

Cherish, most conscientiously cherish, the spirit of Christian love for all who love our Lord Jesus Christ. Pray for success. Rejoice over their success. You will be happier and holier if you do. All this you can do, and yet be loyal to God's truth.

For the Christian Messenger.

THREE WEEKS AWAY.

Mr. Editor,—

I had intended when absent from Nova Scotia, to have written *The Messenger* from various points; but I found myself constantly occupied, either in travelling, or in sight-seeing, or in conversation with friends. I will therefore have to content myself with a very hasty sketch of my run into the Upper Provinces.

Although "away down East," so far East that we can see the place where the sun rises, a Nova Scotian can jump aboard the cars and speed his way to the place where the sun sets. I have travelled from my own door all the way to the other end of the Dominion by rail, with the exception of the short distance from St. John to Portland per steamer. I was so unsophisticated, that I took with me my driving overcoat, and had the pleasure of carrying it and watching it day after day, without ever once having to put it on. Cars and steamboats are as comfortable as your own parlors. I believe now that railways are a great success, and that Pullman is to be regarded as a benefactor of the human family. We were seventeen hours going from Portland to Montreal, three hundred miles.—(Two weeks later, in the same time, we rode over four hundred miles from Buffalo to New York.) A good Baptist Deacon (everywhere a generous race) walked me out of the hotel, and insisted that I should be his guest. The Baptists in Canada are erecting a series of first class houses of worship.—In Montreal, in Toronto, and in Guelph, three beautiful structures each of stone, and each differing in its style, and size, have just been erected. These vary in cost from twenty-five to ninety thousand dollars—and I was glad to hear that there are Baptists able to give from five to fifty thousand apiece—and that they have done it.

The Baptist Convention was, I presume, well attended, but there is not the same prominence given to Foreign Missions as with us. There is a large field for missionary labor in Ontario—and the attention of the brethren seemed to be chiefly given to home work.

I had the pleasure of meeting at Guelph, several brethren well-known in the Lower Provinces, and it was with a peculiar feeling I saw the faces of Munro and Hurd, and Goodspeed and Porter, Rev. E. F. Curry, too, a New Brunswick man, was designated publicly to the Telooquo field.—Dr. Hurd, who belongs to my own country, not only kindly entertained me, but also accompanied me to Buffalo, and the Falls. This was a merciful arrangement, as otherwise I should have been devoured alive. The Falls are the last place to go to seek pleasure. On the American side, everything is fenced in, and a system of traps is laid for the victim—so much through this gate, so much through that. One cannot get to Goat Island, nor apparently anywhere else, without being blackmailed. However, I had the Dr. as guide. He bluffed the cab-drivers (the hungriest cabbies in creation), and "turned to the right, and turned to the left, and went straight ahead." We paid our quarter, and crossed the Suspension Bridge, and there was the whole of it in sight before us—with its everlasting roar. Now I knew what a "voice as the sound of many waters" is like.

Well we gazed a while and then sauntered down the other bank a mile or so, crossing over to the American side by the Suspension Bridge, I took the New York Central at 2 o'clock P.M. and was in New York next morning, at 7. I immediately struck for the nearest Nova Scotians I knew, and found my old friend George Dimock in Elizabeth N. J., who kindly took me in and showed me various points of interest in the metropolis of the United States.

I feel well repaid for my journey. As you travel day after day through this Dominion, and as its many resources, its vast farming districts, its noble forests, and its rising manufactories, the impression is fixed upon the mind, that this Canada is a great country. One can tell very little by maps, and

the knowledge of other countries gained from reading or conversation is exceedingly limited. It is necessary to take your traps and go through Canada, before you have anything like an idea of its dimensions and resources. Hoping that many of my brethren may at a future time take the same trip, and assuring them of a warm reception by the Baptists of the Upper Provinces—I must close up this very crude sketch.

D. A. S.

Amherst Nov 25, 1875.

The Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, N. S., DECEMBER 8, 1875.

Ever since it became so publicly known that Professor Paine, of the Congregationalist Seminary in Bangor, taught his Theological students that the voice of History showed that immersion was the original and proper mode of Christian baptism, our venerable friend the Rev. Mr. Sommerville has, nevertheless, been endeavouring to demonstrate that the voice of Scripture is opposed to such teaching. If he alone were concerned in this matter we might let all he has said pass without a word of remark, but lest his bold affirmations and his confident tone should lead any person to suppose that his teachings are as correct and consistent as he seems to suppose they are, we may devote a little space to examine what he has said during the discussion, and our readers may then judge for themselves as to what is the true value of his views and arguments.

