

work of other reformers would not have succeeded. The triumph of his principles was assured by the power of his speech and of his writings, as well as by his heroic actions. What constituted his power was his firm conviction that the principles he defended were true, his trust in God, his talent as a preacher, and his humility. His eloquence was that of the heart, and was at once both practical and popular. His writings formed an epoch in the literary history of Germany, by fixing the popular language which had been previously little written. As Dr. Dollinger says: "He marked, by the indelible zeal of his genius, the language and culture of Germany." True, he was powerfully seconded by such men as Staupitz, who often cheered him in his hours of depression; Melancthon, whose gentleness helped to moderate his vehemence; Bugenhagen, who was his true friend in evil days. What an enlightened and devoted assistance also did he receive from his colleagues and students, and from the Electors of Saxony, whose names deserve the veneration of all Protestants. Without their aid he must have found it difficult to hold in check both Pope and Emperor.

And yet Luther was not without his faults and contradictions, as witness his belief as to the personal presence of the Devil in the Wartburg—his theory of the Communion, his impetuosity, passion, and even violence of character, his intolerance towards Zwingli and the Swiss Reformers—most of which may no doubt be explained by the continual struggle in which he lived, his previous training and his present surroundings.

As a man, he was full of heart, of faith, and of enthusiasm. In his family (he had six children—three sons and three daughters) he was at once affectionate and firm. Amongst his friends he was gay and vivacious, but ever true. After quitting the monastery he regarded joy as a benediction, and one of the privileges of the Christian. He was generous, disinterested and always poor. He delighted, like his Master, in private prayer; and had naturally a robust constitution, which constant work and preoccupation wore out early.

Dresden, Saxony, November 6, 1882.

T. H.

ARE OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS PROTESTANT?

MR. EDITOR,—Some men have teachable spirits, and readily embrace the truth when presented. Others are dull of apprehension, and require line upon line, and as "B," who writes for the "Globe," appears to be one of the latter class, you will kindly make room in your excellent journal for the following reply to his letter which appeared in the "Globe" of the 16th inst.

(1) I maintain that the English Protestant Bible, commonly known by the name of the Authorized Version, is the acknowledged representative of the original Scriptures in this Province. And when the School Law recommends the daily reading of a portion of Scripture in our Public schools, it is the aforesaid version that is intended. And as a matter of fact teachers have so understood the law, and it is well known that throughout the Province it is the Protestant Bible that is read in the Public schools. Surely it was never intended by the law that any version, however imperfect or corrupt, could be legally read for the instruction of the youth of the Province. Consider for a moment what is involved in the assertion of "B," that the Douay Bible may be read without violating either the letter or the spirit of the law. Every scholar knows that the Douay Bible contains certain books which Protestants do not admit to be inspired, but which the Council of Trent pronounces to be part of Canonical Scripture, and of divine authority, viz.: Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, additions to Esther, Wisdom, 1 and 2 Maccabees, Baruch, the Song of the Three Children, Susana, and Bel and the Dragon. Now, if according to "B," the law is broad enough to admit the reading of the above-named books for the religious instruction of the young, then it follows that many errors and absurdities may be taught them as the truth of God, e.g.: the fabulous story of Bel and the Dragon, and that of Judith; the statements that Baruch was carried to Babylon (Bar. i. 1, 2) at the same time as when Jeremiah informs us that he was carried to Egypt (Jer. xliii. 6, 7); that Haman was a Macedonian (Esth. xvi. 10), and that, according to 1 Macc. vi. 4-16, Antiochus Epiphanes died in Babylon, while according to 2 Macc. ix. 28 he died a strange death among the mountains. In 2 Macc. xii. 44, prayers for the dead are sanctioned.

In Bar. iii. 4 we read of prayers of the dead. Suicide is excused in 2 Macc. xiv. 42, and in Tob. vii. 16-22, magical incantations are approved of. Now, I ask, will any sane man believe that the School Law provides for the teaching of the aforesaid books in the schools? According, however, to "B," such teaching is just as legal as our Lord's Sermon on the Mount. Moreover, as the right of private judgment in religious matters is denied by the Church of Rome, the Douay Bible is furnished with notes intended to be read in connection with its perusal, lest the unlearned should wrest its teachings to their destruction. "B" tells us, however, that the law forbids note or comment by the teacher in the reading of the Scripture lesson. "B" will bear in mind, too, that the Church of Rome teaches that there is no general obligation incumbent on the laity to read the Scriptures in any version, it being considered sufficient that they listen to it from their pastor, and hence they do not encourage the same. So much in proof of the statement that our Public schools are Protestant.

(2) In regard to the Commandments, the Scriptures determine their number, but not in all cases what they are. We do not find them numbered off as first, second, third, etc., in the Hebrew Bible. Consequently different modes of division have been adopted. The Romish Church have adopted one of the methods of arrangement, and the Reformed Protestant Church—agreeing in this respect with Josephus, Philo, Origen, and the Latin Church until the time of Augustine—has adopted another method, which has the sanction of the best modern theologians even of the Lutheran Church. Now, sir, it is well known that the Educational Department has furnished many of our schools on application with printed forms of the Ten Commandments. And I assert without fear of contradiction by any intelligent person, that it is the Reformed Protestant mode of division that is given. Moreover, let any man enter any of our Public schools and hear the Ten Commandments repeated by the pupils, and he will discover that both in the wording and in the method of arrangement they are such as are adopted by the Reformed Protestant Church, and not such as are approved by Roman Catholics. How the Roman Catholic Church teaches the Ten Commandments may be learned from the following quotations from a Christian Catechism written by the famous Biblical scholar, Philip Schaff, D.D.: "The Roman Catholic Church, following Augustine and Jerome in the fifth century, regards the second Commandment only as an explanation of the first, and in her catechisms generally omits it altogether (the italics are mine), but divides the tenth into two, in order thus to restore the number ten." It is still customary in the Roman Church—especially in those countries where it exclusively prevails—to pay divine honours to images of saints and of the Virgin Mary, and to crucifixes, by kissing them, kneeling before them, offering them incense, sacrifices and prayers, and ascribing to them miraculous cures. This superstitious and idolatrous practice, which commenced in the fourth century and became widely prevalent during the middle ages, although not without protest from the friends of a purer and more spiritual worship, was no doubt the chief, if not the only, cause of the omission of the second Commandment which so plainly condemns all idolatrous use of images.

