

Alex Fleming

Vol. II.

OCTOBER, 1882

No. 10.

BIBLE INDEX

AND

CHRISTIAN SENTINEL

Go set a watchman, let him declare what he seeth. Isa. xxi, 6.
Watchman, what of the *night*? What of the *night*? Isa. xxi, 11.
The *MORNING* cometh, also the *night*. Isa. xxi, 12.
The *night* is far spent, the *DAY* is at hand. Ro. xiii, 12.
Take heed in your hearts until the day dawn. 2 Pet. i, 19.

MANAGING COMMITTEE :

EDWARD TROUT, Toronto.

A. ANDERSON, Hamilton.

WM. FORRESTER, Pickering.

J. J. JOHNSTON, Meaford.

HUGH BLACK, Rockwood.

CONTENTS :

	PAGE
A Review of Dr. J. W. Dale's Theory	257
Faith's Possibilities	271
Report	272
Letter from Green Bay	274
The Tonawanda Debate	275
The Revisers' English	276
Salvation	278
The Stone Hill People and How they Raised Money for Missions	281
Seven Ways to Kill Prayer-Meetings	283
Change of Publishers	285
Obituaries	286
The Fruit of the Spirit, Gal. 5, 22	288

TERMS:—\$1.00 A YEAR IN ADVANCE.

TORONTO, CANADA.

1882.

All remittances and correspondence to be addressed to *Index and Sentinel*, No. 2 Huntley Street, Toronto.

JUST OUT.

Our Discussion on Baptism

WITH

DR. L. D. WATSON,

OF TONAWANDA, N. Y.,

Is now ready for delivery. It contains 296 pages,
printed on fine paper, and is well bound in cloth.

SENT BY MAIL POST PAID FOR \$1.00.

Address, **INDEX AND SENTINEL,**

2 Huntley Street, TORONTO.

BIBLE INDEX AND *Christian Sentinel.*

VOL. II.

TORONTO, OCTOBER, 1882.

No. 10.

"THE WORDS THAT I SPEAK UNTO YOU THEY ARE SPIRIT
AND LIFE."—*Jesus the Christ.*

A REVIEW OF DR. J. W. DALE'S THEORY.

As most modern defenders of sprinkling are dependent on Dr. Dale for whatever of novelty appears in their defences, it is thought well to devote a few pages to his theory as set forth in his own books—of which there are four large volumes. These volumes contain much that is true, much that is half true, and more that is a perversion of truth. The following statements will give a correct idea of his theory. He claims:

1. That the real baptism is accomplished by the Holy Spirit working upon the soul and purifying it.

2. That the ordinance of baptism, which he calls ritual baptism, consists in the use of water—a drop or an ocean—as a symbol of *purification*, not a symbol of burial.

3. That the commission given by the Saviour, Mark xvi. 16, and Matthew xxviii. 19, has no reference to baptism with water.

4. That the baptism commanded on Pentecost, Acts ii. 38, is the *change* of the soul's condition effected by the Spirit, and that therefore there was no water used in the baptism of the three thousand on that day.

5. That the first use of water, as a baptism, in the Church of Christ, and this only as a symbol of the "real baptism," is found in Acts viii. 38. Several passages from his writings will be quoted, that the reader may see his theory in his own words.

In his *Classic Baptism*, page 31, he makes the following statements, which are nearly in harmony with truth:

I. "*Baptizo, in primary use, expresses condition characterized by complete intusposition, without expressing, and with absolute indifference to the form of the act by which such intusposition may be effected, as, also, without other limitations—To MERSE.*"

II. "*In secondary use it expresses condition the result of complete influence effected by any possible means and in any conceivable way.*"

It is scarcely necessary to modify these propositions. The first would be absolutely correct did it read "expresses entrance into condition," etc. The last may be accepted as it stands, since "complete influence" involves an ideal immersion.

The truth of his first proposition may be illustrated thus: Ships are *baptized* by storms, by cannon balls, by overloading, by contact with icebergs, and in various other ways. "The form of the act" by which the ship is *caused* to go down into the water, is indifferent. But its *entrance* into a condition of *intusposition* is secured in every case of its baptism. It is MERSED.

The truth of his second proposition may be illustrated thus: The human mind may be *baptized* (mersed or immersed) in sorrow by the death of a friend, or by the loss of property by fire, or by detection in guilt, or by bad news received by letter, or by wire, or by vocal organs, or "in any conceivable way." So, also, the mind can be baptized in pleasure, in thought, in ignorance and in sleep, by various causes and in many ways. *In all this baptizo differs nothing from the word IMMERSE.*

Dr. Dale's own books contain such phrases as "Immersed in horrors," "Immersed in ignorance," "Immersed in darkness," "Immersed in sleep," "Immersed in thought," "Immersed in pleasure." Besides, the meaning which he gives to *immerse* corresponds with his propositions respecting *baptizo*. He says:

"To IMMERSE—*primarily*—To cause to be in a state of intusposition (enveloped on all sides by, ordinarily, a fluid element), without any limitation as to depth of position, time of continuance or mode of accomplishment."—*Classic Baptism*, p. 196.

Just so. Quite correct. Here is a quotation that will enforce his definition:

“The globe was in a state of immersion a much longer time than forty days.”

The word “immersion” here, refers not to the *pouring* down of the rain or the *rising* up of the waters out of the earth, by the breaking up of its fountains, but simply and solely to the earth's state of *enclosure* or *intusposition*—the “state of immersion.” It is freely granted that *baptizo* is used among the Greeks in this way. Dr. Dale, seeing that *baptizo* and *immerse* agree throughout, seeks to make it appear that there may be an “immersion without an immersion !” He quotes in proof these lines from Walter Scott :

“The boat received the shower of brine which the animal spouted aloft, and the adventurous *Triptolemus* had a full share in the immersion.”—*Classic Baptism*, p. 207.

Dr. Dale adds : “Here is an immersion by sprinkling.” Not so. The immersion *resulted* from an abundant “spouting.” Yet *immerse* does not mean to *spout*. Sprinkling upon a vessel will not result in an *immersion*. But, in any case, Dr. Dale is trifling when he speaks of an “immersion without an immersion.” If Jesus should to-day speak from the open heavens and say, “Go teach all nations, *immersing* them,” such men would still practise sprinkling on the plea that you can have “an immersion without an immersion,” or an “immersion by sprinkling.” *Dr. Dale has written exactly on this line*. Heaven could not command immersion in language sufficiently definite to shut out such cavilling. No word in English or Greek, or any other language, is sufficient for the task.

In *Classic Baptism*, pp. 78-9, Dr. Dale says :

“A baptism can be effected by anything of whatever dimensions, or of whatever nature, physical or unphysical, which is capable of exercising a controlling influence over its object, thus bringing it into a new condition. It was on this ground that the Greeks represented a baptism to be effected with a cup of wine, by perplexing questions, and by a few drops of opiate. . . Accumulate around these baptisms metaphor, figure, picture, and what not, I make my argument with finger pointed to the cup, the question, and the opiate drop, and say, *the old Greek baptized through a thousand years by such things as these.*”

Just so ; and what of it ? Dr. Dale's own books furnish proof that the Latins and the English together have *mersed* or *immersed* through two thousand years "by such things as these."

Mersus vino, Somnoque.—*Livy*.

MERSED by wine and sleep.

Potatio quæ mergit—*Seneca*.

The drink which MERSES.

Invadunt urbem somno vinoque sepultam.—*Æneid*.

They invade the city BURIED in sleep and wine.

"The world was fast sinking into a sea of drunkenness, and the only wonder is that it was not entirely *submerged* under the flood."

