," the duty of contributing to every good object, as contrasted with teaching by precept.

J. McCULLY.

Halifax, March 29, 1872.

For the Christian Messenger.

ONTARIO CORRESPONDENCE.

WINTER UNYIELDING. THE NINE HOUR MOVEMENT AND THE PRINTING OFFICES. THE CANADIAN MONTHLY. DR. RYERSON AND HIS LITTLE BOOKS vs. THE GLOBE AND THE BAPTIST.

"When is Spring coming?" "Did you ever know so cold and wintry a march?" Such are some of the stereotyped salutations which pass from lip to lip as acquaintances meet from day to day. And no wonder. April is almost at the door and yet there is scarcely any more indication of the coming of April sunshine and showers than there was six weeks ago.

True we, in the West, know nothing of the trials and tribulations of your "snow blockades." In fact not for many years, I think, has there been on the whole so little interruption of railway travel as during the current winter. The frequent engines on the Great Western, with their long trains of freight and passenger cars, come and go with unfailing regularity. The shrill whistle of the locomotive, the heavy roll of the Pullman Palace cars, the