MR. SOMMERVILLE'S CONSISTENCY IN COURTESY.

Here it is, "Poor John Brown of Cow Bay;" there it is, "Had I known who he was I should not have spoken of him so lightly." "I ask his pardon."

Mr. Brown complains of Mr. S's style and asks him to produce, from the Old Testament or the New, proof for infant baptism; Mr. Sommerville replies by telling him that "He is making rapid progress in the School of Scandal." Referring to a Baptist Minister, but mistaken in his man, he asperses him with the charge of "contemptible trickery;" and the elegant simile of "stop thief" is made, by the Rev. Mr. Sommerville, to do duty in characterizing us, yet the same Mr. Sommerville complains that it is insinuated that he is Rabshakeh, and that he has not read the Acts of the Apostles carefully; yes, it is the same Mr. S. who makes these complaints, that charges Baptists with being "blind-folded, cabletowed, and swear what they are told."

WHAT MR. SOMMERVILLE DOES SEE, AND WHAT HE DOES NOT SEE.

He sees that Jesus did not command John to baptize him, as we had said, by the way, and not critically. When the Saviour applied to John for baptism, "John forbade him," and, on Jesus saying, "Suffer it to be so now"—a verb in the imperative—he baptized him. To sift all the imperative out of this is sharp, we will not say hyper-critical exercise in exegesis; and it is also notably superfluous; as the matter of its being a command out and out, or a request, or a request partaking of the nature of a command, does not touch essentially the matter in hand.

We had inferred that the Lord took the Supper with his disciples, and so expressed ourselves; not, however, grounding on the statement the fact we had undertaken to establish, and did indeed establish. Our inference that our Lord participated by eating and drinking, in the Supper, was drawn from the expression, "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine," &c.; an expression used by our Lord at the close of the Supper. Mr. S. "finds that it is not true." Here again is evidence of nice and laboured discrimination on a matter that in no way affects our argument. Our statement was by the way, Mr. S. declares his decision as the decision of a critic after critical examination. He is positive. In fact, as Hezekiah says, "He can dogmatize." As a mirror, in which to see the arrogance of his own *ipse dixit*, we will hold up to his eyes the opinion of no less a man than the distinguished and scholarly, Abbott—Pedobaptist—of Harvard University, who says on this point, "His [Christ's] own partaking of the Eucharist gave still further sanction to his injunction that his disciples," &c. As we cannot be trusted, we refer not to our impartial and intelligent readers, but to Mr. Sommerville, who says, "I hold him (Ed. of Mess.) utterly

unreliable," we take the liberty of directing the attention of the Rev. Mr. S., that he may verify our extracts, to the article on Baptism by Mr. Abbott in Smith's Bible Dictionary.

We may also take the occasion to remark that we do not feel certain which of the two learned gentlemen is correct in this matter.

Furthermore, on the authority of God's word, 2 Kings v. 10—"Go wash in Jordan seven times," and 14th verse, "Then went he down and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God," we stated that Naaman was commanded to dip himself seven times in Jordan. Mr. Sommerville says "Naaman was not commanded to dip seven times, or once, in Jordan." He surely did dip himself, and it was done according to the saying of the man of God—i.e. according to God's command. We fully agree with Mr. S. that all human assertions should be tried by the Word of God. He shall have the full benefit of it in this case.

According to the saying of the man of God, Naaman dipped; according to the saying of Mr. S., "He is at perfect liberty to perform the ablution as he pleased." According to the saying of the man of God he dipped himself; according to the saying of Mr. S., "he might have dipped the part affected." How does Mr. S. know that the disease was local? According to the saying of the man of God he *dipped himself* seven times in Jordan; according to the saying of Mr. S., "He might have laved the water on the diseased part." According to the saying of the man of God, he dipped, according to the saying of Mr. Sommerville "he might have sprinkled himself seven times. What he did do was "according to the saying of the man of God; according to the saying of Mr. S., "he might have erred through ignorance or recklessness."

For saying that Naaman was commanded to dip in Jordan we are charged by Mr. S. with "handling the Word of God deceitfully." Mr. S. will have scripture interpret Scripture. He is shy of human literature, especially for the sake of the people. We object not. Here God commands Naaman to do something. King James' scholarly servants dress the command, as given, in the word "wash," the command as obeyed, in the word "dipped." Mr. S. gets out of the "Floods" of these translators by going into the "showers," a rendering of his own. We might suggest "bathe" for "wash" in the case in hand and perhaps be more correct than Mr. S. is in his attempt to get rid of "Floods;" but we shall leave things as they are, and remind Mr. S. that he ignores God's definition of the command given to Naaman, for the obeying of it is graphically described and endorsed by God, and substitutes in its place a series of conjectures, having not even reason, but simply fancy as their author. Mr. S. does not see that God commanded Naaman to dip himself.

