





Davis  
1915.

Barnett  
# 36978

---



Theol.  
M

# LAURA CLARENCE:

A TREATISE ON BAPTISM.

BY

REV. D. McNAUGHTON, M.A.,

AYLWIN, QUEBEC.

---

200051  
21/1/26

TORONTO:

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, PRINTER, 5 JORDAN STREET.

1882.

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

DEDICATED

TO MY ESTEEMED FRIEND,

Rev. T. Hill, D.D.,

KANSAS CITY.





## INTRODUCTORY.

---

WHEN a new book is offered to the public, it is expected that the author will give some reason for offering it; and when one is offered on such a subject as Baptism, on which so much has been written, it may well be asked what end is to be answered by the one here offered?

I would simply say, that many of the books which treat the subject in the most satisfactory way are too expensive to be within the reach of the masses. On the other hand, many of those got up in a cheap style are not sufficiently full to give anything like an intelligent view of the subject. I have endeavoured to present the principal classical arguments to be found in the larger works in as concise a manner as possible, with some additional arguments which, as far as I know, are not elsewhere to be found. One object which I have kept continually in view is to shew that the responsibility for all the unhappy divisions which have taken place in the Christian Church on this subject rests with the immersionists. Pædo-Baptists of every name continually hold out the olive leaf, and are ready to fraternize; but they are invariably repelled, their baptism ignored, and all who are unwilling to be immersed are placed beyond the pale of the Church, and by many of them placed beyond the hope of heaven. It may be said those

are extremists, and that all Baptists do not hold such views. But those extremists are the only consistent Baptists; if they would take the same moderate ground with respect to immersion which Pædo-Baptists take with respect to sprinkling, they need not be Baptists at all.

The form which I have chosen was simply to make the book more attractive to the young, and at the same time to illustrate Western manners and customs. Many of the peculiar phrases to be found are given with that object. Some of the most unusual phrases are quoted *verbatim et literatim* from a popular Baptist work called "Theodosia." They are given to shew the styles of expression in which some of those writers indulge.

With these few explanations, I offer this little work to the public, asking for it a candid perusal, and hoping that, by the blessing of God, it may be instrumental to some extent in promoting the cause of truth.

# INDEX.

## CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
Conversation between Laura Clarence and Mr. Jones—Believe and be Baptized—Infant Membership—Baptism and the Lord's Supper—The Clarence Family—An Immersion Described . . . . .	9

## CHAPTER II.

Effects of Immersion on a weak subject—Suspension of a natural law, or a Miracle required—"Theodosia Ernest"—Immersionists' manner of treating opponents . . . . .	16
--	----

## CHAPTER III.

Elder Cleghorn and his manner of Preaching—Aunt Jennie—Mr. Clarence and Mr. Jones begin to investigate the subject of Baptism—Classical meaning of "Baptizo"—How Words change their meanings—The point at issue between Immersionists and Affusionists—Different meanings of "Bapto" and "Baptizo"—Baptism of a Pond with a Mouse's blood—Of a Mountain with a Stag's blood—Of Nebuchadnezzar with the dews of Heaven—"Immerse" as an equivalent for "Baptize"—"Dip" as much a Greek word as "Baptizo," "En," "Eis," "In," "Into"—Our Saviour's Baptism—John's Baptism—Sprinkling under the Mosaic Law . . . . .	18
--	----

## CHAPTER IV.

John Baptizing at AEnon—Baptism on the day of Pentecost—Baptism of the Eunuch—Symbolical cleansing was by Sprinkling—Baptism at Samaria—Paul's Baptism—Perversion of the ordinance of Baptism—All Baptized into Moses in the Cloud and in the Sea . . . . .	41
---	----

## CHAPTER V.

Cahullan—Little Mike—Elder Bump—Mike's Experiment—Immersion a Popish rite . . . . .	61
---	----

## CHAPTER VI.

	PAGE
Elder Cleghorn's Visit—Prominence given to the Family Relation in the Scriptures—Covenant with Noah and Abraham included the Children—Circumcision a Seal of the Righteousness which is by faith—Responsibilities of Parents—Connection between the Old Dispensation and New—Wild Olive Tree—Church and State Connection—Comparing Fruit—Alexander Campbell, Stone, Thomas, Brigham Young—More general Revival of Religion—Circumcision and Baptism—Baptismal Regeneration .....	73

## CHAPTER VII.

Position of Children in relation to the Church, and their Claims—Church and State—Lydia—Philippian Jailer—Meaning of "Unclean" .....	93
--	----

## CHAPTER VIII.

Sister Streetyarn—Sister Clemens—Practice of the Early Church .....	105
---	-----

## CHAPTER IX.

Elder Bump and Sister Streetyarn act in concert—A Congregational Meeting resolved on—Mr. Jones' Dilemma—Laura helps him out of it—Congregational Meeting comes off—Mr. Jones resigns—Meeting breaks up in Confusion—Lawsuit.....	113
--	-----

## CHAPTER X.

Elder Bump succeeds Mr. Jones—Marriage to Sister Streetyarn—Mr. Jones is ordained—Married to Laura—They go as Missionaries to India—Laura's Letter.....	127
---	-----

---

DISCOURSE ON UNIVERSALISM.....	133
--------------------------------	-----

# LAURA CLARENCE:

## A TREATISE ON BAPTISM.

---

### CHAPTER I.

“**O**NE Lord, one faith, one baptism.’ Is not that plain? Certainly no one disputes that. There is only one Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and as we are saved by faith in that one Lord, there can be but one faith; and as baptism is the outward visible act by which we profess our faith in that one Lord, there can be but one baptism into that one faith in that one Lord. So far we are agreed. Really,” said Mr. Jones, “you do not appear to be far from the kingdom. Why not be baptized and become a Christian at once? It appears to me strange that any one should understand the way of life so clearly, and not be willing to take that one step necessary to get into the fold of Christ. You believe; why not be baptized?”

“I have been baptized,” said Laura.

“You mean that you were sprinkled when you were a baby, I presume; but we do not look upon that as baptism. Faith must precede baptism, and as an infant cannot believe, it is not a fit subject for baptism. ‘Believe and be baptized’ is the command. Faith first, baptism afterwards, is God’s order. As your sprinkling was not preceded by faith, it was not baptism. You have yet to be baptized if you would be a Christian.”

“Faith must precede salvation,” replied Laura. “‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth

not shall be damned.' If the child cannot believe, it must be damned. Do you believe that all infants are damned?"

"No," replied Mr. Jones, "we believe that they are saved by the mercy of God, for Christ Himself has said, 'of such is the kingdom of heaven.'"

"You admit, then," said Laura, "that infants are fit to be members of God's Church above, but not to be admitted as members of His Church below. You set up a higher standard of qualifications for the Church below than for the Church above. We simply conclude that if they are members of the Church above, they are fit for the Church below; and we admit them by the same ordinance as we admit adults. We dare not reject from Christ's Church on earth those whom He has declared members of the kingdom of heaven."

"There really does appear to be a difficulty here," said Mr. Jones.

"How do you explain this text—'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned?' We do not understand it as spoken of infants at all, but simply of adults. Every adult who hears the gospel must accept or reject. We must believe or not believe. It is he who rejects the gospel that is damned. The infant cannot reject—hence does not incur the penalty of those who do. The text says, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.' It is not said that he that believeth not and is not baptized shall be damned, but simply he that believeth not. Infants are not included in the number who believe not, and do not incur this penalty of damnation till they are of a sufficient age to reject the gospel. Hence we recognise them as members of Christ's Church ever after, unless they publicly reject the gospel by their future lives and conduct."

"I must give a little more thought to this subject," said Mr. Jones, thoughtfully.

"But what about the one baptism? Though we believe that there is only one baptism, we are far from admitting that there is only one mode of baptism, or that immersion is that mode."

“I cannot understand,” said Mr. Jones, “how there should be more than one mode. It appears to me that an ordinance so important that it is the door of entrance into the Church, must be one well-defined act. Is it not said (Acts viii. 38, 39) that they went down into the water and came up out of the water?”

“We are simply informed,” said Laura, “that they both went down—both, remember—and that there he baptized him. We are not told the mode. For aught that appears here, the mode may have been either pouring, sprinkling, or immersion. But there is another point in connection with this subject which I would like very much to hear explained, and you would confer a great favour on me by explaining it.”

“With the greatest of pleasure,” said Mr. Jones. “I know from experience how hard it is to get quit of old prejudices and preconceived notions. I was brought up a Presbyterian myself, and I know how to sympathize with you in your difficulties.”

“As to that,” said Laura, “you appear to think you must be right, because you have changed and forsaken the way of your fathers; and I must be wrong, simply because I continue in what appears to me to be the good old way. If there is so much virtue in changes, you should make another change, and you might be still further improved.”

“You surely do not understand me to advocate a change unless it be from a wrong way to a right. It does not appear to have occurred to you that it is necessary to prove that our way is wrong; you assume it without proof.”

“Oh, we are not quite so unreasonable as that,” said Mr. Jones. “But what is your difficulty?”

“It is this,” said Laura: “How much bread and how much wine should I use when I partake of the Lord’s Supper?”

“I do not suppose,” said Mr. Jones, “that the efficacy of the ordinance depends on the quantity of the elements used, but in the faith of the participant.”

“But is it not called a supper?” said Laura. “Does not the Greek word translated ‘supper’ mean a full meal?”

Can it then be properly called a supper when it is *not* a full meal?"

"I do not know as to that," said Mr. Jones; "I do not understand Greek."

"I should think," said Laura, "that without a knowledge of Greek you would have a difficulty in dealing with such a subject as baptism. But what is the custom in the society to which you belong?"

"Well as to that, we simply taste the bread and the wine, and for aught I can see, that answers the end quite as well as if we should use ever so much."

"Precisely so," said Laura; "precisely so. And we Pædo-Baptists believe that a little water applied represents the cleansing of the soul from sin, as well as if we should use ever so much. 'Washing' and 'baptism' are in the Scriptures interchangeable terms. Washing with water, or baptism with water, represents the baptism or cleansing with the Holy Spirit. Did you ever hear of the subject being immersed in God's blessings? Are not the blessings always applied to the subject? The baptism with the Holy Spirit—the greatest blessing which God ever communicated to His fallen creatures—was by pouring. God's Spirit was poured out upon His people on the day of Pentecost. They were not immersed in it. Is it not a little unfortunate for you immersionists that the word 'immerse' is not in the Scriptures at all? But even if it could be proved that the Apostles baptized by immersion, the liberty which we would be taking in changing the mode to suit the climate and other circumstances, would be no greater than you take with the Lord's Supper. In order to be consistent, you should celebrate the ordinance at night, in an upper room, reclining at the table, according to the Eastern custom, and you should take a full meal."

"People cannot all see alike," said Mr. Jones.

The above conversation took place between a Mr. Jones, a minister of a denomination known as Reformers, Christians, or Campbellites, and Laura Clarence, a daughter of Rev. J. Clarence, a Presbyterian minister. Mr. Clarence



was then labouring as stated supply in a small town called E——, in the south part of the State of Missouri. He had become deeply impressed with the great importance of the Home Mission work in the Western States. The war had just closed, and everything was in a state of chaos. The work of reconstruction had just commenced. There was a great demand for missionaries to go into those destitute regions to supply the immigrants who were continually pouring in from the Eastern and Middle States with the Word of life. There was not only a great lack of the means of grace, but the preaching which they had was, for the most part, of the most sensational kind. Protracted meetings—or big meetings, as they were called—were looked upon almost as the only effective means of grace. The ordinary means of grace were undervalued. Little was expected from the ordinary Sabbath services. After their big meetings were over, the house of God was in a great measure deserted. The Sabbath was disregarded, and the people would go on in their several ways waiting for another big meeting to get warmed up, as they called it. Men of cultivated minds could rarely enjoy such meetings—hence many of them absented themselves entirely from the house of God. Both branches of the Presbyterian Church, the old school and the new, with a commendable zeal, endeavoured to do their part towards supplying those destitute settlements with the means of grace. Mr. Clarence resigned his charge in Western New York, in which he had been eighteen years, left a comfortable home and a kind people, and moved into a new settlement which had just been commenced in a district which had been depopulated during the war.

Mr. Clarence's mode of preaching was new and strange to those who had been accustomed to the sensational style then so much in vogue in the West; but by his earnest manner and instructive matter, he attracted a large number who had not been in the habit of attending church since they had left the East.

Mr. Clarence's ministry was beginning to bear fruit. By

his faithful preaching, and visiting from house to house, he was beginning to command the respect of the entire community.

His family consisted of four—two sons and two daughters. Laura, the eldest, to whom the reader has already been introduced, was now eighteen. As she possessed her father's love of books, and had enjoyed the advantages of an excellent school in addition to the instruction which she received from her father, she was now an accomplished scholar for her years, and was of great assistance to both her father and her mother. The second was a boy named Alexander. He was a bright, intelligent lad. He had a rich vein of the humorous, with a keen sense of the ludicrous, which caused him to be a general favourite in the community. The other two—a boy and a girl—were aged respectively twelve and ten.

Mr. Jones had a few months before been elected pastor of the Reformers' (or Campbellites) Church in that place. He was a fluent speaker, and as he had been for some years a school teacher he possessed a fair English education. He had for the last two weeks been holding one of their "big meetings." He had that day baptized two subjects—a man and a woman. Laura and her younger sister were passing at the time, and as neither of them had ever seen a baptism by immersion, Laura yielded to the request of her sister, and waited to see it.

Mr. Jones waded into the stream, which was pretty rapid, till the water was over his knees. The man went forward first, and as he was strong enough to bear up against the current, he had no difficulty in reaching the point where Mr. Jones stood. Mr. Jones had no difficulty in plunging him under the water and taking him out again, and though he swallowed some water, which caused him to cough and have the appearance of strangling, he had no difficulty in reaching the shore. The other subject was a young woman of delicate frame, apparently about eighteen. She stepped courageously into the water, but Mr. Jones soon saw that she would be unable to resist the current ; so he hurried out

to meet her, took her by the arm, and led her out to the spot where he had formerly stood. He then carefully turned her face down the stream, so that when she was put down backward her head would be up stream. Though she had not been put so far beneath the surface of the water as the other had been, as she had forgotten the advice which Mr. Jones had given her, to keep her mouth closed, she had swallowed considerable water. And though Mr. Jones assisted her to the shore, and some of the sisters present attended to her with a mother's care, it was a considerable time before she ceased coughing. It was evident her nervous system had received a severe shock.

As Laura and her sister walked away from the place, the sister said :

“I was reading in the Bible lately about afflicting the body to atone for the sin of the soul. This mode of baptism appears to me very much like it.”

Laura was about to reply when she saw Mr. Jones approaching.

He now joined the company, and walked home with them.

It was on the way that the conversation which we have given above took place. The conversation was broken off when they reached Mr. Clarence's gate. Laura invited him into the house. He was introduced to Mr. and Mrs. Clarence, and after a short conversation on general topics, he rose to take his leave.

Mr. Clarence invited him to come and drink tea with them on the following evening.

## CHAPTER II.

MR. JONES was punctual to the hour. Mrs. Clarence had just returned, a few minutes before Mr. Jones arrived, from a visit to the parents of the young lady who had been immersed on the previous day. The young lady had suffered considerably during the night from nervous prostration. Mrs. Clarence said she was now much better, though weak, and she hoped that a few days of quiet and careful nursing would bring her round all right. Mr. Jones listened with rapt attention to the account which Mrs. Clarence gave of the young lady's health. He appeared to be greatly surprised and grieved. After a time he said: "It appears strange to me that obeying the commands of Christ could injure the health or endanger the life of any one."

"Natural causes will produce their effects," said Laura. "The young lady's nervous system appears to have been too weak to endure the shock resulting from being plunged suddenly under water. The mere fact that you were obeying a religious rite did not cause the natural law to be suspended. And it appears to me that we have no right to expect such a thing as a suspension of a natural law, simply because we choose to administer a religious ordinance in a particular way. The suspension of a natural law is a miracle. What right have we to expect that God will work a miracle every time we see fit to baptize by immersion?"

"But if God has commanded it," said Mr. Jones, "will He not protect and preserve those who obey His commandments?"

"But if He has not commanded it," replied Laura, "what then? Where is the command? When we expect God to work a miracle to preserve us in the performance of an act, we have surely a right to show an explicit, unmistakable command to perform the act in that particular way. Can you find any such command as when ye baptize ye shall immerse the body completely under water?"

The conversation was here broken off by the return of Mr. Clarence. When tea was over, Mr. Clarence invited Mr. Jones to accompany him to the library to see some new books which he had just bought. While Mr. Jones was looking through the library, he got his eye on a new book, by a Baptist author, called "Theodosia, the Heroine of Faith." He expressed surprise at seeing such a book in the library of a Presbyterian minister.

Mr. Clarence replied that he always liked to examine both sides of every question, and in order to do so, he was in the habit of reading all the Baptist books he could find.

"Well," said Mr. Jones, "you have hit on a capital book for that purpose, it gives both sides of the question in such a clear way."

Mr. Clarence made no reply.

Mr. Jones then said, "What do you think of the book?"

"I prefer," said Mr. Clarence, "to reserve my opinion till we examine that Greek Lexicon which you hold in your hand."

Mr. Jones handed him the book, and he turned to the word "baptize," and said, "Let us see how far the statements given in 'Theodosia' about this word are correct. You will see on page 36 of 'Theodosia' that the word 'baptize' means *only to dip*—to immerse, to submerge, to soak, to soak thoroughly, to saturate—five in all. Now let us turn to Liddell and Scott, and see what they say. And let us notice that this Lexicon is of the very highest authority, and the authors had no bias towards either side of this question."

"That is admitted in 'Theodosia,'" said Mr. Jones.

"The first meaning in Liddell and Scott is to dip repeatedly. The word 'repeatedly' is left out in your author. Second, to dip under. Then follows in order, to bathe, to steep, to wet, to be soaked in wine, to be over head and ears in debt, to overwhelm a boy by asking him questions, to pour upon, to drench, to dip a vessel, to draw water, to baptize. We have in all twelve meanings. Not one of those meanings exactly as given in your author."

"I thought," said Mr. Jones, "that the second meaning given was 'dip.'"

“It is ‘dip under,’ not simple ‘dip,’ as claimed,” said Mr. Clarence. “From the other meanings it is plain that the conditions of the word ‘baptize’ may be complied with either by applying the subject to the liquid, as in dipping under, or by applying the liquid to the subject, as in pouring upon, or being soaked in wine—that is, to become inebriated. Now, I presume you will not dispute that the wine was drunk by the parties, and that you will not claim they were dipped in the wine till they were made drunk; or baptism may be performed without a liquid at all, as to be over head and ears in debt, or a boy to be overwhelmed with questions. What do you think of your author, who gives ‘to dip’ as the only meaning? You may notice that ‘immerse’ is not given at all, and ‘baptize’ is given last, as if it might be something different from all the others.”

Mr. Jones was silent, and appeared confused.

“Well,” said Mr. Clarence, “we did not invite you here to baptize you by confusing you with questions. Let us go down stairs and have some music.”

Laura took her seat at the piano, and Mr. Jones appeared to enjoy her playing vastly. When he took his leave, Mr. Clarence invited him to return soon, and spend a little more time over the word “baptize.” Mr. Jones cordially accepted the invitation, and departed.

---

### CHAPTER III.

ON the following evening Laura and her brother Alexander went to hear Mr. Jones. Another preacher, a Mr. Cleghorn, filled the pulpit that evening. Mr. Cleghorn had been a school teacher for a few years in the neighbourhood. Though the qualifications of common school teachers in the Western States are not generally high, Mr. Cleghorn, owing to his training for that profession, was in point of literary attainments far in advance of the ordinary “spounders” of the Word. He had, for some time after he had ceased to

wield the *taws*, been editor of a political newspaper. He was a ready speaker, and lost no opportunity of addressing political meetings. He became somewhat celebrated in that region as a political debater. Few could equal him at throwing mud; and when there was any danger of being worsted, few could so adroitly withdraw from the contest. He could, like the ink-fish, discharge his bottle of foul epithets, and like that creature make his escape in the confusion which was raised. It has been truly said that most men think much more on the subject of religion than they get credit for. Mr. Cleghorn thought frequently and seriously on the subject, and the question arose, "What must I do to be saved?" When in one of those moods, he went to hear one of those Disciple or Campbellite preachers, as they are called. The preacher explained the way of salvation in a way that precisely suited Mr. Cleghorn. He compared the way of salvation to a ladder with four rounds—the first, hearing; the second, believing; the third, repenting; the fourth, baptism. "Then," he said, "comes remission of sins as a natural consequence. Some teach," he said, "that the way of life is narrow and difficult, but it appears to me to be mighty plain." In concluding, he said, "All who are here this evening have heard—you are therefore over the first round. I trust you all believe. This is the second stage; you are on the second round. How many, then," he asked, "have repented of your sins? I do not ask how sorry you are, nor how many tears you have shed. I only ask if you are sorry enough to resolve that you will forsake them and be baptized; you are then on the third round. You are nigh the kingdom—only one step from it. But if you remain there, you are still outside of it. You cannot receive remission of sins till you take this one final step. How many are willing to take this final step? Let all who are willing to do so come forward, and give me their hands." About half a dozen went forward; among them was Mr. Cleghorn. They were all immersed on the following day. Mr. Cleghorn was a precocious disciple. He was soon invited to "s'pound on Sundays," and was not slow in accepting the

invitation. He was soon known as a kind of religious gladiator. He was of very much the same disposition as a coloured brother in Tennessee. It was said that he was no sooner out of the water than he produced a Bible, and said: "Now if any gemmin wants to spute, dis chile's ready."

Mr. Cleghorn dearly loved to "spute." He was not long in bringing on an encounter with a Methodist minister, and, as usual, both sides claimed the victory. On the day after the encounter he was exhibiting his trophies and magnifying his victory to a few of his brethren who were met together, when he was brought to a sudden halt by a good old Scotch auntie who got wearied of his boasting.

She said: "You folk jist mind me o' when geese; ye're aye for feightin', an' its nae matter how badly ye're whipped, ye aye come back jist like the ganders to the geese, wi' a' great kecklin' as if ye had din great things."

Mr. Cleghorn turned round with one of those peculiar expressions of countenance which he was wont to assume when browbeating a political opponent; he said:

"Oh, are you a Methodist? Not many Scotch people are Methodists."

"I'm no a Methodist, I'm a Presbyterian," answered Auntie Janet.

"Worse and worse. I know from experience how hard it is for Presbyterians to get over their early prejudices. I was brought up a Presbyterian myself."

"The mair pity ye didna stick to the way ye waur brought up. They wasna many o' your kine in the auld kintra. They waur a few Baptists, but they waur maistly some who had been put out o' the Kirk for some fornication, or some ill da'in or anither. What had ye din that ye had tae lee the Kirk, or tae be put oot—which was't?"

"It's no use of talking to a Presbyterian; their creed is dyed in the wool." The conversation was here dropped.

On the evening in question he took for his text, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned." After a few preliminary observations on the circumstances under which the words



were spoken, he used the illustration of the four rounds of the ladder—hearing, faith, repentance and baptism. He endeavoured to show that all the other steps were of no avail unless the final one was taken, viz., the one into the water. He waxed quite eloquent when showing the folly of those who could suppose that baby sprinkling was baptism. He characterized the act of infant baptism as putting the mark of the mother of harlots on the child. He declared that Dr. Adam Clarke, John Wesley, Dr. Chalmers, Albert Barnes, and all the commentators among the sects, admitted that immersion was the scriptural mode of baptism; but they lacked the moral courage to act on their convictions. He said the baptism of an infant is a sin—an act of high-handed rebellion against God; and warming up, he said, “I even go further; infant baptism is impious, it is an act of sacrilege. I know the preachers among the sects do it ignorantly, as Saul persecuted the Church. But though their ignorance may in a degree excuse their conduct, it does not change the nature of the act. And for one who has studied the subject, who has looked for the authority and failed to find it, to do in the name of God what God has not required, must require a degree of temerity which I trust few of the professed ministers of Christ possess.”\* He was particularly severe on Presbyterians. He said they drank in the creed with their mothers’ milk, and you might as well try to wash a blue stocking which had been dyed in the wool and make it white, as to change a regular blue-stocking Presbyterian and make a Christian of him. He wound up by making an urgent appeal to all who had a desire to become Christians to come forward and give him the right hand. As he had been an auctioneer for some time, he frequently adopted the auctioneer’s style in his harangues. On this occasion he got fairly warmed up, and cried out, “Who wants to be a Christian? Who wants salvation? Don’t all speak at once.” Four or five hands were raised. He then cried out: “The Lord be praised! Who next? The kingdom of heaven for sale here, going cheap, without money and without price, only obey the command.

---

\* Theodosia Ernest, page 323.

Repent, believe, be baptized, and the kingdom of heaven is yours." When he saw that no more hands were likely to be raised he closed the meeting, and announced that the candidates would be baptized on the following Monday at two o'clock p.m. He was about to pronounce the benediction, when a voice from the crowd was heard crying out: "A question, if you please. Will you answer a question?"

"Certainly," said Mr. Cleghorn; "I am here to give information."

"If a limb should fall from a tree to-night and kill one of those candidates while on the way home, according to you he must be lost, because he had not been baptized. He is ready and willing to be baptized; you are not ready to baptize him. Of whom would his soul be required?"

Mr. Cleghorn answered, "I have no time to answer such silly questions," and dismissed the meeting.

A few evenings after this, Mr. Jones entered Mr. Clarence's parlour, and he had scarcely sat down when he introduced the subject by saying:

"I am surprised at those statements which we found when I was last here in 'Theodosia.' I have always heard this book spoken of in the highest terms, and greatly praised for its fairness."

"The statements are not mine," said Mr. Clarence; "they are in the books before you, and you may examine all the Lexicons in the world on the subject, and you will find no material difference. The author of 'Theodosia' has simply taken those meanings which suited him, and given them; he has left out all those which did not suit him."

"But has he not given the primary meanings? I have always understood that the primary meanings were the most important, and that those given towards the last were of very little importance."

"That is a mistake into which the author of 'Theodosia' has fallen, and many others as well as he have fallen into the same error. The meanings of the words are not given in the order of their importance, but in the order of their antiquity. The most ancient meanings are given first—

not the most important. If you consult the preface to Liddell and Scott's Greek and English Lexicon you will see that the principle on which it is written is to make each article a history of the word treated of. To investigate the subject in anything like an intelligent way, it is necessary to divide the history of Greek literature into three eras—viz., the Classic, or most ancient, used by Homer and his contemporaries; the middle, in which the Attic flourished, and was used by Xenophon and his contemporaries. The third is called the Alexandrian. This dialect prevailed from the time of Alexander the Great until the Christian era. This is the dialect in which the New Testament is written. When we observe the great changes which have taken place in the English language since the time of Queen Elizabeth—how many words used at that time are obsolete, how others have completely changed their meanings—we will understand to some extent the great change which must have taken place in the Greek language from the time of Homer till the Christian era, which was three times as long as the period between Queen Elizabeth and our own time. Such a change as I have suggested has taken place in the meaning of the Greek word 'baptizo.' Its meaning in the time of Homer 'differed widely from its meaning' at the time in which the New Testament was written. Many respectable Pædo-Baptist ministers are willing to admit that the classic meaning of the word 'baptizo' is to immerse, and yield up that point to the Baptists, believing that the classic meaning is of very little importance in the discussion of the question. I do not, however, agree with this opinion, for reasons which I will give hereafter. But as the position of the immersionist is that baptism must be performed by immersion only, immersion and no other way but immersion, our task is easy; for we have only to show that some other act will fulfil the conditions of the word 'baptize,' and our task is done. We do not deny that immersion is a mode of baptism. We only deny that it is the only mode."

