

John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance." There is no *with* in the original, and the word Baptism is in the accusative case, requiring, as it would seem the proposition (*eis*) into, to make it agree with the context. It would then read—"John verily baptized into the baptism of Repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on Him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this they were baptized into (*eis*) the name of the Lord Jesus."

Rom. vi. 3, 4: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into (*eis*) Jesus Christ, were baptized into (*eis*) His death? Therefore we are buried with," or, *along with*, "Him by means of (*dia*) with the genitive) (our) Baptism, into (*eis*) His death."

I Cor. i. 13: "Were ye baptized into (*eis*) the name of Paul." Ver. 15: "Let any should say that I had baptized into (*eis*) my own name." Notice particularly the *into* in this passage—it is not in my own name—viz., by my own authority, but into my own name; that is, making disciples for myself.

I Cor. x. 2: "And were all baptized into (*eis*) Moses in (*en*) the cloud, and in (*en*) the sea; viz., by means of the cloud and the sea."

I Cor. xii. 13: "By," (*en*) viz., "By means of one spirit, we are all baptized into (*eis*) one body."

Gal. iii. 27: "As many as have been baptized into (*eis*) Christ have put on Christ."

From this consideration of the Proposition (*eis*) we see that it is *into* the name of the Trinity, or the name of Christ, or into Christ, that we are baptized. It is nowhere said that that we are baptized, or immersed into (*eis*) water. Give the word Baptizo the meaning which the Baptists claim for it, and we have this truth taught: That in Christian Baptism the person baptized is dipped, or immersed, into (*eis*) Christ. In other words, that he puts on Christ. It is nowhere said in the New Testament Scriptures that he is dipped or immersed into (*eis*) water. Water is simply spoken of as the outward instrument which is used in the putting on of Christ.

The preposition *eis* is used over 1900 times in the Greek Testament, and the only case that can possibly be made, with any fairness of interpretation, to favor immersion into water, is that of the Ethiopian Eunuch, where it is said concerning Philip and the Eunuch, "They went both of them down into (*eis*) the water, and even in this instance it would be just as correct to say that they went down to, or unto the water. The water being their destination, the goal towards which their action was directed when they left the chariot. The very wording of the passage would seem in favor of this interpretation, "They went down to the water" (probably a roadside spring covered over, and to reach which it was necessary to go down a flight of steps) "They went both of them down to the water and he baptized him. If it was added "Therein," it would be different, but from the parallel passages we know that if anything more had been written, it would have been "Into (*eis*) Christ," or "Into (*eis*) the name of the Trinity."

There are two other prepositions used in connection with Baptizing—*uper* and *upo*—both having various meanings but in connection with Baptism in the Greek Testament, *uper* is used in the sense "On behalf of." Thus in I Cor. xv. 29, "What shall they do which are baptized for (*uper*) on behalf of the dead."

Upo is used in the sense of *by*. Thus in Matt. iii. 13, "To be baptized by (*upo*) him." So also in verse 14, "I have need to be baptized by (*upo*) Thee."

There are some few passages where there is no preposition used, but on examination it will be found that they entirely agree with the doctrine which is taught throughout the New Testament with regard to Baptism viz., that it is into Christ that the person is immersed, and thus by means of Baptism—the outward instrument used in which, is water.

ON THE GREEK TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Paper read before the Rural Deanery of Kingston, Diocese of Fredericton, by the Rev. Francis Partridge, M.A., B.D., Rector of Rothesay, N.B., and Canon of the Cathedral.

At the present time, when much accurate scholarship and learned industry are being applied to the editing of the Text of the New Testament and espe-

ally when the attention of the English-speaking world is being drawn to the subjects of a revised translation of the Bible; it may be of interest to us as students of Scripture and stewards of the mysteries of God, to spend a few moments in the discussion of my subject. Little more can be done in a short paper than to survey the sources whence our present Text is derived, and the principles which should guide those who would construct an amended one.

As far as at present discovered, there are no Greek MSS., existing of the first three centuries. The original autograph MSS., and their immediate copies, have perished, or are not yet brought to light. Perhaps we ought not to expect to find MSS., in volume, of much earlier date than those we have now; for two reasons. First, *a priori*, because the complete Canon of Scripture, as commonly received at present, was not formally ratified by the Church until the 3d Council of Carthage, (A. D. 397). And, secondly, *a posteriori*, because the strictest search has been already made by competent men in every likely place that was accessible.

