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## The Disciple of Christ

Is devoted to the furtherance of the Gospel of Chest, and pleads for the union of all be tievers in the Lord Jesus in harmony with His own prayer: recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, and on the basis set forth by he Apostle Paul in the following terms: "I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one bodily and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all." Eph. iv. 1.6.

This paper, while not claiming to be what is styled an "organ," may be taken as fairly representing the people known as Disciples of Christ in this country.

## A Hindi Pundit on Baptism.

In the year 1856 I was stationed in the holy city of Muttra, in the northwest portion of India, and had a learned Brahman to teach me the Hindustan, the vernacular of some sixty million prople in that part of the country. After my lessons in the language, I often spoke to the pundit about the teachings $c$ ! the Lord Jesus as found in our Holy Scriptures. One day I said:-
" Pundit, you see tidal we read your sacred books, in order to find out what: they contain; why will you not do the same with our Scriptures?"

In answer to this he said:
". Vel!, sir, please lend me a copy of your holy book in Hindustani, and I will read it at home at my leisure."
I was very glad to comply with his request, and, as he was a very intelligent man, I hoped the reading of God's Word might be the means of convinceing him of the truth as it is in Jesus.
The Testament I gave him was the translation sanctioned by the British and Foreign Bible Society, in which the word used for baptism was not translated, but transliterated "bap tisma;" and this one word, simple :as d. it may appear, gave the pundit :a strong objection against the integrity of the whole book.

After keeping the book by him for about three months, he one day brought deriecefrom the Greet- 2 , 10 or it was it back. When I asked: him if he tad
read it, and how he liked it, he replied :
"Yes, I have read much of it, and the teachings of Jesus Christ are indeed most beautiful. I have never, sion.
read anything like it in our holy books. and if all that is written gives true and reliable facts, he must have been a wonderful person, and worthy of worship. But," he added, with an air of cynical doubt, "I fear tie book is net trustworthy."
I asked him what reason he had to think so. He immediately replied :
"Why, there are parts of it which you seem afraid to translate into our language."

This took me by surprise, and I asked shat part. He turned to places he had marked, and called my attenion to the word "bapt'sma," and said:
"I read of a man called John, who is said to have been the messenger of Jesus Christ, who went forth to preach and give baptisms to those who revented; and this bap:isma seems to have been the initiative rite into the new religion. But what it can mean I cannot possibly find out; for the word has no affinity to any of our Indian languages. If I dissect the word into three separate portions, then I can make something of it, but a very iridiculous thing indeed. $B a p$ means father; dis means thirty; ma means mother-so it would read a thirty-father-mother! But this, I suppose, is not the meaning; and I can only conclude that it is a word from some other language of which we people of India know nothing. Yet it would appear that it represents some important past of your religion, and that is the one act by which disciples who believe in Jesus are admitted int w the Christian religion. For I find that not only did John practice it, but Jesus Himself tells His followers to give baptisma in all who believe in His name ; and yet you do not tell us in our own language what this means, for the word is utterly strange to us."
I had nor to explain, as best I could, how matters were, and I never in my life felt so ashamed before a heathen controversialist. I told bim the word ryas merely transferred, not.
 derived from the Greek Iapfo or baptuso;
and thavit was thus fransferied because
there was one patty in the Christian church who practised sprinkling of water, and another mich used omer-
"Well", he said, "which of these two parties translated this book?"
"Those who advocate sprinkling."
"Well," said he, " why then did they not put down sprinkling in our language? Why put a Greek word for a ceremony which your Christ commanded in a copy of your holy books for Hindus, who do not know a word of Greek? This is very strange."
And now he gave 2 knowing look, and said, rather sarcastically :
"I suppose the Christian teachers follow our plan. We give in the vulgar tongue for the common people only as much of the holy books as we think, fit ; and when a word comes, the meaning of which we do not wish all to know, we keep it in the dark under the thick veil of the original Sanskrit, which line y is not how. I mas not before aware of the fact that Christians do this also to preserve the power of the priests."
I now took down a copy of the Baptist translation, and showed him that the word was faithfully translated there into doaiki, which ineans to immerse.

This, however, did not remove his suspicions, and he added :
"Suppose you had given this book you lent me to a person who lived miles away in the country, where he could have no one to tell him what it meant; how could he possibly find out the meaning of the word, or the nature of one of your greatest Christian rites? And though he should believe in Christ, how could he obey Him when you hide from us the nature of your ceremony for the admission of disciples to jour church? He concluded by saying, "I have no wish to offend you, sir; but, to be candid, I must confess that this duplicity has quite shaken my -faith in the whole of your holy book, for people who can prove untrue in one word cannot be trusted as true in mar words.; and I find that, after all, the Ethristian teachers are no better than ourselves, tho, for selfish purposes, kept! back a part of the Ward of God from the part of the Ward
common people."

His mind was so poisoned by this that he would never consent io read the Scriptures. And who can tell how many others have in the same taken offense as to the truth of God?

Does not the above suggest some very searching thoughts to every Christian ? Is there not a grave responsibilit resting 0 each one to be thoroughly loyal to the istinct command of Him whom re call Lord?
If, when our Master, Christ, has distinctly ordained that his disciples should be baptized, we obscure His teaching, or treat it as trivial,, or put something else in ts place, which man has invented, but which our Master Himself never enipined, where is our boasted loyalty to our Lord? Where , is our implicit obedience to His will? By our lack of faithfulness, sven in: what may appear a little matter, we may unwittingly put seriousstumbling blocks in the way of others who match us very na:cort!y, and so they also may be hindered.
One of the fiercest denunciations uttered by the "gentle" Saviour was pronuunced by Him against those who taught the "traditions of men" for the "commandments of God." He also added, ' Verily I say unto you, whoso shall break one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, the same shall be called least in the Kingdom of God."
My reader, if you are a believer in Christ, search the New Testament yourself, unbiassed by prevailing fash: ion, and see if Christ has not distinctly made clear His will to all that: are withing to follow His guidance Search
the Scriptures and see af rials not the thing which the Tor come
manded.
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