

their possession, and common prudence, if nothing higher, should therefore prevent you making statements the fallacy of which can be so easily detected.

We shall now look at some illustrations of your "confident assertions." In reply to my statement that no trace of the "Burial Theory" can be found in the works of any one of the Ante-Nicene writers, the editor gave a number of quotations from writers of that period. One of these quotations was quite irrelevant, as it did not contain the word baptism at all, but only "regeneration;" another taught the true doctrine of the believer's union with Christ through the baptism of the Spirit; and the third quotation I showed to be *spurious*. And how does the editor acknowledge his fault? He says (Nov. 18), "We did not have at hand the works of the fathers, except Tertullian, when we made our quotations, and hence took our quotations at second hand, but from a source that we supposed to be trustworthy." Well, if the editor had stopped here, it would have been all right. But no, he proceeds: "But if they (the quotations) are as false as McKay affirms them to be, we have still abundant evidence, in addition to that of Tertullian, of the error of his statement touching the Ante-Nicene fathers." The editor then proceeds to give some of this "abundant evidence." Now, gentle reader, look at this evidence. In order to show the "error" of my statement, that the Ante-Nicene fathers do not teach that a dipping into water is an image of the rock-burial of Christ, he shows by quotations that certain two writers did teach this theory; but *who were these writers, and where did they live?* Mark it well, they were both popes of Rome, and one lived A.D. 800, and the other A.D. 1044! These are fine instances of *Ante-Nicene writers*, i.e., writers who lived and wrote prior to A.D. 325. I am quite well aware the editor of the "Standard" can get "abundant evidence" from Romish popes, and especially those living about the middle of the "dark ages," for his burial theory; but these are not *Ante-Nicene* writers. The Clement who lived in the first century taught no such doctrine, as any reader will see by consulting the Ante-Nicene Library, Vol. I. Oh, but, says the editor, I got these quotations from Dale's "Christic and Patristic Baptism," p. 591. Yes, Dale gives these quotations, but *does not give* the authors as *Ante-Nicene writers*, but as popes of Rome, who lived—one in A.D. 1044, the other in A.D. 800. He marks them in the contracted form, "Rom. Pont."—Roman Pontiff. But the editor, in his application of these quotations, for some cause or other known to himself, overlooks the words "Rom. Pont., 1044," etc., and so, as usual, his "confident assertion" is but an ignorant blunder or something worse.

Origen did not teach the "Burial Theory," but, as may be seen even in the quotation in the "Standard" (Nov. 18), he taught the true doctrine as found on p. 54 of my book, viz.: that the saints, through the baptism of the Holy Ghost, are identified with Christ in His crucifixion, burial, and resurrection. Our being "nailed to the cross" is, according to Origen, as much the result of the baptism in Rom. vi. 3-5, as our "being buried and risen"; and there is no more warrant for materializing the burial so as to find a mode of water-dipping in it, than there is for "materializing the nailing" of the believer "to the cross" so as to find the contrary mode of baptism in it.

We will now look at another of the editor's "confident assertions." On p. 18 of my book, I maintain that no instance occurs in Greek literature *written before the time of Christ*, where *baptizo* has the sense of "dip," "plunge," or "immerse," as those words are now used. I have made the same statement more than once in these communications. See particularly "Standard" for Oct. 28th. Now, how does the learned editor attempt to disprove these "ignorant statements of mine." Why, he gives quotations, showing the use of *baptizo*, from Plutarch and from Achilles Tatius! And these quotations he repeats no less than three times in different articles. Just think of it. Plutarch was born A.D. 50, and he wrote some twenty or thirty years afterwards; Achilles Tatius flourished A.D. 450. These are nice examples for an editor of so much learning (?) and with so dignified a "Christian (?) Standard," to give, when instances of the use of *baptizo* "written before the time of Christ" are called for! Yet they are introduced to show my "ignorance." "These," says the learned editor, "are simply specimens of the classical (!) use of *baptizo*, and they show just what weight is due to Mr. McKay's assertion." Query: Might not the name of the editor

be very appropriately put instead of mine in this sentence of his?

The instance quoted from Gale is, according to Conant (Ex. 71), "of uncertain date;" it can not, therefore, be quoted as occurring *before Christ*; and, further, there is no baptizing into water in the sentence, but *hudati baptizetai*, baptized with water. *Hudati* is the dative instrumental. On page 250 of his "*Short Method*," Dr. Gallaher deals with this case, and shows the utter absurdity of the immersionist interpretation.

The instance given from Polybius (B.C. 180) is very wide of the mark. I want the reader to examine it closely. It is the best the editor could find. Now, then, what is its value? I asked for instances written before the time of Christ where *baptizo* was used in the *modern immersionist sense*, i.e., the person or thing baptized *moved and put into the baptizing element and then immediately withdrawn*. I maintain that no such instance can be found. To disprove my statement, the editor gives a quotation from Polybius, in which that writer, speaking of the passage of the Roman army through the River Tibia, says, "They passed through with difficulty, the foot soldiers baptized as far as to the breasts" (Conant, Ex. 7). How relevant the quotation! Pray, were the soldiers taken up, put into and under the water, and then immediately withdrawn? If not, then the word baptized is not here used by Polybius in the modern immersionist sense. The other instance is from Strabo (B.C. 30), and is equally unfortunate for the editor's "dipping theory." Strabo—Geog. Bk. 14, ch. 3. 9 (Conant, Ex. 11)—speaking of the march of Alexander's army along the narrow beach (*flooded in stormy weather*), between the mountain called Climax and the Pamphilian Sea, says that "it happened that the route was all the day in the water, they being baptized to the waist." Here again I ask if *baptizo* is used in the modern sense of dipping, i.e., putting into and under the water, and then immediately withdrawing? To ask the question is to answer it—"all the day . . . being baptized to the waist." The "intusposition" was without limitation of time, and, therefore, if this had been a case like a modern religious immersion, requiring the total submersion of the whole body, it would have been a drowning.