"Oh," said Mr. Jones, "I always thought that the question was one between immersion and sprinkling."

“Not at all,” said Mr. Clarence. “As we admit that immersion is baptism, if you would admit that sprinkling is likewise baptism, there would be no issue between us. The mode would be a mere matter of opinion. You might all be either Presbyterians, Methodists or Episcopalians, and continue to immerse and violate no rule of either of those churches; but you deny that sprinkling or pouring is baptism at all, and you unchurch nine-tenths of the professing Christians in the world because they do not agree with you. Immersionists have chosen their ground. If it is narrow, it is their own business. We have only to show that sprinkling is a mode of baptism; not the only mode. We have seen that Liddell and Scott give thirteen meanings; the last is to baptise, or to administer the ordinance of baptism, showing that baptism may mean either or none of the former twelve. The Lexicons give no clue as to which of them is the mode in which the ordinance is to be administered.”

“The Lexicons appear to leave the subject in a very confused, unsatisfactory way,” said Mr. Jones.

“It may be unsatisfactory to Baptists, who have chosen such a narrow bed; but we must keep in view that the lexicographers had not the mode of administering the ordinances of baptism in their minds at all. They have simply given a history of the word, tracing it through all the eras of Greek literature, extending over a period of one thousand years, and given the various uses to which it has been applied. The same sources of information are open to us as to the lexicographers. We can have access to all the Greek authors which they have quoted, and judge from the circumstances the ideas which the writers intended to convey.”

“That would be no easy task,” said Mr. Jones,

“That cannot be helped; there is no royal road to learning. But is it not strange that the mode of administering an ordinance so important, that it is the door of admittance into the Church, should be left so much in the dark? If we take the New Testament for our guide—for ex-

ample, our Saviour's baptism—it is difficult for me to understand how it could have been by any other mode than immersion.”

“We are not yet through with the meaning of the word ‘baptize.’ When we are through with that, we may take up your question. Let us now note some of the ideas intended to be conveyed by some of the Greek authors by the word ‘baptizo.’ Homer, one of the most ancient of the Greek authors, in one of his poems, called ‘The Battle of the Frogs and Mice,’ speaks of a pond being baptized with the blood of a mouse. Now, it is left to the reader to determine the mode of baptism in this case—whether the pond was immersed in the mouse’s blood, or the mouse’s blood was applied to the pond. The idea which the author intends to convey is simply that the water was stained with the blood. This brings us to notice a point which is generally overlooked in the consideration of this question, viz.: The word ‘baptize’ or baptism, is not specific in its meaning; it is generic; it describes an effect, not a mode of producing an effect. For example, the word ‘wash’ describes an effect. That effect may be produced either by plunging the body into water, or by applying water to the body. It is the same with the word ‘baptize.’ In the New Testament the word ‘baptizo’ is frequently translated by the word ‘wash.’ But to return to the classic meaning. Homer in another place speaks of a mountain being baptized by the blood of a stag. It is simply the effect which is described. The mountain was stained. It is immaterial whether the mountain was immersed in the stag’s blood, or the blood was sprinkled or poured on the mountain. We will now give an example of its use in the Alexandrian Greek, viz., the dialect in which the New Testament and the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Old Testament, is written. This Septuagint, or Greek version of the Old Testament, was translated by seventy of the most learned men of Greece, who were appointed by Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, to translate the Old Testament Scriptures from Hebrew to Greek.”

"But I have heard it said that the Septuagint was not good authority," said Mr. Jones.

"It is true," replied Mr. Clarence, "that it is not considered good authority in theological questions. But the question now before us is simply the meaning of a Greek word, and those seventy learned men must surely be competent authority as to the meaning of a word in their own language, and it is reasonable to believe that they would use the word which would best convey their meaning. In Daniel iv. 33, where it is said in our own English version that Nebuchadnezzar was wet with the dews of heaven, in the Greek version it is said he was baptized. Now, the idea intended to be conveyed was simply that he was wet with the dew, or the effect produced by the dew. We are left to judge whether he was plunged into the dew, or the dew settled down upon him as it does upon the grass."

"That is very strange," said Mr. Jones; "I cannot understand how that can be."

"Well," said Mr. Clarence, "it is in the book before us in black and white. I think we have this difficulty met in 'Theodosia.' The author says it is common for poets to speak of being dipped in dew. I am aware that poets are allowed what is called poetical license, and in drawing their fanciful sketches they sometimes use words in a sense far different from the ordinary. But it is with fact, not fancy, we are now dealing. And unless the author of 'Theodosia' denies the truth of the story as given to us by Daniel, and calls it all a fanciful sketch, I cannot see how this plea will help his case."

"But is it not the word 'baptizo' which is always used in the New Testament, and not *bapto*? What then has the passage in Daniel to do with the case? The verb *bapto* is the root. A derivation is never of greater force than the word from which it is derived, and it is generally of less force; hence, as it is the root word which is used, it only makes the case against immersion stronger. It shows that a less application of water than might be made with the dews of heaven would comply with all the conditions of the

word 'baptizo,' as our English word 'baptize' comes from the word *baptizo*. Is it not a great pity that the translators of what is called King James' version did not translate the word 'baptizo,' and not leave it in such an indefinite way? They could find no word on which they could all agree; hence they wisely, as I think, decided to leave it as it is. But Baptist writers are far from being agreed as to what would be an equivalent for the word 'baptize.' Some give 'immerse,' others give 'dip'—neither of them conveys the idea. Nor do they properly describe the mode of administering the ordinance by baptism. The word 'merse' conveys the idea much better than 'immerse.' By prefixing the preposition 'in' to the word 'merse,' we give the word a locative meaning, which 'baptize' does not possess. The word 'immerse' only expresses the act of putting a body under water, but not of taking it out again. The word 'emerge' is required to express the act of taking the body out of the water. Hence, when you administer the ordinance in your way, you both immerse and emerge. If you should cease when you immerse the body, you would leave it under the water."

"But what has all this to do with the case?" said Mr. Jones.

"Only this," replied Mr. Clarence, "that as you claim that baptism must be a well-defined act, it behoves you to find some definite word to describe it. The word 'immerse' does not describe the act which either you or we call baptism. But," continued Mr. Clarence, "it is extremely unfortunate for your cause that the word 'immerse' was ever chosen to describe the act which you call baptism."

"Why so?" said Mr. Jones.

"Because neither in the Vulgate or Latin translation of the New Testament, nor in the works of the early Christian fathers, which were written in Latin, do we find the word 'baptize' translated by *immergo*. Now, it is reasonable to believe that if the word *immergo* had conveyed the meaning of the word 'baptize,' they would have used it, and not have taken a Greek word, Latinised it as we have Anglicised it, and incorporated it into their own language. Peo-

ple are not likely to borrow a word from another language, to express an idea, if they have a word in their own which will answer the purpose. The modern Baptists have taken up a Latin word which the Latins themselves rejected more than eighteen centuries ago, and use it to describe their mode of administering the ordinance of baptism. Our best Latin-English Lexicons give, as the Latin equivalent for 'baptize,' not *immergo*, but *baptizo*; and for 'baptism,' not *immersio*, but *baptisma levatio sacra*, or sacred washing. If you examine the Vulgate or Latin version of the New Testament, you will find that *baptizo* and *baptisma* are invariably used as the equivalents for 'baptize' and 'baptism'—never *immergo* nor *immersio*. The word 'immerse' is not found in the English Scriptures at all."

"But," said Mr. Jones, "did not King James forbid the translators of the Scriptures to translate the word 'baptize?' Is not that the reason why the word 'immerse' is not used?"

"Sofar from King James preventing an agreement in favour of immersion, he was the means of preventing a division on that question. Nearly one-half of the translators were in favour of adopting sprinkling, or pouring, as the only mode of baptism, and excluding immersion altogether. James, though a weak monarch, was a ripe scholar. He knew that the word *baptizo* was not a specific word, but a generic one. He knew that neither 'sprinkle,' nor 'pour,' nor 'dip,' would convey the idea intended to be conveyed by the word *baptizo*; hence he recommended that the word *baptizo* should be Anglicised by having its termination changed. The mode was thus left an open question. Nearly nine-tenths of the Christian world at the present day endorse King James's opinion: they practise sprinkling, or pouring, but admit that immersion is valid baptism. But surely you will not say that King James was responsible for the translators of the Vulgate, in the first century, passing over the word *immergo* and using the untranslated word *baptizo*. It is surely reasonable to believe that the word *immergo* did not express the idea, or they would have used it rather than to have taken a foreign word and incorporated it into their language.



King James only induced the translators to follow the course adopted by the Vulgate, and Anglicise what they had Latinised. We will now consider the claims of the word 'dip.' This word much better describes the Anabaptists' mode of administering the ordinance of baptism than the word 'immerse.' The word 'dip' is as much a Greek word as 'baptize.' It is simply the Greek word *dupto* Anglicised, as the word *baptizo* has been. Now, it is fair to give the inspired writers credit for knowing what they meant—and if they had meant 'dip' they would have said 'dip.' John the Baptist would have said *dupto eis udata* if he had meant dipping; but the fact that he used the language *baptizo en udati*, showed that he meant something else than 'dip.'"

"That is all new to me," said Mr. Jones.

"It is none the less true for all that. I simply give you the words used by the inspired writers, and the meanings given in the best Greek and English Lexicons. But there is one thought more in connection with this to which I would like to call your attention before we go any further. The Greek preposition *en* is always followed by the dative case, and always means motion or rest in a place. It never means motion into a place. Motion into a place always takes the accusative after it; and if there is a preposition used, it is always *eis*, which means 'to,' or 'into.' The language which was used by John altogether precludes the idea of plunging the body into the water. Consult all the Greek authors in the world, and you will not find one who describes such an act as you perform when you administer the ordinance of baptism, in the language in which John describes his work. John said he baptized into repentance, not into water—it was *with* water. But it is a little remarkable that we never read of being baptized into water; it is into repentance—into Jesus Christ, into His death (Romans vi. 3), into Moses (1 Corinthians x. 2). But not into water. We never read of baptizing into water. There is only one apparent exception to this rule; it is in Mark i. 9. It is said that 'Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized by John in Jordan.' The word 'Jordan' is

here in the accusative case. But in the former verse John says, 'I baptize you *en udati*,' or with water, the water being in the dative case; and in the parallel passage in Matthew iii. 6, we have the word 'Jordan' in the dative case, preceded by the preposition *en*. The passage in Matthew precludes the idea of immersion. The parallel passage in Mark makes it possible."

"How do you reconcile the two?" said Mr. Jones; "is not the one in Mark as good authority as the one in Matthew?"

"It is the word 'come,' followed by the preposition *eis*, which puts the word 'Jordan' in the accusative case. The preposition *eis* is frequently translated by 'at,' when the idea of motion towards a place is included. You will see that this idea is included in this passage—hence, *eis* would be properly translated by 'at.' The celebrated German scholar Greisbach gives this passage as an example of this use of the preposition *eis*. In Mark i. 9, therefore, the word 'baptized' could be translated by either 'immersed' or 'sprinkled' without violating any rule in grammar. In the preceding verse, and in the parallel passage (Matthew iii. 6), it could not be construed to mean 'immerse,' 'dip' or 'plunge,' without violating rules laid down by all grammarians worthy of the name in the world."

"But," said Mr. Jones, "I have read in 'Theodosia' that where we have 'I baptize you with water,' we have in Greek 'I baptize you in water;' that the translators of the English Scriptures have changed the Greek preposition *en* to 'with,' to support their own view. How do you explain that?"

"Simply that your author misrepresents the case—whether ignorantly or wilfully is not for me to say. We have seen that the Greek preposition *en* is never translated by 'into.' You cannot baptize in your way without putting the subject into the water. The only preposition which would convey your idea would be *eis*; *en* precludes the idea of putting the subject into the water. But if the translators are wrong here, they are wrong in other places as well. In Revelation xiii. 10, where we read, 'He that killeth with the

sword must be killed with the sword,' should be, 'He that killeth in the sword must be killed in the sword.' It is the preposition *en* which is used here, and if it should be translated by *in* in the one place, why should it not be so translated in the other?"

"I must confess," said Mr. Jones, "that it would be awkward."

"It certainly would, and, what is worse, it would not give the meaning of the inspired writers. Cause, manner, and instrument are put in the dative case in Greek, with or without the preposition *en*. The sword was the instrument with which the killing was done; the water was the instrument with which the baptizing was done. You have no more authority for saying the subjects were dipped into the water, than that they were dipped into the sword. If it was allowable to translate the preposition *en* by 'with' in the one case, it was equally so in the other."

"Can it be possible," said Mr. Jones, "that the statements which are made in 'Theodosia' are so unreliable? I have always heard it spoken of as a book which gave both sides fairly."

"It is not only possible, but certain. The book is full of just such misrepresentations. As for its fairness, it is very much like that of a good old Scotchman I once knew. The best place for holding a series of meetings was being discussed. He advocated the claims of a school-house in his neighbourhood. It was urged that another point would be more central. He answered, 'I think the skill-hoos wud be the maist central for the folk on this side.' Your author looks for arguments which will be fair for his own side."

"I suppose," said Mr. Jones, "that people have all a bias, less or more, towards those opinions which they have been taught in their childhood?"

"It is not opinions I am dealing with at the present time," replied Mr. Clarence, "I am giving you facts. I am simply giving you the words used in the original by the inspired writers, and the connections in which they are used, with rules given by grammarians, altogether irrespective of the

question which we are discussing. But I would like, for your own satisfaction, if you would show these words and rules to some good scholar, and get his opinion from a purely literary standpoint, without any reference to the subject of baptism at all."

"Thank you; I may have an opportunity of so doing at some time."

"It may be well to observe," said Mr. Clarence, "that in the Syriac version of the New Testament the word *baptizo* is translated by a word which signifies 'to stand up.' This gives significance to the words used by Ananias to Paul, 'Arise and be baptized.' It would appear that ordinance was administered while the subject was in a standing posture. This view accords with the meaning and intention of the ordinance of baptism. This text, which all your people are so fond of quoting, Mark xvi. 16, would be more significant—'He that believeth and is baptized,' *i.e.*, 'He who accepts Christ, and makes a profession of his faith or takes his stand as a Christian, by submitting to the ordinance of baptism,' shall be saved. That is what you, as well as we, understand by baptism, taking our stand before the world as Christians."

"But," said Mr. Jones, "is not that a roundabout way of coming at the meaning of a word, to go to the Syriac for it?"

"Your favourite author does so when it suits his purpose. And it is the proper way to learn the meanings of words, to ascertain the ideas which those using them intend to convey. It is surely interesting and important to know the meaning which the translators of the Syriac version attached to the word at that early age. But perhaps we have spent enough of time on the classical meaning of the word. It may be more interesting to consider the various scriptural passages in which reference is made to the subject."

Mr. Jones now looked at his watch, and finding it was half-past ten o'clock, said it was time for him to take his leave. Mr. Clarence, seeing he was quite interested in the subject, invited him to return another evening. Mr. Jones readily accepted the invitation.

Mr. Jones was on hand punctually at the appointed time.

"Where shall we begin?" said Mr. Clarence.

"I am not quite satisfied yet," said Mr. Jones, "with our investigation into the meaning and use of the word 'dip,' I have been consulting some authors on the subject since I was here. I learn that the word 'dip' in Luke xvi. 24 is translated from the word *bapto*. And likewise in Revelations xix. 13."

"Perfectly true," said Mr. Clarence, "but that does not help your case any."

"Why," said Mr. Jones, "I thought the question we were discussing was whether 'dip' was a proper translation of the original word *baptizo*, or *bapto*."

"Not at all," said Mr. Clarence. "We may admit, and we do admit, that the word *baptizo* and *bapto* may be properly translated by 'dip;' but that does not in the slightest degree affect the case."

"Why not?" said Mr. Jones.

"The point at issue between us is not whether the ordinance of baptism may be properly administered by dipping or not, but whether it must be done in that way and no other. We have only to show that it may be done in some other way. We will proceed to the consideration of the texts to which you refer. We will again remind you that the words *bapto* and *baptizo* describe an effect. In Luke xvi. 24, the finger of Lazarus was to be wet with the water. *Bapto* was the word used by the inspired writer. The English translators have translated it by the word 'dip,' because dipping would be a convenient mode of wetting the finger. Any other word which would have conveyed the idea of wetting would have answered the purpose equally well, or better. In Revelation xix. 13, our Lord Jesus Christ is represented as a King riding forth as a warrior at the head of his army, and in the battle in which He is engaged His vesture is stained or dyed with blood. A warrior's garments may be stained either with his own blood or with that of his enemies, or both. Now, Mr. Jones, did you ever hear of a warrior being

plunged into a pool of blood in the manner in which you administer the ordinance of baptism? In what way would you suppose that a warrior's clothes would get stained with blood? I suppose the most likely way would be that they would get bespattered with the blood either of his enemies, or from wounds received in his own person; but in either case the word 'wet,' 'dyed' or 'smeared' would have conveyed the idea much better than 'dipped.' 'Sprinkled' would have conveyed the idea better than the word 'dipped.' You will see that in both of those passages to which you have referred it is an effect which is described. The finger was to be wet with water. The finger would be most conveniently put into the water. In the case of the vesture, the blood would be sprinkled on it. But the word *bapto* is never used in the New Testament to describe the ordinance of baptism; it is always *baptizo*. And though in Luke xvi. 24 the surrounding circumstances show that the word *bapto* is properly translated by 'dip,' no such case can be shown in which, from the surrounding circumstances, dipping or immersion must necessarily have been the mode in which the ordinance was administered. And in many cases the surrounding circumstances are such that it is extremely improbable, if not impossible, that such could be the mode."

"Let us leave that part of the subject now," said Mr. Jones, "and turn to some of the passages in the New Testament in which baptism is referred to, and see if there is not something in the surrounding circumstances which favours the idea of immersion. Where shall we begin? I would like to hear a little more about our Saviour's baptism; for it is said He was baptized in Jordan. And after all that has been said, it appears strange that He should go into the water for any other purpose than to 'be immersed.'"

"We have already seen," said Mr. Clarence, "that the preposition which is used precludes the idea of putting the body into the water. But it is not clear that they went into the water at all. The word translated in Matthew iii. 6 by 'in,' is translated in Romans viii. 34 by 'at.' Christ is said to be *at* the right hand of God. Now, suppose we translate

by 'in,' and read *in* the right hand of God, would we make any improvement?"

"I think not," said Mr. Jones.

"This is only one of the many cases in which the word is translated by 'at.' In Luke xiv. 31, the same word is translated by 'with.' 'Consulteth whether he be able *with* twenty thousand men' would read, *in* twenty thousand men. This would certainly be no improvement. Now, you see, we have examples of the same word being translated by 'in,' 'at,' and 'with.' Suppose it had been translated by 'at' in Matthew iii. 6, it would have conveyed the idea quite as well. The text then simply means that John was carrying on his work of preaching at or near Jordan. The word used does not inform us whether he was in Jordan or not. But suppose he was in the water, it would not follow that he was immersed. He might be sprinkled, or have the water poured upon him; and if the language used precludes the idea of immersion, as we have already seen, we are shut up to some other mode which will agree with the meaning of the language used. We will now proceed to show that sprinkling conveys that idea; and we will give four distinct reasons for believing that Christ was sprinkled, and not immersed."

"But before you proceed to this," said Mr. Jones, "would you be kind enough to explain why it is said in Matthew iii. 16, that 'Jesus, when He was baptized, went up straight-way out of the water.' Now, could He go up out of the water if He had not gone down into it?"

"You appear to forget that He might be in the water without being under it. The word translated 'went up' is compounded of two words—the one means 'up;' the other, 'to go.' It is the word always used to express the idea of going upward, or away from the sea coast or any large body of water. The history which Xenophon wrote of the expedition undertaken by Cyrus against his brother Artaxerxes, was called the *Anabasis*, or the 'going up,' simply because it was inland, or away from the sea coast. The word 'went up' simply means that he went away from the water. The words 'out

of' are translated from the Greek word *apo*. Now, the primary meaning of the word *apo* is 'from.' In all the Greek grammars in which the word is given, the meaning given is 'from away from.' In Liddell and Scott, 'out of' is not given, unless in very rare cases. *Ek* is the word which is the equivalent of 'out of,' and which would have been necessary to convey the idea of the Anabaptist in relation to this ordinance. Why the translators have translated the word *apo* by 'out of,' in this place, is not known, but the translation is a very unusual one. The obvious meaning of the passage is simply that they went away from the water. It is no evidence either for or against immersion."

"But why," said Mr. Jones, "are there so many ways of translating one word? It is very confusing to have half a dozen meanings for one word. Why cannot we have an English equivalent for every Greek word? When so many meanings are given, every man who knows a little Greek feels at liberty to take whichever meaning suits him best."

"There is no help for that," replied Mr. Clarence. "But the paucity of words in all languages is the cause. It is rare that one word can be found in one language which is an exact equivalent for a word in another language. One word must generally be used to convey several ideas, if those ideas are in any way nearly connected with each other. And again, when new ideas are introduced, new words are necessary to express those new ideas, or old words must be used with new meanings. With the introduction of Christianity into the world there was a great demand for new words to convey those new ideas which were introduced with Christianity. And as the idea of Christian baptism was a new one to both the Latins and English, a new word was necessary to convey this new idea; and as neither of them had a word in their own language which conveyed the idea, the Latins took the Greek word and Latinised it, and the English Anglicised it. But as we have treated of this before, we will dismiss it and proceed to the reasons for believing that Christ was sprinkled, or had the water poured



upon Him, rather than that He was immersed. Christ was a priest. The priests were dedicated to their office at the age of thirty years by having oil solemnly poured upon their heads. We are expressly informed (Luke iii. 23) that Christ began to be about thirty years of age, or that He had arrived at the proper age. As He was of the tribe of Judah, and the regular priests were of the tribe of Levi, none of them would be likely to induct Him into the office. John was raised up to prepare the way for Him. One part of the preparation was inducting Him into the office of the priesthood. John was a priest by hereditary descent. His father, Zachariah, was an officiating priest at the time of his birth. His mother was of the daughters of Aaron. He was legally qualified to induct Christ into that office. Christ resembled Melchizedek in this, that he was not a priest by hereditary descent. He had neither father nor mother in the priest's office. Hence he was a priest after the order of Melchizedek. When John hesitated about baptizing Him, He said, 'For thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.' That righteousness was fulfilled in waiting till He was thirty, as well as being inducted into the office. If He was not dedicated to the office at this time, when, where, and how was He inducted? And what is the meaning of all that the Apostle has written in the book of Hebrews about Christ's priesthood? 2nd. His name—Christ—means 'the anointed one.' When He sat down to teach in the synagogue in Capernaum, in the manner of the priests—the first time He took the position of a teacher there—He began His discourse by applying these words of the prophet Isaiah to Himself, 'The spirit of the Lord is upon me, for He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor.' You will bear in mind that this was immediately after His baptism. When and where was He anointed, if not at this time? 3rd. 'The spirit of God descended upon Him.' This was in fulfilment of Isaiah xlii. 1: 'I will put My Spirit upon Him,' or as it is expressed, 'I will pour out My Spirit upon Him.' Oil, in the Jewish dispensation, was an emblem of the Spirit of God. The pouring out of the Spirit on the day

of Pentecost was called 'the baptism of the Spirit.' The water baptism is symbolical of the baptism by the Spirit. When the baptism by the Spirit was by pouring, it is surely reasonable to believe that the baptism by water would be by pouring. His baptism with water will lose much of its significance if we separate it from its antitype, the baptism with the Spirit."

"There appears to be considerable force in your argument," said Mr. Jones. "But as it is all new to me, I would like to take time to consider it further before giving my opinion on it."

"4th. In six different ancient drawings of this scene, which were taken from the second to the seventh century, Christ and John are represented as standing together in the water, and John in the act of pouring water on His head from a shell. This shows the view which was taken of the mode of baptism at that time, which was not more than one generation after the time of the Apostles."

"I have been informed," said Mr. Jones, "that Pædo-Baptist writers generally agree that John's baptism was performed by immersion."

"That is an assertion without proof," replied Mr. Clarence. "I may notice at another time the unfair way in which many Pædo-Baptist writers are quoted. But if you will carefully read the book of Leviticus, you will see that nearly all the various ceremonial washings or cleansings were done by sprinkling. By turning to Leviticus xiv. 5-7, you will see that the ceremony for cleansing a leper was to take a living bird and tie it to a cedar branch, and dip it into the blood of a bird which had been killed in an earthen vessel over running water, and sprinkle the leper with the blood and water. Now, this leprosy is conceded by all Christians to be a type of sin. This blood and water with which the leper was sprinkled represents the cleansing blood of Christ and the Holy Spirit, by which the sinner is cleansed from the leprosy of sin. You will see that the washing, the cleansing, or the baptism—for they are interchangeable terms—was done by sprinkling. If you will turn to Hebrews

ix. 10-22, you will find a more concise account of those washings or baptisms."

"Do you mean to say," said Mr. Jones, "that the word 'washing' is a translation of 'baptism'?"

"It is the word which is translated 'washings' in Hebrews ix. 10, and 'baptisms' in Hebrews vi. 2: 'Which stood in meats, and drinks, and divers washings (or baptisms), and carnal ordinances, imposed on them till the time of reformation. But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause He is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there also must of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength while the testator liveth. Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover, he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood there is no remission.' You see that the divers washings or baptisms referred to in the 10th verse are described minutely in the 13th verse. It was by

sprinkling the unclean with the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, mixed with water. It surely cannot be now denied that baptism may be performed by sprinkling."

"Not if the word 'washing' in the original is 'baptism.' But that is all new to me. You appear to find references to baptism where I never dreamed that they were to be found."

"I could not find them if they were not there. I have simply pointed them out to you. John the Baptist was the son of a priest. He must have frequently seen his father perform those rites of cleansing, or baptism. Those whom he was addressing must likewise have been familiar with them. When he invited them to be baptized, they would naturally expect him to baptize in the way in which they had always seen it done. Had he begun to practise immersion, it would have been a strange, meaningless rite to them."

"Well," said Mr. Jones, "your reasoning appears to be at least plausible." He then looked at his watch, and finding that it was nearly eleven o'clock, he rose to take his leave.

Mr. Clarence, seeing that he was deeply interested in the subject, invited him to return on the following evening; and knowing that there was a younger brother of Mr. Jones, who was attending a Collegiate Institute, then on a visit, he invited him to bring him along. He then handed him the Greek Testament, and suggested to him that he might get his brother to examine some of the passages which they had been considering. Mr. Jones thanked him, and promised to do so.

## CHAPTER IV.

MR. JONES and his brother spent the principal part of the following day in perusing the Greek Testament. James Jones (for that was the brother's name) had begun to read Xenophon, and had little difficulty in reading the passages to which they had been referring. He had a small edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon. They likewise examined a number of other works to which reference had been made in the discussion. Mr. Jones heard simply a repetition of those definitions which he had heard from Mr. Clarence. His faith was now beginning to be shaken in his favourite author.

They were again at Mr. Clarence's in the evening, and were soon at work.

"Have you had an opportunity of looking at those passages to which we referred?" said Mr. Clarence.

"We have examined them carefully," replied Mr. Jones, "and I am quite satisfied. But where it is said that John was baptizing in Ænon, near to Salim, it is added, 'because there was much water there.' What would this 'much water' be used for if not to immerse?"