"The merchant immersed in all the calculations of this world's traffic." "Immersed in thought."

With such phrases from the Latin and English before him, Dr. Dale ought not to be confused or seek to confuse others by such phrases as *baptized* in confusion by questions, or in drunkenness by wine, or in sleep by opiates.

In his *Christic Baptism*, pp. 17 and 18, in answer to the question, *What is Christic Baptism?* he says :

"Christic baptism, as established by Christ, has a two-fold character: 1. Real. 2. Ritual. Real Christic baptism is a thorough change in the moral condition of the soul effected by the Holy Ghost, and uniting to Christ by repentance and faith, and through Christ re-establishing filial everlasting relation with the living God—Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Ritual Christic baptism is not another and diverse baptism, but is one and the same baptism declared by word, and exhibited (as to its purifying nature) by pure water applied to the body; symbolizing the cleansing of the soul through the atoning blood of Christ. . . . Water has, by universal acknowledgement, a physically purifying quality, and hence has been accepted in all ages as a symbol of purity in religious rites. The fundamental characteristic of baptism by the Holy Ghost (*Real* Christic baptism) is moral purification. This characteristic is selected by divine wisdom for symbolization by water in ritual Christic baptism. And having performed this one duty, we say that the symbolizing function of the water is exhausted. It is a matter of universal admission, that if this be the sole office of the water, then, neither quantity nor mode of use has any place for consideration."

This extract gives a pretty full view of Dr. Dale's theory. Without authority, and contrary to the facts in the case, he makes the following assumptions :

1. That the "one baptism" of the New Testament is to be divided in two parts, the one *real* and the other *ritual*.

2. That the *real* baptism is administered by the Holy Spirit, and consists in a thorough change in the moral condition of the soul.

3. That it unites to Christ by *repentance and faith*.

4. That ritual baptism is one and the same baptism *exhibited* by using water in some way as a symbol of *purification*.

There is not a single passage of Scripture that supports any of these assumptions.

Baptism is the symbol of *burial*, not of purification ; hence immersion in water is demanded—not simply the application of water in any way. The Scriptures do not teach that the baptism in the Holy Spirit accomplishes a change in the moral condition of the soul. According to Dale—and it is not disputed—Christ was *baptized* by the Holy Spirit. But he will scarcely affirm that His baptism *effected a change in the moral condition of His soul*—though his theory would require this. The Apostles were baptized in the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, *after* their souls were so changed, morally and spiritually, that they were "continually in the temple praising and blessing God."

Before the day of Pentecost they were united to Christ by faith and repentance, exhibited in their baptism ; how then could this union with Christ be effected *afterwards*, when they were baptized in the Holy Spirit ? The truth is, Christ and His Apostles received the Holy Spirit, not to change their moral or spiritual condition, but that they might accomplish the work given them to do, by being *clothed* in the power or influence of the Holy Spirit ; and they were baptized in water, not as a symbol of any moral change, but as a symbol of His burial in the grave.

The following passages from the pen of Dr. Dale would indicate that he sees the matter all right occasionally.

Speaking of the Greek words translated "in the Holy Spirit," he says :

" *En Pneumati Hagio* does not denote merely instrumentality or inness of condition, but has an inclusiveness which embraces both ideas ; *ho baptizoon* (that is, the one baptizing) is *in* the Holy Ghost, and is thereby invested with power to baptize by the Holy Ghost."—*Christic Baptism*, p. 53.

So he plainly sees that the baptism *in* the Holy Spirit involves "inness of condition" either in fact or in figure, as well as an *investing* or clothing with power. This looks like giving his theory up. It is, in fact, nothing less than this. On the next page he paraphrases Luke xi. 20 thus :

"If I *in*, and therefore invested *with* the power of, the Spirit cast out devils."

Again, speaking of the Greek words translated "in the spirit and power of Elias," he says :

"But inasmuch as this phrase suggests *inness* with a view to a consequent investiture with power, it will follow, that under diverse circumstances, the one idea or the other will emerge into greater prominence, and the translation be fitly *by* or *in*. This is exemplified in Luke iv. 14, 'Jesus returned (*en tee dunamei tou Pneumatos*) *in* the power of the Spirit, as compared with the passage before us, 'Ye shall be baptized (*en Pneumati Hagio*) *by* the Holy Spirit' in whom Jesus is, and by whom, therefore, He accomplishes His work."—*Christic Baptism*, p. 78.

He seems now to have forgotten his theory about the baptism being a "change in the moral condition of the soul" of the parties baptized. The *inness*, the *investiture*, in connection with being "*in* the spirit," seems now to meet the demands of the baptism, or immersion. Not only so, but on page 83 he actually cuts himself off from the idea of "a change in the moral condition of the soul" constituting this spiritual baptism. He says :

"This baptism of the Apostles by the Holy Ghost, and the baptism of the Lord Jesus by the Holy Ghost, were of *the same generic character*, with differences inseparable from the need and the nature of the parties."

Well, as the parties, Christ and His Apostles, stood in a proper moral and spiritual relation to God *before* receiving

the baptism in the Spirit, his definition, which involves "a change in the moral condition of the soul, effected by the Holy Ghost," is necessarily excluded. His admission that Christ's baptism in the Spirit and that of the Apostles are of "the same generic character," simply annihilates all his nonsense about baptism being "a moral change," and "of a purifying nature." The clause, "with differences inseparable from the need and nature of the parties," cannot save his definition from destruction. He speaks the truth when, a little farther down on the page, speaking of the baptism of Christ and the Apostles by the Holy Spirit, he says:

"In both cases there was a thorough change of condition, bringing the baptized under the influence of the baptizer, and investing with his power."

Notice how he here *leaves out* the idea of "a change in the moral condition of the soul," and substitutes correctly, "under the influence of the baptizer," and "investing with his power," involving, truly, "a thorough change of condition," but not "a moral change in the condition of the soul," not a "moral purification." This is the immersion in the Holy Spirit. This is a complete relinquishment of his claim on page 18, that

"The fundamental characteristic of baptism by the Holy Ghost, real Christic baptism, is *moral purification*."

This "fundamental characteristic" must be left out when speaking of the baptism of Jesus by the Holy Spirit, since He was always *pure*; neither can it have any place when speaking of the baptism of the Apostles by the Spirit, since their hearts were purified by faith before they received this baptism. Seeing this, Dr. Dale, as you will notice, actually *leaves it out* from the extract given above. But what has become of his definition when its "fundamental characteristic" is abandoned? This is the state of the case, as a comparison of the extracts we have given will show. Still, when he comes to state the "final results" on the last page, he returns to his first definition, just as if he had not abandoned it when he could not apply it. He says:

"The BAPTISM OF INSPIRATION is a thoroughly changed spiritual condition of the soul, effected by the power of the Holy Ghost through the cleansing blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, and so making it meet for reconciliation, subjection and assimilation to the fully revealed living and true God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost."

If this is true, any one can see that Jesus Christ did not receive the "baptism of Inspiration." Still, Dr. Dale claims that Jesus was baptized by the Holy Spirit, receiving the real baptism of Inspiration. If Christ received Dr. Dale's "baptism of Inspiration," then His soul was changed "by the power of the Holy Ghost through the cleansing blood of the Lord Jesus Christ," and was thus made "meet for reconciliation, subjection and assimilation!"

The utter blasphemy of the thought should banish the theory from the minds of all reasonable men. Neither will Dale's "baptism of Inspiration" apply to the Apostles on Pentecost, as we have already seen, for they had previously been *changed* in soul and *reconciled* to God and brought in *subjection* to Christ. Jesus was *baptized* with the Holy Spirit as well as with water, Dr. Dale being the judge. This fact destroys his theory that baptism is a *moral purification*.

