

cal life, and men of high principle who, happily for us, clung to it, have a degree of mortification to endure which is wholly unnecessary, and which might well be spared. Second, the usefulness of the press as an instrument of political discussion is very much impaired. At the bottom of all really useful discussion there must be honesty in the statement of facts and the weighing of arguments, a disposition to take a full, rounded view of the question, to make full allowance for the considerations which are made against the view advocated, as well as a clear statement of the preponderating reasons which compel its adoption. But when an organ of opinion allows itself, in the supposed interests of party, to suppress facts, to distort statements, to misrepresent arguments, who does not see that its usefulness as an instrument of discussion is to that extent impaired? It has to that extent lost public confidence, and deserved to lose it. It comes to share in the woe, pronounced by the prophet on "those who call evil good, and good evil, who put darkness for light and light for darkness, who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter." In the public interest, this is a matter for deep regret. In the country possessing, like our own, parliamentary government, the discussions of a free press plays an important part. All our interests are made more serious by the fact that public men do their work under its almost ubiquitous eye. How important then that it should be fair and moderate, reserving its severer censures, its words of indignation, for deliberate wrong or really culpable betrayal of the public interests. I say what those most versed in public affairs among you know to be true when I affirm that the unreasoning violence with which public men have been assailed by the organs of the opposite party, the magnifying of mistakes of judgment into betrayals of trust, the insinuation of corrupt motive on the most meagre evidence, sometimes on none at all, has, more than anything, contributed to weaken the effectiveness of their criticism when a really questionable course of procedure has been inaugurated, an actual violation of trust has been committed. Third,—Another and most painful result of the liberties taken with truth in our daily press is to lessen the natural and proper dislike of falsehood in the public mind. At the foundation of almost all that is best in human character is the love of truth, and what must ever go with it, the hatred of lies. It has always appeared to me to be the very soil of goodness. I cannot regard it therefore as anything less than a very serious calamity to have the minds of our people—nearly all of them newspaper readers—made familiar with untruth, finding it served up with the morning paper, if not every day, yet once or twice a week, at the breakfast table. In your name and in my own, I wish to protest against it—to protest against it because it is wicked and to protest against it because it is weak; to protest against it when it is employed against us or against the party, whatever that may be, to which we belong; to protest doubly against it when it is employed for us, professedly in our interest, or in the interest of our party. I wish to put in a claim for the observance of truth, in discussions on the platform, and in discussions in the press, let the effect of it be what it may. Its effect, indeed, must be always wholesome. The party, or the policy, which needs the support of misrepresentation will meet defeat sooner or later, and in the public interest, the sooner the better. Truth alone is strong. And the obligation to observe it is imperative in politics as in every other department of human affairs. The ninth commandment is not suspended before elections, and to suit the exigencies of parties. Lying is not an allowed weapon when a political opponent is to be weakened, not even when he is himself in your opinion steeped in falsehood. Depreciation, evil speaking, does not cease to be sinful when it is anonymous. Fairness, generosity even, are not interdicted virtues in the political arena; nor do bitterness and wrath become Christian sentiments when they are cherished towards public men and professedly for the public good. Must I remind you that the holy and tender precepts of the Gospel are in full force within the domain of public and political life as everywhere else? Such precepts as these, "Putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour," "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour and evil-speaking be put away from you with all malice," "Be kindly affectionate one to another with brotherly love, in honour preferring one another." "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest," that is, honourable, "what-

soever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." Were they practised, even by a considerable portion of those engaged in moulding the political movements of the country, and in giving tone to its political discussions, what a happy change should we not witness!

I have spoken thus strongly and at this length to you this morning, because I entertain a high sense of the importance of political life, in its bearing even on those interests which in the eyes of Christian men surpass all others. The career, which opens out before one entering on public life with high principles and fair talents, carries with it very large possibilities of good. In this connection it is difficult not to think of that noble statesman who, at an age when most men who have lived to see it are seeking rest, is guiding with so wise and firm a hand the policy of the great British Empire. Possessing not only varied learning, vast knowledge of affairs, great capacity for work, a speech of thrilling eloquence, but great fairness and open mindedness, great wisdom in meeting the requirements of new emergencies, great patience in mastering the most minute details, great courage even to breaking with the traditions of his own early life, warm and generous sympathies with the down-trodden and the suffering, resolute faith in the right—possessing such qualities, he seems to tower above the most of his contemporaries, even more by his moral than by his intellectual greatness. Who can over-estimate the good he has done and is doing? What Scottish presbyter or English bishop has been doing more during these years for the coming of the Kingdom of God in the world, than William Ewart Gladstone?

We have men, if of less transcendent abilities yet of similar spirit, among ourselves. They are found I trust in both political parties. Let us give them due honour, even when they differ from us in political sentiments. Let us give them a generous and an appreciative support when they agree with us in questions of public policy. Let us sympathize with them in the difficulties necessarily connected with the government of a country containing such wide diversities of race and religion. Let us refrain from pressing them with selfish demands. Let us make it evident that we desire them to act for the public good. Let us deal leniently with mistakes of judgment, such as the wisest and best intentioned must sometimes make. Let us reserve their severest censures for moral faults for disregard of the public interest, a sacrifice of it to the furtherance of personal or party ends. And speaking to a congregation of professedly Christian people, should I not say, Let us pray for them; let us ask for them the blessing of Him from Whom cometh wisdom, courage, integrity, and then "God, even our own God, shall bless us—God shall bless us; and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him."

