

apt and forcible designation of the ordinary sacrament of regeneration. If the dead rise not, what shall they do, how shall they vindicate their consistency, who are baptized, baptized for the dead?—they who, throughout the world professing their belief in the resurrection of the dead, are being christened in the name of, in behalf of, on account of the faithful departed. First in the name of Christ the risen Lord unto whose death they are baptized, then on account of, with reference to, for all the elect in Paradise, who 'without us cannot be made perfect,' into whose communion, the fellowship of the saints in light, we are admitted by this baptism; and why especially, unless the dead are to rise again, should a dying person be baptized, who is, of course, baptized not at all for the sake of the Church on earth, but of the Church above? This explanation satisfies the linguistic requirements of the text; it takes *hoi baptizomenoi* in its literal and natural sense, it observes the article *ton*, giving to *ton nekron* its usual and technical signification, it does no violence to the preposition,—indeed *hyper*, with its manifold and comprehensive shades of meaning, is just the word for the place. And last but not least, this interpretation spares the honest logic of S. Paul, sheltering the truth of the resurrection which was called in question, under the universal Sacrament of the New Birth, a type of the Resurrection, which Satan had not then—as indeed he has not yet—successfully assailed within the Church. There remains one consideration needed to substantiate this view, a consideration crucial and supreme. Does this view harmonize with the Scriptural, Apostolic Catholic doctrine of Holy Baptism? In other words, has baptism, as here assumed, promise of the life which is to come? Does it really postulate the resurrection? Is it in any true sense for the dead? There are, it must be confessed, among modern Protestants, diverse theories which rob this sacrament of all meaning, efficacy, and grace, even for this life, much more for the future. If baptism be but an empty ordinance, an indifferent rite, a pretty symbol, a touching ceremony; nay, if it be even the necessary form, of initiation into the Church as a society on earth, without being a great deal more, any rational man would be puzzled to use it, or receive it as a serious argument for the resurrection of the dead. St. Paul's reasoning would have fallen very flat upon the average of American Protestants, even of those who condescend to retain baptism at all. Many Dissenters are christened who, having rejected the baptismal creed of the apostles, make no profession of faith in the resurrection—not a few of them, indeed, positively denying it—and who would, therefore, be astonished if told that baptism is a standing and inspired proof of true human immortality, that is to say, of the 'resurrection of the flesh.' If, on the other hand, we simply accept baptism as Christ and His Apostles preached it, as the Catholic Church has always retained it, and as it is most sacredly and conspicuously set forth in the doctrinal and liturgical standards of the American Church, then the force and harmony

of the reasoning appear. Such baptism is for the dead. It is a sacrament administered only on profession of belief in the resurrection of the dead—first, the resurrection of Incarnate God, secondly, the general resurrection, the *again-rising* of the flesh. It typifies not only our dying with Christ, but our rising together with him, it has promise of the life which is to come, because it is *generaliter* necessary to salvation, a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness, a new creation, 'the first resurrection,' a regeneration of water and the Holy Ghost, a calling into a state of salvation, an act which saves co-ordinately with repentance, faith and good works, which saves as truly as the Ark saved Noah, but which saves 'by the resurrection of Jesus Christ,' the revealed way of making sons of God, children of grace, members of Christ and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven, a sure witness and an effectual sign of grace whereby God doth work invisibly in us, the instrument and seal of engrafting into the Church, (which is an eternal kingdom embracing the dead as well as the living), the instrument and seal of the promise of forgiveness and of adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, the everlasting benediction of God's heavenly washing. In short the New Testament identifies or associates baptism with salvation, at least, ten times,\* and the Prayer Book on this point, as in general, reflects the light of revealed truth. The benefits of baptism have reference to the future life, are *nil* without it. Baptism has, therefore, a supernatural and unique relation to the faithful departed. It with its accompanying professions is a perpetual defence of the dead. The waters for the laver of regeneration are drawn not from earth nor from the wells of time, but from the 'Jasper Sea,' from the perennial fountains of Heaven; and 'unto the place whence they come, thither do they return again.' The interpretation here offered comports, therefore, with the Catholic doctrine of Holy Baptism, which always points beyond the tomb. Moreover, it is quite possible that this phase of the sacrament may have been specially emphasized in Corinth, in connection with the deaths which had accompanied the recent epidemic, which God appears to have sent upon the Corinthian Christians for their unworthy treatment of the Holy Eucharist. In conclusion, and as a corollary, the fact that the Church doctrine of Holy Baptism so satisfies the question, so meets the requirement of the inspired argument, is an additional proof, if any be needed, of the far-reaching and beneficial power of the New Birth. Yes, the baptism of the living has reference to the dead, is for them, it proclaims the resurrection. The river of life which flows through earth for the mystical washing away of sin, is indeed 'a river the streams whereof make glad the City of God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High.'—*The Rev. Dr. Little in American Church Review.*

\*Rom. vi. 3 et seq., and Col. ii. 12. Church Catechism, Rev. xx. 5 and 6. See 2 Cor. v. 17, in con. with phrase "Baptized with Christ." St. Mark xvi. 16. 1 Peter iii. 21. Acts ii. 38. St. John iii. 5. Articles xxv. and xxvii. Bap. Office. "The Bible compared with the Liturgy," by Rev. H. I. Bailey, S. P. O. K.

## HOME REUNION NOTES.

THERE is no greater mistake than to look upon Reunion as a narrowing, cramping, and restricting process. The *Christian World*, writing of the daughter Church in the United States, points to 'the exclusiveness of that Communion.' And the *Methodist Recorder*, in a long article on the desire for reunion, which it allows to be very far-reaching, dwells on the exclusiveness of the Episcopal Churches, and writes as if in a Reunited Christendom all special methods of work would be absorbed by a 'gid uniformity. This fear is utterly groundless, as the history of the Catholic Church in the earliest ages, and in our own country up to the time of the Reformation, clearly shows. The narrowing, restrictive process, dates from the history of our divisions.

One glance at this wonderful article in the *Methodist Recorder* of last month shows the narrowness of sectarianism in every sentence. The so-called flirting with Rome, or with the Socialists, or with the Stage, is vigorously denounced. The purity of the writer's own exclusive form of Protestantism is extolled, and though he condescendingly allows the possible salvation of individual Greeks, Romans, and Ritualists, it would be a sin for him and his to enter into corporate reunion with the great christian Churches, which have held the common faith from the beginning until now.

Compare this sectarian narrowness with the breadth of the true Catholic spirit which we find in the Bible. The one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, and one settled form of Church government in all its distinctive parts, united under the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and in the prayers. But side by side with this is the unfettered outpouring of God the Holy Ghost, working through all the various and ever varying ministrations of men and women in the unity of the one Catholic Church. (Romans xii., 1 Corinthians xii. xiii.) The whole energy of the Apostle of the Gentiles seems to have been pretty equally divided between his zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, and his endeavour to check in the bud the narrowness of the sectarian spirit, wherever it showed itself, either in the attempt of the Jewish converts to separate themselves from the Gentiles, or in the first beginning of schism in the Corinthian church, where the "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ," were all equally denounced as alien to the expansive power of the Gospel of love, by which all selfishness should be rooted out for ever.

This egotistical religion which sees only one side of a truth, which is unduly magnified according to the individual beliefs of certain leaders of thought from time to time, is of the very essence of division, and is the cause of that bigotry and persecution which is for a time in abeyance, mainly from the growth among us of a more truly Catholic spirit. Persecution from without we must always be subject to, but the disgrace of Christians persecuting one another, is something which all