

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/  
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/  
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Wrinkled pages may film slightly out of focus.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

# THE CHRISTIAN.

No. 9. } SAINT JOHN, N. B., FEBRUARY, 1840. { Vol. 1.

CONDUCTED BY W. W. EATON.

Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.—*Peter*. On this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.—*The Lord Messiah*.

## BAPTISM.—THE ACTION. No. I.

During the last three centuries the meaning of this word has been in dispute. Whether it expresses one act, or three, has been the controverted point. The pens and tongues of men, eminent for learning, have been employed in this discussion. We have not the vanity to suppose, that, with our limited resources, we can present any thing new. A brief and concise view of the whole controversy is called for. "Baptists" and "Païdo-Baptists" assert and re-assert, that writers have conceded this point, that and the other. Some tell us that such a Lexicographer says that the words in connection with the controversy mean this, and another denies it; and, hence, the controversy is loaded with much superfluous matter. More is said about what commentators and great men have asserted, than concerning the language and meaning of words used by holy men, who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.

The object, therefore, of this paper, is to give a concise scriptural view of the question. We claim no originality in the exposition. We are debtors to Baptists and Païdo-Baptists; but more particularly to the brethren of the Reformation, whose works we shall use as shall best subserve our purpose in exhibiting the truth to our readers. Our time is so much occupied in various ways that we would gladly have presented some other productions on the subject; but none in our estimation, were just what the readers of "The Christian" required.—Generally, they are too voluminous. In them there is such a display of classic lore, that not one reader in a thousand could understand the writers, and consequently his labour is lost. Had it not, however, been for the traditions and inventions of men, no volume need have been put into our hands for the settlement of this and every other question connected with our happiness, but the word of God. But men have propagated other views than those contained in the volume of inspiration, and they must be met and refuted, if we would see the truth victorious.

Many excellent works on this question are extant, but they appear to have been prepared expressly for the profound scholar. Hebrew and Greek characters adorn their pages; all of which to the great mass of readers are *a dead letter*. The writers appear to have spent more time with the gods and goddesses of antiquity, than with the Apostles and Prophets of the Most High. Readers seeing this, imagine that the question is one awfully abstruse, so much so that none but those who have spent all their days with the dead languages can come to any definite conclusion on the subject.

Our object then shall be to make the whole controversy so plain "that he that reads may run," and that "the wayfaring man though a fool need not err in the path of duty."

Many sneer at Baptism as a "non-essential," and at the same time labour the question as though the salvation of the world was suspended on its decision. We shall not anticipate the third part of our subject; but relative to the importance of it we would remark, that we consider an exact agreement amongst professors of religion on a scriptural view of the action, subjects and design of baptism, will be a signal for Christian union and communion throughout Christendom. Believing this, who that desires to see Christians united, would not seek to obtain correct scriptural knowledge of the whole controversy?

Our Baptist friends, generally, look on the subject as not connected with our conversion to God; and at the same time debar from their churches and communion those who have not been immersed, although they acknowledge that they may be the Children of God—his elect people! "God communes with them; they have fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ; but we will not commune with them nor admit them into our churches because they have not obeyed a command of the Lord Jesus which is a non-essential."

This remark is made with reference to only one class of Baptists, not from one unkind feeling, but that they may be induced to examine the subject in all its parts; for should they be excluding from their communion and church privileges one of the children of God, better for them that a mill stone were hanged about their neck, and they drowned in the depths of the sea. With our present views of the wickedness of keeping up divisions in the body of Christ, not for all the wealth of Britain would we dare to raise our hand or voice to prevent the union and communion of all the children of God.

Baptists and Paido-Baptists, the subject before us is an important one! Examine it well.

We have for some time been of the opinion, that one great reason why this controversy has been of such long standing, is the inattention paid to the meaning of words. Nothing more certain than this, viz. that if we do not fully understand the meaning of the words we use we shall never be able to ascertain the meaning of the sentences made up of these words. Let us then attend to the meaning of the principal words used in this controversy.

That the Author of the Holy Volume used words in their common acceptation, is certain; if he did not, a revelation to us it can never be.

If he *could* have made it plain, and *would not*, there would have been a lack of *benevolence*; but if he *would*, but *could not*, there would have been an insufficiency of *wisdom*: neither of which charges dare we prefer against the author of the living oracles.

That every thing connected with our happiness under the christian dispensation is perfectly plain, would appear obvious from the fact that under the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensations many "bodily acts" were required, on an exact attention to which was suspended the life and happiness of their votaries. Then there was no difficulty in understanding the Lord. During those days the people were taught that when the Messiah should have visited the earth, our duties would be still more simple and plain! And has it come to this, that the first act of obedience to the Lord is involved in such utter obscurity, that it requires a classical education, and the painful researches of a lifetime to know what the Lord means when he says, "Be baptised every one of you!" This would indeed be making the present dispensation ten times more abstruse than any former one. But it is not so. As the gospel dispensation came nearer to men, the light grew stronger until the recipients of the truth were surrounded with a flood of celestial light and truth. Yes, the glory of the new covenant was that they should not be under the necessity of teaching every man his neighbour and brother, saying, know ye the Lord for all should know him from the least to the greatest.

With these preliminaries, too extended already, we hasten to enquire into the meaning of the words *bapto*, *baptizo*, *baptisma*, and their derivatives.

To what source shall we direct our longing eyes for the meaning of these words? They were in use in the days of our Lord and his apostles: they were then familiar words. We have not a hint from the New Testament that they were words of doubtful import. Shall we ask Homer, Pindar, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Heraclides, Ponticus, Herodotus, Aratus, Xenophon, Plutarch, Lucian, Diodorus Siculus, Plato, Epictetus, Hypocrates, Strabo, Polybius or Josephus, what the Lord meant by them? Professor Stuart, of Andover, (Mass.) an instructor in one of the first Paido-Baptist theological schools in America, tells us that he has examined all the above authors; he thinks that no occurrence of the words escaped his observation, and in every instance the words meant "*to dip, plunge, or immerse into any thing liquid.*" All Lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this. Mr. Alexander Carson, A. M., Minister of the Gospel, Edinburgh, gives the same testimony, after quoting largely from the above works. Our readers may say we have not these works, and it is only second-hand testimony after all! How do we know that the Savior or the Apostles (except Paul) ever saw one of these books? What books then had they?—*Answer.*—They had the Septuagint Greek of the old Testament. This work, according to Josephus, was the production of seventy-two learned Jews, who visited Egypt in the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus for this express purpose. With their Hebrew copies of the Old Testament before them (than whom no men living understood them better)

they gave to the King of Egypt, and through him to the world, the Old Testament in Greek, a language at that time perhaps more common and perfect than any other. This took place about two hundred and eighty years before the Christian era. This work by christian writers is called the Septuagint, or the Translation of the LXX.

