WHO CAN ENTER THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

It is told of the celebrated preacher George Whitefield that once when preaching he looked upward, and addressing Abraham, said: Are there any Catholics in Heaven? No. Are there any Episcopalians in Heaven? No. Are there any Presbyterians in Heaven? No. Are there any Baptists in Heaven? No. Father Abraham, are there any at all in Heaven? Yes. Who are they? "Those who are born again." This must of course have startled his audience, and filled them with wonder and anxiety, until the last question was answered with a *Yes*.

No words of Jesus, I presume, have divided theologians more than what he said to Nicodemus—"Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God, &c." The Jewish ruler thought that Jesus meant that he must be born a second time of his mother, and to his question Jesus replied, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God."

We are not told that Nicodemus had asked any question about the Kingdom of God but as John the Baptist had preached in the wilderness of Judea, saying, "Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," and in connection with this, he came preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, (Luke, iii. 8.,) and Jesus himself had after the temptation of Satan (Matt. iv. 17,) began to preach, and to say, "Repent," for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," and he also sent his twelve apostles to preach, saying, "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand," and in confirmation of this grand proclamation they were empowered to heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, and to cast out devils, and the seventy were sent with the same instructions, so that all the inhabitants of Judea and Galilee must have heard the grand proclamation concerning this Kingdom, and no doubt Nicodemus was very desirous of hearing from Jesus more about this Kingdom, and it would seem that Jesus spoke to the *thoughts* instead of the *words* of Nicodemus by telling him what was necessary, without which no man could see this Kingdom, and then what was required in order to enter it—Titus iii. 5, is often quoted in connection with John iii. 5, as corresponding with it. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost," and many believe that baptism is equivalent to the washing of regeneration, but there are a great number of pious and well-meaning people, who look upon such an opinion as near akin to heresy, and will say baptism in water cannot have anything to do with regeneration, and I have heard some of these persons say that in the passage, "born of water and the Spirit," that Spirit of course means Spirit, but "water" cannot mean literal water as used in baptism but it must mean the operation of the Holy Spirit by cleansing. As many of these persons believe in sprinkling instead of immersing, no wonder that they can see nothing resembling a burial with Christ, in the touch of a moistened finger or sprinkling of a few drops of water on the face of either infant or parent. There is, however, one Protestant Church that seems to think very differently, for when a child is old enough to repeat the Catechism, he is asked, "Who gave you your name?" and he replies, "My Godfather and Godmother in my baptism, wherein I was made a child of God, a member of Christ, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." If this is true, what a glorious thing it is, to have been sprinkled in infancy. But when the Catechism was compiled its authors evidently thought that dipping or immersing was the institution that the Lord appointed, for they command the priest or minister to *dip* the child unless he is certified that he cannot bear it, and then he is told to *pour* water upon him—they were baptized, pot one of the ing is said about the alternative three thousand, or any of the apos-

of sprinkling. In referring to this in conversation with a Church clergyman, he said, "that dipping was the old and right way, but the people are not at the other way." It is said, "Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin," and I would simply ask, if a minister to please the members of his congregation performs this solemn rite in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in a manner different from what he believes to be the *old and right way*, is he free from sin? There can, I think, be only one answer to this from any one who has a proper reverence for the authority of Him who appointed the institution. I am of the opinion that there are others, perhaps many, who believe that sprinkling is not authorized by the Scriptures, who have not the courage of their convictions to give it up. There is a very large and influential denomination who teach and practice the custom to allow any convert who is old enough to form an opinion on the matter, to decide how his baptism shall be performed, either by immersion, pouring, or sprinkling, and I was told by a very respectable lady that she was present at the river Maitland in Mount Forest at one time, when the minister came with three converts who knowing the privilege that would be accorded. One of them said he was satisfied best with *sprinkling*, and the minister put his fingers in the water, and he was sprinkled. The second one believed that *pouring* was the right way, and water was poured upon him. The third expressed the belief that *immersion* was what the Lord commanded, and the minister led him down into the river and buried him in baptism—and all in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. I would here state, what I presume no one who reverences the Scriptures will deny, that if it is right to do this now, it would have been right for the apostles to do it on the day of Pentecost.; and if it would have been wrong to have done it then, it must be wrong to do it now, as no authority in the universe can repeal a law or an ordinance of God. If it had been right and according to the command of Jesus, then when the multitude were told God had made that same Jesus whom they had crucified both Lord and Christ, and, when they cried out with all the earnestness of overwhelming conviction, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter should have replied, "Repent and be *immersed*, or *poured*, or *sprinkled* for the remission of sins; and we have provided that all may be attended to as they desire. I will go into the pool and *immerse* such of you as desire it, and James will have a pitcher of water to *pour* on such of you as prefer it, and John will have a bowl of water ready to *sprinkle* such of you as think that the right way." Some who have the reputation of scholars, assert that there is no one English word that will definitely represent the Greek word *Baptizo*. It is stated on very high authority in opposition to this that there is no word in any language that has a *command* in it with more than *one* meaning, and it seems from the nature of things that this should be so. If the word baptize means three things, then each individual should have the whole done to him—dipped, poured upon, and sprinkled, in order to obey the command. There are many who say that baptism in water, (it being a more bodily act,) can have no effect as to remission of sins, and I heard a Baptist minister say, when standing in the water preparatory to immersing some converts, "We do not baptize these converts for the remission of their sins, but because their sins are remitted." I would here take the liberty of asking those who agree with him in this, Were the *sins* of the three thousand remitted at the time when they said, "Men and brethren what shall we do?" Or was it when they obeyed the command of Peter, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." I am quite satisfied that if they had remission before they were baptized, not one of the