Speaking of the commission, Mark xvi. 16, he says:

"We accept the real baptism by the Holy Spirit as the sole baptism directly contemplated by this passage, in general, because it meets, in the most absolute and unlimited manner, as a *condition of salvation*, the obvious requirement on the face of the passage, having the same breadth with belief, and universally present in every case of salvation."—*Christic Baptism*, p. 393.

In reply to this, it is sufficient to say that the baptism in the Holy Spirit *is never made a condition of salvation*. The Apostles were forgiven and saved before they received the baptism in the Spirit on Pentecost; how then can Dr. Dale truthfully say of the baptism in the Spirit, that "it was universally present in every case of salvation?"

Speaking of the phrase "baptizing them" in the commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, he says it "is a real baptism without any attending rite," by which he means that it is

accomplished by the Holy Spirit. If this is true, it follows that we have no authority from Christ to baptize any person with water ; and as we *cannot* baptize with the Holy Spirit, there is nothing that we can do in obedience to the Saviour touching this matter of baptism.

Dr. Dale denies that the command of Peter, "Repent and be baptized," includes what we call the ordinance. With him it is the baptism in or by the Spirit that is commanded, and which took effect when the three thousand "gladly received the word and were baptized." He says :

Baptized. "Repent and be baptized." In the last statement we see the reason for the conjunction of these two terms as well as the nature and purport of their relation. Repentance and the remission of sins are, in the gracious system of the Gospel, indissolubly connected. Repentance cannot exist for a moment without the remission of sins, any more than the lightning flash without the thunder peal. To be repentant is "to be baptized into the remission of sins." The Holy Ghost, who gives repentance, does, therewith, confer baptism, *eis aphesin hamartion*. Therefore Peter preaches, "Repent, (and as its inseparable accompaniment) be baptized *into the remission of sins.*" There is no ellipsis to be supplied to make out the import of "baptized." The occasion is too momentous for enigmatic speech. The way of salvation for souls "cut to the heart" cannot be left for human supplement. Therefore the *sine quâ non* condition, "Repent!" is made to ring upon the ear ; therefore its inseparable and cheering accompaniment, "and" (thereby) "be baptized into the remission of sins" is fully stated. There is no use for the *telic* use of *eis*. Its service is demanded in its primary signification. And its power is exhausted in bearing the penitent sinner out of a state of guilt *into* a new state of remission. The phraseology, "Repent and be baptized into the remission of sins" is, in sentiment, nothing else than *Repent and be forgiven* ; but the sentiment is intensified by the form of expression, which teaches us, that as an object put into a fluid having some marked characteristic, and remaining there, is penetrated, pervaded, and embued through every pore with such characteristic, thoroughly changing its former condition, so a guilty soul is by repentance brought into a new state or condition, the characteristic of which ("the remission of sins") penetrates and pervades the soul in every part, subjecting it to its sweet influence.

Most persons will, at a glance, see the absurdity in commanding persons to be baptized by the Holy Spirit, as if it were something to be *obeyed*. Besides, the baptism here commanded is made to go *before* the gift of the Holy Spirit. In the case of Cornelius and his family, the baptism in the Spirit is accomplished by divine power, and *afterwards* they are *commanded* to be baptized in the name of the Lord. It is clear, then, that the baptism *commanded* in the name of the Lord is distinguished from the baptism in the Spirit. The one is a *command*, the other is a *promise*. They are separated in the order of time. They are not identical. Neither is it true that baptism consists in repentance or forgiveness, as Dr. Dale betimes seeks to make appear. If, as he asserts, "the phraseology 'Repent and be baptized into the remission of sins' is, in sentiment, nothing else than *Repent and be forgiven*," then the real baptism takes place in heaven; for forgiveness is accomplished on high. This is not in harmony with his former claim that it is a *change of the soul* of man. But consistency has no place in the theories of those who oppose immersion.

Dr. Dale claims elsewhere that Christ was baptized by the Holy Spirit, and that the Apostles were baptized by the Spirit on Pentecost; how then can the baptism by the Spirit be the equivalent of *forgiveness*, since Christ never needed forgiveness, and the Apostles repented and were *forgiven* before their baptism by the Spirit on that day? Intelligent men should not be deceived by the tortuous and untenable theory of Dr. Dale.

Dr. Dale admits that *baptizo* means to *merse*, to *intuspose*, to *whelm* by some real or ideal surroundings, and he is ready to admit that it is almost the equivalent of *immerse*, since none of these words *take out* what they put in. But he is sure that *baptizo* cannot mean to *dip*, for the reason that *dip* *takes out* what it puts in, while *baptizo* puts its object into a state *intusposition* or *withiness*, and *leaves it there*. He seeks also to put a gulf between *immerse* and *dip* by making the same distinction between them.

This extract will give his distinction pretty fully as to

his supposed difference between *baptizo* and *dip*. He says :

“Now, if anything out of mathematics was ever proved, it has been proved that this word does not mean to *dip*; that it never did, that it never can so mean, without there be first an utter metamorphosis as to its essential character. That which above all other things discriminates and puts a great gulf between *baptizo* and ‘dip’ is the time of intusposition demanded, respectively, for their objects. ‘Dip’ puts its object in a condition of intusposition *momentarily*; it puts in and draws out; *baptizo* demands a condition of intusposition for its object without any limitation as to the time of continuance in such condition, but allows it to remain for ages, or an eternity. There are no writings in which these discriminating characteristics are more essential or more boldly presented than in the Scriptures. It is obvious, that under these meanings no one can be baptized *into water*, for death must follow, and therefore the theory apologetically introduces ‘dip’ and says: ‘The command of God to *baptize* Christians into water cannot be obeyed, therefore *dipping* into water must be substituted.’ But might it not be well to review the theory, and inquire whether God ever gave the command to baptize His people into water? In fact there is not a particle of evidence for any such command. Inasmuch as there is no element in *baptizo* for withdrawing its object from the water, there is nothing in Christian baptism to play the part of ‘resurrection from a grave,’ or of ‘birth from a womb.’ And if there is no provision for taking out of this grave and womb, it will be hard to find any one who will be willing to go into this water-grave-womb. As the theory cannot exist without a *dipping*, and as *baptizo* makes no provision for a dipping, its philological foundation falls out bodily.”—*Classic Baptism*, pp. 22, 23.

Although the Greek Lexicons universally testify that *baptizo* means to *dip*, Dr. Dale declares that “it never can so mean;” and the only reason for so declaring is his own assumption that dip involves *coming out* as well as going in, while *baptizo* demands no act but that of *mersion*, involving simply a state of *intusposition*, or *withinness*, to use his favorite words.

He seeks to draw the same distinction between *immerse* and *dip*. He says :

“Immerse does not mean to dip. No word can by any

possibility mean distinctively *to immerse* and also mean distinctively *to dip*, because these words do not belong to the same class: the one makes demand for condition to be effected in any way, and without limitation as to the time of its continuance; the other makes demand for an act definite in character and limited in duration."

The fact that the English Dictionaries say that *dip* means *immerse*, and that *immerse* means *dip*, is no obstacle in the way of Dr. Dale and his theory.

His declaration to the contrary is enough! Now, I will show from extracts found in his own book that *dip does not take out* what it puts in. Like *immerse* and *baptizo*, it simply *intusposes*. Take this:

"And *dipt* them in the sable well,
The fount of Fame or Infamy."

Dipping into infamy does not involve getting out of it. Again:

"Dipping deeply into politics."

"He was a little *dipt* in the rebellion."

"Persons *dipped* in politics" or in "rebellion" do not, necessarily, ever come out.