We are thus particular in order that all may be fully introduced into the circumstances of those who figured on the stage of action in the religious world, when baptism was understood and practiced in its ancient simplicity. The translation of the LXX. was the source then, from which the New Testament writers derived their knowledge of all the ordinances, forms, and ceremonies under the Jewish dispensation. Of its value the learned and justly celebrated Michalis observes, "The book most necessary to be read and understood by every man who studies the New Testament, is without doubt, the Septuagint, which alone has been of more service than all the passages from profane authors collected together. It should be read in the public schools by those who are destined for the church, should form the subject for a course of lectures at the University, and be the constant companion of an expositor of the New Testament."

*Reader, mark this!* The Septuagint was the source from which the apostles generally derived their knowledge of words. This being in existence before baptism was instituted, what word do they take to express baptism? In that book, read in their synagogues every week, they had *cheo*, to pour; *rantizo*, to sprinkle; *nipto*, to wash the hands, eyes, feet, &c.; *plano*, "to wash clothes by plunging them in water," *lono*, to wash the whole body, and *bapto*, to dip. No words in any language can be used more definitely than those are used in the Greek. Not in one instance, as we shall in the sequel prove, are they ever used interchangeably.

The apostles of the lamb, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, about to give to the church and the world a perfect rule of faith and practice; after baptising many and having submitted to it themselves, always express the action by the words *baptizo* and *baptisma*, words derived from *bapto*, of frequent occurrence in the Septuagint.

If to *sprinkle* or to *pour* be valid baptism, why not, in some cases at least, have *rantizo* or *cheo* as well as *baptizo*? But no, not in *one* instance! When we have "dip," in the Old Testament, it is *bapto*, and its derivatives in the original.

With as much attention and care as possible, we examined the only copy of the Septuagint to be found in the city, and with the aid of Cruden's Concordance, and a list of passages on the same subject furnished by Brother James Shannon, President of the Colloge of Louisiana, (to whom we are very much indebted in this exposition) we are quite certain that in all the following passages from the word of God, the original is *bapto*, in its various forms: Exod. xii. 22—Ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and *dip* it in the blood. Lev. iv. 6—The Priest shall *dip* his finger; also verse 17; xiv. 16. xiv. 6—The wood, bird, scarlet, and hyssop, and shall *dip* them and the living bird; v. 51. Numbers xix. 18—A clean person shall *dip* hyssop in water. Deut. xxxiii. 21—Let Aser *dip* his foot in oil. Ruth ii. 14—*Dip* thy morsel in the vine-

gar. Luke xvi. 24—Send Lazarus that he may *dip* the tip of his finger in water. Lev. ix. 9—Aaron *dipped* his finger in the blood. Joshua iii. 15. The priest's feet were *dipped* in the brim of the water. Ps. xviii. 23. That thy foot may be *dipped* in the blood. Matt. xxvi. 23—He that *dippeth* his hand with me in the dish. Also twice in John, xiii. 26. 1 Samuel xiv. 27—Jonathan *dip*t the rod in the honey comb. 2 Kings viii. 15—Hazeal took a cloth and *dipped* it in water. Revelations xix. 13—He wears a vesture *dipped* in blood. 2 Kings v. 14, we have the only occurrence of *baptizo* in the Septuagint which is rendered *dipped* in the common version. Naaman dipped in Jordan seven times. *Bapto* is used figuratively in Dan. iv. 32, and v. 23, where it is said that Nebuchadnezzar was *wet* with the dews of heaven.

On the figurative meaning of the word, more in some future number, when we shall class these words, and notice the objections to immersion as the only meaning of baptism.

In the Bible the reader will find dip once more, viz. Gen. 37 : 31—“And they took Joseph's coat, and killed a kid of the goats, and *dipped* it in the blood.” The objector may say it would have been difficult for them to have *dipped* his coat unless they had been provided with vessels in which to have caught the blood. Notice then the accuracy of the Greek here ! Instead of *bapto*, in the original it is *emolunan* ; the meaning of which is, *smear*ed, *daub*ed, *defil*ed ! !

Not only is there this precision in the use of *bapto*, but also in the occurrence of *rantizo*, which is as invariably rendered sprinkle as the other dip. In proof of which, here are all its occurrences in the book : Lev. 3 : 2, 8, 13—The priests the sons of Aaron shall *sprinkle* the blood. 4 : 6, 17 ; 6 : 27. 14 : 7—He shall *sprinkle* on him to be cleansed. v. 16, The priest shall *sprinkle* of the oil ; v. 27, the same ; v. 51—*sprinkle* house seven times. 16 : 14—He shall *sprinkle* on the mercy seat ; v. 15. Numbers 8 : 7—*sprinkle* water of purifying on them. 19 : 13—Water was not *sprinkled* on him ; 18—*Sprinkle* water on the tent ; also 19, 20, 21. Job 2 : 12, [some defect in the original—doubtful whether *rantizo* occurs] *sprinkled* dust on their heads towards heaven. Isa. 2 : 15—So shall he *sprinkle* many nations. Neither *rantizo*, *cheo*, nor *bapto*. Should read, so shall he *astonish* many nations. 45 : 8—Let the skies *pour* down [rather *rain* down] righteousness. Ezek. 36 : 25—Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you. Heb. 9 : 13—The ashes of a heifer *sprinkling* the unclean ; 19—He *sprinkled* both the book and all the people ; 10 : 22—Hearts *sprinkled* from an evil conscience ; 12 : 24—We are come to the blood of *sprinkling*. 1 Peter 1 : 2—*Sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus Christ.

In the English translation we have *sprinkling* : Hebrews 11 : 28—Through faith they kept the *sprinkling* of the blood. The Greek has it *proschusin*, to express not simply a *sprinkling*, but rather a *dashing* of the blood of the passover *against* the door-posts and lintels. We have also *sprinkling* in perhaps from five to ten other passages, where the original has *pao*, to scatter. Ex. 9 : 8—Moses *sprinkled* [rather scattered] the ashes towards heaven. Here, as in other places, we behold the superior accuracy of the Greek in the choice of words.