There are three principal sources of authority upon which a Text can be founded, or from which it may be revised. These are the Uncial MSS., or those written in capital letters; the Cursive MSS., or those written in the ordinary current hand; and the Versions, or translations into contemporary languages. There are about 40 Uncial MSS., and in round numbers about 500 Cursive, already collated. Of the Uncial MSS., until within the last few years, those principally relied on, and certainly the most ancient, were the following, (the capital letters being the symbols by which they are known by scholars):—

A. *The Codex Alexandrinus*—given by Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Alexandria, and subsequently of Constantinople, in the year 1623, to King Charles I. It is in four volumes, and is preserved in the British Museum, where the fourth volume is now exhibited in a glass-case. This is generally agreed to be of the 5th century, and contains almost the whole of the Old and New Testaments, with Clement's Ep. to the Corinthians.

B. *Codex Vaticanus*. This MSS. is so called from its being preserved since the 16th century in the Vatican Library at Rome. Whence it was brought to Rome is not known. It contains the Old and New Testament: has been carefully guarded; and has never been competently edited. It is the oldest known MSS., (except perhaps the Sinaitic) being assigned by critics to the 4th century.

C. *Codex Ephraemi* (palimpsest,) so called as consisting of the works of St. Ephraemi Syrus written in cursive hand over very extensive fragments, in the uncial character, of the Old and New Testaments. Tischendorf, (the eminent German critic lately dead,) who has edited it, assigns it to 5th century.

D. *Codex Cantabrigiensis* or *Bezae*—so called because it was given by Beza in 1581 to the Univ. Library at Cambridge. This is a Greek and Latin MSS., and deviates more than any others from the received readings. Its critical value is perhaps the lowest. It is ascribed to the latter end of the 5th, or beginning of the 6th century.

T. *Codex Borgianus*—in the Library of the Propaganda at Rome, probably of the 5th century.

T. *Codex Dublinensis*, (palimpsest).—This MS. was discovered in A. D. 1800, by Dr. Barrett among MSS. in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. The cursive writing over it consists of Chrysostom's treatise *De Sacerdotio*, and the original text was much faded; but Dr. Trejelles in 1853, by the aid of a chemical mixture, was able to decipher most of the MS., and re-collated the whole. It is assigned to the 6th century.

Until A. D. 1859, these MSS., with others of a later date, were the principal basis of construction of a revised Text. All those mentioned, with the exception of A & B, are more or less fragmentary. In 1859, Dr. Tischendorf, who devoted his life to the study and elucidation of the Greek Text of Scripture, searching at the expense of the Emperor of Russia, among the monasteries of the Levant for MSS., obtained possession of a MS. more perfect, and, as he judges, older than any other known MS. It was found in the monastery of St. Catherine on M. Sinai, and an edition was soon published at the expense of the Emperor of Russia. It contains almost the entire Greek Bible,

and is assigned by competent critics, in addition to Tischendorf himself to the 4th century.* This MS. is known as (Aleph) or the *Codex Sinaiticus*.

The cursive MSS. are of much later date, and are none of them (with possibly one exception) older than the 10th century. Less importance is generally at present assigned to these MSS. But I hope to give some reasons further on, why they should receive more attention at the hands of revisers and amenders of the Text of the N. T. than they now obtain.

We come now to the Versions. Of these, the oldest and most important is probably—

1. *The Syriac Version*, of the 2nd century, discovered by Dr. Cureton, amongst the Nitrian MSS. in the British Museum.

Next comes—
2. *The Peshito* (or simple) Syriac version, also supposed to have been made in the 2nd century. The text, as edited, is considered by Alford to be most unsatisfactory.

3. *The Sadikic*—(sometimes called Thebaic), an Egyptian version of the 3rd century.

4. *The Gothic*—made from the Greek by Ulphilas in the 4th century.

5. *The Armenian*—made in the 5th century.

There are many Latin versions, of which several are older than the Vulgate. But the Latin version most used is that completed by Jerome, (A. D., 383), and the authorized edition of the Church of Rome, and called the name of the Vulgate. The oldest and most valuable MSS. of the Vulgate now extant is the *Amiatinus*, written about the year 541 (Tischendorf).