"Put out the principal in trusty hands,
Live on the use, and never *dip* the lands."

This advice of a father to his son not to *dip* his lands (by mortgage) was given because he feared the lands would thus be *sunk* after the dipping, instead of coming out.

"A person *dipt* in scandal."—*Warburton*.

Does this also involve getting out of the scandal? It should, according to Dale's definition:

"The landscape gives the summit of a ridge of land that suddenly *dips from sight*, in the mid distance, and *rises again* in the form of a dim line of high ground drawn along the horizon."—*Rosa Bonheur*.

If *dip* in itself involves *rising out*, why have we "rises again" in addition to it? It is used here like *baptizo* in the Scriptures.

"And Jesus, when He was *baptised*, *went up* straightway out of the water."

Dr. Dale's distinction is a myth. When he quotes:

"She dipped up water in her hands and gave her child," to prove that dip means "to take out" as well as to insert, I answer, it is the "up" that secures the taking out, *not the dip*. In the same way the Greeks spoke of "baptizing out of wine jars." So it is evident that Dr. Dale's distinction between *dip* and *immerse*, and between *dip* and *baptizo*, like his whole theory, rests on no solid foundation.

The following, from his pen, may be safely endorsed :

"It is in proof, that *baptizo* demands for its object a condition of intusposition (usually within a fluid element) without regard to the act to be used in securing such intusposition, and without limitation to the time of continuing in such condition ; never taking out what it puts in."

Very well ; since *baptizo* demands a condition of intusposition without deciding the length of time of continuing in such condition, we will continue to immerse the candidates, making sure that they come out of the water straightway, after the example of our Saviour.

By putting several of Dr. Dale's statements together, their utter inconsistency will appear.

In *Christic Baptism* (p 449) he says :

"*Baptizo* : 1. This word primarily makes demand for the intus position of its object within a fluid element."

This is the exact truth.

2. "This word introduces its object verbally into an ideal element suggestive of a thorough change of condition."

This also is correct.

Speaking of *baptizo* in the commission (p. 405), he says :

"We understand this word here, as in every other like syntactic relation, whether among classic, Jewish or inspired writers, as demanding for its object *withinness of position*, without regard to the manner of introduction and without limitation of time for its withdrawal."

Very well ; who fulfils the commission's demand for "withinness of position"—those who sprinkle or those who *immerse* ? And even should we grant that this is the baptism of the soul, which is accomplished by the Spirit, it still would follow that the symbolic baptism performed by human hands should correspond by meeting the com-

mission's demand for "withinness of position," or immersion.

If, in the commission, *baptizo* "demands withinness of position," he should not seek to darken counsel elsewhere, by asserting that it sometimes means "controlling influence, *without intusposition*, in fact or in figure," (*Classic Baptism*, p. 283.) If this was true sometimes—which is not the case—it should not be used to becloud the commission of our Saviour, since it is confessed that there, and in all like syntactic relations, it "demands withinness of position."

At one time Dr. Dale represents baptism as using repentance and faith as a means of uniting the soul to Christ (p. 17); at another time, "Repentance is itself a baptism," (p. 141); again, "Repentance also effects a baptism."

In another place, "Power is the essential element in Christic baptism," then, in sentiment it is the equivalent of "forgiveness," but "Real Christic baptism is a thorough change in the moral condition of the soul," and its "demand" in the commission is "withinness," and its "fundamental characteristic is moral purification;" but we must not forget that "Repentance is itself a baptism," and also that we should "repent and *thereby* be baptized!" Since baptism is all this, and more, according to Dr. Dale, it is no wonder that my friend Dr. Watson positively denied that our Saviour was baptized, even against the testimony of three inspired men. In view of all that baptism involves, how could He be baptized? Dr. Dale is willing that baptism should mean anything and everything so long as water is hidden from view. When he espies much water he cries out:

"*Baptizo* has no control over water in the New Testament in a single instance" (p. 390).

But in spite of the theory of Dr. Dale, I assert, in the language of Dr. Dale, "That *baptizo* demands for its object a condition of INTUSPOSITION, usually within a fluid element."

This demand should be met.

Immersion meets it.

FAITH'S POSSIBILITIES.

"*All things are possible to him that believeth.*" In these days when infidelity is riding rampant through Christendom, does it behove the followers of Jesus to take the shield of faith upon which to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked one. If in the front ranks of the Church militant each soldier of the cross fights behind its shelter, victory shall follow him, until the warfare shall cease and the crown take the place of the cross. It may be asked, "What is faith?" Simply accepting what God says, and acting upon it. He has said that He is able to save to the uttermost all who come unto Him. Why then are there so many who have heard this assurance so often that the words are quite familiar, and yet they are unsaved? To go back a step further, God has said, "The soul that sinneth it shall die;" and still the world is full of sin. A lack of faith in this statement, closes the eyes of many to its importance. Day after day goes by and they are still sinning and still living. If for one moment the veil of unbelief could be lifted, and they could be confronted with this truth, how gladly would they turn their eyes to the promises of pardon through faith in Jesus Christ. Sad as this undoubtedly is, it would not be so bad if unbelief were outside the pale of the Church of Christ, and found no place in the hearts and lives of those inside. How often do we hear Christian men and women lamenting over their failures and shortcoming as though they were a kind of necessary evil over which they had no control; when God has said that he is able to make all Grace abound unto them. You will hear others say they could get along very well in the Christian course only they have one besetting sin, into which they cannot help falling; whereas God has said that He is able to keep them from *falling*, and not only that, but to present them *faultless* before the throne of His glory with exceeding joy. What battles might be fought and victories won against the world the flesh and the devil, if the children of God could be persuaded to take Him at His word, with the spirit of a little child. With some it is not so much a lack of faith, as its be-

ing centred on the wrong object; and the assurance and confidence which should be realized towards God is placed on their own puny strength and efforts. You hear people who professedly are working in the Master's vineyard, talking of *My Work, My Mission, &c.* To such I would say on the evidence of God's word, write against all work done in this spirit, "Failure," for such it is, since Christ declares emphatically, "Without me ye can do nothing." In vain is the stir and the excitement, the outwardly religious zeal which mark the lives of some, while at heart it is all effort after self-glorification, a seeking to gain notoriety for themselves. The man or woman who achieves most real success, is the one who accepts the statements of God's word with child-like faith, and with a single eye to His glory, *manifests his faith by his obedience*, following step by step in the path marked out by Him of whom it is said emphatically that He pleased not Himself.

A. P. W.

REPORT.

One year has passed since I came to labor in this great Prairie Province. To-day I cast my eyes backward to see what has been accomplished, for life must be measured by its intensity rather than by its length; sometimes we live more in an hour than at other times in a week or month. I commenced my labors here in the beginning of September, '81. My first meeting with the brethren was in Bro. Conner's house, where seven communicants had assembled themselves together with a number of their friends. Afterwards we removed to the court-house hall and from there to the Orange hall, which in the course of the year became the private property of Bro. Connor. We continued to use their building until Aug. 13th, '82, when our new house of worship was ready for opening. I have had the pleasure of organizing the first Disciple or Christian Church in the Province, and administering the ordinance of baptism for the first time in the only way we as a people regard, in every respect, scriptural. This ordinance was attended to in the Assinaboine river (a large and very rapid stream) before a great number of spectators. As we were not far from a few Indian tents, I noticed a few of these dusky originals of the prairie