tles knew that it was; so what becomes then of the statement above; that his converts were immersed by him because their sins had been forgiven.

I shall probably have something more to say on this subject, but this is perhaps as much as you will have room for this number.

W. A. STEPHENS.

THEORY AGAINST PRACTICE.

In a certain college in which the Rev. Dr. ——, a Presbyterian minister, was the Professor of Greek, there was a quizzical genius of a student whose name we will call Newlet. Now, it so happened that the Rev. Doctor was seriously exercised in his mind by the thought that most of the people in the community entirely misunderstood the meaning and use of that much persecuted Greek verb, *Baptizo*; and accordingly undertook to enlighten the natives by preaching a series of sermons on baptism. Newlet attended regularly upon the ministrations of his learned Professor, and in the course of two or three Sabbaths was pretty well dosed with the statement that *baptizo* meant to sprinkle or to pour—not to plunge. But in the course of the regular lessons, in the class room of the college, Newlet was one day called upon to translate a passage from one of the Greek authors. The passage gave an account of a man who became so enraged with another, that he seized a red hot poker and "*ebaptizo eis ophthalmon*." Newlet, with a mischievous twinkle of the eye, but with a grave manner, translated it thus: "He seized a red hot poker and *sprinkled* it into his eye." "How is that," said the Rev. Professor. "He *sprinkled* it into his eye," repeated Newlet. "But," said the Doctor, "the word *ebaptizo* does not mean sprinkle." "Well, sir, it *did* mean *sprinkle* on last Sunday night," replied the mischievous fellow, amid suppressed laughter from the class who keenly relished the joke. The Rev. Doctor looked grave—was silent a moment, and then remarked, "You may translate it *plunge*, here, sir." We are inclined to think that this is quite a good practical refutation of the learned work of Dr. Dale on "Classic Baptism."—*Baptist Visitor.*

YOUR neighbor, no better nor abler than you, is left in wealth and high position, while you are set to lowly toil; will you conclude that God honors him and dishonors you? O, when will Christians learn to look at circumstances no longer through the distorting medium of the world's glasses, but through the clear lens of God's word of truth.

A BAPTIST preacher, whom we know, recently stated in his pulpit, that our members who were attending his protracted meeting were a stumbling-block to sinners and an embarrassment to the meeting. He preferred, therefore, that they would stay away. Their presence was doubtless very embarrassing to the preacher, because he knew they could detect his misapplications of scripture. They were a stumbling-block to sinners, because they would not be manipulated by him in jumping up and down in response to every silly proposition made to the audience. If they know they are doing just what the will of God directs, why should they be embarrassed by any body? We have never experienced any embarrassment by having Baptists in our audience. On the contrary, their presence is a source of inspiration to us. Hence the more the better.—*Old Path Guide.*

DR. TANNER is reported as saying: "Had I been a drinker of alcoholic beverages, I could not have stood this fast ten days." Such evidence should have weight with all frail minded people, more especially when it is well known that prize-fighters, acrobats, wrestlers, oarsmen and pedestrians, while in training, are total abstainers. The highest degree of physical strength and beauty can not be attained by any but the total abstainer.

REPENT ye, church whisky-makers and sellers, and turn from your wicked business. Judgment will soon begin in the house of the Lord. The "horns of the altar" will no longer shelter you.

A NEW party has arisen in some of the Swiss cantons which calls itself Winterthurerhandwerksburschenvor, wartsgrupp. It is not every language, says the London *Echo*, which is so noble and exhaustive as the German. Here, in a single word, these people tell us that they are immigrants of German race, that they are artisans and apprentices, that they hold advanced political opinions, and that they have constituted themselves into a party.

SAVING is money rather than principle.