

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

CONCERNING BAPTISM.—XIV.

BY REV. W. M'KAY, B.A., WOODSTOCK, AUTHOR OF "IMMERSION A ROMISH INVENTION."

From the Christian Standard

MR. EDITOR,—The editor has already acknowledged that there is no instance in the Old Testament where one person "dipped" another into and under water, oil, or blood, for any purpose whatever; let him now gracefully acknowledge that there is no case of baptism by "dipping" (i. e., putting in and immediately taking out again) in the whole range of Greek literature prior to the time of Christ, and not until the Church became overrun with superstition, by and by I hope to get him to see that for fifteen hundred years and more after Christ the Scriptural warrant for baptizing by sprinkling was never called in question; while, on the other hand, no instance of baptism as now practised by Baptists, Disciples, Dunkards, Mormons, etc., occurs in history prior to September 12th, 1633. (See "Immersion a Romish Invention," p. 58.)

In the "Standard" of April 8th, the editor reveals even more than usual in offensive personalities. This is the *argumentum ad invidiam*, unworthy of a high-minded Christian man, and indicating only moral obliquity or a paucity of better argument. Whether I hail from Woodstock, Ontario, or from Cincinnati, Ohio; whether or not I am ignorant or learned; whether or not I am, in the dignified and graceful language of the editor, disposed to "spit in the face" of my superiors—all this and a great deal more of the same kind are matters of little or no consequence to the readers of the "Standard." These readers may, however, be expected to feel the deepest interest in the truth taught in God's word concerning one of the sacraments of the Church; and, therefore, the editor would prove himself more worthy of the prominent position he occupies, and show more respect for the intelligence and Christian character of his readers, were he to deal more with the arguments and less with the author. In his paper of April 8th, speaking in a most uncourteous and unjustifiable manner of Dr. Ditzler, he hurls his usual charges of dishonesty and ignorance against myself. He says of me, "His language is the language of ignorance; his confidence is a false confidence," etc. Now, as I made no pretensions of knowing all things, the reader will not be surprised when I confess that there are many things that I do not know. I do not know how much the editor of the "Standard" knows; and it would not be prudent for me to guess, if the quotations from Plutarch and Achilles Tatius are fair specimens of his knowledge. Take another instance of the editor's knowledge (?) from the same paper (April 8). It occurs in the quotation he makes from the "Campbell and Rice Debate," p. 206. The editor is much exercised over the affirmation in my book, p. 22 (and well he may be), in these words: "The truth, however, is, that no lexicographer whose opinion is entitled to any weight gives 'dip,' 'plunge,' or 'immerse' as the meaning of *baptizo* in the New Testament, much less the only meaning." Now what will the intelligent reader think of the knowledge of the editor of the "Christian Standard" when he learns that the said editor, in a professed quotation from the lexicon of Stokius, gives the words of A. Campbell, and prints them in capitals, as the words of Stokius, the lexicographer? The editor, in quoting the meaning of *baptizo* as given by Stokius, reads and prints from the "Campbell and Rice Debate" the second definition, thus (as translated by A. Campbell): "2. Specially and in its proper signification, it signifies to dip or immerse in water." But A. Campbell himself adds the following: "This is its New Testament sense." And this sentence of A. Campbell is printed by the editor of the "Standard" in small capitals, as the language of Stokius, to convict me of ignorance! Stokius says no such thing, but the very reverse. If the editor has a copy of the lexicon of Stokius, he should examine it; and if he cannot read the Latin definitions, he should get someone to read and honestly to translate for him. And if he never saw a copy of Stokius, he had better be a little more sparing hereafter in his charges of "ignorance" against all or any who may differ from him, for such charges, like "chickens, sometimes come home to roost."

But I am not yet done with Stokius. In the latter

part of his second definition, after saying that *baptizo* means "properly to immerse or dip in water," he adds, "(a) tropically (1) by a metalepsis, it is to wash (*lavare*) cleanse (*ablure*), because anything is accustomed to be dipped or immersed in water that it may be washed or cleansed, although also the washing or cleansing can be, and generally is, accomplished by sprinkling the water. (Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38) Hence it is transferred to the sacrament of baptism."

All the latter part of this quotation from the words "although also the washing," etc., is entirely suppressed by A. Campbell, and left out by the editor of the "Standard." The reader will easily discover the reason for such *prudence*. To have quoted it would have spoiled the purposes of both A. Campbell and the editor. And I leave the conscientious reader to pronounce upon the Christian standard of both the teacher and his disciple, in thus garbling a lexicon to suit their miserable sectarian purposes. So far from Stokius saying that the New Testament meaning of *baptizo* is to "dip" or "immerse," he says the very reverse, and shows that it is used in the New Testament in a very different sense, and he gives chapter and verse where it is so used. He tells us, by his quotation from the New Testament, that what he calls the "tropical" sense is the sense in which *baptizo* is used in the New Testament.

The language of Stokius is but little less distinct than that of the great Schleusner, who says that in the sense of "dip" or "immerse in water," *baptizo* "is never used in the New Testament."

May I not, then, with propriety apply to the editor the words he so graciously applies to me? "If his purpose is to act the partisan, perhaps he has done wisely; but if his intention is to furnish his readers with the material for forming an impartial and righteous judgement, it is a bad failure."

I call for the printing of Grimm's definition of *baptisma* and *baptizo* in an unaabbreviated form, and in the original Latin. Let this be done, and we will probably see another instance of shameless garbling, similar to that of A. Campbell and the editor in their quotations from Stokius, given above.

