

spiritual enjoyment!—the doctrine is exclusive and cruel, and represents the character of the Eternal in an unlovely light, and although the Messiah said that the cup represented his blood shed for remission of sins, it is not certain that *eis* means 'for' or 'in order to'; Greek prepositions have many meanings, and it is very unsafe to build an important doctrine, and one opposed to reason too, upon a single preposition! And the other passages that say 'without the shedding of blood there is no remission,' that 'Christ bore our sins in his own body on the tree,' that 'we have redemption through his blood, even the remission of sins,' &c., must be interpreted in harmony with enlightened reason, and other portions of the divine record that represent Jehovah as merciful and willing to bestow his salvation upon those who are honest, upright, and sincere." To this kind of reasoning I have also listened. Now gentlemen my reply to baptist reasoning and scripture interpretation, shall be the same that yours should be to those who leave out of the remedial system the atonement, the death of Christ as a sin offering.

To such theologians you would say, from the day man sinned against his God, he has not been permitted to approach him only through a sin offering. The word of the Lord plainly and unambiguously asserts that "Christ died for our sins," "that he bore our sins in his body," that he was made a 'sin offering for us.' You would say to him, "Sir, if you don't believe these plain declarations of the divine record, you don't believe the bible; you are an infidel!!" But O man who art thou that thus condemnest! Do you not also say I do not believe that baptism is for remission of sins. I do not hold that the penitent believer is saved from any thing in immersion. I believe remission of sins is independent of any external act. I ask again is not your want of faith in the one case, just as unreasonable as those whom you denounce as unevangelical? Why are they denounced as infidel who deny the atonement? Because they deny the plain declarations of God's word. Are there any passages in reference to the sacrificial death of Christ plainer and more pointed than those adduced in a former paper, and above referred to, namely, "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." "Repent and be baptized for remission." "Arise and be baptized, and wash away your sins." "As many of you as have been baptized *into* Christ have put on Christ." "The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us." Could there be testimony more direct, more positive in favor of baptism in order to the enjoyment of remission of sins, and in opposition to your experiences, and your practical reasoning. Gentlemen, to which will you bow, your own reasoning, or the word of God!! Let me again remind you, with all due deference to your positions in society, that the charge of infidelity can be brought home in full force to any man who says, "I do not believe that baptism is for remission of sins." The man who will change, mutilate, or explain away one text of scripture to subserve a purpose, will soon so blunt his conscience as that he can interpret any other in the same way. When, therefore, you preach from Acts ii. 38, and attempt to make it say something different from what appears on the face of it, do remember that the first passages quoted in this letter, both in the original and in the translation, are *verbatim*. The Lord taught that his blood *was* shed