We next proceed to show that *cheo* is always translated pour. This word is used as definitely as either of the others. In proof of which the reader will notice the following portions of the word of God: Gen. 28: 18—Jacob *poured* oil on the top of a stone; 35: 4—Jacob *poured* a drink offering thereon. Ex. 4: 9—*Pour* water on the dry land; 9: 33—The rain was *poured* on the earth; 39: 7—*Pour* the anointing oil on his head; v. 12—*Pour* the blood of the bullock beside the bottom of the altar. Same expression Lev. 4: 7, 18, 25, 30, 34; 2: 1—He shall *pour* oil on the meat offering; v. 6; 4: 12—Where ashes are poured it shall be buried: 8: 12—Moses *poured* anointing oil on Aarons head; v. 15—He *poured* blood at the bottom of the altar; also 9: 9. 14: 15—*Pour* into the palm of his own left hand; v. 26 18—*Pour* it on the head of him to be cleansed; 41—They shall *pour* out the dust; 21: 10—On whose head the anointing oil was poured; 27: 13—He shall *pour* out the blood. Numbers 5: 15—He shall *pour* no oil upon his offering. Deut. 12: 16—*Pour* blood out as water; v. 24; also 15: 23; 12: 27—The blood of the sacrifices shall be *poured* out. Judges 6: 20—Take the flesh and *pour* out the broth. 1 Samuel 1: 16—I have *poured* out my soul before the Lord; 8: 6—Drew water and *poured* it out before the Lord; x. 1—Samuel *poured* oil on Saul's head. 1 Kings 13: 3—The altar shall be rent, and the ashes *poured* out; 18; 33—*Pour* water on the burnt sacrifice. 2 Kings 3: 11—Who *poured* water on the hands of Elijah.; 4: 4—*Pour* out the oil into the vessels; v. 5—The vessels were brought to her and she *poured* out; 41—*Pour* out for the people that they may eat; v. 40—so they *poured* out for the men; 9: 3—*Pour* the oil on Jehu's head; 16: 13—Ahaz *poured* his drink offering. 2 Chron. 12: 7—My wrath shall be *poured* out on Jerusalem. Job 12: 21—He *poureth* contempt on princes. Ps. 107: 40, the same; 29: 6—When the rock *poured* me out rivers of oil; 30: 16—And now my soul is *poured* out; 36: 27—They *pour* down rain according to vapor. Psalms 22: 14—I am *poured* out like water; 42: 4—I *pour* out my soul; 45: 2—Grace is *poured* into thy lips, 42: 8—Ye people *pour* out your hearts before him; 65: 8—Wine is red and he *poureth* out the same; 67: 17—Clouds *poureth* out water; 79: 6—*Pour* out thy wrath on the heathen; 142: 2—I *poured* out my complaint before him. Songs of Solomon 1: 3—Thy name is as ointment *poured* forth. Isa. 32: 15—Till the spirit be *poured* on us from on high; 42: 25—He hath *poured* on him the fury of his anger; 44: 3—I will *pour* water on him that is thirsty. Jer. 6: 11—I will *pour* it out on the children abroad; 7: 20—My fury shall be *poured* out on this place; 10: 25—*pour* out thy fury upon the heathen; 14: 16—I will *pour* their wickedness upon them; 42: 18—As fury hath been so shall it be *poured* out; 44: 6—My fury and mine anger was *poured* forth. Lam. 2: 19—*Pour* out thine heart like water before the Lord; 2: 4—He *poured* out his fury like fire; also 4: 11. 4: 1—The stones of the sanctuary are *poured* out. Exek. 7: 8—Now will I shortly *pour* out my fury upon thee; 9: 8—Wilt thou destroy all in *pouring* out thy fury; 16: 36—Because thy fulness was *poured* out: 11: 19: 20: 8. 13, 21; 30: 15. 21: 31—I will *pour* out mine

indignation; 24: 3—Set on the pot and *pour* water into it. Zeph. 1: 17—Their blood shall be *poured* out; 3: 8—To *pour* upon them mine indignation. Ezek. 22: 22—I the Lord have *poured* out my fury; v. 31; 23: 8; 24: 7. 36: 18—Wherefore I *porred* out my fury upon them; 39: 29—I *poured* out my spirit on the house of Israel. Hosea 5: 10—I will *pour* out my wrath like water. Amos 5: 8—He *powreth* out waters on the face of the earth; 9: 6. Zach. 12: 10—I will *pour* on the house of David the spirit of grace. Mal. 3: 10—See if I will not *pour* you out a blessing. Matt. 26: 7—*Poured* ointment on his head; Mark 14: 3. John 2: 15—He *poured* out the changers money; 13: 5—He *poured* water into a basin. Luke 10: 34—He bound up his wounds *pouring* in oil and wine; Acts 2: 17, 18; and also Joel 2: 28, 29. Isa. 44: 3—I will *pour* out of my spirit. Acts 10: 54—On the Gentiles was *poured* the gift of the Holy Spirit. Rev. 16: 1—*Pour* out the vials of the wrath of God: v. 2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 17. Here the word *pour* is found about one hundred and ten times. In all these places no other word occurs except *cheo* and its compounds. The common English scholar will see that in no instance will either *sprinkle* or *dip* express the ideas in the connection.

There are perhaps twenty other places where *pour* is found in the English translation. "In several places where the pouring out of a libation or drink-offering was intended, the Greek had *spendo*, the proper word to express that idea. In 2 Sam. 13: 9, when cakes are said to be poured out of a pan, the Greek, with an accuracy worthy of all admiration, has *katekenosen*, emptied out. Take another example. In 2 Chron. 34: 21, 25—God's wrath is said to be *poured out*; in connexion with which we have this assertion—it shall not be *quenched*. Here we have the obvious incongruity of *quenching*, not fire, but something *poured out* as a liquid. The Greek, true to itself, has no such jargon, no such mixing of metaphors; it has the figure of wrath being kindled as a fire, (*ezekante*, from *ekkaio*) and then quenched."

We now come to notice *wash* in its various forms. Some, perhaps all Greek Lexicons, give wash as one of the definitions of *baptizo* and *baptisma*. Let the reader examine those portions of the word of God where wash occurs; and see if there are any grounds for such a conclusion. Is it at all probable that having several words to express different kinds of washing, they would use *baptisma* for that purpose also! And that too when *bapto*, its root was always used literally to express simply dip, and nothing else?

"*Nipto*—to wash. It is spoken of some part of the body, as the hands, the feet, the face, and the eyes," &c.—Parkhurst. Gen. 18: 4—Wash your feet; 19: 2; 24: 32. 43: 24—They washed their feet; v. 31. Exod. 30: 19, 20. Deut. 21: 6—Shall wash their hands. Judges, 19: 21—Washed their feet. Samuel, 25: 41—Let thy handmaid be a servant to wash thy feet. 2 Samuel, 11: 9—Wash thy feet; 12: 20—David arose and washed himself. 2 Chron. 4: 6—The sea for the priests to wash in. 1 Kings, 22: 38—One washed the chariot. Psalms, 26, 6—I will wash my hands in innocency; 58: 10—He shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked; 53: 13—I have



washed my hands in innocency. Proverbs, 30 : 12—A generation not washed. Solomon's Songs, 5 : 3—I have washed my feet ; verse 12. Matt. 6 : 17—When thou fastest, wash thy face ; 15 : 2. They wash not their hands when they eat. 27 : 24—Pilate washed his hands. Mark, 12 : 3—Except they wash they eat not. Luke 11 : 38—They Pharisees marvelled that he had not first washed. John, 9 : 7—Jesus said, go wash : he washed and came seeing ; also v. 11 and 15 ; 13 : 5—Jesus began to wash the disciples' feet, v. 6, 8, 10, 14. 1 Tim. 5 : 10—If she have washed the saints feet. In all the above passages the original is some form of *Nipto*.

*Pluno*—to wash properly as clothes are washed by plunging them them in water. Rev. 7 : 14—These are they who have washed their robes. Lev. 6 : 27 ; 13 : 54, 56, 58 ; 14 : 9 ; 17 : 15–16 ; Neh. 4 : 23 ; Psal. 51 : 2—Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity : v. 7. Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow. Jer. 2 : 22 ; 4 : 14.