looking on in bewilderment. Those baptized at this time were Thomas Sisson, jr., and his wife, who are now *pillars* in the Church; he now fills the office of a deacon. This baptism took place on Oct. 23rd, '81. During the winter months a number were added to our little flock by letter; among these were Bro. A. P. Campbell, from Howard, together with some of his sisters and brothers. Sister Logan also from Howard, afterwards one of the Darroch families from Minto and Bro. McKellar from Mosa. On April 5th, three others were added to our number by baptism, and on Saturday, May 27th, one more was baptized, thus our little flock has been growing, probably not so fast as some of us would desire. Yet gradually we are making our influence felt. We have erected a neat and very comfortable meeting house, which though not very large is sufficient for our present necessity. We have our baptistery and dressing room inside the house; these things are a necessity in the winter in this Province. We have been visited by a number of brethren from the east during the year, I will not now occupy space in giving names. In a previous communication I spoke of Bro. C. Sinclair's visit and labor among us. This is one of the bright spots in the year's history. More recently we have had Bro. Sheppard laboring among us. He remained over three Lord's days. He did not enjoy the best of health while here, but continued to labor every day. Upon the whole we had good audiences while he was here. During the third week of his stay he received word that his wife was ill, which gave him much annoyance and made his visit less pleasant than it otherwise would have been. Though we had no additions by baptism while he was here, yet we considered the meeting a success. Such preaching cannot fail to do much good. We hope to reap the fruit of this and previous sowing at a subsequent period. We have at present about 27 members, being an increase of about 20 during the year; six of these have been added by immersion. In thus viewing the past we have no cause to be proud, but much reason to be truly thankful for our success and prosperity.

God's blessing has been resting upon us. We have been blest temporally and spiritually. Addressing myself to the "Ontario Woman's Mission," and their representatives, the Mission Committee, I have to say that with all my heart I thank you for your confidence in me, in placing me in a position, where I have, I trust, done some good and where the field for usefulness is still open. Once more I find words to be cold and formal. I always find them so when I wish to express profound thankfulness. I ask then that you *receive the gratitude words cannot express*. I do not forget that you have

added to my responsibility by your kindness, to "whom much is given," etc. About two months ago I was engaged by the church here to remain to labor with them during the next year. Take courage and continue the work, place another man in the field at once. If not in Manitoba then somewhere else. Bro. Sinclair and Bro. Sheppard agree with me in saying, we have an extremely hard field to labor in here, and Bro. Sheppard would probably advise to enter some other field. People are here as I said before for the most part to *make money*. But after all if you cannot find a better opening send out a man. Let us work while it is day. I hear there are a number of brethren in Winnipeg, probably a Church could be organized with a little effort.

A. SCOTT.

GREEN BAY, MANITOULIN ISLAND, Sep. 19, 1882.

Dear Brother,—By the liberality of the brethren in Erin Centre and Garafraxa I have been again sent on a short visit to the brethren in Green Bay, to be present at the opening of their new house. I left home on the 4th of the month, calling at Owen Sound; I spent a pleasant hour with the family of Bro. W. A. Stephen, but found that himself and wife were away on a trip up the Lakes; then I called on Bro. Lister, made the acquaintance of his wife and family and enjoyed a good time with him. For the present he is living in Owen Sound. I left Owen Sound at mid-night, and after a somewhat stormy trip and the discomfort attending it, I reached Little Current on Tuesday night and Bro. Skippens' house on Wednesday afternoon. A day's rest put me all right, and then I went to see the new building our brethren have been laboring all the summer to complete. The building, though small, is much nicer than I could have expected to see; a frame house well plastered within and without, good windows and a lofty ceiling. It reflects great credit on the brethren and will be of good service here, as it is the only Church building in the township. The greater portion of the work has been done by Bro. Skippen, assisted by brethren Billington and Beck. We held three meetings on the Lord's day, which were very fairly attended. Bro. Crewson came down from Gore Bay and spoke in the afternoon, and Mr. Barber, a Baptist minister from Manitowaning in the evening. I am holding meetings every night during the week, and shall have three meetings on next Lord's day. At present I do not feel hopeful of much success. The harvest is not yet finished, the weather is rainy and a new source of distraction has been added to these, grow-

ing out of the violent storm of last Thursday. The "Asia," a vessel running in these waters, left Owen Sound just before the storm and should have been here the next day. It is almost certain she has gone down with all on board. Many persons on this part of the Island have friends on board, and the suspense is such that they are unfitted to listen to the message of mercy with the interest they otherwise might.

From conversation with Bro. Crewson I am disposed to think that an effort to spread the Gospel on this Island would be successful if continued long enough. The winter is the only time when meetings can be held here to advantage. In summer the mosquitoes and flies are so troublesome that but little can be done with any degree of comfort and at this time of the year the harvest is too late and travelling on the lakes is both unpleasant and dangerous. But if a man could be sent in here in the fall and sustained during the winter months he would do much good. To the honor of Bro. Crewson it must be said that he is doing much. At present he preaches at four different points; these are widely separated and the road to be traversed rough and difficult. For instance on Saturday last he walked thirty miles and this morning he has started out in the mud and rain to return, goes home to finish his harvest if possible, and then on Saturday next starts on a fourteen mile trip to keep his appointment on Sunday, returning home on Monday, and this repeated almost every week. I think that the brethren on the Island might by a proper effort purchase him a horse which would lessen his labour considerably.

I will drop you a line when I close these meetings, hoping soon to see a copy of the INDEX AND SENTINEL.

I am, your brother in Christ,

J. LEDIARD,

THE TONAWANDA DEBATE.

Our discussion with Dr. Watson is now ready, and in the market. All cash orders are already filled. Those who have simply given their names, without the cash, will kindly remit \$1.00 to INDEX AND SENTINEL, 2 Huntly street, and they will receive the book at once.

Besides the discussion with Dr. Watson, the book contains a review of Dr. Dale; also a chapter of learned testimonies. It contains 296 pages, well bound in cloth. Price \$1.00 post paid.

THE REVISERS' ENGLISH.

LETTER II.

THE CONJUNCTION "AND." A VERB'S AGREEMENT WITH ITS NOMINATIVE.
SINGULAR AND PLURAL OF NOUNS.

To the 'Revision' Editor of Public Opinion," the Rev. T. H. L. Leary, D.C.L. Oxon.

SIR,—One of the most difficult things which I have ever had to believe is that a company of the most eminent scholars in England, after ten and a half years of study, devoted to elucidating the meaning of the Sacred Scriptures, and to expressing that meaning in pure English, have deliberately issued to the world, as the result of so much thought, a work abounding with such errors as are to be found in the Revised Version of the New Testament, a copy of which now lies before me.

That there are among the Revisers some scholars eminent for the possession of a critical knowledge of their own language I know for a fact; but it is evident that they have so been in the minority that they have not been allowed to record, even in a foot-note, their protests against the grammatical errors of their colleagues in the work. I can only hope that those protests, which I am now endeavouring to re-echo, will be taken up by the Press, and that the voice of public remonstrance thus raised will, as with a mighty breath, sweep away from the sacred pages the dishonouring dust of error which the carelessness or the ignorance of man has suffered to rest there.

Having, in my previous letter, pointed out how one of the most graphic passages in the New Testament has been enfeebled by the needless insertion of the conjunction "and" six times in three consecutive verses, I continue my remarks upon the misuse of that part of speech, and shall show that the Revisers have actually treated it as if it were disjunctive instead of copulative; as if, in fact, it were the equivalent of its very opposite, the conjunction "or," and, therefore, as if it separated the parts of a sentence instead of uniting them. One passage is as follows:—"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust *doth* consume" (Matt. vi. 19). If it had been "where moth *or* rust," then "*doth*" would have been correct; but as it is "where moth *and* rust," the nominative to the verb is plural, and therefore, the verb also should have been plural; for it is one of the invariable rules of English grammar that the verb and its nominative must agree. The Revisers should have said, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and

rust consume," not "*doth* consume," for that is saying "*they doth!*"

The law of the agreement between the nominative and the verb, which is one of the simplest in the language, has been strangely lost sight of in many passages, notwithstanding that every word in every passage in the New Testament, has been the subject of deliberate consideration. The bewilderment which one feels in endeavouring to account for such errors surely justifies the expression of a hope that the learned scholars who have sanctioned the publication of those errors, will explain to the world the reason of their existence.