Mr. Clarence then turned to James Jones and said, "Will you be kind enough to turn to the Gospel of John, iii. 23, and tell me the Greek word which you have for 'much?'"

"It is '*polla*,'" said James.

"And how would you translate '*polla*'?"

"By 'many.' The passage would then read, many waters or streams—simply meaning that it was a well-watered country."

"But did you see the advertisement of a camp-meeting which the Methodists are to hold at Sugar Creek on the 15th of next month?"

"I did," replied Mr. Jones.

"Why do you suppose that they have selected the neighbourhood of Sugar Creek for their camp ground?"

"I presume that as many of them will be coming long distances, they will require water for themselves and their horses and mules."

"You do not suppose that the water is sought for the purpose of baptizing?" said Mr. Clarence. "We know that the Methodists do not practise immersion, except in rare cases, at the request of the subject. If one of those advertisements should be unearthed a few centuries hence, it might be as fairly argued that the Methodists practised immersion because they selected their camp ground near Sugar Creek. It was as necessary for those who came to hear John to have water for themselves and horses, as it was for the Methodists. When the site of our church was selected, it was on the ground that it was near a beautiful spring. If some of our discussions should be produced at some future time, and used in the same way, they would prove us all to be Anabaptists."

"That's so," said Mr. Jones; "we must understand by John's baptizing, in this passage, his preaching, his exhortation, and all the other work of his ministry."

It was now decided to take all the passages which treat of the subject in their regular order. They then passed on to the baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost.

"It will be necessary to bear in mind," said Mr. Clarence, "that there is a double baptism spoken of here."

"What are they?" asked the Messrs. Jones, speaking together.

"The baptism by water and baptism by the Spirit."

"I can see nothing about baptism by the Spirit," said Mr. Jones, "in the passage."

"If you will turn to Acts i. 5, you will find: 'John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.'"

"When do you suppose this promise was fulfilled?"

"I cannot say," replied Mr. Jones; "that has escaped my attention."

"It is generally understood to have been on the day of Pentecost, when the Spirit descended upon them."

“Can you suggest any other fulfilment of this promise?”

“I cannot. We are satisfied to take the one which you have given. If you will now read carefully from the beginning of the chapter to the 18th verse, it will be plain to you that what now occurred was a fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel, recorded in Joel ii. 28: “And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams, and on my servants and on my handmaidens will I pour out in those days my Spirit, and they shall prophesy.”

Mr. Clarence then, turning to James Jones, said, “Will you kindly turn to this passage in the Greek Testament, and give us the Greek for ‘pour out?’”

He soon found it to be “*ek keo.*”

“Will you now find this word in the Lexicon and see how it is translated?”

He soon found “pour out” to be the meaning.

“You are now satisfied, I presume, that the word is properly translated in our English version?”

“Entirely so.”

“Is it not plain, then, that the baptism of the Spirit was by pouring?”

“Well, if that was the baptism by the Holy Ghost, spoken of by the Evangelist, I suppose it must be so.”

James Jones then remarked: “It does appear to be strange that this point has been altogether overlooked by our people, but I do not see how it can be got round. As we have learned the mode in which one of the baptizing elements was applied, what authority have we for applying the other in a different way? If a change is made in a rite which you consider of such great importance, it is surely not asking too much to ask for some reason.”

Neither of them answered a word.

Willie Clarence was present, and seeing their confusion said: “Father, I hope you will not baptize them by asking them too many questions.”

"Hush," said Mr. Clarence.

"Well," said Willie, "I was looking in the Lexicon the other day, and I saw that given as one of the meanings of 'baptize.'"

"Well, that will do now," said Mr. Clarence.

"But," said James Jones, "if that is one of the meanings of 'baptize,' I would like to know it. Or is the boy only trying to hoax us?"

"You have only to look for yourselves. The Lexicon is there before you."

James soon found the word, and saw that it was even so.

"I am surprised," he said, "that our own writers pass these things over without notice."

"They have doubtless their own reason for it," said Mr. Clarence. "But let us now return to the question, and examine if we can find any evidence that the Apostles baptized with the water in a different way from that in which God baptized with His Spirit. It would appear that Peter's pungent sermon on that occasion produced a wonderful effect. No less than three thousand made a profession of their faith in Christ, and were received into the Christian Church by the ordinance of baptism. How it was administered we are not informed; but it is reasonable to believe that the Apostles would apply the water in the way in which they had seen the Spirit."

"Is not a Spirit invisible?"

"It would be well for you to follow the advice which you yourselves so frequently give—'Stick to the law and the testimony.' We are simply informed that 'there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and spake with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.' The Spirit assumed the likeness of a tongue of fire, as he appeared in the likeness of a dove at our Saviour's baptism. But this is a digression. We have not a word as to how or where they were baptized. We are simply informed that they were baptized. Let us compare this plain account of this baptism with the accounts given by Baptist



writers of their baptisms. What a minute account we have of the baptism of Theodosia in your book! But here we have not one word of the three thousand leaving the place where they were converted, to find a stream or pond in which they could be immersed. Most writers deny that there was any stream or body of water in which they could have been immersed, in or near Jerusalem. We will not, however, urge this point at present. Again, the length of time which would have been required to baptize by immersion would be a serious difficulty. We read that Peter, standing up with the eleven, addressed the people. And from the fact that Peter was so careful to have the blank which was made by the defection of Judas filled by another who was to be chosen expressly to take a part of the ministry in the place of Judas, it is fair to infer that only the twelve took a part in the ministry that day. Now, this would be two hundred and fifty subjects to each Apostle. How long time, do you suppose, it should take one man to baptize two hundred and fifty?"

"I do not know," said Mr. Jones; "I never baptized so many at once."

"I have heard it said that from one hundred to one hundred and fifty would be as many as an able-bodied man would be able, with justice to himself, to baptize in a day."

"I think," said Mr. Jones "that a man may baptize two hundred and fifty in a day. I would not see any great difficulty in the Apostles baptizing them all."

"We must remember that it was about the third hour, or nine o'clock, when Peter began his address. Considerable time must have been taken up with his address and exhortation, so that the day must have been pretty well advanced before the baptism commenced. Now, if all those three thousand had been marched off, according to your custom, to be immersed, is it credible that there should be no mention made of it?"

"Scripture stories are generally brief, and few particulars are given," said Mr. Jones.

"It is true they are brief, but when an incident is related it is generally done minutely. For example, when our Lord's ministry is described, we are told at one time that He taught in a house, at another time by the seaside, at another time in a ship, at another time on a mountain. The same with His Apostles. We read of them, on one occasion, going to the river side to hold a prayer meeting, but never to baptize. We have only one case recorded of any one being taken from the place where he was converted to be baptized."

"What case is that, pray?"

"It is the case of the Eunuch. He left his chariot. But we need not go far for a reason, for, of course, they had no water in the chariot."

"Can you find in your records of baptisms performed in connection with your ministry, a number of cases equal to those recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, and find no mention made of repairing to a stream, or to some body of water which would be suitable for the purpose?"

"I had not thought of it. I do not know that I could. It never struck me in that light before. And there is some force in the argument. But as you have made a reference to the baptism of the Eunuch, I would like to hear that explained, for surely the description which is given of that baptism looks very much like immersion."

"All right," said Mr. Clarence; and turning to James Jones, he said: "Will you be kind enough to find the passage in the Greek Testament, and tell me the word given for 'went down?'"

"*Katabaino*," replied Mr. Jones.

"You have begun to read in the 'Anabasis,' have you not?"

"We had just got through the first book when our Institute closed."

"Can you tell me the derivation of the word 'Anabasis'?"

"*Ana*, upwards; and *baiuo*, I go."

"And why is the book called the 'Anabasis'?"

"Because it describes a journey inland, or away from the sea coast. It was therefore a going up."

“Could you tell us what word would be used to describe an expedition towards the sea coast?”

“It would be a *‘katabasis,’* or a *‘going down.’* You will see, then, that the word used by the Evangelist was the one which was always used in impressing the idea of downwards, or towards a body of water. We are simply told, then, that Philip and the Eunuch went towards the water. What word have you for *‘into’*?”

“*Eis,*” replied James Jones.

“Will you please turn to the Lexicon and give us the meaning of *‘eis’*?”

“*‘They are,’ ‘to,’ ‘unto,’*” etc., etc.

“That will do,” said Mr. Clarence. “Now turn to John xx. 3. By what word is the coming of the disciples to the sepulchre expressed?”

“By *‘eis.’*”

“Now you will see that *‘eis,’* in this passage, is properly translated by *‘to,’* for in the next verse we read: *‘yet went they not in.’* When we read in the passage under consideration that Philip and the Eunuch went down to the water, it might as well have been added, *‘yet went they not in.’*”

Both the Messrs. Jones cried out at once: “Oh, you have no right to add anything! Take the simple text as it is.”

“True,” said Mr. Clarence, “we have no right to add nor to diminish. And if we have no right to add *‘yet went they not in,’* you have just as little right to add *‘and they went in.’* The text simply brings us to the water. There is nothing added to inform us whether they went into the water or not, but we read that they both went down. Whatever length the one went, the other went also. All that is added is, *‘he baptized him.’* We are not told how. For aught we are informed in the passage, it might have been either the one way or the other.”

“That’s so,” said James Jones. “*‘What’s sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.’* That Greek is knocking our immersion all endways like; but, never mind, let us hear what it does say. But does not the word *‘ek’* mean *‘out of?’* How could they come out of the water if they were not in it?”

"Will you kindly find the word in Liddell and Scott?" said Mr. Clarence.

He found it and read: "From, out of, away from a place."

"You will see that if we applied your rule, and confined ourselves to the primary meaning, we would be shut down to 'from.' We will not, however, take advantage of that. It is enough simply to say that 'ek' is opposed to 'eis.' We need not follow it any further."

"Well," said Mr. Jones, with an evident feeling of disappointment, "it appears, after all, that it is left an open question. If there is no evidence that immersion was the mode, there is none in favour of sprinkling."

"To leave it an open question is to decide it against you," said Mr. Clarence; "for your position is immersion, and nothing but immersion."

"Well," said Mr. Jones, "we may go on to something else."

"Not yet," said Mr. Clarence; "we are not yet done with this passage. We wish to see if there is anything in it which appears to favour sprinkling." And turning to Willie, he said: "Get your Bible, and find Isaiah, chapter liii. and verse 5."

He found it and read: "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers," etc.

"I presume you recognize this as the passage which the Eunuch was reading when Philip met him."

"Certainly," said Mr. Jones. "There can be no doubt as to that."

"Philip then asks him if he understands what he is reading. He confesses his ignorance, and invites Philip to take a seat beside him in the chariot. He then asks Philip the question, 'Of whom speaketh the Prophet—of himself or of some other man?' That Philip then opened his mouth and preached Christ, *i.e.*, that that wonderful person of whom he had been reading was Christ, the Messiah."

"But," said Mr. Jones, "Philip must have preached to him about baptism, or why would he have asked to be baptized as soon as he saw the water? He must have got the idea of baptism in some way."

“Quite true,” said Mr. Clarence; “but we must keep in view the Bible was not then divided into chapters and verses as it is now. The books were written from beginning to end without break or division. It is only reasonable to believe that the Eunuch began at the beginning of the book, and had got as far as the passage quoted in the Acts of the Apostles. Now, Willie, go back eight verses and read.”

Willie counted back and found that it brought him to the 13th verse of chapter lii. He then read: “Behold my servant shall deal prudently; he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high. As many were astonished at thee; his visage was so marred more than any man. So shall he *immerse* many nations,” etc.

“Well,” said Mr. Jones, “I never saw that before; but surely that is conclusive for immersion. What has become of all your explanations, now, in favour of sprinkling?”

“But are you sure,” said Willie Clarence, “that this applies to Christ?”

“Certainly,” said Mr. Jones. “Those verses which you have now read describe His humiliation as plainly as those quoted in the Acts of the Apostles, and Philip declares plainly that it was Christ he was preaching.”

“Willie,” said Mr. Clarence, “will you please read that passage correctly?”

Willie read it, and put “sprinkle” instead of “immerse.”

“Let me see that,” said Mr. Jones.

Willie pointed out the place, and Mr. Jones read it for himself. A cloud appeared to pass over his countenance, and he laid down the book and made no reply.

“The old story of the lawyer and the ox,” said Willie.

Mr. Clarence continued: “When we consider that the Eunuch was a Jewish proselyte, and knew that all the ceremonial cleansings under the law were by sprinkling, and as Philip preached to him Christ, and doubtless referred to the commission which he had received with the other disciples to go and preach the Gospel to every creature, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and

of the Holy Ghost ; and that he, as one of Christ's servants or apostles, was now, in obedience to that command and under that commission, preaching the Gospel to him as a representative of those nations who were referred to by Christ in the commission. Now, observe, the prophet says : 'He, that is Christ, shall sprinkle many nations. Christ had come, and begun to baptize those nations through His disciples.' In the one case the word 'sprinkle' is used, in the other 'baptize;' but it is evident that one and the same thing is meant. Hence there was nothing more natural than that the Eunuch should ask to be baptized, and that the baptism should have been by sprinkling. It is extremely improbable that immersion should have entered into the minds of either, as it would have been utterly void of significance to both. But, with the Jewish modes of purification, they must have both been familiar. These rites were all performed by sprinkling."

"But is it perfectly clear that all the ceremonial rites under the law were performed by sprinkling?" said Mr. Jones.

"Read Numbers xix. carefully. You have there an account of the preparation and use of the water of separation. This was to be sprinkled on, for every kind of sin and uncleanness. What is baptism but a rite of separation? You understand it in that way as well as we. When you baptize a person on profession of his faith in Christ, it is understood that by this act he professes to be separated from the world, and to be united to Christ as one of His disciples. In Ezekiel xxxvi. 25, it is said: 'I will sprinkle clean water (or cleansing water) upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you' (or separate you). The great question for fallen man is how to be just with God. What he wants to be placed in a state of justification is the cleansing by the blood of Christ, and the renewing by the Holy Spirit; or, as the Apostle expresses it, 'the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.' The sprinkling of Ezekiel was symbolical of that washing or renewing. As

the blood of Christ has been already shed, it was unnecessary that the blood and the ashes of the heifer, representing Christ's blood, should be mingled with the water. Hence, simple water is now used in the ordinance of baptism to represent this cleansing."

"Well, that is all new to me," said Mr. Jones; "I must consider it more, at my leisure."

"If you are satisfied with this, we will now briefly consider Philip's work in Samaria. We read, Acts viii. 5, that Philip preached Christ to them, and as the result many were baptized, both men and women. We are not informed how they were baptized. But as Samaria was built on the summit of a high mountain, water was scarce. If this had not been so, the woman of Samaria would not have been obliged to go out to Jacob's well with her watering pot to bring water into the city. It would have been a difficult task to get water to baptize by immersion. If Philip had taken them away to a stream to immerse them, it would have been mentioned."

"Not necessarily so," said Mr. Jones.

"Well, the burden of proof will lie with you to prove that they really went to a stream for that purpose."

"The next case to which we come is the baptism of Paul. Will you please read Acts ix. 17-19 inclusive: 'And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been great scales: and he received sight forthwith, and rose and was baptized. And when he had received meat, he was strengthened. Then was Saul certain days with the disciples which were at Damascus.' Let us observe that he arose and was baptized. This looks very much as if he was baptized while in a standing posture. The word by which 'baptize' was translated into the Syriac, means 'to stand.' If he had been required to leave the house to be baptized in a stream or pond by immersion, would not a small degree of

common sense have suggested to Ananias the propriety of giving him food to strengthen him before submitting his nervous system to such a shock as it must have received from being suddenly plunged into cold water? Reflect how absurd it would be to take a man out of bed who had been sick and blind for three days, and had not tasted food during that time, to a pool of water, and, while in that weak condition, plunge him into the water without giving him a morsel of food before starting out. If he had been taken from the house, they surely would have given him the food first; but it was not till after he was baptized that he received the food. It is incredible that he should have been taken from the house under such circumstances, and no mention made of it. A popular Baptist writer draws a graphic picture of Saul in his feeble state going forth, leaning on the arm of the pious Ananias for support, to the river, and there being immersed. But the Scriptures are silent on this, and we have no right to add anything to the Scripture record. The next case which we will notice is that of the Centurion. The account given by the Evangelist is as follows: 'While Peter spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles likewise was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and glorify God. Then Peter said: Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized.' When Peter was rehearsing this event afterwards (Acts xi. 15), he says: 'And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord Jesus, that He said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as He did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; who was I, that I should withstand God?' 'Who can forbid water?'—*i.e.*, who can prevent water or keep it back? Why talk of keeping back



the water from the subject, if the subject must be brought to the water? How do you explain this, Brother Jones?"

Mr. Jones replied: "There is a difficulty here which I had not observed before."

"Again, Peter expressly declares that it was when he saw Cornelius and his family baptized with the Holy Ghost that the words of the Lord Jesus, connecting the water baptism with the baptism by the Spirit, recurred to him, suggesting the idea of the water baptism, that he commanded them to be baptized with the water, as he had seen them baptized with the Spirit. Now, this simple question arises: In the case of a baptism with two different elements, the one element is poured upon the subject—would that suggest the plunging of the subject into the other element? God's mode was pouring. He poured His Spirit upon them. Is it not presumptuous in us to use a mode so widely different as immersion? Are we at liberty to use the one element in a different way from that in which God uses the other, when the action is described by the same word? If God Himself, when baptizing with His own Spirit, chose the mode of pouring or sprinkling, who are we that we should withstand God, and choose another mode which has not been appointed in His word?"

"Well, that is coming down heavy on our side," said James Jones.

"Well, I must confess," said Mr. Jones, "that I have not examined that subject so carefully as I should have done. I had been satisfied with the account of our Saviour's baptism, and that of the Eunuch, and had let this pass with too slight an examination."

"We will briefly notice the baptism of Lydia," said Mr. Clarence. "She was baptized at the river, near Philippi. But the Apostles did not go to the river to baptize. We are told that they went to hold a prayer-meeting; that they spent a part of the time in speaking to the 'women who resorted thither;' that the Lord opened the heart of Lydia, so that she attended to the things which were spoken of Paul, and that she was baptized then and there. Nothing is said

about the mode in which the water was applied. We now come to the baptism of the Philippian jailor (Acts xvi. 24-40). It appears that the Apostles had been put into the inner prison; their feet made fast in the stocks; the prison was shaken with an earthquake; the jailor was frightened and was near committing suicide, knowing that if the prisoners escaped he must pay the penalty with his life; he is barely prevented by Paul's word; he then rushes into the inner ward, where Paul is, trembling, and in a state of the greatest excitement throws himself at Paul's feet, and cries out, 'What must I do to be saved?' Paul explains to him the way of salvation. He then took water and washed their stripes and was baptized, he and all his. Not a word of taking them away to a river, but it was done straightway. Let us notice the order of the events. He brought them out of the inner prison, where they lay bound, into the court of the prison. It was then that Paul preached to him and to all that were in his house, and that he washed their stripes and was baptized—doubtless with the water which had been brought to wash their stripes. He then took them into his own house and set meat before them. Now, I would ask if it is at all probable that Paul should have asked that jailor to take his prisoners out of that prison at the midnight hour—a thing which he could only do at the risk of his life—and take them to a river some considerable distance outside of the city limits and there baptize them, and return to the court of the prison; and after all this that he should have taken them into his own house and set meat before them? Is it probable, is it even possible, that an incident so striking and so important should have occurred, and that such a graphic and accurate historian as Luke should make no mention of it? Is it credible that this man, now rejoicing in the new-found pearl of great price, should have permitted those outraged prisoners, whom he had now discovered to be the servants of the Most High God, mangled and bruised by the forty stripes, save one, which they had received on the previous day, their limbs cramped by being fast in the stocks, and famished with long fasting, to under-

take this labour, even if the rules of the prison had permitted him, without first giving them refreshments? We find that he gave them refreshments immediately after the baptism. If they had to be taken away to a river to be immersed, might we not expect that any man of common sense, and possessing the ordinary feelings of humanity, would have given them their refreshments first?"

"That reasoning does appear plausible," said Mr. Jones; "but we must not go by mere probabilities. We must to the law and the testimony."

"Very well," replied Mr. Clarence, "let that be the standard of appeal, by all means. We can find within the limits of the law and the testimony evidence that they had sufficient water on hand to baptize by sprinkling. The water which was brought to wash or baptize their bruised limbs—for washing and baptizing are interchangeable terms—would be sufficient to sprinkle them. You must go beyond the law and the testimony to find water to baptize by immersion. Where did they find the water? Information is here wanted."

"That's a poser," said James Jones.

Mr. Jones, senior, said: "They may have found water in some cistern."

"But," said Mr. Clarence, "we cannot take maybe's. We want proof. We have found the water—where do you find it?"

Mr. Jones possessed the prudence to say nothing where nothing could be said. He at length said: "If you will turn to Romans vi. 3, you will find something which means immersion, if words have any meaning."

"Well," said Mr. Clarence, "let us examine the passage carefully." Then turning to Willie, he said: "Will you please read from the beginning of the 3rd verse to the end of the 14th verse—'Know ye not, that so many of you as were immersed into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by immersion into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even we also should walk

in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."

"Willie," said Mr. Clarence, with an attempt at sternness, "please read that as it is in the book."

"Well," replied Willie, "I was out hearing Elder Bump the other evening, and he proved very much to his own satisfaction that the word 'baptize' should always be 'immerse,' so I thought I would read it that way, that we might hear how it would sound."

"That will do, Willie," said Mr. Clarence. "Let us proceed with the question. The apostle says, 'We are buried.' Now, whatever condition is meant by 'being buried,' it is evident that the apostle, and they to whom he wrote, were in it at that time. Now, how were they buried?"

"I presume in the usual way," replied Mr. Jones.

"I think if you read the next clause you will find that it was by baptism."

"There is no getting round that," said James Jones. "Well, we require to know now how this baptism was performed."

"Oh, I see how it is!" said Willie; "they have made a slight mistake. They have simply taken the door to unlock the key, instead of taking the key to unlock the door. They have taken the burial to explain the baptism, and have not noticed that the baptism explains the burial. A slight mistake—a very slight mistake."

"That will do, Willie," said Mr. Clarence; "you had better, for the present, leave the discussion to older heads. Still there is a point in what he says. The next question is into what was he baptized? It was into Jesus Christ—into death—not into water. We have no reference in the passage to anything resembling immersion in water. We have the word 'baptism' and the word 'burial' mentioned in the same passage. Let us see what relation they bear to each other. First let us consider what kind of a burial it is that is spoken of here; whether is it a real burial or a figurative one?"

“I presume it must have been a figurative one,” replied Mr. Jones; “for it is said, ‘we are buried with Him.’ Hence, whatever that condition was, they must have been in it when the Apostle wrote.”

“Very well,” said Mr. Clarence, “as figurative or symbolical burials were common among both the Greeks and Romans, let us see how they were conducted. The Romans, to whom Paul was now writing, must have been familiar with figurative burials.” Then turning to James Jones, he said: “I presume you have read in Horace.”

“I have read the first book,” replied Mr. Jones.

“You probably remember the twenty-eighth Ode, addressed to Archytes?”

“Quite distinctly.”

“I presume you remember,” continued Mr. Clarence, “the superstitious belief on which this custom was founded. The souls of those to whom funeral rites were denied were destined to wander round in the neighbourhood of the body for one hundred years before they could be admitted into their Elysium. Hence, anyone who, by accident, found a dead body, or any part of it, over which the funeral rites had not been performed, was liable to a severe punishment from the gods if he did not perform those rites. The figurative burial consisted in sprinkling the remains three times with a small quantity of earth. As soon as this simple ceremony was performed, the soul was supposed to be set free. Have you ever read Sophocles’ *Antigone*?”

“No, I have never read that.”

“Well, no matter. If you can procure a good English translation—and such can now be easily had—you will see that the ceremony was precisely the same among the Greeks. Now, as figurative burials were by sprinkling, just as figurative washings or baptisms were by sprinkling, it is clear that if this text refers to the mode of baptism at all, it points to sprinkling as the mode. The Jews did not bury their dead under the earth, as we are in the habit of doing. They buried in sepulchres which were not generally below the surface of the earth. They were entered just as rooms are en-

tered with us. The bodies were laid on shelves, and the door tightly closed. The modes of burial, in none of those countries, had the slightest resemblance to immersion. But into what were those Roman Christians said to have been baptized, or immersed? Not into water, but into Christ, into His death, etc. It is evident the Apostle's remarks have no bearing whatever on the mode of baptism. He compares baptism into Christ to a burial with Him, to being planted with Him, to being crucified with Him. Hence, the mode of burying a dead body has no more to do with the mode of baptism than to the mode of planting a tree, or making a cross, or crucifying a victim. The Apostle says, 'We are buried,' 'We are planted,' 'We are crucified.' The baptism refers to the one as much as to the other. What does the Apostle teach them in this passage? He simply teaches that when we are baptized into Christ, we are incorporated with Him; that we are a part of His body; that we have put off the old man, and put on the new; that we are now as dead to our former life of sin as if we had been dead and buried and had risen again; that we are planted with Christ as a part of His body; that our old man—that is, our carnal lusts have been crucified; that we are now new creatures in Christ Jesus."

"Well," said Mr. Jones, "that exposition is altogether new to me. I would like to reflect on it a little more. Perhaps we might as well pass on to some other passage."

"There is another point or two yet which I would like to notice in connection with this passage before I leave it."

"Oh!" said Willie, "father reminds me of a lawyer I was reading of not long ago. He was defending a client in a case of damages, said to have been inflicted by his dog on his neighbour's cow. The legal gentleman undertook to prove: (1) That the wounds were of such a nature that they could not have been caused by a dog's teeth; (2) The only dog his client ever owned had no teeth; (3) That at the time the injury was done his client had no dog. Perhaps father thinks he has only proved two of his points. He now wishes to prove the third."

Though Mr. Jones' face had been rather grave, it now relaxed into a smile.

Mr. Clarence reminded Willie that he never could keep his tongue quiet. He then said, "We will now pass on to 1st Corinthians x. 1."

Willie then read: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

"Now, while in this condition, under the cloud, or, as it is in the second verse, in the cloud, and in the sea, they were all baptized, or shall we say immersed? Now, into what were they immersed? Not into the cloud, not into the sea, but into Moses."

"But it is not 'into' Moses, but 'unto' Moses, as it reads here," said Mr. Jones.

"No matter," said Mr. Clarence; "it is all the same in Greek;" and turning to James Jones, he said: "Will you find the passage in the Greek Testament and read it?"

James Jones found the passage and read it, and said: "True enough, it is the same word we have in Acts viii. 38, where it is said they went down into the water."

"Now, they were enveloped in the cloud, walking in the trough of the sea. In that position they were baptized, not into the water, but into Moses. How they could be immersed into Moses is for you to say."

"There is a difficulty there," said Mr. Jones.

"The difficulty is all with the word 'immerse.' If we stick to the text there is no difficulty. The children of Israel professed their faith in Moses as their leader, marching down into the sea under his leadership. They accepted Moses as their leader, just as the Christian accepts Christ as his leader. They are said to be baptized into Moses, just as the believer is said to be baptized into Christ. The mode in which the baptism was administered is described in the 77th Psalm, verses 16th to 20th: 'The waters saw Thee, O God, the waters saw Thee; they were afraid: the depths also were troubled. The clouds poured out water; the skies sent out a sound; Thine arrows also went abroad. The voice of Thy thunder was in the heaven; the lightnings lightened;

the earth trembled and shook. Thy way is in the sea, Thy path is in the great waters, and Thy footsteps are not known. Thou leddest Thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron.' It is evident that they were baptized by the water being poured upon them from the cloud. Now, is it not worthy of notice that we have two cases recorded in which the ordinance of baptism was administered by God's own hand—the one with water, as here recorded, the other with the Spirit on the day of Pentecost? In both cases the baptism was by pouring."