*Louo*—Grammarians, says the learned Duport, remark a difference between *louo* and *pluno* and *nipto* ; that *louo* is spoken of the *whole body* ; *pluno* of *garments and clothes*, and *nipto* of the *hands*. So says Parkhurst, a clergyman in the established church.

Here are all these places where we were able to find wash in the above signification : Exod. 2 : 5, The daughter of Pharaoh came to *wash* ; 29 : 4, Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring and *wash* ; 40 : 12, Aaron and his sons thou shalt *wash* with water. Lev. 14 : 8, Shave and *wash* himself in water ; Deut. 33 : 11. Lev. 14 : 9 ; 15 : 16 ; 14 : 4, 24 ; 22 : 6 ; 17 : 15, 16. Ruth 3 : 3, *Wash* thyself and anoint thee. 2 Kings 5 : 10, 12, 13, *Wash* in Jordan—may I not *wash* in the rivers of Damascus—why not *wash* and be clean ? Job 9 : 30, If I *wash* myself with snow water. 2 Sam. 9 : 2, David saw a woman *washing* herself. Isa. i : 16, *Wash* you make you clean. Ezek. 23 : 40, For whom didst thou *wash* thyself. 16 : 4, Nor was *washed* in water ; v. 9. Sol. Songs 4 : 2, Like sheep that come up from the *washing* ; 6 : 6. John 13 : 10, He that is *washed* needeth not save to *wash* his feet. [in this sentence we have *louo* and *nipto*.] Acts 9 : 37, Dorcas was *washed* ; 16 : 33, *Washed* their stripes ; 22 : 16, *Wash* away thy sins. 1 Cor. 5 : 11, But ye are *washed*. Heb. 10 : 22, Your bodies *washed* with pure water. 2 Peter 2 : 22, Sow that was *washed*. Rev. 1 : 5, *Washed* us from our sins. Eph. 5 : 26, *Washing* of water by the word. Titus 3 : 5, *Washing* of regeneration.

We ask with surprise, at the conclusion of our labor in collecting these portions of the word of God, could words be used with greater precision than in all of these instances ? There are a few, and a very few figurative applications of these words, but on the whole, the words *dip*, *sprinkle*, *pour*, and *wash*, in the English language are not more expressive of the meaning usually attached to them, than are their Greek representatives. The most common English scholar may now, with these passages before him, draw his conclusions with as much certainty as though he could read the original. And we hope that our friends who practice sprinkling and pouring, calling it baptism, will remember that it would be just as light a task to prove that *sprinkling* meant

dipping, as to prove that *bapto*, *baptizo*, or *baptisma*, expressed either pouring or sprinkling !

“ In Mark, vii. 3-4, *nipto* is distinguished from *baptizo*. The Jews eat not except they wash (*nipsontai*) their hands. But when they have been to the market, lest they might have touched something unclean, in order to make sure work of it, they dip (*baptisontai*) the whole person.” If all who profess to be religious would be as careful at the present day, this article would be uncalled for !

The above passage, we presume, is that from which Lexicographers have come to the conclusion that *baptisma* must sometimes mean to wash. The common English translation in this passage gives us wash for two words that in no place in the Old or New Testament are synonymous. For what reason is *baptisontai* in this place rendered wash ? Perhaps the translators imagined that it would be inconvenient for the Jews to dip themselves before eating ! Let such persons read the following from the Law of Moses :—The person who should touch a “grave,” the “dead,” or even the “bone” of one slain, after being sprinkled with a certain preparation, “on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be unclean at even. But the man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation.”—Numbers, xix. 18-20 ; Lev. xvii. 15, 16. All who have attentively examined the Law of Moses, are aware that the life of the individual depended on the precision with which their duties were performed.—Why then should it be thought a thing incredible that a Jew coming from a market where he had been exposed to all manner of uncleanness should “bathe” his flesh—should dip himself ! And the fact that Paul, writing to the Hebrews, well acquainted with all these things, (chap. ix. 10,) uses the same word when referring to Jewish rites and ceremonies, strengthens, yes, confirms the above view. The divers washings (*baptismois*) and carnal ordinances unquestionably refer to the bathing and dipping of garments, &c. and the sprinkling (carnal ordinances) observed under the law. But these, however, were to continue only until the times of Reformation !

But a word or two on the carnal ordinances as contra-distinguished from divers *baptismois*. “The Jewish priests were made, after or according to the law of a carnal commandment, our High Priest was not made after such a law. The consecration of a priest required, according to the law, sprinkling, shaving, washing the clothes, and cleansing the flesh—consequently the ‘ordinances concerning the flesh’ included the sprinkling, and then its being distinguished from the divers baptisms confirms the matter still more. But on this we lay but little stress, as it is plainly shown in the 9th chapter, that the divers baptisms and the divers sprinklings are diverse things.”

“In 2d Kings, v. 14, *louo* is distinguished from *baptizo*. Naaman is commanded to wash or bathe (*lousai*) himself in Jordan.—Here the Greek has *lousai* from *louo*, which expresses both the act, and design with which that act was performed, viz. that of cleansing him from the leprosy. In this it corresponds precisely with *bathe*, or *wash*, in its

common acceptation. 'Then he went down and *dipped* (*ebaptisato*) himself.' Here the act alone is expressed, and therefore *baptizo* is used."

"In Luke, vii. 38, 44 : Mary is said to *wash* the Savior's feet with tears. Here the Greek has neither *bapto*, *nipito*, nor *louo*, but the very word which is most appropriate, viz. *brecho*, to wet or moisten. Properly speaking, she neither *washed* nor *dipped*, but simply *wet* them, and so the original expresses it."

"In Mark, vii. 4, and Luke, xi. 38, we have *wash* denoting simply *dip*, and here *baptizo* is found in the original. It must not be forgotten, that wherever we found *dip* in our version, we found *bapto* or *baptizo* in Greek, with but one exception, and that too, where not simple dipping, but *daubing*, was intended. In Heb. ix. 26 : washings, the noun, is expressed by *baptismos* ; and in Eph. v. 10, and Titus, iii. 5, where it denotes *bath*, it is expressed in Greek by *loutron*, the proper word to convey that idea. In Acts, xxii. 16 : '*wash away*' (viz. thy sins) is expressed by *apolousai*, which is here distinguished from *baptizo*. Again, we perceive the usual accuracy of the Greek. *Apolouo* expresses the *design* of the act ;—*baptizo* denotes simply the *act of immersion* itself. Ananias commanded Saul to wash away his sins in baptism ; but he understood Greek too well to command him to baptize them away. Such a command would have been no less absurd than '*Dip away thy sins.*' If *baptize* were synonymous with *wash*, the command to *baptize away* his sins would have been as proper, as that which Ananias gave him, viz. '*Wash away thy sins.*'"

But to conclude for this number, as this article is too extended already—with the above facts and arguments, what is the scriptural conclusion ? Is it not that by baptism the Saviour and his Apostles meant *immerse, and nothing but immerse* ?