You will pardon me for going over all this, which of course is perfectly familiar to you all. But it was necessary to do so, in order to make my argument clear. It is evident that there is in all this quantity of *apparatus criticus*, a vast mass of authority of varying value and almost bewildering divergence, from which to obtain a correct Text of the N. T.

[To be Continued.]

*A most interesting and enthusiastic account of his researches, and the discovery of this MSS. is given by Dr. Tischendorf in the introduction to a pamphlet, entitled, "When were our Gospels Written," published by Religious Tract Society, price 2s. sterling. The whole pamphlet will well repay perusal.

Correspondence.

The columns of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN will be freely open to all who may wish to use them, no matter what the writer's views or opinions may be; but objectionable personal language, or doctrines contrary to the well understood teaching of the Church will not be admitted.

THE MARRIAGE BILL.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—Now that the Sister's Marriage Bill has happily been thrown out in the Senate, it behoves Churchmen to consider what is to be done next. It must not be forgotten that one of the arguments for the rejection of the Bill, was, that sufficient time had not been given to the people of the Dominion for the formation and expression of their opinions upon it. But for the excellent and timely pamphlet by the Bishop of Nova Scotia, and the action taken by our Bishops in general, there is every reason to believe that the Bill would have passed the Senate. Our thanks are due to their Lordships, and to Senators Dickey, Allen and Kaubach, for their speeches in the debate. But the snake can hardly be said to be scotched, much less killed. We may be sure that those who have already violated the law will not relax in their efforts to get it altered. The Bill will come up again next year. How are we to use the time gained?

I would suggest:—
1.—That it might be well to form a Committee of the Synod to select and distribute pamphlets bearing on the subject, and to consider what further means might be adopted for leading people to regard it rightly.

2.—That the clergy should at this juncture take especial care to familiarize their people with the law of God, and the teaching of the Church concerning marriage.

One fact has come out clearly in the recent discussions, viz.: that we can expect no assistance from Romanists in our endeavour to uphold the law of God. Roman Catholics as well as Protestants, we are told, petitioned in favour of the Bill; one Roman Catholic Senator, at least, spoke and voted for it; one Roman Catholic Bishop only, (see speech of Senator Ferrier), withheld his assent from it.

True, the marriages in question are condemned by the Church of Rome, but only as offences against discipline, not as being contrary to the law of God, and a dispensation, it is said, can readily be obtained.

This may surprise some who only consider the fact that marriage is regarded by the Church of Rome as one of the Seven Sacraments, but it admits, I think, of a ready and sufficient explanation, which I will only glance at. A priesthood under the enforced rule of celibacy cannot be expected to regard the married state exactly in the same light as we do.

Before I conclude, permit me to recommend Littledale's "Plain Reasons" to any of my brethren who may be troubled by Roman Catholic proselytizers. It can be had at Gossip's, Halifax, for 25 cents.

The suggestions I have thrown out above may possibly elicit other and better ones from some of your readers. The main point is that we should not let slip the advantage gained.

T. D.

Kings College, N. S., May 10.

A FEW FRIENDLY SUGGESTIONS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—We think that you might propose in your paper a number of Bible questions if you can find room in it for them; also, you might give one or two good sermons in every issue. There is a large staff of clergymen in our province who might send you a good sermon every week for publication; for instance, there is a sermon published in the St. John Telegraph every Saturday—it is one of Talmage's sermons, and it has a great tendency to increase the circulation.

Yours respectfully,

WILLIAM DAVENPORT.

Gibson, N. B.

THE "SHORTER" AND "LARGER" CATECHISMS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—In looking over the old Canons of the Church, I find a larger and shorter Catechism required to be taught by schoolmasters. That those are not the Catechism now in use, is evident from the 59th Canon. I have made the following extracts from the Canons referred to. Will you, or one of your correspondents, kindly enlighten the readers of your paper as to what Catechisms are referred to in the 79th Canon?

Yours, &c.,

CHURCHMAN.

Canon 59.—Every Parson, Vicar, or Curate, upon every Sunday and Holy Day, before Evening Prayer, shall, for half-an-hour or more, examine and instruct the youth and ignorant persons of his parish, in the Ten Commandments, the Articles of Belief, and the Lord's Prayer: and shall diligently hear, instruct, and teach them the Catechism set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.

