

ped Dianna the church of God, for it is designated the *ecclesia*, though in the English Testament this fact is not seen, as the translators have put it, "And when he had thus spoken he dismissed the assembly." In the same chapter that *lawful convocation*, to which the Town clerk intimated there should be committed, is expressed by the same word. A people then called out from others for any purpose is a church in the general sense of the word *ecclesia* but the church of God, of Christ of the First-born, is a very different church, and is never said to have existed till after Jesus, its chief corner stone had been laid in the tomb. He came to lay its foundation, not to build one already laid. His church was future when he came—his words were, "I will build my church." Judaism did not possess, and was never intended to possess, a church in the New Testament acceptance of of the term—a fact which our State-church friends always manage to forget. With the Jews and with Pagan nations the religious and political commonwealths were identical. That a society should exist in an exclusively religious interest was incompatible with every idea of the Jewish theocracy, and would not have been tolerated for a single hour. Their system recognized no distinction between the men of the commonwealth and the true-hearted who worshipped God in a spirit of holiness. As then the church did not exist in the days of Moses and the Prophets, and the Jewish children were not in it, the argument falls to pieces."

"Baptism," said Mr. C., "we were always taught, came into the room of circumcision, and it was argued that, as infants were circumcised they should be baptized. This I felt to be appropriate."

"Felt to be appropriate! Do you settle a question of this sort by feeling?" responded Mr. Bell.

"No, Sir—not when I deal with it as a logician. But I have told you that I have not been previously induced to examine the question. I am now more than ever disposed to do so and therefore I give out what I have held under the influence of early teaching, and in consciousness of fitness and not as the result of logical enquiry. I have said that I did not want to be disturbed, neither do I now desire to get into trouble by discovering that infants are not proper subjects for baptism. I would much rather hold to my present practice but I am here, and I have no intention to run away from the truth, and still less to shuffle it out of the road. You may therefore deal with my remarks upon circumcision."

"Very well! Let us look at it. Infants were circumcised, therefore they should be baptized, as baptism is in the place of circumcision. This we have fairly to carry out. Infants were to be circumcised at eight days old, therefore infants must be baptized eight days after birth! Then, only male infants were circumcised, therefore only male infants are to be baptized. Again, servants bought with money and captives taken in war were to be circumcised, as property and

without regard to faith, and therefore such servants and war-prisoners, without reference to faith in Jesus, should also be baptized. I am afraid our friend Clearthought will get into trouble over this question, for if he has not to give up infant baptism altogether, he must, upon his own ground, set it aside in regard to females, and he must undertake to baptize certain adults without faith or repentance. But further—in this case, as in the last, the major premise is a falsehood. 'Baptism came in the room of circumcision!' Where is the proof? Where is proof that it came in the room of anything that ever existed in heaven, or on earth, or under the earth? Baptism came into its own place, and came not in the room of anything. The opposite position is pure invention to support a practice which has not one inch of solid ground to rest upon."

"Is not baptism called by Paul 'the circumcision made without hands?' asked Mr. Atkins.

"No, Sir. Baptism is mentioned in the next verse. The circumcision made without hands is that of the heart, which comes in the room of that which was outward in the flesh, and on that very account infants are not its subjects, and so, as the baptism is the burial of those whose hearts are circumcised by the truth, infants are certainly ineligible. But who refers to baptism as a circumcision made without hands! I never yet knew a person baptized without hands. Hands are as much necessary in baptism as in circumcision."

"I regret," observed Mr. Clearthought, "that I have to leave early this evening. Pray extend your charity so far as to give me credit for not running away from the investigation and I will reward your liberality by resuming the subject at our next meeting."

THE EVIDENCE OF FEELING.

A man has purchased a farm and feels much delighted with his new home. He has his deed duly executed and feels well satisfied with his bargain. A neighbor meets him and conveys the unpleasant intelligence that there is a mortgage upon the property which antedates the deed. "Impossible is the response, "I never felt better about anything I did in my life; I am sure, Sir, you are mistaken, for I have no misgivings upon the subject." "Feel right Sir, or feel wrong, I tell you that there is mortgage on your property and you had better see to it." "I feel quite satisfied." "Now be persuaded to consult a lawyer on the Records of the Registry Office," urges his friend, and at last, urges successfully. He goes to a lawyer and lays his case before him in this fashion:—

"If a man buys a farm, pays for it, and gets a good deed, how ought he to feel about it?" "Why," says the lawyer, "he ought to feel well satisfied, contented and happy upon the subject." "Just the way I feel Sir; my title is all right, Sir, I'll give myself no more trouble about it."

E. S.