

author, but unfeignedly admire his penetrative genius and convincing style of argumentation. Mr. McLean was a theological giant, whose tread made the ground occupied by Dr. Wardlaw, Mr. Glass, and others, to tremble beneath them. Dr. Wardlaw's reasonings about the Abrahamic covenant and infant baptism are scattered to the winds, and Mr. Glass's "dissertation" is completely divested of every claim to the serious attention of Bible readers.

We will not, however, occupy the little space we can spare by remarks of our own, but submit to our readers a few specimens of the work, and these we select, almost at random, from a mass of valuable material:

THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST.

It has been argued, that as baptism in the Holy Ghost is expressed by *pouring him out* on men, therefore, baptism in water, must be performed by *pouring* water on them. But the extraordinary effusion of the Holy Ghost is variously expressed in the Scriptures. It is called *anointing, filling with, giving of, pouring out* of the Holy Ghost, and believers are said to have all been made *to drink* into the Spirit. Now which of all these expressions alludes to the manner of baptism in water? If it be said *pouring* alludes to it, I ask upon what authority is this affirmed? The Scripture does not call this expression *baptizing*, more than the rest. The truth is, all these are but different expressions for the same thing, viz., the giving of the Holy Ghost; but none of them are expressive of the manner of that action called *baptism*, nor so much as allude to it. *Pouring*, in particular, does not allude to the manner of *baptizing*, but to that of *anointing*; see Acts x. 38; 2 Cor. i. 21; 1 John ii. 27, the manner of which was by *pouring*, see Exod. xxix. 7; Matt. xxvi. 7; and it also alludes to the *watering* of fields to make them fruitful, for under this metaphor the effusion of the Spirit is often set forth; see Isa. xlv. 3, 4; xxxii. 15, compared with Heb. vi. 4, 7, 8.

THE MUCH WATER AT ENON, &c.

"His (John's) reason for choosing the latter place (Enon), we are expressly told, was 'because there was much water there,' which could only be necessary for immersion. Some, however, have diminished the waters at Enon into small shallow rivulets, to prevent immersion if possible; and no doubt they would have done the same with Jordan, if they were not more afraid of a sneer, than of wresting the Scriptures; for they would rather turn the whole country into a dry parched wilderness, than suffer John to immerse any. But that we may swell these waters at Enon again to proper depth, let it be noticed that the words, *ludata polla*, or *many waters*, are the same that are used in Rev. i. 15; xiv. 2: xix. 6, which do not signify the purling or murmuring of shallow brooks or rivulets, but

the boisterous roaring of great waters, like those of the sea, for it is compared to the voice of mighty thunderings; and that the land of Canaan was abundantly supplied with *deep waters*, is evident from Deut. viii. 7."

BEGGING THE QUESTION.

In reply to one of our author's pamphlets, Mr. Carter accused him of 'begging the question,' or taking for granted the point of debate. The following was his reply, p. 280:—

"In answer to this charge, I shall state the question, and see which of us has *begged* it. The question or point in dispute, if I mistake not, is this, Whether there were any infants baptized in these houses? I denied there were—1. Because in all the accounts of those houses, there is not a word said of infants or of their baptism; for this I referred to the passages themselves. 2. Because it is affirmed of all that were baptized in those houses, that they believed, rejoiced, &c. This also I rested upon the authority of these accounts, which was the best I could produce. I know nothing, therefore, which I have taken for granted, except it be this, that infants cannot be said to believe, rejoice, &c., and for this I shall only appeal to common sense. It might reasonably be expected that the Pedobaptists, however firmly persuaded of their favourite point upon other grounds, would candidly give up those houses as unserviceable to their cause; but instead of this, they, with much confidence, *beg* one question after another in every step of their argument. They *beg* leave to assert that there were infants in those houses; and—2. They *beg* also to be excused from proving it, thinking they have sufficiently acquitted themselves, when they have put it upon us to prove the negative. Should we tell them there are many houses *without* infants, and that therefore their assertion is at best but uncertain; should we come a little closer to the point, and remind them that the Scripture informs us, *all* in those houses heard the word and believed, which infants were not capable of, and that therefore their assertion is evidently false, they will then—3. *Beg* to have it granted that it was only the parent, not the houses, that believed and rejoiced; or, if that will not do, that the word *all* signifies only the adult *part* of the house, and that the other part consisted of infants. Should we, for argument's sake, grant them the unscriptural supposition, that there were infants in those houses, they have still—4. To *beg* the question as to their baptism. How so? Is it not said expressly, that *all* in those houses were baptized? True, but they have already begged that the word *all* might signify only a *part*, i.e., the adult part of a house, therefore it can conclude for the baptism of none else; so that to make out the baptism of these imaginary infants, they are obliged to

reverse their former position, and to *beg* the" may be comprehended in the word *all*, from which they had before begged to exclude them. In short, when *all* in the houses are said to believe, they restrict it to adults; but when *all* in the *same passage*, and in the very same house, are said to be baptized, they extend it to the infants: Why? Because they take it for granted that there were infants in those houses, and that they were proper subjects of baptism, which is the very point in debate. I am afraid there is something more than *begging the question* in this manner of arguing. It looks too like *handling the word of God deceitfully*."

In conclusion, we trust that our enterprising friend, the publisher, who has brought out these seven volumes at so cheap a rate, will not be allowed to suffer loss; but that the libraries of Christian ministers, and biblical students generally, may be enriched with the works of Archibald McLean; and as there are many *poor* ministers who would be glad, if possible, to possess them, we earnestly recommend our wealthy brethren, for the sake of the truths they love, to help them in this matter.

IS STRICT COMMUNION AN OCCASION OF DIVIDING GOD'S CHILDREN?

We admit the fact, but refuse the blame. We freely admit that there are multitudes of God's dear children unenlightened as to baptism; many of them have never attended to the subject; and others, through the influence of custom and false instruction, have seriously taken up with infant sprinkling in its stead. It is also a fact, that whilst they and we continue in our present sentiments, we must remain divided as to visible church communion. But the question is, Who are to blame? those who observe and stand to the Scripture rule, or they who do not comply with it? And whether should Christians unite in observing Christ's institutions, or in dispensing with them? The very state of the question is a sufficient answer to such as hold the institutions of Christ of indispensable obligation. We are grieved to think that so many of the real children of God are living in the neglect of the very first ordinance of the gospel; we endeavour to hold it forth to them consistently by our example, doctrine, and separate communion: we cordially invite them to fellowship with us in this and all the other institutions of Christ, according to the order in which he has placed them; and we earnestly pray to their Father and ours, that he would dispel their ignorance, remove their prejudices, and subject their consciences to this and every other part of his revealed will; but while they remain in their present mind, we dare not meet them any nearer, nor step over the sacred boundaries which Christ has marked out in his word, in order to give them the right hand