(3) I reiterate the assertion that in the prayers prescribed for use in our Public schools God alone is worshipped, through the one Mediator, Jesus Christ. And I unhesitatingly affirm that in several instances Roman Catholic children have been forbidden to take part in such religious service—in one case known to the writer of these lines—by the priest acting for the parents, and in others by the parents themselves. Now, I again ask, if such prayers are not regarded as savouring of Protestantism, why do such things occur? If my opponent wants further proof of these facts, and will go to the trouble, he can see the parties face to face. It will be remembered, too, that Roman Catholics rightly demanded and obtained Separate schools for their children on the ground (1) That sufficient religious instruction was not given in our Public schools, and (2) That what was given was of a Protestant character. I repeat the question, Does not the priest still urge Roman Catholic parents to support Separate schools for their children for the above reasons? I may add, too, that no such thing as Protestant religious instruction is given anywhere, if that given in our Public schools, in so far as it goes, is not of such a character. I admit with "B" that Roman

Catholics may visit, teach, or be taught in the schools; but that does not change their Protestant character any more than the fact that persons belonging to one branch have visited, taught, and been taught in institutions belonging to a different branch, without changing their denominational character. I venture to say that I have reared a pillar that will stand, notwithstanding all the snowballs "B" or "Alter B" may cast against it. *Veritas vincit.*

SAMUEL ACHESON.

The Manse, Wick, Nov. 23.

A REPLY TO "ALTER B"

MR. EDITOR,—Permit me, in a few words, to show that my critic's reasoning, however plausible, is quite fallacious. (1) It is not by those things in which Lutherans agree with Roman Catholics, but by those things in which they differ from them, that they are distinguished. In like manner the Roman Church agrees with the Reformed Church in many things, but the Roman Catholic Church has one method of wording and dividing the Ten Commandments, and the Reformed Protestant Church has another method. It is the latter that is adopted in our Public schools. (2) The Roman Catholic Church agrees with the Reformed Protestant Church that God should be worshipped, but Roman Catholics say through many mediators, Protestants through one, Jesus Christ. It is the latter method that is adopted in the prayers presented for use in our Public schools. If "Alter B" ever learned any logic it is evident that he has quite forgotten it.

SAMUEL ACHESON.

The Manse, Wick, Nov. 27.

CONCERNING BAPTISM.—IX.

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

From the Christian Standard.

MR. EDITOR,—On page 23 of my book I make a clear distinction between *real*, or spiritual baptism, and *symbol*, or water baptism. Real baptism, I say, "denotes a thorough change of spiritual condition, effected by the Holy Ghost applying the blood of sprinkling to the soul." "And this spiritual baptism of the soul," I continue, "is made manifest, or signified, by an external rite, in which pure water is poured or sprinkled upon the person." A sacrament always consists of two things—(1) An outward, visible sign; and (2) an inward, spiritual grace, thereby signified. In baptism, the outward, visible sign is water applied in the name of the Triune God to the person of the subject baptized. The inward, spiritual grace thereby signified is a changed condition, or spiritual purification of the soul, effected by the immediate personal power of the Holy Ghost. The changed condition of the soul is thorough, complete, entire, for God is its author. And the same God has appointed the sprinkling of pure water (Num. viii. 7; Ezek. xxxvi. 26) to be the *external symbol* of that internal change, or spiritual purification. The following are some of the instances in the New Testament in which the words *baptize* and *baptism* refer to the changed condition of the soul. 1 Cor. xii. 13; Eph. iv. 5; Gal. iii. 27 (last clause); Matt. iii. 11 (last clause); Mark i. 8 (last clause); Luke iii. 16 (last clause); John i. 33 (last clause); Rom. vi. 3-5; Col. ii. 12. And the following are some instances where water was sprinkled or poured upon the person to symbolize (not to effect) the changed, purified condition of the soul: Matt. iii. 11 (first clause); Mark i. 8 (first clause); Luke iii. 16 (first clause); John i. 26; Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts ii. 38; xvi. 15, 33. The reader will please open his Bible and read these passages, and observe how the inspired writers contrasted and made a sharp distinction between *real spiritual baptism* and *symbol water baptism*. The water is the sign of—picture of—the real baptism. There is one baptism (1 Cor. xii. 13), and one sign, or symbol, of baptism, the sprinkling of pure water in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. In Rom. ii. 28, the Apostle Paul tells us explicitly that the *outward act of cutting off the flesh was not circumcision*. The *real* circumcision, he tells us, was "of the heart." See Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6; Jer. iv. 4; Acts vii. 51, for some of the passages where the word *circumcision* has reference to a spiritual condition. If, then, the cutting off of the flesh was not circumcision—and Paul says it was not—what was it? Turn to Rom. iv. 11: "And he received the *sign of circumcision*, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he