DICTION FIRST PERISHES BY AN OPPONENT.

Naaman dipped and was blessed; the priests dipped the birds and blessings came. Asher's foot was dipped in oil and his house was blessed. Priests dipped themselves, in the temple-service, and were blessed in it. Alas, Mr. S., for a score or more of years, has, we are informed, been ringing out, in private and in public, from the chimney corner and from the pulpit that immersion is a *symbol of irremediable destruction*; hence these desperate efforts to divorce dippings from blessings, and yoking them with judgments and cursings, and, under this Pedobaptist lash of "sprinkle forever," to drive dipping into outer darkness!

This dictum however old, however dear is gone, let us hope to be heard of no more: and it would be far better for Mr. S. to bid it adieu, than to try to hold it by quibbling about the blessing not being "in" the dip, but connected "with" the dip.

WHAT WE DID TEACH AND WHAT WE DO TEACH.

Mr. S. says we teach "that immersion originated with the baptism of Christ which he (we) does not believe and did not intend to teach." Mr. S. states what he cannot substantiate.

Again we are compelled to confront Mr. S. in his huge efforts to escape the pressure brought to bear upon him. We cut all his ancient dippings, washings and sprinklings from the gospel day-church-baptism, and we challenge him to bring from God's word a command, an example or authority of any kind by which to link the baptism of John and Christ with anything that

went before; and he finds himself face to face with a hopeless, impossible task. We are not at a loss to understand the veiled meaning of those dexterous exploits in interpretation of such matters as to whether Christ ate the Supper himself, and whether he requested or commanded John to baptize him—matters that touch not the vitals of the question. The main question must not be trifled with; it must not be evaded.

Again, we affirm that the Lord's Supper of this dispensation did not exist in either of the old economies. Mr. S. admits this. Again we affirm that Christian baptism, the baptism of Christ's church of this dispensation had no existence in the old dispensations. God ordered, for the tabernacle and temple-service, sprinklings, dippings, anointings and various performances; but the baptism of the Christian church is not there. We do not deny that the Jews had a dip unto Moses, that birds were dipped, that priests were dipped and sprinkled; but what we say is, that, in the old dispensation, there is no baptism recognized, of which John's baptism is a recognized and accredited extension; of which the baptism of Christ by John, and the baptism of Christ's disciples by Christ's disciples are declared repetitions. Here we are pleased to hold Mr. Sommerville to his own terms—Keep in the bible. Will Mr. S. give us from God's word baptism such as John's and Christ's before the days of John and Christ? Mr. S. must remember these baptisms were away from the temple, ignored the temple service, and were, in the one case, unto repentance and for the remission of sins, and, in the other, when fully developed, were in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

In his letter of Nov. 19th, Mr. S. attempts to prove by some sort of analogy between "one hope" "one Lord" and "one faith," which stretch away back over the old dispensation, that "one baptism" synchronizes with them. But his baptism is sprinkling here, and it is circumcision when he deals with infants. Here are two. Which one does Mr. S. give up on the 19th of Nov. 1875? Show us that either of them has come to Christ's church.

Does Mr. S. know what he himself believes, what he does teach, and what he does not intend to teach?

From the Bible we try to hold him obligated to show where there was baptism in the Mosaic dispensation of which the baptism of John and the baptism of the Christian Church is an extension?

The Lord's Supper was instituted by Christ on the eve of his crucifixion. Baptism was instituted by Christ—to prevent the opportunity of quibbling—let us give the whole space, from the first dip of John to the first dip on the day of Pentecost, as the time in which Christian baptism originated. Back of that, Mr. S. may show us, if he can, from the bible, a man preaching as John did, men preaching as the apostles did, and, apart from temple and tabernacle-service, baptizing those who received their doctrines! Will Mr. S. please dispose of that bit of labour, before he goes into the scenes of bleeding beasts and sprinkling priests, to find the definition of a rite that did not have an existence in that day.

DICTION SECOND PERISHES BY THE HAND OF ITS AUTHOR.