"But," said Willie, "we have just as strong evidence of immersion in this case as of sprinkling or pouring."

"How do you make that out?" said Mr. Clarence.

"The Egyptians were immersed."

"Quite true," replied Mr. Clarence; "but they were not immersed, they were drowned. There are two points clearly proved in this passage. The children of Israel were baptized by sprinkling, and infants were the subjects of it as well as adults. If not, they were all selected out of the camp of Israel and left to the tender mercies of the Egyptians; for all who passed through the sea were baptized."

"But," said Mr. Jones, "that belongs to another dispensation. It is Christian baptism we are discussing now."

"You appear to forget," said Mr. Clarence, "that it is the language of the Apostle Paul we are considering now, and the Apostle said he would not have them ignorant of it; and if you read the passage carefully, you will see that Paul explains the whole to refer to the spiritual union which exists between Christ and His believing children—explains the bread and water which they ate and drank to be Christ. They drank of that spiritual rock, and that rock was Christ. Egypt represents the kingdom of sin and Satan. This deliverance by passing through the sea, being baptized while in the sea by the water being poured upon them from the cloud—their journeying through the wilderness, being supported by God's bounty, is simply a comprehensive parable describing the deliverance of God's people from the bondage of sin and Satan by being bap-



tized into Christ—as the children of Israel were baptized into Moses—and being led by His Spirit and fed by His bounty, during our pilgrimage through this world. Now, let us observe, that the children were sharers in the baptism, and in all the other benefits which flowed from their covenant relation to God. The Apostle connects those two things together. By what authority do you separate them, and cut off the children?”

The Messrs. Jones then took their leave.

---

## CHAPTER V.

ON the day following, the Clarence family were very agreeably surprised by a visit from an old friend and college companion of Mr. Clarence's, named Cahullan. Mr. Cahullan was a clergyman of the old school. The cut of his coat, and his style of tying his cravat, belonged to the last century. In all his deportment he appeared to be impressed with the importance of magnifying his office. His motto was, “Let all things be done decently and in order.” Every word he spoke, either in the pulpit or out of it, and every action, down to sneezing and using his pocket-handkerchief, were done with due deliberation, and with a due sense of clerical dignity. He was tall, and, though past his three score years and ten, erect, and of commanding presence. He had much of the manner and bearing of the ancient Highland chieftain. But beneath his rigid exterior he possessed much of the genial humour and urbanity for which his countrymen are noted. To know him was to love him. He was a universal favourite with both old and young. In his younger days he was in the habit of making extensive missionary tours through the newest and most sparsely settled parts of the country, preaching in log cabins, barns, and school-houses, and wherever he could get a few people together to hear the Word of Life. Though on the Sabbath day he would scarcely smile without atoning for it with a

sigh, it was no unusual thing for him, at his week-day appointments, to throw off his coat, after the services were over, and beat all the young men on the ground at throwing the sledge hammer and shoulder stone, and other athletic games. Though some of the elders, at times, shook their heads gravely at what they called his "unminister-like" conduct, they could not deny that his influence among the young was great, and that it was increasing. As he was now a widower, and on the list of retired ministers, and his family were all settled down in life, he was at leisure to make a lengthened visit. Mr. Clarence had, therefore, little difficulty in prevailing on him to spend the winter with him.

On the day following, the Messrs. Jones and Elder Bump, the pastor of a Disciple or Campbellite Church in the neighbourhood, called on some school business, as Mr. Clarence was superintendent of the schools in that county.

As it was near noon when they got through with their business, Mr. Clarence invited them to remain and dine with him. They were taken into the parlour, and introduced to Mrs. Clarence, and Laura, and Mr. Cahullan. They were all quite well, except Elder Bump, and he was "right smart." He then gazed at Mr. Cahullan with one of those belligerent expressions of countenance with which he was in the habit of trying to intimidate his opponents in his ecclesiastical combats, for, like most of his brethren, he was quite an ecclesiastical gladiator as well as an inveterate joker. He now considered that it behoved him to perpetrate a joke of some kind; and not seeing in Mr. Cahullan a suitable subject, he glanced his eye at Mrs. Clarence, and then at Mr. Clarence, and said, "How young your wife looks! Why, bless my soul, you look a'most old enough to be her pa!" And as he always made it a rule to laugh at his own jokes, this sally was followed by an explosive burst of laughter, in which none joined except himself.

After an interval of silence, Mr. Cahullan said, "Appearances are deceitful."

Elder Bump turned suddenly round and said, "How, brother Chadband?"

He had once had an opportunity of reading some of Dickens' works, and he had got hold of that name, and he was in the habit of using it to all clergymen indiscriminately when he wished to be witty.

Mr. Cahullan, seeing that both Mr. Clarence and Mrs. Clarence felt annoyed, calmly said, "Oh, never mind; our friend wishes to make a joke, and that is the best he has. Let us take the will for the deed, and, in the language of his hero, Chadband, with whom he appears to be so familiar, 'Let us be joyful, for it might have been worse.'"

Laura then informed them that dinner was ready, and they all adjourned to the dining-room.

There was a little negro in the village, named Mike. This lad had an interesting history. On the 1st of January, 1863, when President Lincoln's emancipation proclamation took effect (to use Mike's own language), they were all turned free—he among the others. This, with Mike, meant being turned out of his home, which, though a poor one, was the only one he had ever known. There is truth in the old adage, that "though ever so homely, there's no place like home." Mike's master was not unkind. He seldom noticed the children at all till they were old enough to work, unless they happened by chance to fall in his way, and then it depended on the humour in which he happened to be whether he would throw them a few coins or candies, for the amusement of seeing them scramble for them, or distribute a few blows among them promiscuously with his riding whip, for the fun of seeing them dodge the blows and scamper away, those who were fortunate to escape laughing at their less fortunate companions, who (as they expressed it) "kotched a lick o' massa's whip." Mike's mother was owned on a plantation about six miles from that of his master. Her master was severe. She could never see her child except by stealing away at the midnight hour, walking those six miles, and creeping noiselessly into the little cabin in which Mike slept. She would then take him out of his little cot, and fondly clasp him to her bosom. Maternal affection was as strong in the heart of that poor

slave as in the heart of any mother in the land. Poor Mike was frequently waked out of his sleep by her caresses. When he would feel her warm tears falling on his cheek, he would throw his arms around her neck, and say, "Don't cry, ma; you's got yer chile all right. Yer bad massa won't see you here." She would sometimes sit for hours, gazing by the moonlight on the calm features of her child, as he slept on her knees so peacefully and so free from care, a smile sometimes playing over his countenance, as he would partially awake and feel her arms still encircling him. At times she wept and prayed, O, so earnestly, that the good Lord would either take him to His own home in heaven, or help him to get away to Canada where he would be free. When she had remained as long as she dared, she would replace him in his little cot, kiss him good-bye, steal noiselessly away, walk hurriedly back, and creep into her own little garret before the day had dawned, so that she might be ready for the summons to her daily toil; but the memory of those happy hours would linger with her during the day and nerve to endure her bitter lot. Those visits were continued weekly till Mike was about five years old. She was then sold and conveyed to the distant South, and Mike saw her no more. But the memories of those visits and prayers remained with him during his life.

There was a good old slave-woman on the plantation, known as Aunt Betsy, owing to the motherly interest which she took in all the children. She took a particular interest in Mike. She said he was "a mighty peart young un." Mike always went to her with all his childish grievances, and she had always a word of comfort for him. When that day came which appeared such a dark one to poor Mike, "when massa turned 'em all free," Mike still clung to her as his guardian. Though she could do little to help him, she had always a word of comfort for him, and she would frequently say, while her own heart was sinking within her, "Trust de good Lord your ma used to pray to; He'll 'liver you some o' dese days." Mike would sometimes answer, "But He didn't keep dem bad men from takin' her away

down South." Poor Aunt Betsy took the shortest and surest way out of all such difficulties. She would say, "Neber mine, chile; you can't 'speck to understan' all dat de good Lord dus. Trust Him for all dat." One day, when poor Mike appeared to be reduced to his last extremity—his clothes were torn to rags, he had failed to get a cent or a morsel of food either by running errands or by begging—he had gone to Aunt Betsy; she had divided her last crust with him, and given him her most fervent "Lor' bress ye, chile; trust Him yet," while the tears were streaming from her own eyes. Mike went out, and was sauntering listlessly along the main street of the town, gazing eagerly at the cakes and other eatables exhibited in the shop windows, as if he would devour them with his eyes. Mrs. Green, a kind-hearted lady, originally from the State of New York, passed by. She saw poor Mike as he stood before one of the shop windows, and pitied him. She felt her pocket, but it was empty. She had been shopping, and spent her last cent. Mike noticed the movement, and his countenance fell when he saw her hand come out empty, but as she passed he heard her say, as if to herself, "Poor fellow!" These were the first kind words poor Mike had heard for a long time, with the exception of what he heard from Aunt Betsy. He followed her, and carefully noticed the house into which he had seen her enter. He saw two or three children meet her at the door, and he heard one of them call her ma. So he knew it was her home. A new idea now took possession of his mind. He ran to Aunt Betsy to unfold it to her. He cried out, "Oh, Aunt Betsy, I'se sœ'd de most splendidest lady eber was. As she pass'd me on de street she looked at me, O, so kine, an' she said 'Poor fellow!' an' she spoke so purty. It was jes' like my poor ma used to speak. I fust thought she must be one ob de angels my ma used to speak about, but I followed her an' saw her go into a house, an' I hearn a purty young un call her ma. O, if I cud only get her fur a missus! Won't you cum an' ask her? mebbe she'll take me."

"It ain't no use," said Aunt Betsy; "there's such lots o'

cullud folks a'runnin' round a'beggin'; eberybody's got tired o' givin' to 'em. 'Tain't no use, chile."

Mike pleaded so hard that Aunt Betsy went, simply to please him. Aunt Betsy told Mrs. Green how the boy had taken a "likin' to her." Mrs. Green said she had more than she could do to provide for her own children, and, as they had lost all they had during the war, they had hard work to get along. She asked a few questions about Mike. Aunt Betsy told her the straits to which they were reduced, and added, "Mike's a mighty peart young un, an' he won't steal nor tell no lies; an' his ma was a mighty good woman, an' always prayed dat de good Lord 'ud keep him from eberyting bad an' make him a good man." Mike cried out, "Dat's so. I ain't no nigger. I don't steal, and I pray to de good Lord ebery day to keep me from eberyting dat's bad." Aunt Betsy saw that Mrs. Green's sympathy was fast becoming enlisted, and she pleaded more earnestly. Mike ably seconded her efforts with his tears. Mrs. Green was a brave woman. She had, on one occasion, when an armed band came to arrest her husband on suspicion that he was a rebel sympathizer, seized a revolver and stood up boldly in his defence, and if necessary she would have fought to the death; but she could not resist Mike's tears. She soon had her handkerchief to her own eyes. Mike saw his advantage, and like an able tactician, followed it up. Mrs. Green soon capitulated. She said she would "take Mike, and trust to Him who feeds the fowls of the air to supply their wants, and that Mike should share with her own children." Aunt Betsy and Mike cried out in chorus, "Lor' bress ye, missus; de Lor' will reward you." Aunt Betsy was about to take her leave, but Mrs. Green asked her to remain for a short time, and sent her little girl to the kitchen for some fragments of bread and meat which had been left over from the dinner, and gave them to Aunt Betsy. She cried out again, "Lor' bress ye, missus, for I'se so hungry!" Mike ran to her for a share, but Mrs. Green took him with her to the kitchen, and gave him some there. He seized a large piece of meat and ran to a corner with it, and

began to eat it with the greediness of a half-starved dog. Mike had never, up to this time, learned to use a knife or fork or spoon. The young slaves on the plantation had always been fed in the same manner as the dogs. Mrs. Green had to begin to teach him to use all the various utensils used at the table, the same as if he had been an infant. Mr. Green was a kind-hearted man, and cordially fell in with this arrangement, as he did with every other arrangement which his wife saw fit to make. Mrs. Green repaired and fitted up some old clothes which belonged to one of her own boys, and on Sunday she dressed him up in a suit of clothes which had belonged to a boy of theirs who had died when he was about Mike's age. Mike was much elated with his changed circumstances. He now said he was better off than before "massa turned him free." When he saw other poor little coloured boys wandering round in the same forlorn, distressed condition in which he had lately been, he would laugh at them and call them "dirty little niggers." But he did not forget Aunt Betsy. He heard Mrs. Green say one day that she was in want of a washerwoman on whom she could depend to do her washing regularly. Mike cried out, "Law me, missus, Aunt Betsy's de gal 't'll do yer washing up to fits. If ye'll jest say de word, I'll go and git her fur you." Mrs. Green agreed to his proposal, and also allowed him to wear his Sunday clothes. Mike set out in great spirits. He created quite a sensation among the little "cullud folks" in the neighbourhood of Aunt Betsy's cabin. When Aunt Betsy saw him she cried out, "Bress de Lord!" and Mike said, "Bress Missus Green." "Don't forget," said Aunt Betsy, "dat it was de good Lord dat sent Missus Green to take you." She went with Mike, and did the washing so much to Mrs. Green's satisfaction that she employed her regularly and recommended her to others, and she soon had as much work as she could do. Her cabin became a regular rendezvous for all the little refugees, and many of them had cause to rise up and call her blessed.

Mike had become acquainted with Alec Clarence at the

Sabbath school. Alec had invited him to the manse, and he soon became a frequent visitor there. He was there on the day of Elder Bump's visit. He had been out on the previous Sabbath hearing Elder Bump. The Elder had that day used rather a novel illustration in his discourse. He said that before a man was baptized he was like a goat, but after he was baptized his condition was changed and he was like a sheep—that the change was as great as if he had gone into the water a goat and come out a sheep. Mike reported the case to Alec, and told of an amusing experiment which he and a few more coloured boys had tried with Mr. Green's goat, from which he had concluded that "dat ar' preacher had told a mighty big lie." Alec was so much amused with the experiment that he could not resist the temptation of getting him to relate it before Elder Bump. Alec always liked a practical joke. Accordingly when they were all seated at the table, Mike poked his head in at the door, and said, "Law me, if dat ar' ain't de preacher what told such a mighty big lie last Sunday!"

"What lie did I tell, you black rascal? How dare you say I told a lie?"

Mike was about to back out, but Alec pushed him forward again into the room.

Elder Bump felt that he had committed himself in the language he had used. He then turned to Mike and said, "Come, boy, you may just as well tell me what lie I told."

"Well," said Mr. Cahullan, "you may as well tell now, since you are asked to do so; but I hope you will never again be guilty of such rudeness."

"Well," said Mike, "he said dat when you put a goat into de watah it'd dun come out a sheep. Now, Sam an' Andy an' me took Massa Green's billy goat down to de mill-pond, an' we socked him into de watah tree times, an' he dun come out a goat ebery time. Der wa'n't no more wool on him arter he come out o' de watah dan before."

The whole company was convulsed with laughter, in which even Elder Bump joined.

"Well, my little boy," said Mr. Cahullan, "you got cheated



out of your wool, for you appear to have expected that the hair would be turned into wool."

"Why, sartin," said Mike; "dat's what dis 'ere preacher sed."

"Well," said Elder Bump, "there is no accounting for the strange mistakes that ignorant people will make."

"It was not such an unnatural mistake considering the illustration, and the illustration quite well suited your doctrine of baptismal regeneration."

"Who says that I believe in baptismal regeneration?"

"It certainly follows from your illustration. You certainly teach that unless a man is put under the water he cannot be a Christian."

"We do teach that it is necessary for a man to obey the commands of Christ and be immersed, and I fail to see how a man can be a Christian and refuse to obey the commands of Christ."

"Do you mean to say that the word 'immerse' is the exact equivalent for the word 'baptize'?" said Mr. Cahullan.

"I would like to ask you a question, as it is not often that I have an opportunity of being among noted scholars and linguists. I would like to know if the word '*xeo*' is not the word for 'sprinkle' or 'pour' in the Old Testament Scriptures?"

"Well," said Mr. Cahullan, "as I asked my question first, have not I a right to have it answered first?"

"Well, if you cannot answer my question, why will you presume to argue with me?"

"Well, I only asked a question; if you do not see fit to answer it, there is no harm done."

Elder Bump apologized, and said, "Well, I asked the question for information, and you would oblige me by answering it."

"Well," said Mr. Cahullan, "your object was not very apparent in your manner; but if that was really your object, I will inform you that there is not such a word in the original of the Old Testament Scriptures. The original is Hebrew, and the word you have given me is Greek."

Elder Bump was silent, and looked in an appealing manner to James Jones. Mr. Jones assured him it was so.

Mrs. Clarence saw his dilemma, and relieved him of all further difficulty. She rose from the table, and led the way to the drawing-room.

"I did not quite understand your views on baptismal regeneration," said Mr. Cahullan.

"Well, of course we do not believe in it at all. It is only a relic of Popery. I have always understood that none of the Protestant sects believed in it only the Episcopalians, and there's only a paper wall between them and the Papists. Of course we cannot believe in it, when we don't believe in baby sprinkling at all."

"As the offensive epithet—'baby sprinkling'—which you now used was handed down to you by Alexander Campbell and other leading men in your denomination, you are not responsible for it, so I will pay no attention to it; neither will I notice your cut at the Episcopalians, as they can defend themselves. I would simply say that from your explanation of your opinions on the ordinance of baptism, you are the most thorough advocates of baptismal regeneration in the world. We all believe in regeneration by spiritual baptism, and that the water baptism is only a symbol of the spiritual, and may or may not accompany it. The Episcopalian body, with the exception of the Ritualists, hold this view. The only bodies of Christians in the world who hold that the water baptism is necessarily accompanied by regeneration, without making the spiritual a condition, is your own and the Roman Catholic."

Elder Bump made no reply, and Mr. Cahullan continued:

"As you consider immersion so essential, I would like to know what you would think of a case in which a subject might feel it to be his duty to baptize himself, being unable to find any brother to do it for him. Would his baptism be valid?"

"Certainly not," said Elder Bump.

"Suppose he should do part of it himself, and the minister should complete the operation?"

“I never heard of such a case,” said Elder Bump; “but I presume not.”

“I think you see it every time you see a subject immersed,” said Mr. Cahullan. “The subject walks out into the water and immerses his feet and legs. The minister simply completes the operation by putting the remaining part of the body under water. In order to baptize the whole body, you would require to raise the subject, by means of a windlass or some other mechanical contrivance, above the water, and let him down into it till the whole body should be immersed. When the practice of immersion was first begun, when the subject went or was put into the water up to the neck, the minister then baptized him by pouring or sprinkling water on his head. The immersion was then no part of the baptism.”

Elder Bump then said, “If that is the way in which you treat a serious and important subject, it is time to give up the discussion.”

“I beg pardon,” said Mr. Cahullan, “I have not the least intention of treating the subject in any other than the most respectful manner. I claim to speak the words of truth and soberness. I have simply shewn that in your mode of baptism you do not perform the act which you profess to perform. I now go further. You are all very fond of describing the ordinance of infant baptism as the invention of the mother of harlots. I will now proceed to shew that your immersion, as a substitute for baptism, is neither more nor less than an invention of that same scarlet-attired lady to whom you are so fond of referring.”

“Oh! oh!” said Elder Bump; but as he made no remark, Mr. Cahullan continued:

“Shortly after the time of the apostles, innovations were introduced into the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper. Instead of being celebrated as a feast to commemorate the dying love of Christ, it began to be regarded as a real sacrifice in which the real body and blood of Christ were present. The ordinance of baptism was tampered with in the same way. The simple application of water in the name of

the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, was not sufficiently specious and impressive to please the carnal eye. Hence at an early period in the Christian Church the practice was introduced of taking candidates for baptism into an anteroom, stripping them of their clothing, and when in a nude state washing them by dipping them three times in water. Sometimes oil, salt, or honey were mixed with the water, and various exorcisms were used. They were then clothed in white raiments, taken into the church, and baptized by sprinkling. The dippings or immersions were not at first looked upon as baptism, but simply a preparation for it; but in time it gradually took, to a greater extent, the place of baptism. Now, let us observe, the dipping must be done three times. To dip once was the same as not to dip at all. The first distinct mention which we have of dipping in connection with baptism is by Tertullian, who lived at the beginning of the third century, and he acknowledges ('De Corona Militis,' chaps. iii. and iv.) that those dippings, with all the accompanying ceremonies, were based simply on tradition, and were destitute of all scriptural authority. Exclusive immersion, as you practise it, was unknown till the beginning of the seventeenth century.\* But during all that time sprinkling was practised, and its validity was never denied. The true meaning of the ordinance of baptism was gradually lost sight of. The outward form was exalted, and the spiritual meaning was in a great measure lost. Instead of using it to represent the cleansing from sin by the application of the blood of Christ and the Holy Spirit, immersionists make it to represent a burial. It would be strange, indeed, when Christ instituted only two ordinances, that they should both shew forth the same thing. The ordinance of the Lord's Supper shews forth his death. To make the ordinance of baptism represent simply his burial, makes it meaningless. The notice of a burial is of no importance further than that it is an evidence of the death. And then you add to the absurd-

---

\* See McKay's Treatise on Baptism.

ity by placing the ordinance representing the burial before the one representing the death. If your mode had been of God's appointment, it would surely have been free from this absurdity. But take the Pædo-Baptist view of the ordinance—how plain, simple and consistent it is. The candidate makes a profession of his faith in Christ. He then receives the ordinance of baptism representing the cleansing from sin by the application of the blood of Christ and the Holy Spirit. By this act he takes his stand as a Christian, as it is expressed in the Syriac version of the Scriptures, and is introduced into the family of Christ, and he is now entitled to come to His table and eat and drink in His presence."

"Well," said Elder Bump, "you have a strange way of mixing things up." But he now remembered that he had another engagement for that afternoon, and all his time would be required to meet it, so he took his leave, and the Messrs. Jones accompanied him.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

A FEW evenings after, the Messrs. Jones returned to Mr. Clarence's, partly, as they said, to apologize for what they called Elder Bump's eccentricities, but it was evident that they were interested in the question and would like to discuss it further. Mr. Clarence invited them into his study, and Mr. Cahullan accompanied them. Mr. Jones said that as he failed to find a single command or example for infant baptism in the Scriptures, he was at a loss to understand the grounds on which Pædo-Baptists based their doctrine.

At this point Mr. Cleghorn came in. He had come to see Mr. Jones, and not finding him at home, he had followed him to Mr. Clarence's. Mr. Clarence informed him of the point they were discussing. Mr. Cleghorn said, "That is a point very easily decided. Just find one plain command in

the Scriptures for baby sprinkling, or any example of Christ or His apostles practising it, and the case is decided in your favour. If you fail to find such, the case must be decided against you. That is surely a fair way of putting it. Let us to the law and the testimony."

"By all means," said Mr. Clarence; "but I would like to ask you one question: Do you admit women to the Lord's Supper?"

"Certainly," said Mr. Cleghorn; "but what has that to do with the case?"

"Simply this," said Mr. Clarence: "I would like to know where you find your command or example for it."

"Well," said Mr. Cleghorn, "I cannot at once lay my hand on one, but I am sure there are plenty to be found."

"I would like," said Mr. Clarence, "if you would find one, for hitherto I have failed in the attempt; but we will not press you for the Scripture proof at present. I would just ask you on what grounds you admit women to the communion?"

"I find," said Mr. Cleghorn, "that women as well as men believed and were baptized, and if they were in this way admitted as disciples, they were eligible to partake of the Lord's Supper."

"Precisely so," said Mr. Clarence. "You infer from certain data that they should be admitted, hence you admit them. We infer from certain data, which is to us satisfactory, that children should be admitted into the Church as disciples, hence we admit them. So far we are agreed. But it is now time to enter fairly into the consideration of this subject. We find in all God's dealings with the human family a great importance attached to the family relation. When God had determined to destroy the human family with the flood, it was with Noah and his family that He entered into a covenant to save them by means of the ark. Ham gave little or no evidence of piety; yet he was saved because he belonged to the family of Noah. God entered into a covenant with Noah to save him and his family. When the human family were a second time wandering from God, and He had determined to establish a Church to be a receptacle of His

name and knowledge, this Church was not composed of a few pious individuals, though such could at that time have been easily found. There were Melchisedec and Job and his friends, who must have lived near that time; and there were in all probability many more besides who were worshippers of the true God. A Church could have been easily formed on the model of the Baptist Churches, but God's ways are not our ways, neither are His thoughts our thoughts. He chose Abraham from among all those who lived in the world at that time. He entered into a covenant with him, not only on his own behalf, but on behalf of his family. Abraham's family were placed in a covenant relation to God, as well as the family of Noah. You will see that in both of those cases the faith of the parents was the ground on which they were chosen. God said of Noah, 'Thee only have I found righteous in my sight.' That grace which Noah found was the means of saving the whole family. He said, 'Come thou and all thy house into the ark.' The Apostle teaches that this salvation from the deluge is a type of the salvation from sin by our Lord Jesus Christ. It is so used in 1st Peter iii. 20: 'Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.' The like figure whereunto even baptism doth save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. Noah and his family were saved by water, it is said in our English version. How could they be saved by water, or the flood, when all the rest of the human family were drowned by the same flood? Our English translation is sadly at fault. The primary meaning of the word translated 'by' in this place is 'through,' and it should have been so translated in this place. The apostle means that they were saved or preserved through or during the continuance of the water of the flood. The ark carried or preserved Noah and his family through that deluge, just as Christ carries His elect through the deluge of sin, sorrow and suffering which is overwhelming the world. In order to be saved, Noah and his family must

enter the ark and abide in it. If we will be saved, we must enter Christ and abide in Him. 'If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered.' How do we enter Christ? By being baptized into Him. 'Know ye not that as many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death.' We are baptized (or shall we say immersed?) into Jesus Christ, not into water. We must not put the water in the place of Christ. The baptism is simply the door of entrance, and whether it is by sprinkling, pouring or immersion is of little importance provided that it is the answer of a good conscience toward God. Now, Noah was commanded to take his family with him into the ark. And suppose there had been any infant grandchildren there, would he have left them out? What do you think, brother Cleghorn?"

"Oh, I don't suppose he would have done that."

"Now, as this is a figure of our salvation by Christ, are we at liberty to leave out our children? Are we not exhorted, we may say commanded, to bring them in? 'The promises are to you and to your children,' said Peter. There are few of the snares of Satan more dangerous than a doctrine which teaches parents to ignore their responsibility for their children. It is well known that the rules of the Baptist Church strictly prohibit its members from indulging in the practice of dancing; yet I knew a mother, who was a member of that communion, who was in the habit of encouraging her daughter to attend balls and parties where dancing was the principal amusement. This mother would have been expelled from the Church if she persisted in going to such places herself; yet she had no hesitation in assisting her daughter to dress and prepare her toilet for such occasions. No parent possessed of an ordinary share of natural affection would expose his child to physical dangers to which he was unwilling to expose himself. Why should he be willing to imperil his soul by exposing him to temptations to which he would be unwilling to expose himself? If I could see that your baby sprinkling was any protection against sin, I would be willing to adopt it; but I fail to see the point."