#### CONCERNING BAPTISM.—VII.

BY REV. W. A. M'KAY, B.A., WOODSTOCK, AUTHOR OF "IMMERSION A ROMISH INVENTION."

From the Christian Standard.

MR. EDITOR,—Whether the person in baptism is to be put into the water, or the water put upon the person, is to be determined by the classic use of *baptizo* before it was used in the Scriptures, and by the use of the word in the whole Bible—Old as well as New Testament. What, then, is the meaning of *baptizo* in the Greek classics? Immersionists tell us, with a charming confidence, that it always meant "to immerse." "The thing is so evident that it does not require proof." "All the scholars say so." Dr. T. J. Conant, in *Baptizein*, p. 159, says: "Whenever the idea of total submergence was to be expressed, whether literally or metaphorically, this (*baptizo*) was the word that first presented itself."

The editor of the "Standard" will pardon my "presumption," if I decline to bow to the bare statements of immersionists, however confidently made. I prefer to examine facts for myself. What, then, are these facts? Here they are: In all heathen Greek older than the Christian era there are only twenty-two well-authenticated cases of the occurrence of *baptizo*: and if the editor of the "Standard" will examine these cases, one by one, as I have done, he will not find "dip" or "immerse" (in the immersionist sense) in any one of the twenty-two instances. He will find that *baptizo* is in Greek always a word of power. When a person was brought completely under the in-

fluence or power of anything, he was said by the Greeks to be baptized with that thing. Alexander the Great was brought completely under the intoxicating influence of wine: the Greeks said that he was baptized with wine. But neither literally nor metaphorically was he "dipped" into wine. Instead of being put into wine, the wine was put into him. A merchant was brought completely under the depressing influence of debt; the Greeks said he was baptized with debts. A man was brought completely under the power of sorrow; the Greeks said he was baptized with his tears. Was he dipped into his tears? And so in other cases. A ship was baptized when it was sunk in the depths of the sea; the coast was baptized when the tide flowed in upon it; a wave rolling over a vessel and sinking it, baptized it with its contents; a man was baptized when he was drowned, or when he drank an opiate, or water from the fountain of Silenus. But "dip" will not answer in any one of these cases. The coast is not taken up and "dipped" in the sea which rolls back upon it. Drowned ships and drowned men are not "dipped" (i.e., plunged beneath the watery element and then immediately withdrawn). A man is not dipped when he drinks a liquid.

After giving many instances of the occurrence of *baptizo* in the Greek classics, Robert Young, L.L.D., of Edinburgh, author of the great "Greek and Hebrew Concordance," and perhaps the most learned linguist in Great Britain, says: "From all this I gather that the word (*baptizo*) has no real specific reference to mode at all, but to the object, effect, or result contemplated."

"Whatever," says Dr. Dale (Classic Baptism, p. 354), "is capable of changing the character, state, or condition of any object, is capable of baptizing that object; and by such a change of character, state or condition does, in fact, baptize it." In effecting these classic baptisms we find that the baptizing element or instrumentality was invariably moved, while the person or thing baptized was passive or receptive.

If *baptizo* was the "word that first presented itself to express the idea of total submergence," how does it happen that the following classic Greek writers (and many others) in all their varied and voluminous writings, never use the word *baptizo* at all? The writings of Homer (B.C. 1000), Hesiod (B.C. 1000), Herodotus (B.C. 484), Æscylus (B.C. 525), Æschines (Greek philosopher, B.C. 350), Æchines (Greek orator, B.C. 397), Sophocles (B.C. 495), Euripides (B.C. 480), Thucydides (B.C. 471), Theocritus (B.C. 270), Theophrastus (B.C. 382), Xenophon (B.C. 445), Aristophanes (B.C. 456), Bion (B.C. 287), and Moschus (B.C. 270), do not contain the word *baptizo*! Did none of these classic Greek authors, poets, historians, orators, philosophers, even once, in all their extensive and voluminous works, have occasion to use the idea of "dipping," "plunging," or "immersion"? We know they frequently express the idea. Well, then, what word or words did they use to express the idea? They certainly never used *baptizo*. But they do use the following words, whose meaning I give according to Liddell and Scott: *Buthizo*, to immerse, to sink; *embuthizo*, to sink to the bottom; *katabuthizo*, to plunge under water; *bapto*, to dip; *duo*, or *duno*, to dive; *duplo*, to duck; *fontizo*, to plunge into the sea; and *katapontizo*, to throw into the sea, to plunge or drown therein. These eight Greek words are used as equivalents to the Latin *mergere*, to "immerse;" but *baptizo* is never used in the sense of "immerse" in the modern immersionist sense. Aristotle (B.C. 385), the prince of Greek classic authors, and the most accurate of all Greek writers, used the word *baptizo* but once, and then not in the sense of dip, plunge, or immerse. Plato (B.C. 429) uses *bapto* but twice, and not in the sense of "immerse."

So much on the meaning of *baptizo* in heathen Greek before the time of Christ. Not once is it found in the modern immersionist sense of "dipping." It is always a word of power, having "no specific reference to mode, but to the object, effect or result contemplated." So, when we come to the Word of God, we find this word used, not in a narrow, mechanical sense of "dipping," but as indicating an effect infinitely grander, nobler, more powerful than any water-dipping. The apostles were baptized with the Spirit. They were brought completely under the purifying influence of the Spirit. They were baptized with fire. They were brought completely under the influence of the tiny flame which sat upon them. Their dross was purged away. They became red-hot men. They spake with tongues of fire. The children of Israel