But to sum up the arguments—*Bapto* in some form is found in the Old and New Testaments *twenty-one times*, and with but two exceptions, (and these figurative) it is translated (by men who practiced sprinkling and nothing else) *dip*.—*Raino* or *Rantizo* are found in *twenty-six* places, and invariably rendered *sprinkle* ; never once by any word that would leave the least suspicion that it had any connection with baptism.

*Cheo*, and its compounds are found about *one hundred times*, and invariably rendered *pour*.

*Nipito* occurs *thirty-one times*, always used for a partial washing.

*Pluno* is found *thirteen times*, and perhaps in many more places than those named ; and the same may be said of

*Louo*—which is laid before you in *thirty-three* places, and as invariably refers to a complete bathing.

With all these stubborn facts, (which must be apparent to the most common capacity) can there be a remaining doubt as to the act designed by the word *baptism* ? If only in a large majority of instances, *bapto* meant to dip, all reasonable men would give their voice for immersion ; but when in *not one* instance *bapto* can be rendered by any other word, and make sense with the connexion ; nor the other terms by any English word than those by which they are usually translated, what can

the whole must we think of the practice of sprinkling and pouring of water as an ordinance of God, and calling it *baptism*?

Depend upon it, reader, the sprinkling and pouring "mode" of baptism has not a peg on which to hang *one* argument in the Word of God!

EDITOR.

---

[FROM THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.]

ESSAYS ON MAN IN HIS PRIMITIVE STATE, AND UNDER THE  
Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Dispensations.—NO. IX.

JEWISH AGE.—NO. I.

As the first religious economy was patriarchal, because adapted to families in an unassociated capacity; so the second was national, because adapted to families in an associated or national capacity. The first required but the existence of a single family for the enjoyment of all its institutions and privileges: the second required many families living together in close neighbourhood and under one and the same civil government. Thus we find in the preliminaries to the Sinaitic institution, that it was proposed to constitute a religious nation a kingdom of priests, a holy people, upon a certain basis. To the preliminaries, as proposed by Moses, the people assented, and on their consent was issued the constitution. This was written by the King in his own handwriting upon two tables of stone. This was the supreme law of their social, religious, and moral relations. And all their other laws and institutions were but the development and application of its principles to religion and politics.

Abraham was called at a time when idolatry began to appear in Chaldea, and when families began each to have a family god. When his descendants became numerous and large enough to become a nation, and the nations had each its own God, it pleased the Ruler of the Universe to exhibit himself as the God of a nation. Hence originated the theocracy. Here it is necessary to adopt a few general principles of much importance in understanding the varieties which have appeared in the divine government. From the Fall of Man the Governor of the World withdrew from all personal intimacies with the race. He no longer conversed with man face to face as he was wont to do in Eden. The recollections of the Divinity became more and more faint as Adam advanced in years; and the traditionary information communicated to his descendants became less vivid and impressive in every generation. All new communications from the Creator were through symbols, by messengers, or rather through things already known.—Things entirely unknown can only be communicated to the mind by things already known. This axiom is at the basis of all revelations, and explains many otherwise inexplicable incidents in the divine communications to man. The natural symbols and the artificial names of things became, from a necessity of nature, the only means through which God could make himself known to man. This too, has been the invariable rule and measure of all the discoveries which God has

made of himself, his purposes, and will. Hence the spangled heavens, all the elements of nature, the earth, and the sea, with all their inhabitants; the relations, customs, and usages existing among men, have all been so many types or letters in the great alphabet which constitutes the vocabulary of divine revelation to man. He has even personated himself by his own creatures and spoke to man through human institutions. Hence he has been called a Sun, Light, Father, Husband, Man of War, General of Hosts, a Lord of Battles, King, Prince, Master, &c. He has been spoken of as having eyes, ears, mouth, hands, feet, &c. He has been represented as sitting, standing, walking, hastening, awaking. He has been compared to a unicorn, lion, rock, mountain, &c. He has made himself known in his character, perfections, purposes, and will, by things already known to man. This is the grand secret, which, when disclosed, removes many difficulties and objections, and sets in a clear light the genius of the Jewish age of the religious world.

Now when God became the king of one nation, it was only doing what, on a more extensive scale, and with more various and powerful effects, he had done in calling himself a Father. Both were designed to make himself known through human relations and institutions. One type, symbol, or name, is altogether incompetent to develop the wonderful and incomprehensible God. But his wisdom and goodness are most apparent in making himself known in those relations and to those extents which are best adapted to human wants and imperfections.—And the perfection of these discoveries consists in their being exactly suited to the different ages of the world and stages of human improvement. At the time when he chose one nation and made himself known to all the earth as its King and God, no other name, type, or symbol, was so well adapted to this benevolent purpose, as those selected. For when Israel was brought out of Egypt all the nations had their gods; and these gods were esteemed and admired according to the strength, skill, prowess, and prosperity of the nation over which they were supposed to preside. Hence that God was the most adorable in human eyes whose people were most conspicuous.

Wars and battles were the offspring of the spirit of those ages contemporaneous with the first five hundred years of the Jewish history, and with the ages immediately preceding. Hence the idea was, that the nation most powerful in war had the greatest and most adorable God. Now as the Most High, (a title borrowed from this very age) always took the world as it was at every period in which he chose to develop himself anew, or his purposes, he chose to appear as the Lord of Hosts, or God of Armies. And to make his name known through all the earth, he took one nation under his auspices, and appeared as their Sovereign and the Commander in Chief of all their armies.—Hence the splendid and easy bought victories of the Israelites. One could chase a hundred, and ten put a thousand to flight. This explains the deliverance out of Egypt, and how the Lord permitted Pharaoh's heart to be hardened—for the purpose of making his name known through all the earth. Pharaoh and his Court knew not the God of

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and impiously asked, "Who is the Lord that I should obey him?" But Moses made him know, and tremble, and bow. By the time when the Jews were settled in Canaan, the world was taught to fear the God of Israel, the Lord of Hosts; and so it came to pass that all the true and consistent knowledge of God upon the earth, amongst all nations, was derived directly or indirectly from the Jewish people.

But we must not think that only one purpose was gained, or one object was exclusively in view in any of these great movements of the Governor of the World. This is contrary to the general analogy of the material and spiritual systems. By the annual and diurnal revolutions of the earth, although by the former the seasons of the year, and by the latter day and night seem to be the chief objects, there are a thousand ends gained in conjunction with one principal one. So in this grand economy, many, very many illustrious ends were gained besides the capital one just mentioned. For as in the vegetable kingdom we have a succession of stages in the growth of plants; as in the animal kingdom we have a succession of stages in the growth of animals; so in the kingdom of God there is a similar progression of light, knowledge, life, and bliss. We have in the vegetable kingdom, the period of germinating, the period of blossoming, and the period of ripening the fruit. So we have infancy, childhood, youth, and manhood, in our own species. Each period calls for special influences, and a peculiar treatment. So it is in the kingdom of God. It had its infancy, its childhood, and its manhood. In each stage it was diversely exhibited. The Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Ages were adapted to these.

