

more probable that he sprinkled or poured water on the affected part and was thus cleansed? Or take another example still more to our purpose, in Dan. iv. 83. and v. 21. We read that Nebuchadnezzar was "wet with the dew of Heaven." Now in each of these cases the Septuagint version says he was baptized, now will the Anabaptists pretend to say that he was dipped in the dew? Did not the dew fall on him? I might, did time allow, produce other examples, but these are sufficient for our purpose. We turn now to a remarkable passage in the Apocrypha, written in Greek, in Eccles. xxxiv. 25. We read "He that washeth himself after the touching of a dead body, if he touch it again, what avail eth the washing." In the first clause the Septuagint reads "He that baptizeth himself" etc. Now what was the Jewish law in regard to those who had touched a dead body; were they immersed? Turn to Numbers xix. 18, and you will find that they were to be sprinkled seven times by the priest, and this sprinkling is called by the writer of the book Ecclesiasticus, a baptism. But let us proceed to the New Testament, and note a few passages in it where it is evident the word cannot be translated dip, but means wash, referring to the act of cleaning and not to the mode by which the cleansing is effected.

The first passage to which I would draw your attention, is in Mark vii. 3-4., "For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands off eat not, holding the tradition of the elders, and when they come from the market, except they wash (baptize) they eat not, and many other things there be which they have received to hold as the washing (baptism) of cup and pots, brazen vessels and of tables."

Now are we to suppose that the Pharisees every time they came from the market totally immersed themselves. This seems out of all character. The mode of washing the hands in the East is to hold them over a basin while the attendant pours water over them.

Cups and pots might be dipped, but it is probable that brazen vessels or tables or beds as the margin reads, were; these beds were the long matted couches on which several persons sat or rather reclined, while they took their meals, and it is hardly probable that they were dipped, or that every house contained a tank large enough to dip them. The next passage is St. Luke xi. 37, "he marvelled that he had not first washed (baptized) before dinner." In the East it is usual to wash the hands and feet before a meal, but not to immerse the whole body. Here is another case where baptism cannot mean total immersion.

The last passage I shall quote (not that I have quoted all that might be adduced, for that would have led me to a prolixity which our limits will not allow) is from St. Paul's 1st Epistle to Cor. x. 1-2, "All baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Now were the Israelites dipped in the Red Sea? this was rather the fate of the Egyptians. The Israelites went through on dry land, and if the water touched them at all it was simply the spray that sprinkled them. Neither were they dipped in the cloud. Here too is a case of infant baptism, they were "all" men, women and children baptized.

But leaving this part of our subject we turn now to the last and most difficult part of our subject, viz.: The grace annexed to and accompanying the Sacrament of Baptism.

I say advisedly the most difficult part of our subject, not that there is any real difficulty to those who are content to abide by simple and plain teaching of the word of God. The difficulty lies in convincing the Anabaptists, and all other dissenters, who

when they come to a subject like this, notwithstanding their professed reverence for scripture, cast its teachings on one side and ask such questions as "What good can baptism do?" "What benefit can there be in a little water?" and the like, and coming with the foregone conclusion that it can do none in the face of the clear and plain declarations of scripture, they ridicule the sacrament of Christ's own appointment, or treat it as a mere empty form without any spiritual grace annexed to it.

Before we proceed further we will in a few words refute the teaching of the Anabaptists on this point, and then proceed to the general consideration of the subject. The doctrine of the Anabaptists is, That none are to be baptized, but those who are already regenerated, none but those who are true believers, and known to be such to us. But of what use I ask, is the sign when we have the substance? Of what use is it for them to put their seal to an instrument after they have fulfilled the conditions of it. "Seals are not," says Bishop Beveridge, "administered or annexed to any covenant because the conditions are fulfilled or performed, but rather that they may be performed." If this view be correct, then none can ever be baptized, because none but God can read the heart, and none but he can know whether those who profess to believe are in reality believers or only hypocrites. Thus on the Baptist hypothesis Baptism is first unnecessary and gives no grace, and secondly, it is impossible because none can read the heart but God.

(To be continued.)

HUSBANDS AND WIVES.