Canon 79.—All schoolmasters shall teach in English or Latin, as the children are able to bear, the larger or shorter Catechism hitherto by public authority set forth.

DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—The obnoxious Bill has not passed the Senate, and only just not. It behoves the friends of the present state of things, whereby Church rule, family comfort &c., are preserved, to keep on the alert.

It has been well said:

"This question is no party question. It is not, as it has been alleged, the High Church party alone that combats and condemns this unholy crusade against the integrity and purity of our marriage laws. The most typical representatives and the most able champions of the Evangelical party, past and present, have denounced this scandalous Bill. The late Dean McNeile, the late Canon Stowell, as also the present Dean of Ripon, the present Bishop of Rochester, Canon Garbett and Canon Kyle have been as strenuous in their opposition to it, as Canons Liddon and Gregory, and Archdeacon Hesse.

In a letter addressed to a contemporary, Canon Garbett thus expresses his opinion of the threatened measure:

"For myself the cogent arguments by which Archdeacon Hesse, the Rev. W. H. Galloway, the ministers of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland who published their address to the Nonconformist ministers of England in 1871, and other writers, have proved marriage with a deceased wife's sister to fall within the prohibitory degrees of the book of Leviticus, appear to me to be unanswerable, and I have formed this opinion after carefully reading what has been written on both sides. As to the policy of legalising such unions, I believe it would be most disastrous, alike to the peace of families and to the general morality of the nation. During an active ministerial life of almost forty years' duration, the greatest part of which has been spent amidst large populations, and in intimate communication with the middle and working classes, I can only recall one single case of such a marriage, and firmly believe that the plea frequently urged that a relaxation of the law is required by the circumstances of the working classes, is altogether founded on a mistake."

"It has been repeatedly urged, in defence of this measure, that the wife's sister would evidently prove the best step-mother children could have, as she would be bound to them by the double tie 'aunt and step-mother.' This is an argument, even if true, of simple expediency, and therefore cannot even be entertained by those who believe that the Church has already decided this question for us. But what we here contend for is that it is not true to fact. Experience, on the contrary, has shown, in England and abroad, that aunts have altogether ceased to be aunts in the true sense of the term when they become step-mothers to their sister's children, and have proved the harshest of step-mothers when they have children of their own, according to the well-known principle of our corrupt nature by which we are moved to hate those whom we have injured. The law that invites an aunt to become a rival to her sister, in the affections of her husband, when living, and a possible step-mother to her deceased sister, deprives, not only the mother and children of the unrestrained and undivided affection of an aunt, which is one of God's best gifts, while the mother lives, but is likely to engender domestic misery to the children when their mother has passed away, and her children are left to the proverbial tender mercies, not so much of an aunt, but of a step-mother with children of her own to claim her first and dearest affections."

I notice that one of the most valuable advocates of the "Repeal Bill"—admits he is *particeps criminis*; perhaps that may in some measure account for his zeal. "I can name" says he "two such cases where I had myself to act as the guide from St. John to Eastport on Missions of this kind."

The law-maker assisting in the evasion of the law!

Yours,

QUISQUIS.

"THEREIN" AND "THEREWITH."

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—I do not wish to enter into the somewhat perille controversy on the subject of the Baptismal Service between the Vicar of Newport and your correspondent "T," but I think that both would do well to make themselves better acquainted with the rules and technicalities of the Church before rushing into print.

The term *effundendo*, if I am correctly informed, is not recognized as representing any mode of Baptism in use in the Anglican Church; nor is the word *effusion* correct as indicating the action of pouring water upon the person baptized. *Affundo* is to pour upon, *effundo* is to pour out, consequently *effusion* is the word that each should have used.

B.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE.

Arnos, N. S.,

May 11th, 1880.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—In the article which appeared in your issue before last, headed the "Alumni of St. Augustine's College, my name was omitted."

Least my contemporaries in the other Dioceses should bethink themselves on reading the article either that they have failed to notice my obituary or that I must have left Nova Scotia, will you please oblige by inserting this. I am still in charge of the Cumberland Mines Mission.

Yours very truly,

ED. H. BALL.