

had," etc. That is, the external rite was a sign or symbol of the internal, real circumcision of the heart. So, also, we find in the Bible "one baptism," denoting a changed condition of the soul, and one sign or symbol of baptism, the sprinkling of clear water. But just as in many places in the Bible the outward rite or sign is called circumcision, so we find many places where the outward rite or sign is called baptism.

Such, I believe, is the clear teaching of the Word of God, and such is the teaching of page 23 of my book; indeed, in some form or other of every page of that book. But the editor of the "Standard" calls this "McKay's new and marvellous definition." It is neither "new" nor "marvellous" to anyone who has intelligently read the Bible, or who has paid any attention to the discussions of scholars on Bible baptism. It is certainly not "new" nor "marvellous" to the editor of the "Standard," although he thus designates it for the purpose of creating prejudice against it in the minds of a certain class of his readers. The distinction between *real* or *spirit* baptism and *symbol* or *water* baptism has been adopted as the teaching of God's Word by the vast majority of the Protestant world; and it may be found, in some form or other, in their subordinate standards, and in the writings of their representative men. Here, for instance, is what Dr. A. A. Hodge, in his exposition of "The Confession," p. 342, teaches: "Baptism with water symbolizes baptism by the Holy Ghost. But baptism by the Holy Ghost unites us to Christ, and makes us one with Him in His death, in His resurrection, in His new life with God, His righteousness, His inheritance, etc., etc. Spiritual baptism carries all these consequences, and water baptism represents spiritual baptism; therefore, we are baptized into Christ, into His death, into one body—to be buried with Him, to rise with Him, so as to walk with Him in newness of life, to put on Christ (as a garment), to be planted together with Him (as a tree), etc. None of these have anything to do with the mode of baptism, because it is simply absurd to suppose that the same action can at the same time symbolize things so different as burial, putting on clothes, and planting trees. The real order is: washing with water represents washing of the Spirit; washing of the Spirit unites to Christ; union with Christ involves all the consequences above mentioned. Baptism of the Holy Ghost, of which water baptism is an emblem, is *never* set forth in Scripture as an 'immersion,' but always as a 'pouring' and 'sprinkling' (Acts ii. 1-4, 32, 33; x. 44-48; xi. 15, 16)."

Thus writes Dr. A. A. Hodge, and similar testimonies from leading and representative scholars can be multiplied to any extent. The editor of the "Standard" knows this, and yet, presuming on the ignorance of his readers, he characterizes the distinction between real and symbol baptism as "McKay's new and marvellous definition."

But I now want the reader clearly to observe how the editor tries to disprove what he calls my "new and marvellous definition." A careful examination of this point will enable the intelligent reader to discern the fallacy of at least three-fourths of what the editor has thus far written as his review of my book and my communications. The editor takes what I say of *real* or *spiritual* baptism, and applies it to *symbol* or *water* baptism, and then exclaims, "How absurd!" A man's shadow is not the man himself, and because what I say of the *man* (or the substance) is not true of the *shadow* (or symbol), then it is not true at all! So reasons the editor in his own "new and marvellous" way. If the reader wishes to see a sample of this reasoning, he has only to consult the "Standard" of March 25th, or almost any copy of the "Standard" after that date, but particularly in the issue of September 30th. I will only give a single quotation, as showing the editor's peculiar tactics in dealing with my argument, although I might fill pages. In the "Standard" of March 25th, the editor, speaking of my definition of *spiritual* baptism, uses the following words: "But if sprinkling or pouring is a mode of baptism, then it is a mode of accomplishing 'a thorough change of spiritual condition by the Holy Ghost applying the blood of sprinkling to the soul.' This surely proves too much for Mr. McKay." And so the editor reasons that because "sprinkling or pouring" cannot do what I say the *Holy Ghost* does, therefore my definition of real or spiritual baptism is incorrect and absurd! Having set up a man of straw, he finds no difficulty in knocking it down.

Now I wish here to say that in one respect this

method of meeting my argument is extremely satisfactory to me, for it is an involuntary tribute to the strength of my position. It is thus virtually acknowledged that my argument is not vulnerable to criticism, until metamorphosed into something that can be assailed or ridiculed by those who cannot refute the real position. But what a peculiar "Standard" of "Christian" honour and truthfulness the man must have who will condescend to such misrepresentation. How much more worthy of a "dignified Christian standard"-bearer to accept the truth, which he cannot refute at once, even from an opponent. The editor should either gracefully surrender, or at least honestly attempt to show that what I say is not true of *the thing of which I say it; i.e.,—show that what I say of real baptism is not true of real baptism; and that what I say of water baptism is not true of water baptism.* When he does this, he will honestly grapple with my argument, but not till then. He knows very well that he could easily make absurdity of a great part of the Word of God by precisely the same reasoning as he applies to my statements on real and symbol baptism. For instance, he could take any of the above-quoted passages, which speak of that circumcision which is "of the heart," and apply what is said to other cases where the circumcision is "outward" and "of the flesh;" then he could amuse himself by exclaiming, "How absurd!" But more on this point in my next. And yet this is the same editor who complains so loudly that his own writings, and those of A. Campbell, are "misunderstood," or "misapplied," or, as he says in one place, "misrepresented" (?). He is not, however, the first criminal who has attempted to divert attention from his own guilt by shouting, "Stop the thief!"

The editor of the "Standard" must be exceedingly hard up for argument when he seizes on a mere typographical omission of an "s" in Dr. Ditzler's book in order to denounce that scholarly and Christian man as one who cannot write English without "liability to ignorant blundering." In point of ability and mental calibre, Dr. Ditzler has nothing to fear from a comparison with his critic. And such quibbling criticisms only betray the weakness of the cause which the critic advocates, and his barrenness of better material.

