

the originator of the Christian Church, and His teaching or commands concerning the Holy Spirit and acting them out in life after a matter-of-course manner.

These were the only essentials of Christianity, and all other things were under the simple law of expediency. All then that was essential about initial conversion was the acceptance of Jesus Christ as Lord and Master, in the absolute sense; and all that was essential for continuance in conversion was obedience to King Jesus in His directions concerning the Holy Spirit as supreme guide and teacher for every separate individual.

It is true that Jesus Himself instituted baptism as a formal rite by which this acceptance of Himself should be made public. But evidently the manner of performing the rite was to be determined by the conveniences and surroundings of the occasion. Hence the words of Christ concerning it are as fully kept when a multitude is sprinkled *en masse* by one person, as when an individual is thus dealt with or even plunged into water amidst the singing of psalms and the solemn reading or repeating of many prayers. The spirit of the rite is fully met when he who turns to Christ seals his determination publicly by baptism under any form.

So, too, seemingly, the continued profession of this faith is made public, amongst other things, by the use of the simple rite of breaking bread and tasting wine in the name of Christ. Thus, two as simple acts as can well be conceived of, are connected with the initial act of publicly accepting Jesus Christ as absolute Lord of the life and this continued attitude thereafter.

Now, this is all that can by any ingenuity be connected with the Pentecostal life, as essential in its character, the first two facts mentioned constituting conversion and its continuance—that is, as regards its Godward aspect—and the last two having respect to its manward aspect.

We further remark, with respect to these two acts connected with the attitude of the converted towards men, that any particular forms or ceremonies to be connected with them as essential

or even certainly helpful must be shown to have been distinctly commanded by Christ Himself. But all that His words concerning them can be made to clearly imply is that the nations are to be baptized into the name of the Trinity, and Christians, as often as they partake of bread and wine in His name, celebrate His death.

As far as Scripture utterance is concerned, there is a legitimate doubt concerning the necessity of continuing the rite of baptism amongst *Christian* people in any form; that is, there is no room for dogmatic statement concerning this thing. This, however, does not interfere with the right of any denomination making it one of its institutes or even tests of membership, and according to any formulated method. We say not that tradition may not be sufficient authority for its continuance. We simply here point to a clear, unmistakable fact, viz., that Jesus gave no directions concerning this matter to make it unmistakably clear that He meant that Christian people should perpetuate baptism in after generations. Nor did any of the apostles allude to such statements of Christ, let alone repeat them, after a definite, authoritative manner. But as we remind ourselves that we are touching one of the hottest of the many burning questions which agitate denominational life, with this mere incidental allusion to it, we pass on.

We call then, in this article, special attention to the simplicity of detail surrounding conversion in apostolic days.

HOW ACCOUNT FOR THE DIFFERENCE?

Wherever results are witnessed, it is a legitimate work to search for their causes.

In our first article we discovered that the cause was not the obtainment of better results than the original ones, seeing that the utmost attempted was to approach to them without expecting to overtake them. Who, we ask, has ever heard the claim put forth of exceeding Pentecostal times?

There must, therefore, be in present results some essential quality or factor