"I do not like that term, baby sprinkling," said Mr. Jones. "We have no reason to doubt that they who follow that practice are as sincere in it as we are in ours; and I think, when speaking on religious subjects, we should treat each other's opinions with respect."

"Oh," said Mr. Cahullan, "he is not responsible for that phrase; he found it in one of your text books all ready to his hand, and such phrases are very convenient when a man falls short of arguments. I fear, brother Jones, you are getting a little shaky when you do not relish them."

Mr. Clarence then proceeded: "When Abraham was called and separated from the world, the seal of the covenant—viz., circumcision—was placed upon him. This rite was called by the apostle the seal of the righteousness which is by faith. How ready we would be to conclude that faith must be a pre-requisite of circumcision if we were not informed that Isaac was circumcised when eight days old, and that this was the age prescribed for the administration of this ordinance. It was the seal of the righteousness which is by faith. Of what faith? Can you tell me, brother Cleghorn? Was it by the faith of the child, or whose faith was it?"

Brother Cleghorn made no answer.

"It must have been Abraham's faith. Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness. The Jewish child was admitted into the Church by the faith of the parent. He was initiated into the Church by the same rite as the parent had been initiated. Why should the want of faith be any barrier in the way of the Christian child being received into the Christian Church? Why should it not be received on the profession of the faith of the parent?"

"Oh," said Mr. Cleghorn, "we do not admit that baptism has come in the room of circumcision."

"It makes no great difference whether you admit it in words or not. You agree with us that circumcision was the door of entrance into the Jewish Church. Baptism is the door of entrance into the Christian Church. The one stands precisely in the same place as the other, whether it has

come in the room or not. As far as you use baptism at all, you use it in the room of circumcision. You take upon yourselves the responsibility of excluding the lambs from the fold."

"Well," said Mr. Cleghorn, "you really have made out a better case for baby sprinkling—excuse me, I meant infant baptism—than I expected."

Mr. Clarence continued: "By a careful examination of the Old Testament Scriptures it will be seen that the children held a prominent place in the Church throughout the whole Jewish economy; that the parents were held responsible for the religious instruction of their children as well as providing for their temporal wants. Moses, in Deuteronomy vi. 7, charges the children of Israel to be diligent in teaching God's ordinances to their children: 'And thou shalt talk of them when thou walkest by the way, and when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and upon thy gates.' This passage shews the grave responsibility which rested upon parents. They were to teach their children constantly, both by precept and example. The house and its surroundings was to have a religious aspect, and constantly to remind them of their religious duties. The children were to live in an atmosphere imbued as it were with religion. We may see the light in which Joshua viewed the responsibility which rested on him toward his family from Joshua xxiv. 15: 'Choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye now dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.' Joshua could promise for his family as well as for himself."

"But perhaps you forget," said Mr. Cleghorn, "that we live under the Gospel dispensation, and that we are freed from the bondage of the law."

"I do not forget," said Mr. Clarence, "that with an

increase of freedom there is an increase of responsibility. We are only freed from the bondage of the law that we may serve Christ; and in this freer and more liberal dispensation under which we are placed, our responsibilities to our children, with all our other responsibilities, are increased."

"You have a strange way of bringing us always back to Old Testament times; it is with the New that we are chiefly concerned," said Mr. Cleghorn.

"I shall now proceed to shew," said Mr. Clarence, "that we are more interested in the ancient dispensation than you appear to suppose, and it is the Church of the Old dispensation which exists to-day, and of which we are members if we are Christians."

"Oh, we are all Jews, then, eh?" said Mr. Cleghorn.

Mr. Clarence then proceeded, without noticing his remark: "This may be seen from Romans xi., 15-25: 'For if the casting away of them—that is, the Jews—be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead? For if the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches. And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear.' Now, what is the olive tree if it was not the Jewish Church, or rather the Church of God under the Jewish dispensation? What were the branches which were broken off, if not the unbelieving Jews? What were the wild olive branches, if not the Gentiles who were brought to Christ? Into what root were these wild olive branches grafted, if not into the covenant made with Abraham? If this is not the true meaning of those figures, will you be kind enough to tell me what they do mean?"

"Well, that will require some consideration," said Mr. Jones.

"I see," said Mr. Cleghorn, "we cannot get you away from the Jewish dispensation and the Old Testament times."

"Oh," said Mr. Cahullan, "he wants to hold on to the root. It is well to see always that we have the root of the matter in us."

"Well," said Mr. Clarence, "I do not want to get away from either the Old dispensation or the Old Testament Scriptures when I remember how frequently Christ quoted them in all His discourses, and that He declared that He came not to destroy the law and the prophets but to fulfil them, and that heaven and earth should pass away before one jot or tittle of the law should pass away till all should be fulfilled. I only regret that I do not love and prize those Scriptures more highly. Paul's caution may be applicable to some of us: 'Boast not against the branches, for thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.'"

"Oh," said Mr. Cleghorn, "that covenant of which you have so much to say relates merely to temporal blessings. I fail to see what it has to do with the case."

"I think," said Mr. Clarence, "if you will turn to Hebrews vi., 13-20 verses, you will see clearly that it refers to spiritual blessings: 'For when God made promise to Abraham, because He could swear by no greater, He swore by Himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath: That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, to lay hold upon the hope set before us: which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made a high priest forever after the

order of Melchisedec.' See how close the apostle makes the connection between that covenant made with Abraham and that salvation which is by Christ. It is evident from the 18th verse that the source of that strong consolation spoken of as being enjoyed by those who have fled for refuge to the hope set before them, and which was said to be an anchor to the soul, both sure and steadfast and which had entered into that within the veil, whither Jesus the forerunner hath for us entered, was traced to this covenant made with Abraham. Can anything more clearly shew that the blessings promised to Abraham and his seed under that covenant were spiritual—that the temporal blessings enjoyed were only secondary—that the ground of their hope and of our hope as Christians reaches back to that covenant made with Abraham which was fulfilled in Christ—that the Jewish Church and its polity have the same relation to the spiritual as the outward and visible Church of Christ in our time? Both may lose their power while preserving their outward form. The Jewish Church did so before the coming of Christ. The Christian Church had done so to a great extent before the Reformation. And it is so in many countries of the world at the present day, both Roman Catholic and professedly Protestant. While the form is preserved, there is little of the power left."

"This," said Mr. Jones, "is rather a new view of the case."

"But," said Mr. Cleghorn, "would it not be necessary, in order to carry out the views of Pædo-Baptists, to have the Church connected with the State?"

"Such a connection is not at all necessary. But if the State could be placed in the same relation to the Church as it was under the Old Testament dispensation, there could be no objection. The Church did not recognize the right of unbelievers to remain within it, as taught in most of your books. But the soul that sinned was to be cut off from God's people (Exodus iii. 14). Its discipline was strict, and strictly carried out. The State did not regulate the Church, but the Church regulated the State. The Church

was formed of Abraham and his pious descendants. Those who were not pious, as was the case with Ishmael, and Abraham's sons by Keturah and their descendants, and Esau and his descendants, were cut off, though they had been circumcised."

"But it is with the New Testament dispensation we have to do," said Mr. Cleghorn. "Why did not Christ establish His Church in connection with the State?"

"That is easily answered," said Mr. Clarence. "The Jewish State rejected Christ. If Herod, who heard John the Baptist gladly, and did many things because of him, had repented and received the Gospel, and the mass of the Jewish people with him, there is no doubt but the Church and the State would have remained in the same relation to each other as they had hitherto been."

"But why did the connection which took place between Church and State in the time of Constantine prove so disastrous to the spirituality of the Church?"

"The Christian religion became popular when Constantine connected himself with it. Many united themselves with the Church who knew nothing of the Christian religion except the name. When Christianity was despised, none were willing to embrace it except those who did so from conviction. When it became the religion of the State, many were ready to embrace it for the sake of its mere temporal advantages. Across our northern boundary in Canada, where the Church has as little connection with the State as it has in this country, the most popular Church is the Episcopalian; and those who unite with a Church for the sake of gaining popularity choose that Church, while the same class in this country generally choose the Methodist Church. Neither the doctrine nor discipline of the Church, its connection with the State nor separation from the State, has anything to do with the case. Connection with the State does not necessarily make a Church corrupt, nor does separation from the State make it pure. This is determined altogether by other causes. When all the different States in the world have become so thoroughly

leavened with Christianity that their governments are administered in accordance with the spirit of the Gospel, and rulers generally are under its influence, the most extreme voluntary in the world need not object to such a connection. If all connection between Church and State were so wrong and so ruinous to the interests of true religion as you appear to suppose, why did God place the Old Testament Church which He Himself organized in connection with the State? How can the prophecy be fulfilled, that kings shall be fathers and queens nursing mothers to the Church if all connection between Church and State is to be condemned?"

"I can see no good reason for objecting to such a connection as that," said Mr. Jones.

"But the facts are against you," said Mr. Cleghorn. "It is to this cause that we must trace the formality and want of spirituality in the State Churches of Europe. The babies are all sprinkled, and by that simple act they are made members of the Church, and good orthodox Christians, no matter what their future lives may be. We have examples of orthodox Christian popes excommunicating and hurling their anathemas at other equally orthodox Christian popes, who had been made Christians in precisely the same orthodox way. We have one nation of orthodox Christians cutting the throats of other Christians equally orthodox with themselves. How can we account for such a state of things if we do not trace it to that profane, sacrilegious and anti-Christian mode of admitting members into the Church? The command of Christ was, 'Believe and be baptized.' They have neither obeyed the one nor the other."

"We have already discussed the relation of faith to baptism," said Mr. Jones; "and as for the term 'baby sprinkling,' I regret that you should persist in using it. The use of offensive terms like that can never throw light on any subject."

"Oh," said Mr. Cahullan, "he is using those terms with which he is best acquainted; and if they are the best he knows, how is he to be blamed? He got them out of a book which is very popular among immersionists."

"I meant no offence," said Mr. Cleghorn.

"The fact of two things existing side by side is no evidence that the one is a consequence of the other," said Mr. Clarence. "'By their fruits ye shall know them' was our Saviour's rule."

"That's the point," said Mr. Cleghorn. "If your baby—excuse me, infant—baptism bears such fruit, how can the tree be good?"

"Wait till we examine and compare the fruit of this tree with the fruit of other trees which have been watered according to your mode. Let us compare some of those countries in which this dangerous heresy of baby sprinkling prevails with those which have not been corrupted in that way. Let us compare Scotland with any country you please which has not been corrupted by that dangerous doctrine."

"I do not know," said Mr. Cleghorn, "any entire country in which infant baptism is not practised to some extent."

Mr. Clarence replied: "If you have no trees bearing fruit, how can you compare fruit? I will, however, assist you. You claim that the Greek Church holds your views on the subject of baptism. Take Greece, for example. It has never been corrupted by that anti-Christian practice. The mark of the mother of harlots has never been put on her children. In extent and population it differs little from Scotland. Let us compare the two countries. There is perhaps no country in the world where infant baptism is so universally practised as in the latter. Here children, with very few exceptions, have what you are pleased to call the mark of the beast put upon them in infancy. And how do they stand intellectually, morally, and religiously?"

"We must admit," said Mr. Jones, "that the advantage is altogether on the side of Scotland."

"Let us compare the whole Eastern Church with the Western."

"I do not know," said Mr. Jones, "that there is any very great advantage on either side. Compare the Eastern and



Northern States with the Southern and Western, and you find that in the Eastern and Northern States the people are, with few exceptions, Pædo-Baptists. The principal strength of the various Anabaptist sects is in the South and West. Yet holding what you consider correct views on the subject of baptism did little towards banishing slavery. The battle was fought principally by the New Englanders, who, with few exceptions, had the mark of the beast placed on them in infancy. The fact of Raines being baptized by Alex. Campbell himself, and adopting his confession of faith, did not prevent him from teaching doctrines most repugnant to Mr. Campbell's views and feelings. Raines was a Universalist, and continued to teach that the word 'everlasting' meant finite duration, while Alex. Campbell taught the opposite. Stone likewise received Campbell's confession of faith, and was baptized by immersion; yet he was a Unitarian, and continued to be one, and never ceased during his life to teach that Christ was a mere man. All Mr. Campbell's protests and remonstrances were in vain. He had no discipline by which he could expel him. Dr. Thomas, another coadjutor of Campbell's, taught, in a pamphlet which he conducted, that a man was composed of three parts—body, blood and breath; that the souls of infants, idiots, and heathen had no hereafter; that the souls of the righteous remained in their graves with their bodies till the resurrection; that the righteous should then enter into a state of happiness, while the wicked should be annihilated, both soul and body. By those and similar teachers the righteous soul of Mr. Campbell was vexed from day to day, and he declared on one occasion that the Reformed Church, as he called his followers, suffered more by being cursed by a lot of ignorant, proud, profane, pretentious and contentious teachers than from all the assaults of its enemies. Mr. Campbell saw and felt keenly the difficulty of his position, but he was powerless. All those men had professed to believe that Christ was the son of God and had been baptized by immersion; by so doing they had subscribed to his whole creed, and there was no way by which they could

be expelled from the society, however distasteful their erroneous teaching might be to him."

"But we have no creed except the New Testament," said Mr. Cleghorn. "We put neither the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, nor the Confession of Faith, nor the Methodist Discipline, in the place of the New Testament. We take the New Testament alone as our rule of faith and practice."

"It is a pity you do not take both the Old and the New Testaments as your rule; you would then be one with us as far as that rule is concerned."

"We take both the Old and the New Testaments as our rule. The first question put to a candidate for the ministry in the Presbyterian Church is, 'Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and manners?' And if he cannot subscribe to that he cannot be a minister in that Church."

"Where then is the use of your Confession of Faith if you take the Scriptures as your only rule?"

"Simply that we may know how our ministers understand the Scriptures, and not present to the world such a spectacle as Campbell and Raines and Stone and Thomas, teaching doctrines diametrically opposed to each other. For example, we find them both expounding Matthew xxv. 46: 'These shall go away into eternal punishment'—Raines teaching that the punishment here spoken of was of finite duration, while Campbell taught that its duration was endless. When a man subscribes to the standards of the Presbyterian Church, he simply binds himself to expound this passage in the same way as Campbell expounded it, and in the same way he defines his position in relation to all the doctrines taught in the Scriptures."

"The New Testament is all the creed I want," said Mr. Cleghorn.

"Do you know," said Mr. Clarence, "why you have no written creed?"

"Of course; we do not want any. If we wanted one, what would hinder us from having one as well as others?"

“It is simply because you could not agree upon one. Mr. Campbell saw and knew well the difficulty under which he laboured for want of one, so he called a Convention of all his followers to meet in Cincinnati. He submitted to the Convention a creed containing six articles; but the Convention was unable to agree on it, and, after Mr. Campbell had exercised all his tact and skill in trying to bring about an agreement, the Convention was dissolved, and they separated as creedless as they came together. But although you have no written creed, you have an unwritten one. It is so short that it can be easily remembered without being committed to writing. It consists of two articles. They are as follows: (1) I believe that Christ is the Son of God; (2) Immersion is the only true mode of baptism. You are as strict in carrying out your creed as any denomination in Christendom. We admit that immersion is valid baptism as well as sprinkling or pouring, and we admit members baptized either of the ways. You demand that they shall be baptized by immersion only—by immersion, and no other way but immersion—and it is limited to adults. If a person subscribes to those two articles, he may deny the resurrection of the dead, the future punishment of the wicked, or the immortality of the soul, or any other doctrine which may be distasteful to him, and he can maintain his standing in your Church.”

“I am not a follower of Alexander Campbell,” said Mr. Cleghorn. “I think more of Stone.”

Mr. Cahullan replied: “Precisely so. One saith I am of Campbell, and another I am of Stone, and another I am of Thomas, and yet another may say I am of Brigham Young. I see you are genuine Corinthians. Why find fault with Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Methodists for designating themselves by names characteristic of some feature of their doctrine, discipline, or practice, when so many of you are professed followers of such apostles as Campbell, Stone, and Thomas?”

“I am sure none of us profess to be followers of Brigham Young,” said Mr. Cleghorn.

"Oh, don't be ashamed of your company," said Mr. Cahullan. "If all the sins and errors which have found their way into the Church in professedly Christian countries, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, are to be laid to the anti-Christian, profane practice of infant baptism, and if the only true apostolic way of becoming Christians is to wait till you have arrived at years of maturity, and then to take all the necessary steps up your ladder—*i.e.*, repentance, faith, etc.—till you get on to the last round by your last crowning act of obedience, viz., immersion, what reasonable objection can you offer to Brigham Young and his followers? They embrace your entire creed. They profess to believe that Christ is the Son of God. They have all been baptized by immersion, and, since their separation from the Gentiles, they have never been corrupted by either the profane practice of infant baptism or State connection."

"The New Testament is our creed and book of discipline," said Mr. Cleghorn. "We would try them by that, and surely there could be no great difficulty in proving that the Mormon doctrine and practice is contrary to its teaching."

"What about the Old Testament? Do you reject that?"

"Well, the law of the old dispensation was done away when Christ introduced the new. We do not reject the Old Testament entirely. It is useful in some ways; but it is to the New that we are to look as the guide of our lives."

"That is where your weak point lies. Though your creed of two articles defines your mode of baptism while ours does not, it makes no provision for settling such differences of opinion as existed between the followers of Campbell, Stone, Raines, Thomas, and Brigham Young. You require to meet, New Testament in hand, and discuss the question. Each one may understand a passage of Scripture in his own way, and unless an agreement can be brought about, as it was between Stone and Campbell when they had their great dispute, they must separate and each take his own way."

"What was the dispute, and what was the agreement? You appear to know more about those men than their followers do."

“Stone taught that Christ was a mere man, while Campbell taught that He was divine. As Alex. Campbell’s father had been a Presbyterian minister, and he himself had been trained in Edinburgh University, Stone’s doctrine was exceedingly repugnant to his feelings. He used some strong language when speaking of the dangerous tendency of Stone’s doctrine. Friends interposed on both sides to bring about a reconciliation. It was agreed that Stone might hold those views as a matter of opinion, but not as an article of faith. Each then went on his own way. You might compromise with Brigham Young in the same way.”

“It appears to me,” said Mr. Cleghorn, “that your practice is inconsistent with your theory. You speak of those who have been baptized in infancy as outsiders, and treat them as such till they have come before your session and been examined as to their religious faith and knowledge. You then, and not till then, admit them into Church fellowship, and recognize them as Church members. By this practice you utterly ignore the ordinance of infant baptism. If children are not made members of the Church by this act, I fail to see what meaning the ordinance has at all. It appears to me that it is because you ignore this ordinance, by treating those who have been made subjects of it and those who have not in precisely the same way, that you are successful to the extent you are as religious teachers.”

“Not at all,” replied Mr. Clarence; “we admit that our practice is not equal to our theory, but instead of that being the cause of the measure of success with which we meet, it is the reason why we do not accomplish more. With the general decay of vital religion in the Church in the Middle Ages, a sense of parental responsibility was in a great measure lost. When religion ceased to exercise any salutary influence on the lives and conduct of professing Christian parents, it was vain to expect that it would influence their children. The general revival of vital religion which took place at the Reformation, and in the time of the Wesleys and Whitfield, was of personal rather than of family religion. It became too much the fashion for those who had

been converted after they had arrived at years of maturity, to encourage their children to wait till they had likewise arrived at maturity, and expect to be converted in the same way. The Baptist sect was organized especially to teach that the Church was composed of believers only. They excluded all who were incapable of exercising faith. This new departure, led by the Baptists and followed to some extent, in practice if not in theory, by nearly all the Non-conformist bodies, was caused by the failure of parents to discharge the vows taken upon them at the administration of the ordinance of baptism. But the failure to discharge a duty is surely no good reason for rejecting it altogether. When a more thorough revival of religion takes place, such as was prophesied by Malachi, was inaugurated by John the Baptist, and carried on by Christ and His apostles, we may expect a revival of parental fidelity and domestic piety as well as of personal religion. Malachi, the last of the Old Testament prophets, closed his prophecy by a promise that God would send Elijah the prophet, who would turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to the fathers. The angel Gabriel, four centuries after this time, took up the note just where the earthly prophet left off, and informed Zacharias that his son, John the Baptist, was to be the prophet who, under the name of Elias or Elijah, should begin this great revival. This work to be done upon fathers and children was to be much more than a removal of domestic alienations, though doubtless this was included. It was to embrace a great revival of parental and filial piety. We may see signs of such a revival at the present time in the more general recognition of the claims of the children of the Church, and in the increasing interest of all the different branches of the Christian Church in Sabbath school work. It is to be hoped that the time is not far distant when Christian parents will not only acknowledge their duties to their children by dedicating them to God in the ordinance of baptism, but seek to discharge those duties in His fear and in His love."

“For my part,” said Mr. Cleghorn, “I cannot see what good you do a child by throwing a little water in its face.”

Mr. Cahullan then cleared his throat with great energy and deliberation, and said: “I will tell you, if you can tell me what good it does to a man or a woman to be plunged under water.”

“Oh, that is a religious ordinance,” said Mr. Cleghorn.

“On what authority do you decide that the one act is a religious ordinance and the other is not?”

“That is a fair question,” said Mr. Jones, junior. “We have no reason to doubt that the Pædo-Baptists are as sincere in their opinions as we are in ours; and it always appears to me unbecoming to speak slightingly of the religious opinions of any denomination.”

“I was about to proceed,” said Mr. Clarence, “to discuss the object of Christian baptism.”

“That is what we want to hear,” said Mr. Jones.

“God most graciously condescended to enter into a covenant with Abraham, and to confirm it by an oath. His descendants were embraced in that covenant on the condition that they would all subscribe to it on behalf of their children by the rite of circumcision. His spiritual descendants subscribed to it on behalf of their descendants by the ordinance of baptism. When a Christian parent presents his child to God in the ordinance of baptism, he simply enters into a covenant with God. He promises on his part that, in humble dependence on God’s grace, he will endeavour to train it in the fear and love of God, trusting that God will, according to His promise, baptize it with His Spirit. The application of the water is simply the outward act by which we subscribe to the bargain or covenant. It stands in the place of the seal attached to a document. The seal is of no value in itself—it is simply the sign or witness that a bargain has been made. The application of the water holds the same place in our covenant or bargain with God. In the language of our Catechism, it signifies and seals our engrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagement to be the Lord’s.”

"Does not that sound very much like baptismal regeneration?" said Mr. Jones.

"Perhaps it does," said Mr. Clarence; "but is there not as much of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration in your way as in ours? When you baptize a subject, do you not teach that by that act he is made a Christian? Do you mean that the water washes away his sins?"

"No," said Mr. Jones, "his baptism is an act of obedience to Christ. It is his faith in Christ which saves him."

"But are there not many of your preachers who teach that salvation is inseparably connected with baptism?"

"These are my views exactly," said Mr. Cleghorn.

Mr. Cahullan cleared his throat more vigorously than usual, and said: "Well, your small creed of two articles embraces a great variety of faith and opinion. Here is brother Jones—he would pass for Evangelical anywhere; while brother Cleghorn's views on baptismal regeneration would satisfy any Romanist or Ritualist in Christendom. But perhaps he holds his views as matters of opinion, not as articles of faith."

Mr. Clarence then proceeded: "Was not John the Baptist and Samuel filled with the Holy Ghost from their mothers' womb? Was it not in answer to the prayers of their pious mothers that these children were thus early sanctified, cleansed, or baptized by God's Spirit? What authority have we for denying that God will answer the prayers of other parents as well as those? Is it absurd to expect that God will, in answer to the prayers of believing parents at the present time, regenerate the hearts of their children at the time or prior to the time of their baptism? A want of faith in God is too frequently called piety and humility. A fear of what is called the dogma of baptismal regeneration causes many to cherish a want of faith in God's promises. If there was more faith in baptismal regeneration—not by water baptism but by spiritual baptism—there would not be so many young people growing up outside of the fold of Christ. You believe that there is a responsibility resting upon you to train your children in the right way. If you



believe this, how can it be wrong to acknowledge your duty publicly? This is simply what is done in baptism, and that is the way you understand it when applied to adults. If it is right to acknowledge our duty, is it not right to pray to God for grace to enable us to perform it? If it is right to pray for any blessing which God has promised, is it wrong to expect that God will fulfil His promise? Have we not as good grounds for expecting that God will answer our prayers for our children as for ourselves? Peter said, 'The promise is to you and to your children.' This faith, that God will, in answer to our prayers, regenerate the hearts of our children, or in other words baptize them with His Spirit, appears to me to be the true doctrine of baptismal regeneration. With the views of Ritualists and Romanists on that subject we are not now concerned."

"There is much force in what you say," said Mr. Jones. "I must examine this subject further."

"You bid fair," said Mr. Cleghorn, "to convert brother Jones into a Presbyterian. But I think it is now time to close our discussion for to-night. It is now past ten o'clock."

They then took their leave.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

**I**N the week following, Elder Bump accompanied the Messrs. Jones to Mr. Clarence's. They were all shown into Mr. Clarence's study. Elder Bump gazed at the library for a short time, and said: "Law me! What a slew o' books! When will you be able to read them all through?"

"I do not expect to read them through in a hurry. My library is my dictionary. I consult my books and refer to them in the same way as I do to my dictionary."

"I have Buck's Theological Dictionary and Daniel Webster's Dictionary. Those tell me the meanin' of all the

words I want to know, and I don't care about buyin' more books than I have time to read."

Mr. Jones then suggested that they should enter upon the discussion of the subject which they had met to consider, and said: "The question we were considering when we were last together was the relation of children to the Church of God."

"That is not hard to decide," said Elder Bump. "They are outsiders. No one can be a Church member till he is old enough to believe and be baptized. That is so plain that it needs no discussion."

"Neither of the Church below nor the Church above?" said Mr. Cahullan; "all infants are then excluded from heaven."

"I did not say that," said Elder Bump.

"Well, do you think they are fit for members of the General Assembly of the Church of the First-born written in heaven, and not fit for the Church on earth? Where do you find anything about your Church in heaven?"

Mr Cahullan turned to Hebrews xii. 23, handed the book to him, and said: "Read for yourself."

Elder Bump read it, laid down the book, put on one of his most pugnacious expressions of countenance, then gazed at Mr. Cahullan for a short time, and said: "Well, we will let that go for the present. That passage had escaped my memory. But I would like to know why you do not admit children to the communion if you look on them as Church members?"

"Well," said Mr. Clarence, "I was just coming to that point. The children hold the same relation to the Church as minors to the State. A minor enjoys the protection of the State, but not the right of suffrage. Before the right of suffrage can be enjoyed, a certain well-defined position in relation to the State must be obtained. In this country any native-born citizen, twenty-one years of age, has that right; an alien must go through a certain legal process. In nearly all other countries, in addition to those qualifications, some property qualification is necessary; but citizens of all

classes, including minors, enjoy alike the protection of the State, and the State stands pledged to protect them to the full extent of its power. Great Britain made war on Abyssinia a few years ago, and spent millions of money, to vindicate the rights of one of her subjects; yet that subject, on returning to England, might not have enjoyed the right of suffrage. The Government did not wait to inquire into the civil status of the subject. Children stand in precisely the same relation to the Church. It is the duty of the Church to see that parents discharge their duty towards their children in giving them a proper religious training, and to supplement the work of the parents by providing instruction for them, both in the Sabbath school and the sanctuary. Pastors, parents, and Sabbath school teachers should keep the fact continually before children, that it is their duty, as soon as they have arrived at a suitable age, and have a sufficient amount of religious knowledge and experience, to make a public profession of their faith in Christ by coming to the Lord's table. If children were thus faithfully dealt with, there is little doubt but the opinion expressed by the pious Richard Baxter would be found to be correct, viz., that the names of nineteen-twentieths of the children of the Church would be found on the communion roll as soon as they had arrived at a suitable age. It is one of the most dangerous devices of Satan to teach parents to ignore their responsibility to their children, and to trust that at some future time they will be brought in by some revivalist, at some protracted meeting, as brands plucked from the burning."