[To be continued, if the Lord will.]

PRINCE OF WALES AND LAUSANNE.

MR. EDITOR,—I have been somewhat amazed in reading, in the last number of THE PRESBYTERIAN, your remarks upon the fact that the Prince of Wales has lately sent his two sons to Lausanne to learn French. I could understand that a French paper, out of jealousy, would criticise such a decision; but it is certainly an error for an English Canadian paper to affirm, in a dogmatic way, that to go to Switzerland to learn French is the same thing as going to Cuba to learn good Spanish, or to the Highlands of Scotland to learn good English.

Switzerland is a Confederation of twenty-two cantons; three of them are entirely French, namely, the cantons of Neuchâtel, of Geneva and of Vaud, the capital of which is Lausanne. In the last canton the country people have a slightly peculiar accent called "Le Vaudois," but it is rather agreeable than otherwise. With this single exception, I can assure you that the French language is spoken purely in those three cantons. Their school system, both private and public, has the reputation of being the best on the continent. This explains why so many foreigners, even from France itself, send their children there to be educated. The sons of Prince Jérôme Bonaparte received their education in a private school at Vevey, canton of Vaud. Monsieur Guizot, the celebrated minister of Louis XVIII., was educated in Geneva, and so was also the celebrated writer and orator, Monsieur Edmond de Presansé, and hundreds of others. So that the Prince of Wales knows, I suppose, very well what he is doing in sending his two sons to Switzerland.

If the Swiss are as superficial and incorrect in their language as you seem to think them, how do you account for the fact that they have always distinguished themselves as writers, speakers and scientists? Do not J. J. Rousseau and Madame de Staël stand first in French literature for purity, elegance, and correctness of language? Alexander Vinet, the celebrated critic, and perhaps the deepest thinker of this century, was a Swiss. The celebrated historian, Jean de Muller, Dr. Merle d'Aubigné, well known on this

continent as the historian of the Reformation, were Swiss. Prof. Agassiz, also well known in America, was a Swiss; and so is his former associate, Monsieur Arnold Guyot, the distinguished professor of Princeton College. Earnest Naville, of Geneva; Charles Secrétan, of Lausanne, rank amongst the most appreciated philosophers. Monsieur F. Gode, of Neuchâtel, is considered one of the greatest theologians of our time. The eminent preacher and lecturer of Paris, Monsieur Bersier, is a Swiss. I could add a hundred more names.

It is a mistake to think that it is only in Paris that the French language is spoken in its purity. Those who are called the masters of the French language were not Parisians: Pascal, Cornille, Racine, Lafontaine, Bossuet, Fenelon, Mirabeau, Guizot, Lamartine, Thiers, etc., were not Parisians. Paris, it is true, is a great centre of French literature; but it is not the only place of learning, neither is it only there that you can hear good French. The French pronunciation, unlike that of English and German, is settled, and those only who speak French without any local accent speak it purely, and every well educated people in what is called "La Suisse romande," or in any other part of France can do that. Let me add, in conclusion, that in Russia, Germany, England, America, in fact wherever the French language is taught, the most appreciated teachers are generally Swiss. As your remarks do them injustice, I felt it my duty to correct your error.

F. B. RICHARD,
From Neuchâtel, Switzerland.

[Whilst we give space to the above communication from Mr. Richard, we can assure him that no reflection was intended to be cast on Lausanne as a suitable place for acquiring a knowledge of French. The Prince of Wales may have his own reasons for sending his sons there, although it is natural to suppose that Paris would have been preferred. We disclaim any "dogmatical way" such as Mr. Richard imputes to us. It may benefit Lausanne, however, to have attention turned to it by the Prince of Wales, though with all respect, we are not aware that he is an authority in literary matters. We said nothing, nor even thought anything about "the Swiss as superficial and incorrect in their language." Mr. Richard is in error.—ED. C. P.]

ANONYMOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

MR. EDITOR,—I most heartily endorse your well-timed and vigorous remarks relative to anonymous communications full of slander and invective against ministers of the Gospel. You say truly that clergymen are often pestered with these cowardly missives. I know one who has received dozens of them, in which he is even threatened with murder and arson. It would be very desirable that the progeny of Deotrophis "prating against us with malicious words" should receive the punishment which their infamous doings deserve, but it is neither convenient nor expedient for a Gospel minister to handle such characters. Their cowardly attempts to destroy the good name of a minister—stabbing him in the dark while they keep themselves incognito, should brand them as the willing servants of him whose very name means calumniator—who is pre-eminently "the accuser of the brethren."

Some local papers, I am sorry to say, are not always so considerate as THE PRESBYTERIAN, and often allow their columns to be used by those who seek a cheap revenge upon a minister whose very faithfulness is, in their estimation, his unpardonable sin.

It is also to be regretted that even Christian people lend their ear to those who delight to speak evil of the Lord's servants, and become an illustration of the saying, "The righteous is more excellent than his neighbour, but the way of the wicked seduceth them." Nov. 24th, 1882. S. J.

THE fact that fault-finding is easy should beget watchfulness.

IN the balances of the sanctuary spirit weighs, and an ounce of grace may outweigh pounds of gold.

NO one can measure the possible influence of the apparently small divergence from heretofore accepted truth.

NO man's self is large enough or noble enough to engage his constant solicitude or receive his undivided homage.

IT is the vitiation of politics to ends mainly partisan, personal, selfish, and self-seeking, that makes them grovel.