Again, we are not to consider the special temporal favors bestowed upon the Jews as indicative that the divine benevolence was exclusively confined to one nation to the exclusion of all the earth besides. As well might we say that the husbandman who cultivates his garden despises or neglects his farm, or that he exclusively loves that part of the soil which he encloses with a peculiar fence. Other circumstances and considerations require these specialities. The general good of the human race, and the blessing of all nations in a son of Abraham, were the ultimate and gracious ends in view in all these peculiar arrangements. This promise and guarantee was made to Abraham before the times of these ages or dispensations. So that the calling of the Jews, and their erection into a nation under the special government of God, were but means necessary to that reign of favor under which we now live.

These general and prefatory hints we thought expedient to suggest as preliminary to our essay on the Jewish economy. There is one lesson of more than ordinary importance, which all who have not attended to it ought to learn, not only with reference to our object in these essays, but with reference to many others—and that is, *that things unknown can only be taught through things already known.*

WHAT IS THE DESIGN OF BAPTISM.—No. 3.—“ L. B.” TO “ VERITAS.”  
 “ Fiat justitia ruat coelum.”

VERITAS seems not to understand me. But one thing I must say to him : when he replies to me, I wish he would reply to what I *have* said, and not to what I *have not* said. He says also, that “ I am somewhat obscure as regards my creed.” Obscure indeed, my friend, so obscure that I never had one, nor never will. But if you want to know my religious sentiments, you may have them gratis. They are briefly these : To believe all that God has said, and obey all that he has commanded. The man who believes and acts thus cannot miss heaven.—He next quotes my assertion—or as I would call it, proposition—that none were baptised in the name of Jesus Christ until the baptism of the Holy Ghost was performed ;—then refers to Acts, viii. 15–17. Then he says, “ Now here is a flat contradiction to this assertion.” And what is it ? Why forsooth, that Peter and John found certain brethren who had been baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by laying their hands on them they received the gift of the Holy Ghost. Next he quotes from Acts, xix. 4–6 : That about twelve were baptised in the name of Jesus, and received the gift of the Holy Ghost. Now, in all these quotations there is nothing said about the baptism of the Holy Ghost.—Therefore, no contradiction to my proposition. Your argument that John’s baptism was done away, was a useless one, as it had nothing to do with the question at issue. Of course John’s baptism ceased with his decapitation, as he had no power to baptise afterward. You then go on to say, “ according to L. B.’s. creed, if the gift of the Holy Ghost precedes baptism by water,” &c. To this I cannot say *docuisti* Veritas, for it is not the truth. In the first place I have not published any creed, and in the next place I have not said that “ the gift of the Holy Ghost precedes baptism by water.” Now this is what I said, viz. “ that not one soul was baptised in the name of Jesus until the baptism of the Holy Ghost was performed.” I then proved that the Apostles were baptised with the Holy Ghost before any person was baptised in the name of Jesus.—I next proved that the house of Cornelius were baptised with the Holy Ghost before they were baptised in water in the name of Jesus. It is true that the disciples at Pentecost were baptised in the name of Jesus before the house of Cornelius were baptised with the Holy Ghost. I did not say that all persons were baptised with the Holy Ghost before they were baptised in the name of Jesus. For we are not told that all were or will be baptised with it, unless it can be proved that the baptism of the Holy Ghost and the gift of it are the same thing. In future you will please use my own language, and not make language for me which I do not use, and save yourself the trouble of speaking of my “ creed.”

Now, friend Veritas, to sum up your arguments, they have led you into a sad dilemma, and one horn or the other you must take. In your first article you asserted, that the “ baptism of the Holy Ghost was promised to us at the second coming of our Saviour.” In my reply, I required you to show where the scripture contained this promise. But instead of attempting this, you have crossed your own path, and at

tempted to prove that the disciples were baptized with the Holy Ghost in the days of the Apostles, by quoting from Acts, 8th and 19th chapters, and saying that they contradict my assertion : which is equivalent to saying they were baptised with the Holy Ghost. Again, you cross your own path in your last article. For after quoting the above passage to prove that the baptism of the Holy Ghost follows baptism in the name of Jesus ; in the latter part of your first paragraph you say, "for all the promises in the bible were obtained through faith, for those who received the gift—(I suppose he means the gift of the Holy Spirit) received it through faith before baptism ; but surely no man will come forward and say he has received the Holy Ghost by baptism.—Now I do not understand whether Veritas means to say that no man will say that he has received the Holy Ghost by water baptism, or by being baptised with the Holy Ghost. Either way leaves him in a dilemma. If he means water baptism, then he has said that the gift of the Holy Ghost is received before it ; and then contradicts himself in his last paragraph by saying that "baptism by water was a saving grace, and is to be received as a pledge for the gift when the Savior thinks fit to send it," &c. If he means the latter, then he is at variance with the scripture he has quoted, for those whom Peter and John laid their hands on were baptized in the name of Jesus before they received the gift. But Veritas says,—“Those who received the gift, received it through faith before baptism. My friend thinks the advice I gave him I most need myself, but I think it will not be lost on him if he will follow it. Veritas thinks being buried in water is a far-fetched idea, and wonders where I met with it in Scripture, and wishes me to point it out. Certainly, my friend, this is a reasonable request, and I hope you will point out whatever I may request you to. You will find it in Romans, vi. 4, “Therefore we are buried by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life. That Paul had reference to literal baptism is too evident to admit of controversy. So then, we have a burial in water and a resurrection out of it. This “idea” is as “far-fetched” as from Corinthus where Paul’s letter was written. Nor is this all, for I have been eye-witness to many such burials, besides being buried in water myself. As to being buried in fire, I need only to say, that being overwhelmed and immersed in fire is being buried in it, and such was actually the case with many at the destruction of Jerusalem. I intended to have shown who had power to baptise with the Holy Ghost, and who were baptised with it, and also say something of the Holy Spirit “bringing all things to our remembrance,” but have not room in this number—this being already too long. Perhaps Veritas can inform us, and in the meantime keep to the subject. L. B.

### CHRISTIAN UNION.

“Endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.”—PAUL.

WHEN we speak of Christian union, we mean a real union of Christians—not of sects, nor of professors merely ; but of those who are in deed and in fact ingrafted into the Lord Jesus Christ, and are branches



of the "true vine." Neither by Christian union do we mean that false charity which says, "Oh there are good christians in all denominations!" A simple acknowledgment that they are, or may be christians, without advancing any further, is a hypocritical show unworthy the disciple of the Lord.

The union for which we plead is that of kindred spirits cemented by the love of God. The real lover of his fellow-man does not fellowship him on account of a few opinions or speculations, but because he loves God and God loves him. He recognizes him as a brother, being assured that he is a member of Christ's body. He fraternizes with him in every thing that is connected with his present and future happiness—in all the "work of faith, and labor of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ."