In Matt. xxvii : 56, we read, "Among whom *was* Mary Magdalene, *and* Mary the mother of James and Joses, *and* the mother of the sons of Zebedee;" *i.e.*, those three *was* among them! This is culpable carelessness; for, in the parallel passage in Mark xv : 40, it is said, "Among whom *were* both Mary Magdalene, *and* Mary the mother of James the less, *and* of Joses and Salome." If two Marys are plural, how can three Marys be singular? I was going to say that it is a singular error, but, unfortunately, it is not so, for there are others like it; see Acts xvii : 34, where it is said, "Among whom also *was* Dionysius the Areopagite, *and* a woman named Damaris, *and* others."

In Mark iii : 33, we read, "Who *is* my mother *and* my brethren?" Who *is* they! Carelessness again; for, the parallel passage in Matt. xii : 48, gives the inquiry grammatically, thus: "Who *is* my mother? *and* who *are* my brethren?" The Preface, p. xiv., says, respecting parallel passages, "Where, as in the case of the first three Evangelists, precisely the same clauses or sentences are found in more than one of the Gospels, it is necessary to translate them in every place in the same way."

In Rom. ix : 4, we read of the Israelites, "whose *is* the adoption, *and* the glory, *and* the covenants, *and* the giving of the law, *and* the service of God, *and* the promises." You see it says that all these things *is* theirs! Yet in the very next verse it correctly says, "whose *are* the fathers." How can these errors be explained? I confess that I am more than puzzled by them, when I reflect that the work is the result of ten years' study.

Again, in Eph. iii : 18, we read, "That ye may be strong to apprehend with all the saints what *is* the breadth *and* length *and* height *and* depth, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge." It certainly passeth knowledge why the Revisers have sent forth such English as this. In the passage quoted there are four things mentioned; and the Revisers speak of our being strong to apprehend what *they is!*

We should need to be "strong" indeed to "apprehend" why they is spoken of in this *singular* manner.

Yours faithfully,

G. WASHINGTON MOON.

SALVATION.

SHORT SERMON BY ISAAC ERRETT.

"For we ourselves were once foolish, disobedient, led astray, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But when the kindness and philanthropy of our Saviour God was manifested—not by works wrought in righteousness which we did, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the font of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; whom he poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that having been justified by his grace, we should become heirs according to the hope of eternal life."—TITUS iii. 3-7. (*Alford's Revision.*)

We saw in the first sermon the ruin wrought by sin, and the impossibility of man's recovery, except by help from without and above himself. This estimate of the fallen and hopeless condition of our race is justified by the history of mankind, which is, indeed, but a history of sin, and of unavailing experiments on the part of men at self-recovery. Not that all virtue and goodness were obliterated. Amid the ruins of the temple of humanity, there have ever lingered some beams of the Light which at first filled it with glory. Some nations have been distinguished for particular virtues, and some individuals have been eminent in almost all virtues, according to human standards of excellence. But it is to be considered:

1. That men have never been entirely left to themselves. All nations have inherited more or less of redeeming and regenerating influences through divine movements in human society.

2. The best men of whom heathen nations are wont to boast, derived their eminence from the contrast of their lives with the degraded and demoralized masses around them, rather than from their conformity to such a standard as would fit them for restoration to the fellowship of God.

3. The masses under the reign of sin, even where there was

the greatest intellectual exaltation, have ever been morally degraded, "disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, filled with malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. Read Rom. i. 18-32, for a statement of the moral condition of the Gentile world—a statement fully corroborated by heathen authors; and Romans iii. 9-10, for an inspired sketch of the moral condition of the Jews; and say what hope there was for humanity without a Saviour. The utter hopelessness of this condition may be gathered from two considerations:

(1.) The very impulse to goodness—the desire for it, and the strength to achieve it—was constantly more and more impaired by sin, so that power to do good must come from without.

(2.) Man, as a creature under law to God, can only be justified by complete obedience to that law. Do his best, and there is never any extra virtue that can be urged as an equivalent for sins committed or duties neglected. Even sixty-nine years and three hundred and sixty-four days of perfect obedience, could only answer for themselves—they could not stand, in law, to offset the sins of a single day. Evidently, then, we can not be saved by works of righteousness. Justification by law is out of the question. Our only hope is in the mercy of the God against whom we have sinned. This is the glad revelation of the gospel: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us."

God compassionates his sinful and perishing creatures; his heart of infinite love yearns toward them, and, out of his own treasures of wisdom and of power, he brings forth the means of salvation.

It is well to pause and consider this most precious and vital truth—salvation by grace. It is difficult for men under deep conviction of sin to realize it. They condemn themselves severely, and loathe their own sinfulness, and are apt to transfer to God the hue of their own feelings, so as to see in him only an offended sovereign frowning in wrath on the guilty. That God is just and hates sin, is true; but he does not hate the sinner, nor is it difficult to prevail with him to forgive

those who seek forgiveness. He loves the sinner, and delights to forgive. There is a beautiful and precious word in our text—philanthropy; the love of man. Not the love of a peculiar class of men,—good men, smart men, brave men, elect men,—but the love of man as man, just because he is man, and therefore the love of all men. Divine Love, seeking a world of sinners to save them, is the beautiful spectacle presented to us in the gospel of salvation. Hence that grand oracle: “God so loved *the world*, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”* “God, who is *rich* in mercy (not only merciful, but *rich* in mercy—an immense wealth of mercy not readily exhausted), for his great love wherewith he loved us (not only love, but *great* love—love not hard to be entreated, love not difficult of access, love that does not wait for us to come and seek it, but comes to seek us, and weep over us, and plead with us, and enlighten us, and give the most precious life for us), even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, and raised us up together, and make us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.” Eph. ii. 4-6. “Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that God loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.” I. John iv. 10.

Salvation is, then, of *grace*, not of works. If saved at all, we are saved because God is gracious, and has in mercy provided salvation for us. An immense stride out of darkness into light is taken when we learn that the mercy of God is the fountain of salvation, and that he is rich in mercy to all who call upon him.

But it does not follow, because we are saved by grace, and not by works of righteousness, that we have nothing to do in order to be saved. It is the salvation, not of a mass of unreasoning matter, but of a living, thinking, and moral creature. Salvation is not a mere sovereign act of forgiveness, or the impress of regenerating power upon a passive nature, but the recovery of the understanding, conscience, affections, and will, out of all their perversions and corruptions, and the sad consequences of these perversions, and the placing of that whole nature again in harmonious relations with God. It is to make an ignorant being intelligent, a polluted one pure, a sinful one righteous, a rebellious one obedient, and a despairing one hopeful and joyous. “The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious

*John iii. 16.

appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Titus ii. 11. 14. So also our text marks the contrast between the disobedience, hatefulness, and lustfulness of the unsaved state, and the purity and blessedness of the state of regeneration or renewal.

Now it is evident that such a change involves the consent of the will, the exercise of the affections, and the obedience of the life; and that while God provides salvation, he provides it in accordance with the wants and capacities of our spiritual nature, and seeks to win us to it. It must, on our part, be *received* and *appropriated*.