THE RELIGIOUS WANTS OF THE NORTH-WEST.

MR. EDITOR,—Allow me to thank you for your editorial in last week's issue, and for your insertion of the synopsis of my address in Winnipeg, on the progress of the mission work of our Church in the North-West during the past year. Permit me to reply to objections I have heard urged against contributing to that work, and remove misapprehensions.

First, I have frequently been told that the people in Manitoba are wealthy and do not require help. This is a great mistake. The people who move to a new country are not wealthy. Why should families break up their homes in Ontario or Nova Scotia to go to Manitoba, if wealthy? Who cleared the forests of Ontario, drained its swamps, and built its roads? Were they not, for the most part, those who were driven from the homes of their youth by the pressure of poverty? The same class has gone to Manitoba. Many sold farms here ere they moved west, but a large part of the proceeds went to pay the mortgage that encumbered the property, and with only a small portion of the supposed wealth have they begun life again. Let all who hear of the wealth of the North-West only think of the class of people that left their own neighbourhood, and they will understand the character of our settlers. It should also be remembered that many of the settlers are young men beginning life. Their capital consists of their muscles, and brains, and pluck. These will yield a good return in time, but time is an essential element in the case. I have travelled through the North-West, and know whereof I speak, when I say that a large part of the new settlers are poor. I would be the last to endeavour to lay on the back of the people in Ontario, burdens that the people in Manitoba ought to bear. "But," says the objector, "the people of Winnipeg are wealthy." Many of them are, but they cannot surely be supposed to undertake the whole support of mission work in this wide territory. Who expects Toronto or Montreal to bear the burden of Home Mission work in Ontario? The work is the work of the whole Church, and if Winnipeg does her share, no one can ask more. That she is willing to do this is manifest by her subscribing nearly \$40,000 to the Church and Manse Building Fund. The people of Toronto, with a popu-

lation about four times that of Winnipeg, and a large amount of accumulated capital, subscribed about \$30,000 towards the Endowment of Knox College, which is a local institution. Winnipeg, an infant city of twelve years, gave an equal amount for work in the country lying west of her. Toronto will get much benefit, directly, from the Endowment of Knox College; Winnipeg hopes for no such result from her investment. So much for this objection.

Secondly, others urge that Foreign Mission work is more important than Home. "The people in the North-West have their Bibles, but the heathen perish through lack of knowledge." I never think of putting Home and Foreign Mission work in opposition. Both should be carried on, because both are enjoined by our Lord. The work of the Church is to raise the fallen, and to prevent those who are reclaimed from lapsing. Experience shows that the lapsed are most difficult to reclaim. In our cities and towns they resist influences that have been most successful in Christianizing the heathen. This should incite us to care for the spiritual welfare of our people, and prevent the hardening influence of neglect. They may have their Bibles, but what if they do not read them? Are we to leave them to suffer the consequences? Are their children to be allowed to grow up in ignorance and sin? Would Christianity gain by any such process? If one hundred are reclaimed from heathenism, and two hundred lapse into irreligion, it is evident that Christianity is not advancing. To be successful, the Church should see to it that she holds all her conquests. Like a man seeking wealth, the Church will become rich according to what she retains. Much, consequently, as I like the heathen, I would as soon save one hundred Canadians from sinking into worldliness and vice, as convert a hundred Hindoos to Christianity. And that our people in the North-West, if neglected, will sink in many instances into godlessness and vice, admits of no question on the part of those who are competent to judge.

Moreover, one of the best methods of making Foreign Mission work successful is by cultivating the home field. Successful Foreign Mission work grows. There is an increasing demand for men and means; but how can this demand be met by a Church that is stationary at home? The settlement of the North-West will increase the wealth of Canada immeasurably. The resources of the country are, unquestionably, vast. If the inhabitants are Christians their means are at the disposal of the Church for Foreign Mission work, but if the people are godless, the Church will be deprived of their aid in her enterprises. The true friend of Foreign Missions will hence cultivate the home field as a means to obtain the necessary funds to evangelize the heathen.

Thirdly, others urge that there is no need of the haste in prosecuting this work. They wish us to remember the early settlement of Ontario, and ask us to wait till people can support ordinances themselves. One would like to ask those who advocate this policy a few questions. Were the pioneers of Ontario and Quebec satisfied with the policy pursued towards them? Was the policy of starvation conducive to spiritual health in the case of the individual Christian? What were its effects on the Church? Is it not true that irreligion and worldliness were begotten of the policy adopted? Did not people feel keenly the apparent neglect of the Church? Did not thousands of families leave her communion for ever in consequence of this neglect? Along the Ottawa, in the eastern townships, north of Lake Erie, large numbers of Presbyterians settled. The Church failed to send missionaries to form them into congregations, minister to their spiritual necessities, or dispense the sacraments of the Church. Smarting under their wrongs, these people, attached as they were to the Church of their fathers, left her communion in thousands, and are now found in other folds. The Methodist Church of Canada in many a district is largely composed of the children of sturdy Presbyterians. New Brunswick has been almost wholly lost to the Presbyterian Church through neglect. To hear some people discuss the policy pursued in early days, you would think it had been eminently successful instead of being most disastrous to the spirituality, power and prestige of the Church. We want not to imitate, but avoid, the mistakes of the past. There were excuses that could then be urged that have no longer any force. The country then was poor. There were few men of means in the communion of the Church. Congregations had enough to do to support ordinan-