This is the one ruled out by its author as useless. Here it is. "We can never learn the design or form of an ordinance by the name given to it." We denounced it as unbaptist. Mr. S. says he does not state that Baptists, "reckless as are many of their statements," ever held to such a doctrine. Who does hold it? Do Pedobaptists? Mr. S., taken as a representative, does not admit it? Why lay it down then? Why write a long paragraph of challenges to Baptists to prove immersion in this way? Mr. S. seems unwilling to reveal his design. The attempt was to leave the impression that Baptists obtain their views of baptism from the name of the ordinance; for Mr. S. says, "it is too notorious to be denied that their main argument in support of immersion is derived from the meaning of the word baptize." To ascertain the meaning of baptize in all its actual relations and uses, where it is used in scores of places, many of which are detailed and graphic descriptions, and to get the meaning from the simple name of the ordinance, Mr. S. himself will not fail to see, are quite different things. We flung back the insinuation; Mr. S. pleads innocence, and so pronounces by implication, the dictum itself useless;

and so the insinuation and the thing that insinuates go out of existence.

WHAT MR. SOMMERVILLE DID SAY, AND WHAT WE DID SAY.

Here are the words of Mr. S. in his first article, "Must it then appear impossible that there should arise, even under the eyes of the apostles, men who, dissatisfied with Jewish sprinklings, thought this advanced dispensation demanded something more grand and imposing, and insisted that the disciples should all be dipped?" In another article Mr. S. says, "Suppose that it is fully ascertained and admitted that baptism by sprinkling was ridiculed by the devil's ministers * * * abandoned, and immersion * * substituted in its room."

In referring to this and giving the substance, not the exact words, we said, "He (Mr. S.) undertakes to guess how immersion originated." "Men arose under the eyes of the apostles who were dissatisfied with sprinklings, and demanded that the disciples should be dipped."

These words says Mr. S., "Are an untruthful representation of both my words and my ideas." But this Mr. Sommerville, who, on account of the above, makes sweeping charges, does not fail to display rare courage in an attempt to make the readers of the *Presbyterian Witness* believe that Baptists do not accept the Old Testament as divine authority; and, to sustain this audacious and heavy charge, adduces a garbled extract, wrung from its connexion, from Dr. Wayland's writings, and a bare reference to the articles of the Baptists of these provinces, but does not give even a garbled quotation from them. The Rev. Mr. Saunders, in the *Witness* of last week, gives some full extracts from accepted sources, which rolls this unwarrantable and monstrous charge back upon its author.

A HALF ADMISSION. HALF A LOAF BETTER THAN NO BREAD.

"The Word" (baptize) says Mr. S. "expresses covering, wholly covering, but still covering as opposed to dipping or immersion." Then he adds, "The Ed. M. may now prepare himself for rare fun." In the same connexion he undertakes, having in mind the overflowing of the shore by the tide, to express which Aristotle uses the word baptize, to show how sprinkling can come into the place of the word that means "covering and wholly covering."

He thinks it is easy and simple. This is the solution. "When water is symbolically applied, a partial application, a few drops, the spray dashed from the branch of hyssop, will as fully answer the conditions of baptism, in its widest sense, as all the waters of the Atlantic." Mr. S. did the italicizing.

To justify this Mr. S. refers to the ordinance of sprinkling by the priest to cleanse the leprosy. But the word directing the priest meant *sprinkle*, the word that directs Mr. S. according to his own definition, means to *cover*, to *wholly cover with water*. Now we shall ask Mr. S. two questions and he will deny neither their pertinence nor their importance. Would the priest have obeyed God, had he covered the leprosy person with the fluid instead of sprinkling him? If not, does the Rev. Mr. Sommerville obey God, when, instead of covering the subject of baptism, he only applies to it a few drops of the fluid?

Neither the priest of the old dispensation, nor the preacher of this dispensation has any authority for adding to or taking from God's word. Out of his own mouth, we convict Mr. Sommerville of departing from the plain literal instructions, received from the highest source in the universe, and received in connexion with the greatest matter that engages the mind of God, angels and men. It is futile for Mr. S. to further attempt to darken counsel by vain reasonings; and we hope, in the light of the following fact, he himself may be convinced:—Rev. Mr. Boggs, one of our missionaries in India, states, that while on a tour to a distant part of that field, a young man was found who had obtained the Scriptures and by them had been led to Christ. He asked for baptism. Rev. Mr. McLaurin enquired how he wished to be baptized. He was confused and did not understand. Mr. McLaurin explained to him that some Christians baptized by sprinkling &c. It had never entered his mind. He saw in God's word that it was his duty to be baptized, and that immersion was the mode. He was baptized.

Had Mr. Sommerville been there, he would have felt it his duty to have