The whole subject of salvation, then, lies within the scope of two inquiries:

I. What has God done to save us?

II. What is man required to do to be saved?

We will attend to these in their order.

THE STONE HILL PEOPLE AND HOW THEY RAISED MONEY FOR MISSIONS.

A missionary came along to the Stone Hill church. The members were really interested. They wanted to do something, they said, but they hadn't any ready money. The missionary replied that he didn't want money; he would take produce. He spoke to them thus: "I know your circumstances well. Here you are a little farming community; you've only got about sixty members in your church; most of you are scattered about on a dozen farms. Now, wouldn't you be willing to give a little wheat and a few potatoes and a few apples to spread your Master's gospel? Very well. Now I don't want money; I'll take produce. Honor the Lord with the first fruits of all thine increase."

"But how will you get possession of the produce?"

"Oh," he replied; "I will get you to bring it to the village some time when you are coming in on business. Brother Elwell will receive it at his store, and turn it into money; after which it will be easy enough to send it along."

In the main, the plan seemed reasonable; but they doubted whether it would work well.

"You leave it all to me," said the missionary. "You do just as I say. Get an old flour barrel or a bag, or a box of any kind, and chalk on it, 'For the Lord;'; then, when you gather your wheat, take a bushel, or a half bushel if you think the other too much, and put it into the sack that belongs to the Lord. At another time, do the same with your oats,

and when the season comes round, put in a bushel of apples, and then, later, your bushel of potatoes. Perhaps your wives and daughters would agree to give a pound of butter or a dozen of eggs, the first yield of every spring. You will be surprised how it will foot up."

"Well, well," they said; "it looks fair enough; it would be no harm to try it for a single time; only we might not get a good price for these donations of produce."

"Don't trouble yourself about that," said the missionary; as soon as you have measured out your bushel into the Lord's sack, your work will be over; let it remain at the Lord's risk; whether it sells for little or much, it is His business. If any of it rots, or is eaten by rats, or if it meets with any accident, still consider it the Lord's loss, and not yours."

"They laughed at his idea. Three or four said they would do it; others hung back. One man there was a day-laborer; every year, there were a few or more days in which he had little to do. He said he would give one day's work every year; he would fix on a certain day ahead; when that fixed day came round, he would consider it the Lord's day; whatever he might happen to make on that day should be the Lord's without fail. If that day should happen to be a rainy day, or, if he got nothing to do on that day, it should be the Lord's loss and not his.

"Another brother was a shoemaker. He offered to give the work of four Saturday nights of each quarter; those particular nights, and no other. Whatever jobs of half-soleing and mending boots and shoes came to him on those evenings were to be paid into the Lord's treasury. If no work should happen to come in, it was to be the Lord's loss, and not his; or, if he should be sick and unable to work, the loss still was the Lord's; he was free from his obligation.

"A grocery keeper agreed to fix on one day of the year, to be determined on at least three months in advance. On that day, whatever might be the profits of his sales, whether five cents or five dollars, should be devoted to the spread of the Gospel.

"The results surprised them all. In previous years they had never taken more than six or seven dollars for mission purposes. Elwell, the grocer had received the produce and made the sales and collected the little sums earned. He now rendered his account:

Received from John Pye, one day's work.....	\$	75
Thomas Smith, four evenings' patching shoes.....	1	30
Edward Manly, one bushel of wheat.....	1	00
" " " " " potatoes.....		40
" " " " " corn.....		25
" " " " " apples.....		50

“	“	“ pound of butter.....	15
“	“	“ dozen of eggs.....	12
John Elwell, one days' profits of grocery.....	2	25	
Eli Rees, bushel contributions, wheat, apples, etc.....	3	35	
Henry Davis, bushel contributions and other things.....	3	75	
John Kirk, bushel contributions, wheat, apples, etc.....	3	32	
Timothy Dexter, bushel contributions and poultry.....	5	50	
Edward Rodden, bushel contribution, a ham, wool, etc.	8	00	

And so the accounts went on. Over forty dollars were raised, and sent on to the Missionary Union to support a native preacher somewhere in China.

The members enjoyed the giving. John Pye said he never put forth his strength with so much pleasure, as on that day when every stroke of his hand was to help his Master. It sweetened his toil for a month afterward. Thomas Smith said that on those nights when he was working for missions, the sound of his lap-stone was like music in his ears. John Elwell said, it was the easiest and smoothest day's business he ever did in the store. Edward Rodden said that whether any missionaries came along or not, henceforth the Lord's work should have a share in the yield of everything on his farm, from the sale of a fat ox down to a peck of turnips. Giving had been a blessing to him. It had kept God before his mind. It had sanctified his flocks and his herd, and he meant to do a great deal more next year than he had done this year for missions at home and abroad. He hinted, also, about their being able to raise the pastor's salary next year. Money-getting might be made a curse, or it might be made a means of grace; and so said they all.—*National Baptist*.

SEVEN WAYS TO KILL PRAYER-MEETINGS.

There are many persons who seem to desire to accomplish the object contemplated by this article; but who set about their work in such a bungling sort of way that we have thought they might be grateful for some definite and formulated instruction concerning the best means for accomplishing the end they have in view. We have, accordingly, drawn upon the experience and observation of several of our brethren whose opinions are entitled to respect, we have given the matter no little thought; and venture to lay down a few rules for the attainment of an object which would seem to be dear to a good many Christian hearts:

1. Be irregular in your attendance of the prayer-meeting. One might think that systematically "forsaking the assembling of yourselves together—as the manner of some is," would exert a more deleterious effect upon the prayer-meeting

than to attend it semi-occasionally ; but we are satisfied that this view is incorrect. If all the members of a church would tacitly agree to absent themselves habitually from a prayer-meeting, of course the meeting would soon die ; but if only half of them adopt this course of action, the prayer-meeting will still live and may prosper. As it is not likely that all the members of a Christian church will acquiesce in a resolution wholly to forsake the social assemblies of God's people—as it is not likely that even a clear majority of them will do so—we reiterate our advice : Be irregular in your attendance. Come just often enough to make your semi-occasional absences a grief and burden to those who are always there. Lead them to expect you and then disappoint them. It will have an exceedingly depressing effect. This effect can be intensified, during a season of increasing religious interest, by absenting yourself for three or four successive weeks.

2. Come late to prayer-meeting. This rule is not without exceptions. We have known excellent effects attained (in the direction of the object contemplated by this article) where persons of prominence in the church were systematically the first ones at the prayer-meeting, and took seats in about the middle of the house, so that three-fourths of those who came after them—taking seats behind the early comers—would be at least forty feet from the leader of the meeting. As a rule, however, come late if you want to kill the prayer-meeting. Come tramping in during the reading of the Scriptures or the remarks made upon them, so that neither you nor anybody else, will have any definite idea what direction the leader intended to give to the thought and feeling of God's people. The effect will be admirable.

3. Sit well back in the prayer-meeting, and as far apart as possible. There is something gained in sitting close together, so that you can whisper and giggle with your neighbors ; but the best results are attained by sitting moodily apart. At any rate, sit back. A household interested in any common object cluster closely about a common centre, and each borrows enthusiasm from personal contact with his friend and brother. Reverse all that in the Christian household, if you want to kill the prayer-meeting.

4. If you can sing, start some tune which no one but yourself ever heard. If you can't sing the effect is all the better. The best time to start this tune is just when the leader is about to give out a hymn in which all could join, and which would appropriately voice the sentiment of the meeting.

5. If you speak or pray let it be ; (1) At the utmost possible length. Twenty minutes is none too long. (2) On an entirely different theme from that which your brethren have been considering. 3. If possible at the very close of the meeting.