The Christian union which we advocate, is, in a word, that which unites the followers of the Lord around one table. The question with us, is, *Does he enjoy communion with God?* has he been engrafted into the Lord Messiah? does he love him supremely? does he bring forth the fruits of the spirit? If so, God loves him—Jesus is not ashamed to call him brother—he is a temple of the Holy Spirit. It is then our highest honour and joy to recognize him as a companion and fellow pilgrim to the celestial Canaan.

Shall we dare to slight or disregard him "who has fellowship with the father, and with his Son Jesus Christ?" "He that hateth his brother is a murderer." "Receive ye one another as Christ has received us to the glory of God."

O how happy the world soon would be could they see this glorious consummation? If all the followers of the Lamb were openly and really united together, when we saw a disciple we should see a brother; one who would sympathize with us in all our sorrows and afflictions! Infidelity, which has fattened on the dissensions of religious professors, would stand aghast; and the white horse of the gospel would drive forward gloriously; sin would hide its deformed head, and moral corruption would melt away like dew before the rising sun; the salvation of the Lord would be known; the kingdom of Immanuel would soon receive every child of Adam; and the reign of the Lord would in reality be acknowledged "from sea to sea, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth."

All Christians pray for this. They therefore desire it. *Is it then possible for all the followers of the Lamb to form one communion?*—Unhesitatingly we answer, YES. They have all been united; for several generations they formed one communion.

*What was the cause of their union?*

1. Their master commanded them to be united. "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another." "Be perfectly joined together in the same mind and judgment." "Be kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another."

These portions of the word of God prove, that it is a command of

the Lord that Christians should be one. He, then, who says or does any thing to prevent this love and union, is disobeying the Lord; he is a heretic; for the very meaning of the word heretic is a factionist. He who sought to make parties amongst the disciples of the Lord in the days of the apostles—he who was desirous of dividing the body of Christ was a heretic!

2. Another cause of their union was—the *Lord gave them his spirit*. All who became followers of the Lord possessed one spirit. “*After that ye believed you were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.*” Hence he authorised the Apostle to say, “if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his.” Christ’s spirit is his mind. “Let that mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus.” They then were partakers of his disposition or spirit, the fruits of which were “Love, joy, peace,” &c. All, then, who became the disciples of the Lord, would of necessity love the whole human family with a love of benevolence; and the disciples with a love stronger than death. The disciples were taught that they should, were it necessary, lay down their lives for each other.

In what a strong contrast does this delineation of character appear with the distracted state of the Christian profession at the present day! The spirit of Christ possessed such a peculiar attraction, that the steel, charged with the magnet, does not more certainly turn to the pole, than did those who had believed and surrendered themselves to the Lord Messiah attract each other. They were ready and willing to suffer any thing for each other and the cause of the Lord. *Note.*—From this may we not conclude, that those who are not anxious to see the followers of the Lamb united have not his spirit?

3. They sought union, because it was the condition on which the Savior prayed for the conversion of the world. Like their master, they desired the regeneration of sinners. They knew that union was strength. And the beloved disciple did not fail to record the Lord’s Prayer, John vii.—“I pray not for these (the Apostles) only, but for all them also who shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one—that the world may believe thou hast sent me.”

Here the blessed Jesus prays for the union of his followers, in order that through them conviction might the more readily be fixed on the minds of unbelievers. Can any Christian read the Savior’s language, and not feel that he is bound by every grace of the spirit of God to cultivate union and peace amongst the followers of the Lord? Will he not make every sacrifice in his power to promote so desirable an object? “The saviour prays for the union of his followers; will I then,” says the devout follower of the Lamb, “oppose the solemn petition of him who, only a short time before, ‘sweat as it were great drops of blood!’” He prayed for union; may it then be my sincere and earnest prayer and endeavor to live, so that all the disciples of the Lord may love me. Dare I do any thing which will separate those who are engrafted into Christ—Lord keep me from it!” Such soliloquies, we think, must all devout christians frequently have with themselves when they read the “*Lord’s Prayer.*”

The above are some of the reasons why christians should be united; and such, we presume, was the cause of their union. The fruits of such united efforts we shall notice in another number—what it was, and what it might be expected, under a similar state of things. And will not christians seek for union where it is so desirable—when so much depends upon the hearty co-operation of the friends of Christianity, and so much injury results from the broils and dissensions of professions?

All who think or reason on this subject are aware, that the principal harangues of sceptics, and those, too, which produce the greatest effect on the deluded votaries of infidelity, are made up of histories concerning persecutions by Christians (?), and the bickerings of modern sects.

Will Christians pay so little attention to the plain injunctions of the word of God; the admonitions of the spirit, and the prayer of the Lord Jesus the night in which he was betrayed, to permit pride of opinion, or anything of a trivial nature, prevent their union and communion?

EDITOR.

---

### UNIVERSALISM.

We are not desirous of criticising any system which does not directly or indirectly nullify the proclamation of the gospel; but we sincerely believe, that all kinds of fatalism plunge a dagger into the vitals of Christianity. Whatever good may have resulted from the labours of Calvinists or Universalists, must not be credited to the fatalism connected with these systems, but the truths mixed with these deleterious compounds.

Universalists profess great liberality. The few scattered in various parts of these Provinces think their brethren in the United States are such champions, that they are able to refute every thing written or spoken by a partialist. That our readers may have a specimen of their liberality, we give below a letter written for the "*Trumpet*" nearly two months since. It may be proper, however, first to state a few particulars. Mr. Taylor, a Universalist Clergyman of Massachusetts, passed through New Brunswick and Nova Scotia last season, endeavoring to convince the people that they were giving themselves too much anxiety about their future destiny; persuading them that they were all on the high road to endless happiness and never ending bliss.

On his return he gave the public a narrative of his journey; in which he gave the readers of the *Trumpet* to understand, that a certain Mr. Howard, whom he slanderously calls a "Campbellite," was desirous of having a discussion, and then, for some cause or other, "backed out!" This, reader, you will think is somewhat singular, that a man should first be desirous of having a debate, and then seek to shun it. All who are acquainted with Benjamin Howard know, that he fears not to discuss an article of his faith with any man breathing. The greatest fault his friends find with him is, that he is *too fond* of discussions. But to the letter:

“SAINT JOHN, N. B., DEC. 3, 1839.

“To the Editor of the Trumpet.

“*My dear Sir,*—A few days since, a number of your paper was put into my hands for perusal. I read every thing which promises truth, unmixed with error. In this paper I read the concluding part of Mr. Taylor’s “tour through Nova Scotia,” &c. Being on a preaching excursion through some of the same places myself, I happened at one of the meetings mentioned by Mr. Taylor. I had, also, the pleasure of an interview with him at the house of our mutual friend, Mr. Starr. Having learned directly all the facts and circumstances relative to his interview with Mr. Howard, judge of my surprise when I learned that Mr. T. had told only *part* of the truth in relation to the proposed discussion with Mr. Howard!