"But," said Elder Bump, "I do not see what all this has to do with the question. What do the Scriptures say? Let us to the law and the testimony. If you can find one 'Thus saith the Lord' for your practice, I will give up at once.'"

"You appear," said Mr. Clarence, "to misunderstand the case. It is with you that the burden of proof lies."

"How is that?" said Elder Bump in great astonishment.

"Because infant membership is an ordinance of God, instituted by God Himself. It was the universal practice in

God's Church from the very beginning up to the coming of Christ. God alone has the right to annul any of His own ordinances. It devolves on you to shew when, where, and how He annulled this ordinance."

"The Old Testament dispensation was ended at the coming of Christ," said Elder Bump.

"I think not," said Mr. Clarence. "Christ declared that He came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them; and He said further: 'Until heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle of the law shall not pass away until all be fulfilled. Give us chapter and verse where this ordinance was annulled.'"

"Oh!" said Mr. Jones, "we have had that over already. Let us pass on to something else."

"But there is one difficulty in the way of putting baptism in the room of circumcision which I think you cannot get over very easily. The males only were circumcised; the females were not. Why do you baptize females?"

"That is easily explained," said Mr. Clarence. "You receive baptism in the room of circumcision, as far as you receive it at all. Circumcision was the door of entrance into the Church in the Jewish dispensation; baptism is the door of entrance under the Christian dispensation. You have extended the ordinance to female adults on good scriptural authority. You infer, we think justly, that those female adults should be admitted to the Lord's table; we infer, in addition to this, that their children should be admitted into the Church by the ordinance of baptism."

"That sounds at least plausible," said Mr. Jones, junior.

Elder Bump treated Mr. Jones to one of his most pugnacious frowns, but said nothing.

Mr. Clarence continued: "There are good and special reasons why the rite of admission to Church membership should be applied to females in the Christian dispensation. Under the Jewish dispensation the Church was in connection with the State. Membership in the Jewish Church included civil rights as well as religious. The rights of women, both civil and religious, were comprehended in those of their

husbands. This is the way in which the law of England deals with the civil rights of women at the present day."

"I do not know," said Elder Bump, "what we have to do with the law of England. You appear to have forgotten that our Declaration of Independence, issued on the fourth of July, one thousand seven hundred and seventy six (1776), declares that 'these colonies are and shall be forever separated from Great Britain.' Did we not then free ourselves from English laws and institutions? I repeat, what has English law to do with us?"

There was a general outburst of laughter, to which Elder Bump replied with another of his most pugnacious frowns; and Mr. Cahullan, without going through the formality of clearing his throat, said: "Elder Bump has been more fortunate than most of us. It is evident he has never had occasion to be in any of our law courts, or he would have heard English law and precedents quoted every hour of the day; and if his case did not happen to be a good one, he might find that he had lost it through some application of English law."

Mr. Clarence then proceeded: "This same principle is recognized in our naturalization laws. When a man takes the oath of allegiance, and goes through the necessary process to become a citizen of the United States, his wife and family are included in the transaction. By the act of the man, his wife and all the minors of the family enjoy all the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States. The rite of circumcision did the same for females in the Jewish dispensation. Under the Christian dispensation the Church was separated from the State, because the State rejected Christ. It was necessary, in this new state of things, that the status of women in the Church should be recognized separate from their husbands. Under the Gospel dispensation Zion was to be enlarged; her cords were to be lengthened, her stakes strengthened. The little stream which was to make glad the city of God had hitherto been confined to the land of Israel. It was to be deepened and widened so that its healing waters should extend to all

nations. From this fuller, freer, larger and more liberal dispensation, it would be strange indeed if the children were excluded. Would it not be strange, indeed, if that Gospel net which was first spread at the gate of Eden, with this one promise that 'the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent, whose folds have been ever since extending and becoming wider and farther-reaching, should at the introduction of Christianity, the time of its greatest stretch, so greatly and so suddenly contract, that it would no longer contain the lambs of the flock which had been embraced within its folds for the previous two thousand years? Scripture and analogy are alike favourable to such a conclusion. We will examine some scriptural passages which appear to have a bearing on the question."

"That is what I have been waiting for," said Elder Bump. "To the law and to the testimony."

"In Mark x. 13, we read that they brought young children to Christ, that He should touch them: and His disciples rebuked those that brought them. And when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said, 'Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And He took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them and blessed them.'"

"Oh," cried Elder Bump, "I knew you would soon get caught when you went into the Scriptures. Christ put His hands on them and blessed them, but He did not baptize. Why do you go farther than the example which Christ set you, and baptize them? We read, John iv. 2, 'that Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples.' He baptized neither infants nor adults. So if you apply your rule, you must throw baptism overboard altogether, and baptize neither infants nor adults. Why do you quote the passage then?"

"You shall hear presently. But will you be kind enough to tell me what you understand by 'the kingdom of God' in this passage?"

“I understand it to mean the saints in heaven,” said Mr. Jones.

“I understand it to mean the Gospel Church, made up of all true believers,” said Elder Bump.

“A narrow creed and a broad church,” said Mr. Cahullan. “If we take the definition of Elder Bump, the children are not only members, but model members; for Christ says, ‘Of such are the kingdom of heaven, and whosoever receiveth not the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein.’ If they are fit to be Church members, should they not be received in the same way as adults, viz., by baptism? and if we take the definition of Mr. Jones, we must surely admit that if they are fit to be members of the Church above, they are fit to be members of the Church on earth.”

“You have caught them both,” said Mr. Jones, junior; “but I would like to hear the reason you give for Christ not baptizing those children if they were fit to be members of His Church, both in earth and heaven.”

“Christ had not then given His commission to His disciples—‘Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.’ This ‘preach the Gospel,’ as it is in Mark, and ‘teach,’ as it is in Matthew, means to make disciples of. They were to make disciples of every creature, both high and low, rich and poor, civilized and barbarous, old and young. Let us now take Peter’s speech on the day of Pentecost. Let us remember that Peter was a Jew, speaking to Jews. His address produced a profound impression. They that heard were pricked to the heart, and cried out, ‘Men and brethren, what shall we do?’ His answer was, ‘Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Christ, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is to you and to your children.’ What promise? The baptism of the Holy Ghost. Now, those Jews to whom Peter spoke would naturally have understood that their children would be heirs of the same promise with themselves, even if Peter had omitted to mention them; but, lest they should be left in any doubt on the

subject, he specially mentions the children as heirs of the promises of the Gospel, and that they stood in precisely the same relation to the Church under the new dispensation as the old."

"You appear to forget," said Elder Bump, "that we live in a new dispensation which has nothing to do with children. We are not under the law, but under grace."

A loud wheezing sound from Mr. Cahullan's throat apprised the company that he was about to spread out his sentiments, and all eyes were turned on him, and he proceeded in slow and measured tones to say: "You appear, rather, never to have learned that while the apostles were commanded to preach the Gospel to all nations, they were commanded to begin at Jerusalem. And they did begin at Jerusalem. While that city stood it was the centre of their mission, and they were loath to go beyond it. Peter required a special revelation to convince him that the Gentiles were heirs of the promises of the Gospel at all. The Jews were so largely in the majority, that they made an attempt to force all the Gentile members to keep the whole law of Moses. When the Council was held in Jerusalem to settle the matter—as recorded in Acts xv.—it required all the eloquence of Peter and Barnabas and Paul, and the prudence and address of James, who appears to have presided on that occasion, to prevent them from carrying out their object. The decision was that the Gentile members should only be required to abstain from meats offered to idols, from things strangled, and from blood and from fornication; while the Jewish members were at liberty to practise circumcision, and to keep the law of Moses, but they were not to force it on others. They were strict in their observance of the Jewish law, and they attached so much importance to circumcision that Paul, on his last visit to Jerusalem, in order to please them, circumcised Timothy, who was a Greek. This circumcision was the badge of infant membership. Infant membership was as much the rule in the Christian Church in the time of the apostles, as it was in the Jewish



Church in the days of David. Will you be kind enough to tell us when infant membership ceased?"

Elder Bump was silent for a few moments, and then said, "I cannot see where you find your authority for putting baptism in the room of circumcision."

"You appear to have forgotten," said Mr. Jones, "that we ourselves use baptism in the room of circumcision, as far as we use it at all. If they can establish infant membership, infant baptism must go with it."

Mr. Clarence then proceeded: "If you will be kind enough to turn to Colossians ii. 10, you will see clearly that baptism and circumcision hold precisely the same place in the scheme of salvation, and represent exactly the same thing. 'And ye are complete in Him who is the head of all principality and power, in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: having been buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead.' What could the circumcision without hands mean but regeneration? The Colossian Christians were circumcised in that way, and it is evident that it consisted in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ, or by Christ putting away their sins. And now the apostle changes the figure slightly, but it is evident he is speaking of the same thing—'Having been buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead.' The great topic which the apostle is discussing is the removing of our sinful nature, and our union with Christ. He uses two figures. By the one, sin is cut off; by the other, it is washed away."

As Elder Bump made no reply, Mr. Clarence said: "I presume we are now ready to examine some of the New Testament evidence."

"By all means," said Elder Bump, "that is what I have been long looking for."

"We find, Acts xvi. 15, that 'the Lord opened the heart

of Lydia that she attended to the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized, she and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there.' You see Lydia's household was baptized as well as herself."

"Oh," said Elder Bump, "I can prove that Lydia's eldest daughter was married on the following Lord's day."

"Where will you find your evidence?" said James Jones.

"In the verse following the one in which you prove that Lydia had any infants baptized."

"We read," said Mr. Clarence, "that both Lydia and her household were baptized; but there is no mention of any one except Lydia making a profession of faith. We prove the baptism of the household—it remains with you to prove that they, or any of them, made a profession of their faith, or were capable of making such a profession. The burden of proof rests with you."

"That's so," said Mr. Jones, junior.

"Well," said Elder Bump, "Lydia was a woman in a respectable position, and she probably had a number of servants. Her household may have been made up of those servants."

"You are not willing to accept probabilities from us," said Mr. Clarence; "you demand evidence. Be kind enough to furnish some proof that they, or any of them, were capable of exercising faith. We prove that they were baptized; you prove that they were believers."

"Well," said Mr. Jones, junior, "you may as well yield that point, or you may be called upon to prove the marriage you spoke of."

"Well," said Mr. Clarence, "we will pass on to the case of the jailor's family. We are simply told that Paul, in answer to the question, 'What shall we do?' said, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house,' and that all the household were baptized. As in the former case, it remains for you to prove the profession of faith. Paul, in 1st Corinthians i. 14, gives a list of the bap-

tisms which he performed in Corinth. There were only three cases, and two out of the three were households. Paul did not know whether he had baptized any more or not. It is evident he did not attach the same importance to the ordinance as you do, or he would never have thanked God that he had brought so few over the last step towards being Christians. But can you cite an example of any Baptist missionary baptizing two entire households out of three cases in which he administered the ordinance of baptism?"

Elder Bump was silent.

"We read in 1st Corinthians vii. 14: 'For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.' We surely cannot understand 'holy' in this place to mean free from sin, or that one parent making a profession of Christianity could give to the other parent and children purity or freedom from sin. 'Holy' has in this place the meaning which it generally has in the Scriptures, *i.e.*, separate from or set apart for a particular object. These children were holy in the sense in which their parents were. They had been separated from the world by becoming Christians. The public act by which those parents had been separated from the world was baptism. Their children had been separated also, and how, if not by baptism? The teaching is simply this—that if one parent is a professor of religion, the children have a right to be baptized."

"But the word 'unclean,' in this passage, means illegitimate, and the term 'holy' simply means legitimate," said Elder Bump.

"I know that is the teaching of your text book, 'Theodosia.' But you will see the absurdity of this theory when you reflect that a profession of Christianity at that time gave a person no right under Roman law, except to suffer martyrdom. The Apostle Paul himself, a short time after this, was beheaded for his profession of Christianity. Instead of Christianity giving to its professors a civil status, it deprived them of what they already possessed and imperilled their lives."

"Is that statement really to be found in 'Theodosia?'" said Mr. Jones, junior.

Mr. Clarence rose and took the book, found the place and handed it to him. Mr. Jones read the passage aloud, and then said: "I never thought much of the book on account of its wholesale abuse of other denominations; but I am done with it now." He then closed the book and threw it from him in disgust.

Elder Bump then rose and looked at his watch, and said it was eleven o'clock, and high time they were on their way home.

Mr. Jones apologized for the lateness of the hour to which the discussion had been protracted, and said that he had been so interested that he had not observed the flight of time.

Mr. Clarence replied: "That is exactly my own failing. I take no note of the flight of time when I get started at a discussion."

Mrs. Clarence, with her keen womanly insight, saw that Elder Bump was considerably crestfallen, and she invited them all to return on the following evening to tea.

The two Messrs. Jones at once accepted the invitation, but Elder Bump said: "I'd like ter, but I've dun promised to go to see Mr. Cleghorn to-morrow evenin'."

"Well, can't you come on the next evening?" said Mrs. Clarence.

"Well, I've dun promised to go to town with brother Cleghorn, an' I mightn't be back in time."

"Well," said Mrs. Clarence, "can't you come on the following evening?"

And he "dun" consented to come, and they then took their leave.

## CHAPTER VIII.

SISTER STREETYARN was a single lady of uncertain age, and more uncertain memory. She had great difficulty in remembering events which dated back more than twenty years; while some of her schoolmates, who claimed to be younger than she, could distinctly remember events which had transpired more than thirty years back. She had about the usual proportions of oil and vinegar in her composition; but they were indifferently mixed. She had, before she was out of her teens, been quite a belle. She had, to use the language of the poet Campbell, "been courted and jilted," and from that time the vinegar had always appeared more prominently on the surface. This was especially the case when courtship or marriage happened to be the topic of conversation. But to be brought in contact with sorrow and suffering always brought all the oil in her nature prominently to the surface. She would in such cases, when her sympathy was fairly enlisted, be willing to go on her hands and knees any distance if necessary, to relieve distress, and many poor, destitute, motherless children had cause to rise up and call her blessed. It was rumoured that she had several times aspired to the position of step-mother in some of those destitute families, but the evidence was never altogether satisfactory. It was observed, however, that as soon as one of those vacancies was filled she discovered that her mission there was ended, and she rarely, if ever, afterwards entered that dwelling. She had sufficient means to maintain her comfortably with economy, and she lived retired. Her only companion was a niece, the daughter of an only sister, who had died when she gave birth to this her only child. Sister Streetyarn had adopted this child with the full consent of its father; and as he married again in about a year after his wife's death, there was an impassable gulf between him and his child. Sister Streetyarn could never forgive him for his

haste in marrying; hence they were completely estranged from each other. Sister Streetyarn had the child all to herself, and lavished on her all the love that was in her nature, which the child was beginning to repay by attempting, with an encouraging degree of success, to regulate both her own conduct and that of her aunt according to her own sweet will. Sister Streetyarn dearly loved news, and as there was no newspaper in the town, she was the medium for the circulation of all the news. She was always fully posted, and ready and willing to post any one who applied to her for information. When Elder Bump paid his next visit there, he proved to be a perfect mine of information. She soon drew from him a full account of the discussion which had been going on at Mr. Clarence's. She pumped him dry before she let him go; and when she got through, she was fully loaded and primed. Whatever was lacking in Elder Bump's narrative, her imagination supplied. Next day Sister Streetyarn just thought of it, that she wanted a "dress pattern" that Sister Clemens had "bor'erd," and guessed she'd "jest go down an' git it." She spent a couple of hours with Sister Clemens, looking at the patterns and discussing the news of the neighbourhood. She then "guessed it was time to be a-goin'." Sister Clemens then invited her to stay to tea. She consented; but she first learned that "Elder Jones was to hum"—for it was there that Mr. Jones boarded. They were scarcely seated round the table, when Sister Streetyarn asked if they were all well "down to ole man Clar'ns'?"

"If you mean," said Mr. Jones, "the Reverend Mr. Clarence, they were all quite well when I was there last."

"I 'low it's not so long since you were there; but hear him wi' his Mister an' Rev'rint an' all that high style. I reckon you'll soon be too high fur us plain folks. I've been a-hearin' that you're a-puttin' in for that 'ere gal o' the parson's mighty strong, an' arter a-spendin' so many nights in their grand parlour, an' hearin' her a-ding-dongin' on her pianner, it's no wonder ye talk mighty grand."

"Well," said Sister Clemens, "if he should be a-puttin' in

for both the gal an' the pianner, where's the harm? I 'low brother Jones hes jest as good a right to lead roun' a sister or a wife as any other brother. That's what Paul says, mind ye."

"I 'low," said Sister Streetyarn, "the most o' our preachers these times would a mighty site ruther lead roun' a wife nor a sister; and if they do take roun' a sister, it's some other man's sister, you bet."

"Wal, I reckon that's kin' o nat'ral," said Sister Clemens.

"Fur more o' natur' than grace among the preachers these times, sez I," retorted Sister Streetyarn, and heaved a deep sigh to relieve her burdened heart. She then proceeded: "I 'low ole man Clar'ns 'ill soon hev' you turned over to be a baby sprinkler."

"I would take it as a great favour," said Mr. Jones, "if you would not talk in that slighting way of a man who never speaks disrespectfully of any other person."

"Oh, yes, yer a-gettin' quite brotherly over it, after pretendin' yer a 'scussin', as ye call it; but Elder Bump told me that nather you nor yer brother helped him one dogon bit, an' when any o' ye did put in a word, it was to help the parson. Elder Bump had the whole three o' ye to fight—I may say the four o' ye, for that ole wheezin' Scotchman, Coo'lan, or whatever ye call him, was a-pilin' in, an' was the wurst o' the hul' kit. Oh, it was jest orful the way he talked." She then gave a deep sigh, and went on: "Oh, jest like as not ye'll be a-jinin' the Presbyterians, or the 'Piscopalians (I think that's what Elder Bump calls 'em). Their preachers wear long white nightgowns. Jest like as not we'll see you wi' a big white choker an' a long white nightgown on, holdin' a baby in your arms, an it' a'mulin' and pukin' all over yer dress, while yer a sprinkling the water ont' it.\* Oh, I think I see ye!" She then gave a deep sigh, and rested her head on her right hand, as if overcome with emotion.

Elder Jones succeeded in containing himself while Sister Streetyarn was spinning her yarn, but he now broke out

---

\* This expression is quoted verbatim from "Theodosia."

and said: "I am disgusted with the abusive way in which some persons calling themselves Christians speak of people who shew more of the spirit of the Master than they do themselves. I must say that I feel bound to give the preference to those professing Christians who shew the most love for their Master, even if they have not been baptized by immersion. And I would say, as Alexander Campbell said, 'If I should do otherwise, I would be a bigot among believers, and a Pharisee among Christians.'"

"Oh," said sister Streetyarn, "as for Campbell, he was raised a Presbyterian himself, an' he never was as good a Christian as Stone. Gie me Stone; he can cum down on the baby sprinklers in a way that makes me feel good. But ye needn't get so riled about it. I'm sure what I said is all for your good, an' if ye are so much takin' up wi' that ar' gal, I'm sure I wish ye much luck in her; but if ye are so mighty saut on gittin' a wife, ye'd jest orter put in for Elder Bump's daughter, an' git her, an' ye'll have a wife what 'ill be a wife, an' I'm sure it 'ud be 'nuff site better to have a wife 'at could cook a good meal of vittals, than one that 'ud be good for nuthin' but a ding-dongin' on the pianner and readin' big books and talking about Greek. Ye can't live on pianners nor Greek, no how."

During the time that sister Streetyarn was delivering those sentiments, Mr. Jones was sidling off towards the door, and at this point he bade them good night and disappeared. Sister Streetyarn soon saw that sister Clemens did not quite endorse all she had been saying, so she soon "guessed she'd be a-goin'."

Mr. Jones returned between nine and ten o'clock, and with candle in hand was proceeding to his bed-room, when sister Clemens said: "Well, I was jest rale mad at sister Streetyarn to-night. When she does get saut agin anybody, she's jest as bitter as wormwood." And then laying her hand on his arm, she put her face within ten inches of his, and proceeded in a low confidential tone to say: "Wal, if ye have takin' a likin' to the parson's gal, that hain't her fault; and if she's takin' a likin' fur you, that hain't your



fault; and if you have both takin' a likin' for one another, that hain't no business o' sister Streetyarn's."

Mr. Jones was sidling off towards his room, but sister Clemens squeezed his arm more tightly, put her head a little closer, and spoke more confidentially, and said: "Wal, now, I think you'd do rale well to git that gal o' the parson's. I hearn folks say she kin cook jest as good a meal o' vittals as any gal in this town, an' you'd have the pianner in the bargain. Tell ye what, I've a likin' for music. Ye see I was brought up in Massachusetts, an' I used to go down to Bosting now and agin wi' my pa, when I was a bit o' a gal, and when I'd hear them 'ere pianners, it used to make me feel good, you bet. One night last week, I was passin' Clar'ns', an' his gal was a-playin' a tune I us't to hear down to Bosting, an' I stopped to listen, an' the fust thing I know'd my eyes were a-sloppin' over. It made me think o' the time when I us't to go down to Bosting, when I was a bit of a gal. That's what's the matter. An' ye mout be the means o' turnin' ole man Clar'ns to be a Christian. An' I tell ye he's one o' the splendidest men in this 'ere town, if it warn't for that 'ere baby sprinklin'; so put in for the gal, sez I."

Mr. Jones had by this time reached the door of his room, and by a determined effort he succeeded in making his escape.

The next evening found Elder Bump and the Messrs. Jones in Mr. Clarence's parlour.

"I think," said Mr. Jones, "that as we have spent a considerable time on the Scripture arguments, it is now time to enquire what the practice of the Church from the time of the apostles downwards was."

"I do not see," said Elder Bump, "how any one can defend infant baptism from the practice of the early Church. It is well known that the custom did not exist in the time of the apostles, and that it was neither known nor practised for more than seven hundred years after that time."

"I have read that statement in 'Theodosia,'" said Mr. Clarence; "but though it may be neither known to you nor to

the author in whom you trust, it is well known to all who have taken the pains to investigate the question, that it was the practice of the Church from the time of the apostles downwards."

"We want something more than mere assertion—we want proof," said Elder Bump.

"The proof is at hand," said Mr. Clarence. "Justin Martyr, born near the close of the first century, observes, when speaking of those who were members of the Church, that a part of them were sixty or seventy years old, who were made disciples in infancy. The scriptural mode of making disciples, as you have already admitted, is by baptizing (Matthew xxviii. 20): 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them,' etc. To 'teach' is to make disciples of; and if you know of any other way of making disciples that was ever practised than baptism, will you be kind enough to inform me?"

"I am afraid the information will be hard to find," said Mr. Jones. "But the word 'infants' at that time was a more general term than it is with us. It sometimes meant adults up to the age of twenty-five. I would have no objection to baptizing any number of infants of that kind."

"The evidence of Irenæus, who was born about the year 97, will settle that point. He was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of the Apostle John. He says Christ came to save all persons who by Him are born again unto God: infants, and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons. The historian begins with the lowest or youngest, and gives four periods of age before he reaches the elder persons, or adults."

"Oh, do give up the infants of twenty-five," said Mr. Jones, junior.

"But he does not say that they were baptized—simply that they were 'born again,'" said Elder Bump.

"He explains in another place," said Mr. Clarence, "that by being 'born again' he meant baptism. If you could have proved that the infants spoken of were twenty-five, you would not have raised the question as to whether being 'born

again' meant baptism or not. Clemens Alexandrinus, born about the middle of the second century, when reproving the Christians for the use of idolatrous and indecent engravings, exhorts them to use only those that were becoming and useful, and particularly exhorts fishermen to choose the image of an apostle baptizing infants. Tertullian, born about the year 97, says, 'The delay of baptism is more useful, according to every person's disposition, but especially with regard to children.' The reason which he gives for this delay is that their faith was not entire or complete. As Tertullian only urges delay, it is obvious that the rule of the Church was to baptize infants, for he would have had no occasion to urge delay if the practice had never existed. Origen, born about the year 184, and a man of more information than any other of his time, says, 'Infants are baptized for remission of sins. The Church hath received the tradition from the apostles, that baptism ought to be administered to infants.' Cyprian, who was contemporary with Origen, says that 'Sixty-six bishops, being convened in a Council at Carthage, having the question referred to them whether infants might be baptized before they were eight days old, decided unanimously that no infant is to be prohibited from the benefit of baptism, although but just born.' Now, the question was not whether infants should be baptized or not. This question had never been raised; but if the baptism should be delayed till the child was eight days old, the unanimous decision was that delay was not necessary, but that children might be baptized as soon as born. Gregory Nazianzen, born in the early part of the fourth century, exhorts parents to offer their children to God in baptism. St. Augustin, born in the middle of the fourth century, says, 'The whole Church practises infant baptism; it was not instituted by Councils, but was in use from the beginning.' He also says that he did not remember ever to have read of any person, whether Catholic or heretic, who maintained that baptism ought to be denied to infants. This, he says, the Church has always maintained. Pelagius, a contemporary with St. Augustin, declares that he

had never heard even any impious heretic who asserted that infants are not to be baptized. Pelagius is a witness of high authority. He was born in Britain, and travelled through France, Italy, Africa proper, and Egypt to Jerusalem. If such a practice had existed in his time, it seems impossible that he should not have heard of it. A person who employed himself extensively in examining this subject gives the following as the result of his enquiries: First, during the first four hundred years from the formation of the Christian Church, Tertullian only urged the delay of baptism to infants, and that only in some cases, but neither any society of men, nor any individual, denied the lawfulness of baptizing infants. Secondly, in the next seven hundred years, there was not a society nor individual who even pleaded for this delay, much less any who denied the right or the duty of infant baptism. Thirdly, in the year 1120, one sect of the Waldenses declared against infant baptism because they supposed children incapable of salvation. And that appears to be the only consistent ground on which baptism can be denied to infants."

"I think not," said Elder Bump; "infant damnation is a horrible doctrine, and I have never heard of any who held it only Presbyterians."

"Well, on what ground do you deny the right of baptism to infants?"

"Of course, on the ground that they cannot believe."

"Well, 'he that believeth not shall be damned'—a child believeth not, hence it must be damned."

"You are too fast," said Elder Bump.

"He is not faster than the Scripture passage which he quotes," said Mr. Jones, junior. "If the child is excluded from baptism for want of faith, it must be excluded from heaven for want of faith. Hence it must be damned."

"I think Mr. Clarence has about made a convert of you," said Elder Bump.

Mr. Clarence then continued: "The main body of that people rejected the opinion as heretical, and the rest which held it soon came to nothing. The next appearance of this

opinion was in 1522. This was the date of the origin of the Anabaptist sect."

"I don't know about those authorities," said Elder Bump.

"The authors are all reliable," said Mr. Jones, junior.