The reader, who is not in fetters to a cast-iron theory, will have no difficulty in seeing that in both the above instances, quoted by the editor to prove "dipping," the word *baptizo* is used not to indicate *mode* at all, but the *state or condition* of the soldiers at the time. Mode of action has nothing to do with it. The RESULT simply is indicated. If, however, the editor is determined to find mode in these instances, we remind him that the Roman soldiers mentioned by Polybius (Conant, Ex. 7) were "baptized to their breasts" by the surging billows of the river Yebia, swollen by the heavy rains *coming upon them*. As to the soldiers of Alexander the case is equally clear. The ground over which they were marched, we are told, was dry except in stormy weather. There was a storm, we are informed, while Alexander was passing; and, like every storm-lashed beach, the waves rolled over the ground of march, and then receded. As the soldiers of Alexander passed this narrow beach they were "baptized as far as the waist" by the rolling waves. In both cases we may thus learn, from surrounding circumstances, that the baptizing element *came upon* the persons baptized, instead of the persons baptized, after the manner of dippers, being put into the element and then immediately withdrawn.

That the above is a fair interpretation of Polybius and Strabo, I refer to a passage in Diodorus Siculus, Bk. 16, ch. 80 (Conant, Ex. 13). Speaking of the defeat of the Carthaginian army on the banks of the river Crimissus, Diodorus says: "The river rushing down with a more violent current, baptizing many, and destroyed those attempting to swim through with their armour." Here the baptism was effected by the water of the swollen river *coming upon* the soldiers while they were on the bank of the river. These soldiers were not "moved and put into the water," though they were so handy to it—even on the bank of the river—but the water (the baptizing element) came upon them. Just as in the other cases the rushing, surging waves of the swollen river, coming in contact with the soldiers, effected the baptism. In all these instances, *baptizo* clearly refers, not to mode, but to the *state or condition* of the persons mentioned. At the same time it is clear from the narrative that this

*state or condition* was brought about, not in the modern "dipping" fashion, but by the baptizing element *coming upon* the person baptized.

Again I call upon the editor to produce, if he can, one solitary instance in Greek literature written before the time of Christ where *baptizo* is used in his sense of dipping into water and immediately withdrawing. No such instance can be produced, and the editor knows it, and hence such irrelevant quotations as above referred to.

### MANITOBA MISSIONARIES.

"THE LABOURER WORTHY OF HIS HIRE."

MR. EDITOR,—I venture to write to you on a subject which those who manage the money matters of the Church, especially the leading men of the Home Mission Committee, may not thank me for raising. This is for an increase of salary to our Manitoba missionaries. In the year 1872 the salary of a missionary in Manitoba was \$600. With a strong opposition on the part of members of the Committee I fought for the increase to \$700. Since that time the necessities of the case were such that the salary of married missionaries was raised to \$900, and that of unmarried missionaries to \$700. Two years ago a reduction took place, by which, while the unmarried missionary may receive \$800, the married missionary receives the same. On the whole, that seemed a reasonable thing at the time. It looked like a premium, in one view, in favour of the unmarried missionary, but in another it was but giving him his rights and a *solatium* for his supposed loss of domestic comfort. There seemed ground at that time for supposing that the increase of railway facilities would lessen prices. I confess that was my own impression; perhaps the "wish was father to the thought." I am equally free to confess that the last two years have completely upset our calculations. Such a rise in the price of land has resulted from a large importation of foreign money that rents have increased enormously; wages have increased in proportion; labour of all kinds has increased in two years from thirty to fifty per cent. Merchants, accordingly, must charge much higher prices. The consequence is that the poor missionary finds himself *compelled to pay* from twenty to thirty per cent. more for his purchases; in some articles even more. Let me give some idea of prices in Winnipeg. Wood, that I have bought large quantities of during the last twelve years, and which, till two years ago, I purchased for \$4.50 a cord, cannot now be got for less than \$5 or \$7. Beef, that I have bought large quantities of at seven cents per pound gross, now costs ten and eleven cents. A two-pound loaf of bread in Winnipeg is now eight and a half cents, while two years ago it was about six cents. Everything indicates a rise of values in all directions. Now it may be said, that if everything is higher than the people will be able to contribute more. This is true, but it does not help the missionary. Suppose a supplemented congregation—and most of our congregations are not yet self-sustaining—is able to raise \$600. It receives \$200 from the Home Mission Committee as supplement. By an extra effort the little handful raise the \$200 themselves; the result is the same to the missionary. He gets from the people simply what the Home Mission Committee formerly gave. I have said the result is the same: it is not quite the same. The extra effort of the congregation to raise the \$200 represents the doubtful part of the salary; and the spectacle will be seen, too often, I regret to say, a reality, of the minister's exchequer being empty, and perhaps a half a quarter's salary or more in arrears. I have never been one to join in an unreasoning clamour about raising salaries, without, at the same time, looking at the other side of where the funds are to come from, but I feel it my duty to state the case, and as having been a good while in the North-West, as one likely to know of what I speak. I am happy to say that through a more organized effort to increase its funds, and through several large donations, the Home Mission Committee is in better circumstances than for some years past. Let justice be done to our hard-working men on the frontier. If provisions cost what I have stated at Winnipeg, they will not cost less when carried several hundred miles west. If we are to retain our missionaries on the ground, and induce others to come to our aid, there must be an effort made to enable them to live. The increase in values being such as I have said, the least that any regularly ordained missionary of our Church should receive in the North-West is one thousand dollars a year.

Winnipeg, Feb. 7th, 1883. GEORGE BRUCE.