The clever and rather cynical author of the paper, "Virginibus Puerisque," in this month's *Cornhill*, expressed in a refined way a feeling which thirty years ago found constant expression in literature, but has more recently passed into oblivion. He advises everybody to marry, and even tries, like Mrs. Hannah More—whom, nevertheless, he would despise as much as he does a teetotaler—to instruct his readers whom it is best to marry; but all through his pleasant sentences one detects a faint but perceptible contempt for the "domestic man." The notion of to-day, certainly amongst women, and we should have said among men, is precisely the opposite of the one in *Cornhill*,—that it is not the man of petty interests and trivial occupations who is the "domestic man," that is, the man with whom an average woman can live happily, but the man of keen interests and absorbing pursuits, to whom home and the wife and the children and the closing out of external pressure bring the sense of rest. Not one woman in fifty, unless she is for some reason—such as fortune, rank, or beauty—a great "catch," has anything like a real power of selection among admirers; and even when she has, she often gives it away, in obedience to a passing, possibly sensible, possibly blundering, fancy that she has found an ideal. Let the woman's first requisite be a man whose home will be to him a rest, and the man's first object be a woman who can make home restful. It is the man with many interests, with engrossing occupations, with plenty of people to fight, with a struggle to maintain against the world, who is the really domestic man, in the wife's sense, who enjoys home, who is tempted to make a friend of his wife, who relishes prattle, who feels, in the small circle where nobody is above him and nobody unsympathetic with him, as if he were in a heaven of ease and reparation. The drawback of home life, its contained possibilities of insipidity, sameness, and consequent weariness, is never present to such a man. He is no

more bored with home than with sleep! He no more tires of his wife than of his own lighter moods. He is no more plagued with his children than with his own happy thoughts. The worry and the sameness and the weariness are all outside, and home no more insipid than his berth to a sailor, or his tent to a soldier on active service. He gets from the home just the change, the fillip, the pleasant stimulus which the idle man receives from the society he happens to enjoy. There is not much champagne in life, anyhow, but for the active man most of the little is at home.

But then it must be home, and that is just the point where the rule we have laid down for women begins to operate for men also. They at least have the power of selection, and they would, if they were wise—which, as a rule, they are not—use it to select the women who can make home attractively restful. As we should say to women who wish for domestic happiness, never marry a lounge, a pleasure-seeker, or a fribble; so we should say to men with the same yearning, never marry a fool of any sort or kind. There is no burden on earth like a foolish woman tied to a competent man: unable to be his sweetheart, because she cannot help dreading him; unable to be his confidant because she cannot understand him; unable to be his friend, because she cannot sympathize even with his ordinary thoughts. No beauty, no sweetness—though fools are never sweet when things go wrong, or they have to "put up with" anything—no amount of that household capacity which many men so absurdly overrate—as if any able woman could not learn to manage household in three months—can compensate for the absence of clear thought, quick comprehension, ability to follow and credit or discredit a statement of fact, competence to understand what the husband is. This is the rock on which thousands of the marrying men of this day split. They have somewhere in their heads a secret belief that intelligence and the domestic virtues cannot go together; that a wife who can feel intellectual interests will never be content to stay at home and look after the children; that a clever woman will, above all, be incapable of worshipping themselves. There never was a theory more unreasonable, more mischievous, or more influential. It is, we imagine, utterly hopeless to attack it in print, for men read the answers, assent to them with one side of their heads, and then reject them with the other: but they may rely on it that it is false; that there is more capacity of affection, of domesticity, and of self-sacrifice in the able than the foolish; that cultivation diminishes selfishness, and that it is the ignorant who are most dependent on external circumstances for the continuous geniality of character. It is not the stupid or the blank minds which make allowances either for defects or idiosyncrasies, and the sweet reasonableness which they are seeking; though they do not know it, is given to the silly.—*Spectator*.

A DWARF Negroid people have been discovered in New Guinea, who may be classed with the Bushmen and Akka of Africa.

PROFESSOR CHILDERS died July 25th. He was the author of a Pali dictionary, a work of great eminence. It is impossible, says a competent judge, to realize how great the loss has been to science. To an unusually powerful memory, and penetrating intellect, he united an indomitable energy, a single-handed devotedness to truth, and an unusual earnestness in the cause of research. He has done much to bring English scholars acquainted with the religious literature of Buddhism.