"But if we had not any of the evidence which we have quoted—and let us suppose that the practice of infant baptism was unknown to the apostles and the early Church—might we not reasonably expect that we would have some account of its introduction? We can get an account of the introduction of all the errors and corruptions which have ever found their way into the Christian Church; we can give the date of the introduction of the dogmas of Transubstantiation, the Immaculate Conception, and Papal Infallibility; we can find the names of the authors, the Councils which sanctioned them and their dates; but who can tell us anything about the introduction of this dogma of Infant Baptism? Who was its author? What Council sanctioned it? What Pope decreed it? Surely a dogma which requires the performance of an act so sinful and of such high-handed rebellion against God, so impious and so sacrilegious,\* could not have been clandestinely smuggled into the Church. Can you give any account of its origin, its authors or promoters? You tell us it is a Popish rite; if so, what Pope introduced it? Information is wanted on that subject."

"Come, Elder," said Mr. Jones, junior, "if you can give us any information, let's have it."

Elder Bump made no reply.

"Well," said Mr. Jones, junior, "the case appears to stand about so: Mr. Clarence has shown clearly (to my mind at least) that the covenant made with Abraham embraces all his spiritual seed in the Christian dispensation as well as the Jewish; that the children are embraced in that covenant, and stand in the same relation to the Church in the new dispensation as in the old. We are challenged to give any evidence that God ever annulled the ordinance by

---

\* "Theodosia Ernest," page 323.

which children are members of the visible Church. We fail to give any. When we come to the New Testament Scriptures, we find at least one case of the administration of infant baptism on a rather extensive scale; and a number of household baptisms, in which it appears to be next to impossible that there should have been no infants. When we come to the evidence of the Christian fathers, they are unanimously in favour of infant baptism. And we are asked when the practice was introduced—if it was not the practice of the early Church—and we can give no answer.”

Elder Bump treated Mr. Jones to one of his most belligerent looks, but said nothing.

Mr. Clarence then continued: “I now feel it to be my duty, though a painful one, to give a few examples of the way in which many Baptist writers misrepresent the authors whom they quote. I saw a pamphlet a few days ago, written by a Baptist doctor of divinity. He professed to prove his doctrine from Pædo-baptist authors. He represents Dr. Adam Clark as saying: ‘In primitive times the manner of baptizing was by immersion, or dipping the whole body in water, and this manner was significant of the dying and rising referred to by Paul’ (Romans vi. 3). Will you be kind enough, Mr. Jones, to take the book and read the whole passage bearing on the question, and let us see what Dr. Clark does say?”

He took the book and read: “In primitive times the manner of baptism was probably by immersion, or dipping the whole body in water, and this manner of doing it was significant of the dying and rising referred to by Paul. I say it is probable the apostle alludes to the mode of baptism by immersion, but it is not absolutely certain that he does so, as some do imagine; for in the next verse our being incorporated into Christ by baptism is also denoted by our being planted or rather grafted together in the likeness of His death; and Noah’s ark floating upon the water, and sprinkled by the rain, is a figure corresponding to baptism (1 Peter iii. 20), but neither of these give the same idea of the outward form as burying. Further, we must be careful

not to lay too great stress on such circumstances." "I am astonished," said Mr. Jones, laying down the book.

"To profess," resumed Mr. Clarence, "to give the sentiments of an author, and to leave out words and otherwise garble the passages which he professes to quote, is so dishonest that I know not how to express myself. Albert Barnes is treated in the same way. The author quotes the part of the passage which suits him, and then stops without mentioning that Barnes adds: 'While it is admitted that the allusion is probably to the custom of immersion in baptism, yet the passage cannot be adduced as an argument that favours that mode as the only one, or that it is binding on Christians in all places and in all ages, for the following reasons: First, the scope or design of the apostle is not to discuss the mode of baptism, or to state any doctrine on the subject; it is an incidental allusion to it in the course of an argument, without stating or implying that this was the universal mode even then, still less that it was the only possible mode. His main design was to state the obligation of Christians to be holy from the nature of their profession at baptism—an obligation just as impressive and as forcible from the application of water in any other way as by immersion. It arises from the fact of baptism, not the mode. It is just as true that they who are baptized by affusion or by sprinkling are baptized into His death, and become professedly dead to the world and sin, and are as much under obligations to live to God as those who are immersed.' We have in those extracts given the exact words of the author. Dr. Chalmers is another writer who is misquoted and misrepresented in the same way."

"Oh," said Mr. Jones, "I do not care about hearing any more; I am satisfied; and after the way in which the author of 'Theodosia' quoted Liddell and Scott, I am not surprised. When I find a writer profess to give the precise words of an author, and give only three meanings out of twelve, to give the first of those incorrectly, and to give one which is not in the author at all, I am done with such an author. I find 'to pour upon' one of the meanings of

*baptizo* in Liddell and Scott. The author of 'Theodosia' does not give it. He gives 'immerse,' which Liddell and Scott do not give at all."

"Well," said Mr. Clarence, "I have read the book, and I must say that I was quite amused with the assurance of the author. He puts forth as his champion for immersion a tutor employed in teaching the junior classes in a Presbyterian college. Though he does not profess to have gone through a college course himself, he confutes all the professors and the president of the college, and shows them to be completely ignorant of the contents of the books on their own shelves. He shows D.D.'s, and especially Presbyterian D.D.'s, to be the greatest ignoramuses in the world. He is a teacher under them, and they are employed by the Faculty and considered competent to teach the higher classes, and he only the lower. Yet in this subject he proves them to be the most ignorant and inconsistent class of men in the world. He shows that college-trained men are of all others the most hopelessly ignorant and inconsistent, yet he holds his position as a teacher in one of the very worst kind of colleges. The fact that nearly nine-tenths of the Christian world, comprising nearly all the learning of the schools, are on the opposite side, is not thought to be a matter worthy of consideration by this self-sufficient dominie."

"Well," said Mr. Jones, junior, "I never did like that way of abusing other denominations in which so many of our people indulge; and I had a little experience, when I was a chaplain in the army during the war, which cooled my ardour not a little."

"And what was your experience?" said Elder Bump with a frown.

"The surgeon came and told me of a poor fellow who was given over to die, and wished to see a minister. He requested me to accompany him and see him. I went. The surgeon introduced me, and told him I had come to give him spiritual counsel, and left me with the wounded man. I asked him a few questions about his past life. He told me he had led a wild, reckless life, and had neglected



to seek his soul's salvation; 'and, now,' he said, 'I am about to appear before my Judge, in an unprepared state.' And turning his eyes upon me with an earnest, appealing look, he said, 'What shall I do to be saved?' I was puzzled and confused. If he had been in health and strength I could have easily said, 'Believe and be baptized,' but I knew that baptism was out of the question, and I simply said, 'Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved,' and then left him. I had just reached the next ward when I met the surgeon. 'How is that poor fellow?' he said. I answered, 'He's pretty sick.' 'I knew that,' he said, 'before I brought you to him; but what of his spiritual condition?' I could make no answer. The surgeon said, 'That is just what I expected. Your religion is not suited to a sick bed.' He then turned and left me, and called a Presbyterian minister. The next day curiosity prompted me to go again and see the poor fellow. When I asked him how he was, he said, feebly, 'I feel much weaker—I feel I am near my journey's end, but I do not now fear death. That other chaplain read and prayed with me, and pointed me to the Saviour, and I now trust that the Lord has had mercy on me.' Those words of the surgeon, 'Your religion is not suited to a sick bed,' appeared to sound in my ears for many days. Though I had been brought up in the Presbyterian Church, I had never heard the subject of baptism discussed in a Presbyterian pulpit. The minister with whom we worshipped appeared to ignore the whole question. The young people got into the way of attending the Baptists and the Campbellites, as they were called, on the Sabbath evenings. We continually heard that immersion was the only mode of baptism; that all the Pædo-baptist writers of any note admitted this, but they did not wish to disturb the faith and practice of the Church. As we never heard anything on the other side, the natural conclusion to which many of us came was that the Pædo-baptists had nothing to say in support of their system; and several of us were baptized in what was made to appear to

us the scriptural way. We had no suspicion that those Pædo-baptist authors had been so misrepresented."

"Well, seek the good old way now, and let the past suffice to have gone in the way of error," said Mr. Cahullan.

"Very well," said Elder Bump, "you'd better turn to be a baby sprinkler at once, for you've clean gone over to that side now;" and he rose abruptly, bade them good night, and rushed out of the room.

The Messrs. Jones remained for a short time. They expressed regret that Elder Bump should have acted so rudely, and cordially thanked Mr. Clarence for the instruction which they had received; and as Mr. Jones, junior, was about to leave E—— to return to college, he bade them all an affectionate good-bye, and they then took their leave.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

ELDER BUMP went directly from Mr. Clarence's to sister Streetyarn's, and, though it was now nearly eleven o'clock, he called and gave a full account of the discussion. He dwelt at great length, and with great severity, on the defection of the Joneses. He said 'what was bred in the bone was hard to get out of the flesh;' that they who were born Presbyterians could not be easily changed to anything else; and that he feared the Joneses never had been very good Christians.

"That's what's the matter," said sister Streetyarn. "My mother knowed the Joneses long ago, an' I've often hearn her say that 'they war rale blue-stockin' Presbyterians dyed in the wool;' an' it's little wonder they don't make very good Christians. I hain't got no use for such Christians. If they want to be baby sprinklers, let 'em go, sez I."

Before these two separated that night they had laid their plan of campaign. Next day sister Streetyarn discovered that she had an errand at the house of almost every brother and sister in town, and she embraced the opportunity of

posting them thoroughly in the discussion, and everything else which related to the Joneses. She suggested to the deacons that it might be well to hold a congregational meeting, and "jest find out what all the brethren and sisters thought about it." It was time to know "whether they were a-goin' to hev a baby sprinkler to 'spound to them a Sundays or not." The result was, that a meeting was appointed to be held on the following Wednesday evening.

On the following Monday evening Mr. Jones called at Mr. Clarence's. Mr. and Mrs. Clarence were both from home. Hence, on Laura devolved the task of entertaining him. Though neither of them were fully aware of the fact, it had turned out as sister Clemens had suggested, *i.e.* they had rather "taken a likin' for one another." Laura received him cordially, and it was surprising how soon the sunshine of her presence dispelled all his gloomy feelings. She entertained him with music for a short time, but they were soon engaged in conversation on the subject which had of late engrossed so much of their attention. Mr. Jones frankly admitted that the discussion in which they had been engaged had caused him to see the whole question in a new light. He said he did not think he could ever feel at home among his own people, and his mind was not at all clear as to what it was his duty to do.

"That must be a matter for earnest prayer," said Laura. "God has promised His Spirit to all who ask Him, and His Spirit will guide His children in the way of all truth, if they are only willing to submit to His guidance. But it appears to me that you, and all the body to which you belong, attach far too much importance to the mode of baptism. If the Apostle Paul had attached as much importance to the ordinance as you do, he would never have thanked God that he had baptized only two families, and one other person, but whether this person had a family or not he does not inform us. If he had, like Elder Cleghorn, looked upon baptism as the last round of the ladder, and, till that last round was reached, seekers of salvation, however penitent, were still outside of the kingdom and heirs of wrath, would

he ever have thanked God that he had left so many in that perilous condition? We find that he purposely abstained from administering this ordinance personally, lest his doing so should prove a stumbling-block to others by leading them to believe that he baptized in his own name; and he adds, 'Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.' Those few whom he baptized at Corinth must have been a small part of the converts whom he made in that place. You see that he attached little importance to the ordinance itself, compared with the preaching of the Gospel, and he must have attached much less to the mode of administering it. It is well known that circumcision was universally practised throughout the Jewish branch of the Christian Church; and, though the apostle knew that there was great danger of this ordinance being made a stumbling-block to the weaker brethren, by leading them to trust in the ceremonial law for salvation instead of trusting to Christ, so far from interfering with this practice, he himself circumcised Timothy, to make him more acceptable to the Jews. He took on himself the Nazarite's vow, and shaved his head at Cenchrea in fulfilment of it, and he kept the hair till he had arrived at Jerusalem, that he might burn it in the presence of the priest. And in order still further to conciliate the Jews, he accepted the advice of James, to pay the expenses and superintend the purification of four Nazarites who were too poor to pay the expenses themselves. Seven days were required to complete this process. Sixteen victims, with cakes of fine flour, were to be offered on the altar; the hair was to be cut off and burnt before the priest. Paul was under the necessity of wasting seven days of precious time, which he would gladly have spent in preaching the Gospel, waiting among those paupers, seeing the priest sacrifice all those victims, and beholding the smoke of all those sacrifices ascending to heaven. How did all this agree with his former preaching to the Gentiles about their freedom from the bondage of this law, when he was himself willing to submit to its bondage? The explanation is simply this: the apostle had one great object before him, of

which he never for a moment lost sight—that was, the furtherance of the Gospel. If the Gospel freed him and others from keeping the law, it likewise left them free to observe it if they chose. Now, surely he who could make such great concessions to the opinions and prejudices of others, would have felt himself at liberty to adopt any mode of baptism which would be most likely to further the cause of his Master. He who could say, ‘Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature,’ could have said, and would have said if the question had ever been submitted to him, ‘Neither immersion, nor sprinkling availeth anything, but a new creature in Christ Jesus.’ Surely he who could be ‘all things to all men’—a Jew while among Jews, and a Gentile while among Gentiles—that by all these means he might win them over to Christ, would have had no scruples about being a Methodist while among Methodists, a Baptist among Baptists, an Episcopalian among Episcopalians, and a Presbyterian among Presbyterians.

“Indeed,” said Mr. Jones, “it does appear to me that there is far too much stress laid on those minor differences; and I must admit that our practice is far different from that of the apostle.”

“Well,” said Laura, “though all denominations are chargeable with this narrowness to some extent, it is with the advocates of immersion that the responsibility rests of using that ordinance which Christ gave to be a bond of union between His people, as a cause of division. Even if we should now obtain unmistakable evidence that immersion was the mode in which baptism was administered by the apostles, would the liberty of changing to sprinkling or pouring be greater than the liberty which has been taken with the Lord’s Supper? Methodists and Episcopalians kneel; Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists sit; and it is well known that neither of those modes is the apostolic one. Christ and His disciples reclined on a mat or couch. Now, I cannot see but anyone would have just as good grounds for denouncing all the other denominations in the world for

not following the apostolic mode of partaking of the Lord's Supper, and starting a new sect called 'Recliners.'"

"Well," said Mr. Jones, "I cannot see but they would have as good grounds as the Baptists; and it is strange that I never saw that before."

Laura continued: "'Without faith it is impossible to please God,' and a simple, childlike faith is at all times pleasing to Him, in whatever way it may be expressed, whether by the mother presenting her infant child in the ordinance of baptism, and praying fervently, though silently, that God will baptize it with His Spirit while His minister baptizes it with water, and that God will cleanse its inward nature while the water, the symbol of cleansing, is applied outwardly; or by the adult going down to the water, as he believes, in imitation of His Saviour, and silently praying that while he is being plunged beneath the water, that God will cleanse him thoroughly from all his transgressions, so that he may rise to all the life of God. A short time ago I got my hands on a Baptist hymn-book; I found a section of some twenty pages devoted to teaching the doctrine of baptism by immersion; and I may here remark that it is in all probability due to those hymns that the Baptists, and all advocates of immersion, are so thoroughly grounded in their faith."

"You think, then," said Mr. Jones, "that rhyme has more to do with it than reason."

"Well," said Laura, "I do mean that those sentiments thrown into rhyme, in connection with the music, is calculated to produce a much greater effect than could be produced by any appeals to reason. But though baptism by immersion may be an important means of grace to those who can go down into the water, as they believe, in imitation of their Master who passed beneath Jordan's wave, it could not be the same means of grace to me, as I do not believe that Christ went under Jordan's wave at all. On the other hand, infant baptism, wherever practised in faith, is an important means of grace; and I firmly believe that I

myself am to-day a standing monument of that grace, which I have inherited, like Timothy, from my grandmother."

"That's pretty strong," said Mr. Jones. "Do you mean to say that grace is hereditary?"

Laura answered: "I do, to some extent; but hear my story, and you will be in a better position to judge. I have often heard my father relate this incident: When he was a child, about seven years old, he was enticed by some older boys to unite with them in profaning the Sabbath-day. When his mother called him to account for it, he made the excuse, which boys so frequently make, that it was no worse for him than for the others. His mother replied: 'It is worse for you than for the others; you should know, and you should never forget, that when you were an infant, I carried you to the church in my arms, and there, your father and I dedicated you to God in the ordinance of baptism. You are God's child. You are a child of the covenant. I gave you to God; and when you break God's commandments, by profaning His day, you are disobeying your Father in heaven.' My father says that he never forgot that lesson. When tempted to sin, the thought always came into his mind, 'I am God's child; God has a claim upon me.' This impression never left him, and when old enough, he felt it to be his duty to study for the ministry. And I think I may safely say that, under God, my parents were the instruments in bringing me to a knowledge of the truth, and giving me a hope of eternal life."

Mr. Jones appeared to be deeply interested, and Laura went on to say: "If you study the biographies of great and good men, you will find that they have, with very few exceptions, been dedicated to God by pious mothers. Your own Alexander Campbell was dedicated to God in the ordinance of baptism, and was a child of the covenant; and he never altogether lost those impressions which were early made on him."

Mr. Jones now turned the subject to the one which was uppermost in his mind, *i.e.*, the congregational meeting which was to take place on the following Wednesday

evening. He said he expected nothing else but the congregation would be so divided, that even if he could command a majority, there would be such an amount of friction that the position would be far from comfortable; and he added: "I am tired of this Congregationalism at any rate. In the Presbyterian Church a minister has the Presbytery to fall back upon, while with us a few troublesome individuals can drive a minister from his place, and likewise stand in the way of his getting another congregation."

"Well," said Laura in a bantering way, "if you would like to try Presbyterianism, I presume the way is open to you."

"I do not know yet what course I may feel it my duty to adopt," said Mr. Jones.

"You had better come back to-morrow evening," said Laura, "and consult my father. Tell him everything that is in your mind, and he will endeavour to advise you for the best." To this Mr. Jones agreed, and took his leave.

On the next evening he had a long, confidential interview with Mr. Clarence, the result of which was that Mr. Clarence agreed to apply to his Presbytery, at its next meeting, to take him under its care, and assign him a course of study with the view of entering the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. Mr. Clarence advised him, in view of the divided state of his congregation, to hand in his resignation at once. To this he agreed, and took his leave.

On the following evening Mr. Jones' congregation was assembled at an early hour. Most of the younger members expected a lively time and a little excitement, and they attended with the same motive as they would have attended a horse-race or a dog-fight. The meeting was called to order by electing Squire Bungay to the chair.

Squire Bungay commenced by saying: "Brethren and sisters, we have met here this evening to consult for the welfare of the Christian Church and the spread of the Gospel in the town of E—— and the surrounding country. The meeting is now open for any of the brothers or sisters to speak their minds."



Deacon Crabtree then rose, and after clearing his throat and putting up one foot on the nearest bench, he proceeded: "A few months ago things looked as if"—and he cleared his throat again—"we were a-spreadin' a bit. Whar's the spread now? 'hem! That's what I'd like ter know. Well, as I was a-sayin', whar's the spread? It looks mighty like as if we're a-goin' back instead o' for'ard. Well, 'hem! as I was a-sayin', somethin's got to be done, or we'll be flat down on our back the first thing we know. That's what's the matter." He then cleared his throat, and guessed he'd no more to say jest now.

He had no sooner sat down than sister Streetyarn was on her feet. She said: "Talk about spreadin.' I 'low thar's a slim chance for spreadin' as long's we've a preacher what likes better to run round arter the gals than to 'tend to his dooty. Gi'e me the preacher what can take his own part, an' pitch into Presbyterians and Methodists, and all as don't give us the true Gospel, sez I. And none o' yer foolin' roun' arter parsons or their gals either, sez I."

Deacon Clemens was just springing to his feet when the chairman motioned to him to wait, and told him that Mr. Jones had the floor.

Mr. Jones simply said, that, as he saw that the congregation was divided, he believed that his usefulness there was gone; that owing to that and other circumstances, he had decided to tender his resignation.

He had scarcely sat down when Deacon Clemens sprang to his feet and cried out: "Now ye've dun it, Deacon Crabtree!"

"Dun what?" said Deacon Crabtree, in his shrill, screeching voice.

"Why, driv' away our preacher. It's jest your fault-fandin' an' sister Streetyarn's, both o' ye, that's knocked everything endways."

Deacon Crabtree ran across the room and leaned forward and brought his hand to within a foot of Deacon Clemens' nose, and said, "I know that aint so; it's jest yerself and

the preacher that haint attended to yer dooties; an' ye haint goin' ter run this ere institooshin any longer."

Deacon Clemens said: "I'll run you mighty quick, you bet!" and dealt him a blow between the eyes which left him sprawling on the floor beneath a bench.

Deacon Clemens had no sooner done this rash act than all the clemency in his nature returned. He ran to him and lifted him up in his arms. If Deacon Crabtree had been a Southerner, blood would probably have been spilt, but he had been brought up in Connecticut; and though he had spent the greater part of his life in the west, and had adopted western manners pretty thoroughly, he never had taken very kindly to the use of the revolver or bowie-knife. So he choked down his wrath far enough to say: "I'll hev yer before Squire Solomon some o' these days." The chairman tried to restore order, but failed, and the meeting broke up in confusion.

A few days afterwards, constable Ketchum served Deacon Clemens with a writ, summoning him to appear before Squire Solomon. As it had been agreed to have a jury to try the case, Deacon Clemens called on Mr. Clarence, and requested him to consent to act as a juror. Mr. Clarence refused, on the ground that, according to the laws of the State, ministers were exempted from serving on juries. Deacon Clemens insisted that as the law of the State did not prohibit a minister from serving on a jury if he was willing to do so, that he would take it as a great obligation if Mr. Clarence would waive his right of exemption and serve, as he would like to have at least one man on the jury in whom he could place confidence. Mr. Clarence replied that if he should consent to act when it was known that he could be exempted if he wished, that they would both lay themselves open to suspicion, and no good end could be answered.

The case came on in due time. Deacon Clemens owned that he had got riled and given Deacon Crabtree a left-hander; so few witnesses were examined, and Deacon Crabtree's lawyer had very little to do. He had, however, come

there to address the jury, and he was determined to do so ; so he spread out on general principles for about half an hour. He dwelt on the enormity of the outrage, the great disgrace to the Church and the community for one deacon to strike another deacon in the church, and he hoped they would see it to be their duty to put on a fine as high as the law would allow. The jury retired, and in a few minutes returned with the very singular verdict—"Guilty, but served him right." Squire Solomon said he had no option left him in the case further than to fix the sum in which the defendant should be fined. He would accordingly impose a fine of one dollar ; and with regard to the costs, he would take nothing for his own trouble. Constable Ketchum said, "I'll take nothing for my trouble." Each of the jurymen remitted his claim, and two or three of Deacon Clemens' friends paid the fine. Deacon Crabtree had his lawyer to pay, and so the case was ended.

---

## CHAPTER X.

**A**FTER a few months' vacancy, Elder Bump was hired for half his time. Elder Bump's congregation had got tired of paying for his full time, so they agreed to take half time. Deacon Clemens began to attend the Presbyterian church, and after a few months he applied for membership, and was accepted. He was eventually installed into the office of deacon. Sister Clemens became a frequent visitor at the manse. She said it made her "feel good to hear that gal play on that 'ere pianner," though she complained that she "often felt like sloppin' over at the eyes," because it made her "think o' the folks down to Bosting." Some eight or ten of Mr. Jones' members began to attend the Presbyterian church during the time of the vacancy. They continued, and in due time became members. Elder Bump got Mr. Cleghorn to help him to hold a "big meetin'," but the meeting didn't prove to be very big ; for though Mr.

Cleghorn went over his oft-repeated story of the ladder with the five rounds—repenting, believing and being baptized, etc.—and went over his usual stock-in-trade of the unscripturalness and foolishness of “baby sprinklin’,” and reminded them that it was the mark of the mother of harlots, and proved to his own satisfaction several times that immersion was the only mode of baptism, they got only one addition—and that was one of Elder Bump’s own daughters. Everything settled down quietly in the Christian church in E—, though they were not able to pay Elder Bump much for “’spoundin’ a’ Sunday;” he had a farm and was not totally dependent on his people, and he could give them cheaper preaching than they had been in the habit of getting from Mr. Jones. As he had now been a “widderer” for a considerable time, he began to think of making a change in his household arrangements, and he had no great difficulty in persuading sister Streetyarn to accept the position of stepmother in his family, which she did, as she said, “for the sake of the chillen more ’n anything else.”

Mr. Jones appeared before the O—e Presbytery at its next meeting, underwent an examination, and was received. He had a two years’ course assigned to him. In the meantime he was appointed to a mission station in the neighbourhood, and to Mr. Clarence was assigned the task of overseeing his studies. The two years soon passed over, and Mr. Jones was duly licensed to preach the Gospel.

It is an old saying, that “the course of true love never runs smooth.” If it had been our object to write a novel, we would have illustrated this maxim by treating our readers to a few fainting-fits and an attack of brain fever or some other catastrophe, *à la mode* “Theodosia Ernest,”\* caused by some misunderstanding, and cured when the misunderstandings were removed. We will simply say, that in the case of Mr. Jones and Laura it ran its course with about the average number of difficulties and trials, doubts and fears, and in due time they found themselves in the position in relation to each other described as being “en-

---

\* Percy in “Theodosia.”

gaged." When Mr. Jones asked Mrs. Clarence's consent, she said: "In committing Laura to your keeping, I commit to you a precious treasure—a child of the covenant. She has grown up within the fold of Christ."

It had been one of Laura's fondest dreams from her early childhood that she would be able to go some day as a missionary to India. At first she feared to open her mind to Mr. Jones on that subject, but she was much gratified to find that Mr. Jones entered cordially into her views; so, with the consent and concurrence of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence, they offered their services to the Board of Foreign Missions. Their services were accepted, and they were assigned to a mission field in Madras. A meeting of Presbytery was appointed for his ordination. The occasion was a solemn one, and what rendered it much more interesting was that their marriage took place at the same time. There were few dry eyes among the spectators as they saw those two young persons standing by the altar, pledging themselves to each other, and at the same time consecrating themselves to the work of God. Many and earnest were the prayers which ascended to God for them by the different members of Presbytery who took a part in the exercises. A few weeks were spent in visiting friends and making preparations for the journey. Laura's parting with her parents, and brothers and sisters, was tender. Her mother stood, with her eyes partially blinded with tears, watching the train, which was carrying the light and joy of their household, till it gradually vanished from her sight. She then took her husband's arm, while their children brought up the rear, and they walked slowly, sadly and silently to their home, from which the light now appeared to have fled.

We will now close by giving one of Laura's letters to her mother, written three years after their arrival in Madras:

"DEAR MOTHER,—We have great reason to be thankful that our health has been so wonderfully preserved to us in this hot climate. Our little boy is now two years old. Though his complexion would be called dark in America or

Europe, his fair skin is a source of great curiosity to the natives. In this climate Americans and Europeans soon lose their colour as well as their vigour, but our little Paul has been wonderfully healthy. He has been the means of opening to me an entrance to many a Hindoo dwelling.

“As you have often been informed, the women are completely secluded from the outward world. It is the female missionaries alone who can gain access to their dwellings, and that is generally accomplished by stratagem. I always take my boy with me, and the curiosity of the women to see him overcomes their prejudice. When I have once gained access, I compare my own little boy with theirs; compare our ways of feeding them; and I begin by suggesting improvements in their way of dressing and feeding—giving them small presents when I can get any of them to accept—and during all those visits I embrace every opportunity of speaking to them of Christ, who loved little children.