Watch your chance—letting slip of course, a great many chances which an ordinary mortal would choose—and pop up just as the leader is about to pronounce the benediction. The effect will be most happily deleterious—not merely on the meeting in which your efforts in this direction are crowned with success, but on subsequent meetings.

6. If possible, get up a controversy with the leader, or with some brother who has preceded you, when you speak or pray. Find fault with his exegesis. Carry his suggestions to ridiculous lengths which he never intended, and then expose the fallacy of them. Turn the prayer-meeting into a debating society if you possibly can. This will tend to promote irregularity of attendance on the part of some who are inclined to be constant. If done in prayer, the effect is greater than if done in the course of remarks; and we have seen it very neatly done in prayer more than once.

7. We are at first inclined to announce as our seventh rule: Hurry out of the prayer-meeting without speaking to anybody—without shaking hands with man, woman or child. This line of conduct has its influence, and may be occasionally indulged in—especially where the theme of the meeting has been, “brotherly love,” or the nature of the meeting tender and melting—with effect. But on the whole our seventh rule shall be: Linger after the prayer-meeting; manifest a heartfelt interest in the welfare of Zion; but, criticise everything that has been said and done. Find fault with the leader; make fun of this sister’s grammar that brother’s tones and looks and gestures. If you hear anybody else doing this, make sure that the brother or sister criticised hears of it. By adopting this course you can carry the work of killing the prayer meeting out of the prayer-meeting, and scatter it through the week.

P. S.—Of course, if you don’t want to kill the prayer-meeting you will take pains to violate the rules given above.—*Examiner and Chronicle.*

CHANGE OF PUBLISHERS.

The entire control and management of the following works have been transferred to Bro. John Burns, publisher, of St. Louis, Mo., who will re-issue the works in an improved manner:

Memoirs of A. Campbell, by Dr. Robert Richardson. Popular Lectures and Addresses of A. Campbell. Campbell and Owen Debate. Christian System. Christian Baptism. Memoirs of Thos. Campbell, by A. Campbell.

Bro. Burns is anxious to obtain energetic colporteurs. These books should be in every Christian library.

OBITUARIES.

At her father's residence in Eramosa, Aug., 1882, our sister, Sarah Hamilton, the beloved daughter of Bro. John Black. She leaves a husband and one child to mourn her loss. A large gathering of sympathising friends testified their sense of her worth. Her end was peaceful though her sufferings were great. She sleeps in Jesus.

J. L. HILLSBURG.

One of the excellent among women departed from our midst last month. Her name was Almira Palen, wife of the late W. A. Palen, who, previously to her marriage, was numbered with numerous members of the Werden family, in Hallowell and Athol, in the county of Prince Edward.

Sister Palen left us on the 5th of May, happily ripe for the glorified state. A journal published at Picton truthfully testifies: "Her end was perfect peace." To those who stood at her bedside, in view of death's momentous change, she said: "I have lived for years in the full assurance of faith in the Lord, and I wish you all to understand He does not fail me now. O, the grace and the love of Jesus, my Redeemer!" These words from a sister of seventy-two years, after living a Disciple, amid trying opposition, for over forty years, was to the devout heart encouraging and edifying. The Lord is the Saviour.—*Living Laborer*, London East, Canada, June 28, 1882.

PRICEVILLE, Sep. 18th, 1882.

Brother McDiarmid.—Perhaps you are informed of the sad and sudden death of David King, the only son of Henry King of Artemesia township near Priceville, which took place on Lord's day, the 10th inst. The deceased and his father were hitching the horse to the buggy at their door for the purpose of going to meeting. The boy while holding up the shafts was kicked on the breast and only survived the fatal blow for about six hours. He was eleven years and five months old. The melancholy event so unexpected, fell hard on the bereaved parents and his dear sister, especially as he was a kind and obedient son to his parents and to his sister a tender and affectionate brother. Indeed, all who knew him could not but love him and admire his noble, cheerful, and kind conduct. Elder Daniel Ferguson delivered an impressive and very appropriate discourse on the occasion, and a number of sympathizing Christian ladies sang at the close of the service that beautiful hymn by Sankey, "When He cometh to make up his jewels," &c. On Tuesday following

his remains were followed to the place of interment by a large concourse of sorrowing friends and sympathizing neighbors.

Yours fraternally,

JOHN McKECHNIE.

PRICEVILLE, Sept. 24, 1882.

DEAR BRO. McDIARMID,—I received your sympathizing letter with a very thankful heart. I did not expect that you had us in such affectionate remembrance, on account of your being now three years without seeing us, and being at so many different places, and mingling with so many people. I should think this would have the effect of erasing from your mind, to a great extent, almost any obscure individual. But I am especially pleased that you remember our darling little boy. David had not obeyed the Gospel, yet I am not at all solicitous about his eternal well-being. I never pressed that matter upon him. I never believed in pressing any one to obey the Gospel except they did it understandingly, which I doubt if he was capable of doing. He was indeed a very good obedient boy, and his heart was big with love to everybody, especially his mother and his sisters and myself. I think the person does not live who can say that he ever heard a bad word out of his mouth, or used any one otherwise than with the greatest consideration and respect. He was a beautiful reader of the Scriptures, and it was our custom before retiring, all to join and read verse about, in which he always joined, except when he was very tired or sleepy. He was a great help to me in my work, being very active, and willing to do anything he could with pleasure. The day before he was killed he loaded loose oats all day. His school teacher, a pious Godly man, says that he does not think in all his experience he ever knew a boy so amiable and good in his disposition. He was also the making of a splendid scholar, being intelligent and bright, learning everything thoroughly. He and I intended to be your guests a day or two at the time of the Exhibition. We had it arranged to go on Tuesday, the 12th; but alas! for earthly hopes. We carried his remains to the little cemetery at Bro. McKechnie's on that day. We miss his noble form all over our home, and his soft gentle words as he would ask some interesting question, or offer to do some service for us. His mind and his little hands were always busy about something noble and good. We draw consolation from the firm belief that he was carried by angels to Abraham's bosom; and that when Jesus comes again his corruptible body will put on incorruption. May we who are left weeping on the shores of time so live that we may join him in that better world where there shall be no more sor-

rows, nor tears, nor pain, nor death. His death was caused by the kick of a horse. We were hitching up to go to the house of worship when he was kicked. We did not think it was serious, as he walked and talked and appeared strong. The doctor thought there was no danger of death, but he was bleeding to death inwardly. He lived from twelve o'clock until the sun was setting, when almost without a struggle his gentle spirit passed away while leaning upon my throbbing bosom. He was 11 years, 4 months and 11 days old, beloved by all who knew him. Strong young men wept like children. The brethren and neighbors extended their services and sympathies to an extent seldom witnessed. Our hearts go out to them all in thankfulness and gratitude. May the consolations and promises of the Gospel sustain and cheer us in this sad hour. Amen.

Your Brother,

HENRY KING.

THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT, GAL. 5, 22.

Bring forth the fruits of the Spirit in love,
Gentleness, meekness, long suffering and joy ;
And set your affections on treasures above,
To cherish these graces your soul power employ.

Let meekness, temperance, goodness and faith,
All gracefully blending your being control ;
And guided in all things by thus the Lord saith,
His words always reigning supreme in the soul.

Yes keep them in memory, also in heart,
To make you like Jesus : meek, lowly and true ;
O ! let their bless'd influence never depart,
And, " Come then ye bless'd," He will say unto you.

And then more than ever has enter'd the heart,
Of glory and gladness and blessing shall be
Given to sinners who chose the good part,
When they the great King in His beauty shall see.*

W. A. STEPHENS.

*Isaiah, 33, 17, "Thine eyes shall see the King in his beauty."