“Our nearest neighbour (except the natives) is a Baptist missionary. He visits us frequently, and we find it exceedingly refreshing to meet one engaged in the same high calling. A short time ago we found him in a state of great perplexity from a difficulty growing out of his peculiar views on the subject of baptism. His heart had been cheered by the hopeful conversion of three influential men belonging to the Brahmin class. After the ordinance of baptism had been administered, two of them brought their children to him and requested him to baptize them. Mr. Smith (the Baptist missionary) was of course under the necessity of declining. ‘What!’ said the native, ‘Me a Christian—my child not a Christian! Shall I go to heaven—my child go to hell? That is not a good religion.’ Mr. Smith explained that the child could not exercise faith. ‘Your book says, ‘He that believeth not shall be damned’—must our children be damned because they cannot believe? I will not be a Christian if my children cannot be Christians.’ Mr. Smith was struck dumb for some time, and he thought of the awkward position in which he found himself placed. He then said, ‘Christ loves little children. When He was in the

world He took them in His arms and blessed them, and said "of such is the kingdom of heaven." 'Well,' said the Brahmin, 'If Christ did so, why do you refuse them?' Mr. Smith was silenced again. He then said, 'I will be back to-morrow, and I will bring the other missionary with me, and I trust we will be able to show you that we follow the example of Christ.' 'Good,' said the Brahmin, 'we want to take our children with us.'

"Mr. Smith came round that evening, and related the case to Mr. Jones. 'Well,' said Mr. Jones, 'how much more clearly the difficulty is seen when it comes up in practice. There is no other way for it but I must go with you to-morrow and baptize those children. It is absolutely necessary that it should be done; and for you to do it might involve you in difficulty with the Baptist Board. You see, brother, how awkward your position is; and if the Lord prospers your work, your difficulty will be increased, for all the different forms of religious belief in the East—Hindoos, Bhuddists and Mahomedans—hold to infant membership.' Mr. Smith saw the matter in an entirely new light.

"On the day following Mr. Jones accompanied Mr. Smith and baptized the children. They then made an agreement that they should act in concert—that Mr. Smith should immerse all the adults, and Mr. Jones should baptize all the children by sprinkling. Mr. Smith had made arrangements for holding a communion about the same time. He now saw how absurd his position would appear to the natives if he should refuse to permit Mr. Jones and myself to commune with them. So he invited Mr. Jones to assist, and we had a time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. Since this arrangement was entered into the Lord has blessed our labours much more abundantly. We find that union is strength; and we trust that we shall find a fulfilment of the promise that 'One man shall chase a thousand, and two shall put ten thousand to flight.' If Christians throughout the United States could see the matter in the same light as we-in India see it, you would not find them quarrelling

and dividing, and wasting their strength over such a question as the mode of baptism. Mr. Jones is enjoying excellent health, and we enjoy ourselves here as well as we could have expected to have done if we had remained in the United States. We intend to petition the Board of Foreign Missions to give us leave of absence for a year, so that we can have an opportunity of visiting our native land again, and seeing all our dear friends. How I anticipate the joy of seeing you and my dear father, and my dear sister and brothers, and all my dear friends. Praying that God will bless and keep us all in safety till we meet again; and when done with our meetings and partings in this life, that we may all have an abundant entrance into His kingdom,

“Your affectionate daughter,

“LAURA JONES.”



## DISCOURSE ON UNIVERSALISM.

---

[We append a discourse on Universalism, delivered in New Lancaster, Kansas, in October, 1868, in reply to two discourses delivered by a Universalist preacher.

The discourses were delivered before the same audience, on the same day. This fact is mentioned to explain some of the phraseology used throughout the discourse.

This discourse was published at the time in pamphlet form and in the county newspaper. The interest which it evoked at that time has induced the author to embody it in this work.]

---

*“These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.”—MATTHEW XXV. 46.*

NO beings like us, possessed of immortal souls, destined to live throughout the countless ages of eternity, and who can enjoy this present state of existence but a very short time, it is a question of vast and vital importance what our future state shall be; whether we are destined to enjoy a state of eternal bliss, or whether there is a possibility of failing to secure that condition. There are many who deny the doctrine of future punishment, simply because it is not in their estimation proved to a demonstration, and placed beyond a doubt. I would ask if this mode of arriving at a conclusion is one becoming rational beings? Is this the way in which we act in mere worldly affairs?

Should a mariner, voyaging over an unknown sea, hear a report that the waters of that sea were obstructed with numerous rocks, reefs and shoals, on which a large proportion of the vessels navigating it were wrecked, their crews, cargoes and passengers lost, would he wait till the existence

of those obstructions was proved beyond the possibility of a doubt before he would use any precaution to prevent such a catastrophe? Would he not, if a prudent man, use every means in his power to gain information on the subject? And if he believed that there was one chance in a thousand of the report being true, he would seek to avoid those dangerous waters. If a chart were put into his hands which would not only show the dangers, but point out a straight and narrow channel by which he might avoid them, how carefully he would examine his chart!—how cautiously he would steer through the narrow passage which he was informed would lead him in safety into the harbour whither he was bound! The question would not be, “Is there a possibility of the report being false?” but “Is there a possibility of its being true?” Were we to act with similar prudence in spiritual things, the question would not be, “Is there a possibility of the doctrine of future punishment being false?” but “Is there a possibility of its being true?” And if there is the most remote possibility of its being true, it becomes us, as rational, intelligent beings, to give the subject our earnest, candid consideration.

It is a remarkable fact, that in what is confessedly the most important question in the world, we are satisfied with the smallest amount of evidence. On evidence which would not at all be satisfactory in worldly affairs, we place our hopes of eternal happiness. The everlasting punishment of the wicked is a subject so dreadful and appalling that few can approach it and contemplate it with a steady eye. He who attempts to describe it, unless absolutely assured of his own salvation, knows not but he is pronouncing his own doom, or, at the very best, that of some of his near and dear friends, relatives and neighbours.

But as the doctrine holds such a prominent place in the Scriptures—as the word of God abounds with threatenings as well as promises—as our fears are appealed to as well as our hopes, it is no mark of wisdom to close our eyes to this fact, and act like the ostrich of the desert, which, when pursued and in danger of being taken, hides its head and

quietly submits to its captors. We should, on the contrary, give this subject our most serious attention.

In treating this subject, I shall first endeavour to prove that there is such a thing as future punishment; second, that the punishment is eternal.

First. It is alleged by Universalists that it is inconsistent with the character of a purely benevolent Being to inflict eternal punishment on beings of His own creation for any sins which they may commit in this short life. If we were to determine, *a priori*, what conduct the benevolence of God would prompt Him to pursue, we would conclude, without hesitation, that an infinitely benevolent Being would produce nothing but the highest state of enjoyment—that every creature of His creation would be perfectly holy and happy. But very different from this scheme is the actual state of things. Sin has reigned from the very beginning; and sorrow and suffering, the consequences of sin, are as widespread as the human race. What is all history but a record of the crimes, wrongs and sufferings of the human race; of the wrongs and injuries which one part of the human family has inflicted upon another; of the truth of the saying of the poet, “Man’s inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn?” Who that has seen the horrors of a battlefield, as many in this congregation must have done, can be otherwise than painfully impressed with the vast amount of both natural and moral evil in the world? Who that has seen those numerous engines of destruction ranged in order, and for hours together belching and thundering forth their leaden rain and iron hail, scattering death, destruction and human misery in every conceivable form broadcast in terrific profusion, sending innumerable pangs to the hearts of thousands of widows and orphans throughout the land; the air rent as if with the roar of artillery, mingled with the shrieks of the wounded, the groans of the dying, the oaths, blasphemies, shoutings and jestings of the combatants, but must be convinced that sin, sorrow and suffering prevail to an alarming extent? Who that has sat by the couch of a

sick, suffering infant, has seen its plaintive eyes upturned for help, has heard its feeble moans and cries, while the mother could only answer with her tears—has seen the frail form gradually wasting away, till at last it finds relief from its sufferings in death, but must see that pain and suffering prevail to a fearful extent even where there is no actual sin? Now, these are stern realities which meet us at every turn. How are they to be accounted for? Do they accord any better with the scheme of the Universalist than with our own? The only rational explanation which can be given is that given by the apostle, that “sin has come into the world, and death by sin.” The whole constitution of things by which we are surrounded is a standing testimony of God’s hatred against sin. Throughout all the Divine administration, as far as we can trace it, every violation of a Divine law, whether natural or moral, is followed by punishment. Every violation of a physical law, whether by excessive eating or drinking, or over-work, brings its pains and its penalties in the form of disease, suffering and premature death. All the vices and irregularities of youth, though long indulged in with impunity, invariably bring their punishment in after-life, sometimes in extreme old age. The long delay which sometimes takes place before sin is visited with punishment, should suggest the probability of punishment after death, and prepare the mind for the reception of the doctrine of future punishment. Indeed, it is a strong presumption in favour of such a doctrine.

We likewise find that every violation of a moral law brings its punishment. Every indulgence of any of the malevolent passions, whether anger, envy or revenge, brings its punishment in the form of shame, remorse and unhappiness. The word “passion” itself is highly suggestive. It is derived from a word which means “to suffer;” hence to be in a passion is to be in a state of suffering. It is impossible to see a man in a violent paroxysm of rage without feeling that he is in a state of suffering. To use an expression frequently used by Universalists, “He may be

said to carry a hell in his own bosom." Let us suppose a whole community under the influence of those passions, altogether removed from every ameliorating and hallowed influence, one goading on another to greater rage and frenzy, and we have a state of things which may well be called a hell. It is not necessary to suppose any vindictiveness on God's part in dealing with sinners. We need not imagine Him to be contriving modes of inflicting pain upon them. It is only necessary to permit the sinner to reap the fruit of his own ways. This, according to Universalists' own showing, is hell, and it is sufficiently dreadful. If every violation of the laws of God, whether physical, mental or moral, brings its punishment—and this is as clearly discernible throughout all the Divine administration in this life as if God should write it with His finger in the sky in letters of fire, or proclaim it in thunder tones by a voice from heaven—are we to believe that God's government will be administered on a different system in the future state, and that, instead of punishing sin as He does in this life, He will in the future life reward it with His approbation—that He will cease to make any difference between the righteous and the wicked? Shall he who has spent his whole life in suffering for righteousness' sake, and he who has spent it in inflicting suffering, be placed on a level in the future state? Shall the bloody Nero and the martyr Stephen be rewarded alike with crowns of glory in the world of bliss? Yet this is Universalism.

It is urged by Universalists that the wicked may change in a future state, or, in other words, the state of probation extends beyond the grave; and that all the temptations to which we are exposed in this life being removed, the wicked may then forsake their sins and turn to God. There is not a hint of such a doctrine in the Scriptures, and all analogy is against it. Evil habits, the longer indulged, are the more difficult to amend. In old age, when the whole being has become thoroughly infected and invested with sin, a change becomes to all human appearance impossible. Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then

can they who have learned to do evil learn to do well? The teaching of the Scriptures, confirmed by our own experience and observation, is, that the paths of the righteous and of the wicked, which separate from each other at conversion, continue to diverge through life. The path of the righteous, in proportion as he grows in grace, continues to shine brighter and brighter unto the perfect day; while the path of the wicked, as he advances in wickedness, grows darker and darker, till his sun sets in eternal night. When the curtain of death drops, the doom of both is unalterably fixed. That gulf which has been widening through life becomes impassable at death. As we are taught in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, they who would pass from the one side to the other are not able. Were it otherwise—were it so that they who inherit the doom of the wicked could pass over and enjoy the state of the righteous, why may not the righteous fall from their happy state and inherit the doom of the wicked? If the state of the wicked is not fixed and permanent, what security have we that the state of the righteous is unalterably fixed? If the state of probation extends beyond the grave, why will it not apply to the righteous as well as the wicked? If Universalism removes the fears of the wicked, it likewise cuts off the hopes of the righteous. The very condition of probation implies a possibility of failure. A failure to secure happiness is misery. An objection, therefore, against future punishment applies with equal force to the whole dispensation in which we are placed. But can we see no benevolent object in the infliction of pain in the natural world? If violations of the physical laws were attended with no pain; if we could cut and mangle our flesh or fracture our limbs with impunity; if we could labour incessantly without being warned by a feeling of pain and fatigue that our bodily strength is overtaxed, a large proportion of the human family would, during the inexperience of childhood and the buoyancy of youth, break down or wear out their constitutions, and few, if any, would ever arrive at the age of maturity. The pain, remorse and unhappiness

attendant on the indulgence of the malevolent passions, whether anger, envy or revenge, go far to deter from similar violations; and for aught we can see, the future punishment of the wicked may have the same effect. The knowledge that a life of sin unrepented of will be followed by an eternity of suffering may, and doubtless will, be the means of deterring many from continuing in the broad road which leads to death, and of turning them into the paths of righteousness, and thus the aggregate amount of happiness in the universe may be largely increased by this apparent severity; so that the punishment of the wicked may be traced to the benevolence of God. The judicious parent who exercises a wholesome discipline in his family, and restrains them by occasional severity from the ways of sin and folly, largely increases their happiness by this prudent conduct; while, on the other hand, an indulgent father, who, through a mistaken kindness neglects to exercise a proper discipline, and allows his children to follow the bent of their own inclinations, permits those seeds to grow which will bear a rich harvest of sorrow and suffering in after-life. It is doubtless the same in the jurisprudence of heaven. Though in the higher plane of Christian life love is the prevailing motive, yet few have ever been brought to repentance without being, to some extent at least, influenced by fear of punishment.

We will now proceed to examine some of the arguments drawn from the Scriptures in favour of Universalism. The first to which our attention was directed was from the case of Cain. It was argued that because God did not punish Cain with death, but, on the contrary, hedged him about with His providence, and forbade all his fellow-men, under a severe penalty, from injuring him, therefore God is too benevolent to punish sin. Let us examine the Divine record on the subject: "And now art thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand; when thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield to thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the

earth. And Cain said unto the Lord, My punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold, Thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth; and from Thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that everyone that findeth me shall slay me. And the Lord said unto him, Therefore whosoever shall slay Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest anyone finding him should kill him." Our Universalist friend said nothing about the curse pronounced against Cain. If he thinks it a trifling matter, Cain did not think so. He claimed that his punishment was greater than he could bear; that he was hidden from the face of God. As God is the author and fountain of happiness, to enjoy the presence of God—as Cain evidently did, to some extent at least, up to this time—is happiness. To be banished from God is misery. This was the curse inflicted upon Cain, and who can tell the extent of the curse of God? The fact of God forbidding all his fellow-creatures from injuring him, simply shows that God took his case into His own hands. He said in Cain's case, "Vengeance is mine; I will repay. Whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken upon him sevenfold." If death is the greatest punishment which can be inflicted on a human being, as Universalists argue, when and where is this punishment sevenfold greater than death to be inflicted? And let us observe, that this punishment seven times greater than death was to be inflicted for a crime which dwindles into insignificance compared with that of Cain. It is difficult to see how this can be explained in any other way than by admitting punishment after death. The next argument was from the expression of Jacob, "I will go down into the grave unto my son, mourning." As the Hebrew word Sheol is in other parts of the Bible translated "hell," the conclusion is at once arrived at that hell and the grave are synonymous terms. Hence, hell, as we understand it, has no existence. Our Universalist friend has correctly rendered the Hebrew word Sheol by the Greek word Hades. As a proof of the correctness of



his interpretation, I would remark, that of the sixty-three cases in which the word is translated into the Septuagint, it is translated sixty times by the Greek word Hades, twice by the word which means death, once by a word which means a pit. As the two words are so nearly equivalent, I will dismiss the Hebrew word Sheol, and proceed at once to the consideration of the Greek word Hades. The word Hades is compounded of two Greek words, viz., Alpha privitive, signifying not, or against; and Eido, I see. It means, therefore, not seeing; or the land of darkness, or the invisible world. This is an idea not unfrequently attached to the state of the departed by ourselves. We speak frequently of the invisible world, of the chambers of the dead, of the house appointed for all living, of the world of spirits. These expressions correspond very nearly in meaning with the word Hades. When the whole man, both soul and body, was spoken of, the Greeks used the word Hades when speaking of his future state. When speaking of the soul and body separately, Hades was the word used to denote the abode of the soul, but never of the body. There are two other words which were used when speaking of the receptacle of the body. The word used by Sophocles, Euripides, Homer and other Greek writers, when speaking of the final resting-place of the body, was Tumbos, the word from which our English word "tomb" is derived. The word used in the New Testament, when speaking of the grave of Lazarus and of our Saviour, was Mnaemion, the root of our English word "remember,"—suggested, in all probability, by the pillar or headstone on which the inscription was written, called the stone of remembrance, but in no case do we find the word Hades used in this sense. It was invariably used in describing the abode of the soul. Homer, in his celebrated poem called the "Iliad," speaks of the souls of his heroes being in Hades, while their bodies were on the surface of the ground, a prey to dogs and unclean birds. This is a decisive proof that by the word Hades the Greeks did not mean grave. Hades was believed by the Greeks to be divided into two parts—Elysium, the abode of the

blest; and Tarteras, the abode of the wicked. In Revelation xx. 14, we read of death and hell, or Hades, being cast into the lake which burns with fire and brimstone. Our Universalist friend quoted this text, and with an air of triumph asked, "Where is your hell now? It is all burnt up." If this text proves anything, it proves too much for Universalists. As Hades comprises the Greek heaven as well as their hell, it proves the destruction of one as well as of the other. But why did he not explain what is meant by the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone? Why did he stop short at that point? Could he be in the position of a gentleman I once heard engaged in a discussion? He read an extract from a certain author. When he stopped reading, his opponent asked him to read a little further in order to give the full meaning of the author. He answered, "I have read enough to suit my purpose; you may read the rest." Had our Universalist friend read enough to answer his purpose? If he has read enough to answer his purpose, he has not read enough to answer the ends of truth. The cause of truth demands that more be said. Hear the Apostle John on the subject: "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their portion in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone."—Rev. xxi. 8. When this dispensation is ended; when this grand drama of which this world is the scene is brought to a close; when the stage on which it is acted is taken down; when all the furniture, drapery and embellishments, the necessary appendages of the establishment, are folded up, and either destroyed or applied to other uses; when the time comes so eloquently described by the Apostle Peter (2 Peter iii. 10), "in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and all the works which are therein shall be burnt up;" when there are no more births, there will be no more deaths; hence there will be no more necessity for receptacles for the dead. Hades or hell, with all the appendages of this dis-

pen- sation which are not necessary in the new dispensation, shall be destroyed by being cast into the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death. The next argument to which our attention was directed was from the original meaning of the word "hell." He informed us that it is derived from the Saxon, and meant originally a covering or roof; that the ancient Saxons sometimes spoke of helling a house when they meant putting on a roof. Covering a grave was called helling it. At a later period it began to be used to mean the grave. Thus far he is right. But is he not aware that with the progress of ideas words change their meaning? When new ideas are introduced, it is plain that new words must be introduced to be vehicles for the new ideas, or old words must be used with new meanings. With the influx of new ideas consequent upon the introduction of Christianity arose the necessity of meeting the demand for words to convey those new ideas. Many old words were used for this purpose, and in time their original meanings were lost. This was the case with the words Heaven and Hell, and to some extent with the word Hades. It is a little remarkable that Universalists should claim to be in advance of all other denominations, and at the same time go back to our barbarous ancestors for the meaning of words in use at the present day. Because our pagan ancestors, who had never learned Christianity, attached a different meaning to the word Hell from that which Christianity has taught us to attach to it, are we to come to the conclusion that the teaching of Jesus with regard to future punishment is false? Because the word Heaven is derived from a Saxon word which means the higher regions of the air, are we to come to the conclusion that there is no heaven beyond the atmosphere which surrounds this earth? Because the ancient Romans, by their word Cœlus, translated Heaven, meant the hollow vault or sky over our heads, must we believe that there is no heaven beyond the line which bounds our view? Because the Greeks derived their word which we usually translate Heaven from the same root as the word

“mountain,” and believed Mount Olympus to be the residence of their gods, the throne of Jupiter, the king of their gods, occupying the loftiest peak, are we to believe that there is no heaven higher than Mount Olympus? These would be the legitimate results of the arguments laid before us. Again, in Matthew xvi. 26: “For what shall it profit a man if he should gain the whole world and lose his own soul?” we are informed that the word “soul” should have been translated “life.” The word *Psucha*, translated “soul,” is derived from a word which means to “breathe.” The word is a comment on Gen. ii. 7, “He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.” It means the vital principle, or soul, considered apart from the body. Losing the soul, or vital principle, means something widely different from what we mean by losing the life. In its general acceptation, losing the life means a separation of soul and body, and not the loss of the soul; but, on the contrary, in the case of the righteous, it is an immense gain to the soul. The change proposed by our Universalist friend would be simply to deny the existence of a future state.

We come now to the consideration of the word *Gehenna*, which was treated at considerable length in the discourses to which we have listened. I have great pleasure in endorsing the definition given by our Universalist friend. He very correctly explained it to mean the Valley of the Son of Hinnom. The quotation which he read from the prophecy of Jeremiah, showing the fearful abominations wrought there, were very well selected and appropriate; but he neglected to inform us that in a later stage of the history of that city and nation, that valley was used as a receptacle for all the filth, refuse and rubbish of the city. Fire was kept continually burning to consume all this rubbish. Everything which by its decay could injure the health of the city was brought here and consumed. The penalty of death was incurred by those who had charge of this fire, if they ever permitted it to go out. Now, as things on earth are figures of things in heaven, the earthly Canaan was a type of the heavenly. Jerusalem in

the land of Palestine was a type of the New Jerusalem which cometh down from God out of heaven; and the Gehenna which was appended to the city of Jerusalem, into which was cast all the filth, refuse and everything which could be offensive or injurious to the inhabitants, is a type of the spiritual Gehenna into which is cast everything that hurts or offends, or can mar the peace, harmony and happiness of the New Jerusalem. As the object of the fires of Gehenna was to promote the health and happiness of the city by consuming that which would be offensive, so the spiritual has for its object to purge the New Jerusalem of everything which can mar the happiness of its inhabitants. It will be seen, therefore, that the future punishment of the wicked is prompted by benevolence on God's part. If the wicked, with all their unhallowed passions, were permitted to enter those blessed mansions, they would mar its peace and happiness. It would cease to be heaven. As the fires of Gehenna were kept continually burning, and were of equal duration with the city of Jerusalem, so the spiritual Gehenna will be of equal duration with the heavenly Jerusalem. If heaven is eternal, therefore hell must be likewise eternal. I now enter upon the second head of my discourse.

The question hinges on the interpretation of the Greek word *Aion*. Universalists claim that it is not correctly translated in our Bible. It means duration of time; a period of time; sometimes it means world, dispensation, generation. Age, or world, is the meaning given to it by Universalists. All lexicographers worthy of the name agree that it means duration as long as the surrounding circumstances permit. Unless limited by some circumstance by which it is connected, it means eternal. Universalists claim that unless some connected circumstance shows that it means eternal, it means limited duration. This is the point at issue between us. The only way to learn the meaning of words is to ascertain the ideas which those using them intended to convey. When the Greeks wished to convey the idea contained in our word "time," they used the word *Chronos*, from

which our word chronology is derived. For "age" they used the word *Ælikia*; for "world," *Kosmos*; for "generation," *Genea*. When *Aion* was used for any of those words, it was used out of its ordinary acceptation. If the Greeks had any idea of eternal duration, it must have been in connection with their gods. The epithet applied by Homer to the gods, invariably translated "immortal" or "everlasting," is a derivative of *Aion*. The Scotch word "aye," found in Rouse's version of the Psalms, is likewise derived from this word. It invariably means "everlasting." Out of the ninety-four places in which *Aion* is used in the New Testament, sixty-six without doubt mean "endless duration." The remaining number are indefinite. The word *Aionos*, a derivative of *Aion*, is used sixty-four times in the New Testament. In fifty-one out of that number it is used in speaking of the happiness of the righteous, seven in describing the punishment of the wicked, and two in speaking of God and His glory. The remaining four are of a miscellaneous character. In the fifty-three cases in which it is used in speaking of God and His glory, and the happiness of the righteous, none will deny that it means "everlasting." Is there any good reason why we should give the word a different meaning when it is used in describing the punishment of the wicked? But Universalists argue that because punishment is necessarily finite, that this adjective, when used to qualify it, must mean finite duration. The question under discussion is the duration of punishment, and they assume it to be finite without proof. This mode of argument is called by logicians *petitio principii*, or begging the question. When speaking of the happiness of the righteous, they use the adjective to qualify the noun. When speaking of the punishment of the wicked, they use the noun to qualify the adjective. Their system of grammar, you will observe, is as flexible as their system of religion.

The phrase "*Eis tas aionas ton aionon*," translated "for ever and ever," is used eighteen times in the New Testament. Fifteen times out of that number it is used in

describing the glories and perfections of God; once in describing the happiness of the righteous; once of the punishment of the devil, the beast and the false prophet; and once of the punishment of the finally impenitent, in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone. You will see that the evidence is eight times as strong that God and the happiness of His saints is not eternal, as that the punishment of the wicked is not eternal. Here I would remark that the phrase translated "for ever and ever" is a very strong one.

As I have already remarked, the Greeks used an adjective derived from Aion when speaking of the duration of their gods. Our Universalist friend very justly remarked that the derivative is never stronger and generally of less force than the word from which it is derived. Here we have not only the stronger term used, but put in the plural and squared when describing the punishment of the wicked. No stronger expression can be found in the Greek language, or, as far as I am aware, in any other language, than is here used to express the duration of the punishment of the wicked. To what conclusions are we then brought from our brief consideration of this subject? If the punishment of the wicked is not eternal, the happiness of the righteous is not eternal. If Universalism be true, neither heaven, the throne of God, nor the great Jehovah can be eternal, as the same word is used in describing the duration of them all. If Universalism be true, justice ceases to be an attribute of Jehovah, as He ceases to make any distinction between the righteous and the wicked. It is said that when Romulus, the first king of Rome, had become so tyrannical and cruel that his subjects could no longer tolerate him, they put him to death, then deified him, believing that though too wicked to live on earth he was fit to reign in heaven. According to Universalist doctrines, the Divine administration would be similar. When men become too wicked to live on earth, He admits them into His presence to live with him forever in heaven. God is thus robbed of some of His essential attributes, and without those attributes His intelligent

creatures cannot adore and worship as God. If we adopt such views, what barrier is there between us and Atheism? We are far from believing that Universalists generally, or any great proportion of them, can be justly charged with holding Atheistical opinions; but many, indeed most minds are so constituted that they cannot adopt such opinions and stop short of the results we have pointed out. Universalism is the high road to Atheism. The system of Christianity has been well compared to an arch. If one stone be removed out of it the whole structure must fall. Remove this doctrine from the Christian system and it must fall.

In conclusion, I would earnestly entreat this congregation, especially the young, to give the subject your earnest, prayerful consideration. Seek not, I beseech you, to make a league with death and a covenant with hell, "For, saith the Lord, your league with death shall not stand, and your covenant with hell shall be disannulled." Though Universalism can give no solid ground on which to build our hopes of salvation, let us rejoice that Christ has opened up a way of escape from that doom which, unless God is mocking us with empty threats, awaits the finally impenitent. Rejoice, therefore, to know that though the wicked shall go into everlasting punishment, the righteous, and each of you may be in that number, shall go into life eternal.







RTheol  
M

200051

Author ..... McNaughton, D.  
Title ..... Laura Clarence: a treatise on baptism.

NAME OF BORROWER.

University of Toronto  
Library

DO NOT  
REMOVE  
THE  
CARD  
FROM  
THIS  
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket  
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"  
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

*Handwritten initials*