“The facts are these: Mr. T. was kindly favored with the chapel in which Mr. H. usually preaches in Cornwallis. His ‘text’ was, “*Who hath saved us and called us,*” &c. 2 Tim. i. 9–10. He preached as the brotherhood usually do—that God first saved the whole human family [from what?], and then called them, &c. He reasoned (?), as our provincial Calvinists would on the same text; with this difference, however, Mr. T. made the “us” refer to the whole human family, and our Calvinists to the chosen before the foundation of the world. He concluded. Mr. H. (after making some inquiries as to the length of time he had to stay in Cornwallis) proceeded to show the exact agreement between Mr. T.’s discourse and the Calvinism which they heard from time to time; then added, that there was but the difference of two words—*whole* and *part*, and that Universalism was rather an improvement on Calvinism; to which Mr. T. responded “Amen; and Ameniamen also.” Mr. H. then proposed the following question: “*Will all men be saved with an eternal salvation?*” The negative of this,” said he, “I am prepared to support with Mr. T. or any other person.” Mr. T. said, “*Will a part of the human family be endlessly miserable?*” The negative of this I am ready to discuss with Mr. H. or any other person.”

“Mr. H. remarked, “This gentleman has visited us to correct our errors; he fearlessly asserts that all men will be saved. This is the grand principle in his system. Nature, reason, scripture, common-sense, *all* proclaim the fact according to Mr. Taylor, and will he not take the affirmative of his own doctrine? If he thinks that he can sustain it, why not make an effort?”

“Mr. T. also inquired the reason of Mr. H.’s unwillingness to take the affirmative of endless misery. Who replied, that he would not give his assent to any doctrine which pretended to fix definitely the condition of the wicked. The scriptures leave them in a “lake of fire and brimstone,” stating, that “this is the second death.”

“‘What!’ says Mr. T., ‘has not the gentleman made up his mind as to the condition of the wicked?’

“Mr. H. answered, “if the Apostle John did not know what the righteous would be, [John chap. iii. ‘we know not what we shall be,’]

how can I tell what the wicked will be? I believe that they will be eternally lost?"

"He then offered to take the affirmative of the question to which Mr. T. refers in his "tour," viz. "*Will a part of the human family be endlessly lost?*" and Mr. T. refused to hold a discussion on this question, unless the words "unholy" and "sinful" were added, which would make the question read, will they be endlessly '*unholy and sinful,*' in addition to being lost; which would be precisely the same question proposed at first.

"Mr. T. was too sensible of the weakness of his system to attempt its proof. He was more desirous of caviling at the apparent inconsistencies of others. He evidently, throughout, showed a disposition to "dodge" the main question. Persons not acquainted with the tactics of Universalism, did not so fully perceive this, but Mr. H. did, and Mr. T. knew, when he penned his article, that he positively refused to take the affirmative of his own darling system!

"I have now a proposal to make to Mr. T. and Universalists generally, in order that the truth may be elicited, and the incorrectness of Mr. T.'s narrative fully exposed. Though it may be the boast of Universalists that Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists refuse to discuss the merits of their system, yet there are those who are always ready to discuss the following questions:

"1. *Will all mankind be saved with an eternal salvation?*

"2. *Will a part of the human family be eternally lost?*

"Here are two questions which state the case fairly. Mr. Howard will discuss these questions with Mr. Taylor, yourself, or any other respectable Universalist clergyman in America. If they will visit New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, they shall be furnished with a house in which to hold the discussion; but if they are not desirous of coming so far, you shall be met at Eastport, Bangor, Portland, Boston, or even in Mr. Taylor's own meeting house; providing, however, that on your part a convenient place in which to hold the discussion, shall be furnished in those places.

"In the above questions, each can have an affirmative and each a negative. (Mr. T. says that he once offered to discuss the second, he certainly will not now object to it.) They can agree to speak each four, eight, twelve or twenty times on each question, just as they can agree, so that an equal amount of time may be bestowed on each question.

"Now, if Universalists really believe their doctrine, it is hoped they will show themselves.

"I have written this without consulting Mr. H. since seeing Mr. T.'s article; but if he is not willing to give his assent to the propositions, and I cannot find a respectable man who will—rather than a disputant should be wanted, you can have the services of

"Yours respectfully, to serve in the truth,  
"W. W. EATON."

This letter was forwarded the next day after it was written. We have carefully examined all the "*Trampets*" which have come to Town since then, and not a line as yet appears—not even an acknowledg

ment of its reception. We have not room for any more remarks on the system at present. Our readers may hear something more in future, when it becomes necessary.—Ed.

---

### ELDER SAMUEL ROBINSON,

PASTOR OF THE BAPTIST CHURCH, SAINT GEORGE.

*My dear Sir,*—Being convinced that no other Baptist Clergyman in New Brunswick has been instrumental in adding so many to the Baptist churches in these Provinces as yourself, since you became a member of their communion, and no man belonging to that denomination whom I esteem more highly, or whom I would more readily call brother; I therefore address you thus publicly for the good of the cause of truth, for which we mutually profess to be pleading. “He that doeth the truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.” This is my apology for publicly addressing you.

You are aware that we are accused by the Baptists of holding and advocating many erroneous doctrines; and also rejecting some principles considered by the “evangelical” as essential to the truth. Among the former, we are accused of making *too much* of baptism, and the latter, of denying the *influences of the spirit*. To both of these we plead *not guilty*. In this letter I shall notice the subject of baptism. Between us there is no dispute as to the *action* expressed by that word. As to the subject, there is a greater difference, I presume, in our conduct, than in our profession; for we readily declare, and most *sincerely* believe, that no person is a fit subject for that ordinance, but a *believer* in the Lord Jesus Christ.

And when I come to reflect on the *design* of baptism, I do not know whether there is any difference! If you, my dear Sir, are to be taken at your word, (and I know not the man that dare dispute it) there is no difference here! Many of our Baptist friends in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would be astonished at this last remark, concerning one of their most popular clergymen. Perhaps they would have been more astonished had they heard you, Sir, in the presence of Mr. Crawley and other Baptist ministers, make the following remark, at a protracted meeting held the last month in this City:—“We know nothing about unessentials in our religion; ‘Repent and be baptised every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.’” You must be as heretical as ourselves as to the design of baptism, for we never said more than this; and it is well known to you and many others, that there are leading men in the Baptist Church in this City, who say as much about “baptism for remission of sins” as we have ever done. Why then do the Baptist Churches esteem *these* as their *very dear* brethren, and us as heretics? Is that which is innocent and praiseworthy in them criminal in us? You and they may say that it is from other considerations

that they lack christian charity for us. The other causes shall be noticed in due time; but I desire to know of you a few things relative to the practice of the baptists. If you are orthodox in their estimation, and I know that no man living is generally more beloved by his people than you are in Saint John, how is it that you exhort sinners to "be baptised for the remission of their sins," and then spend several hours of an evening hearing what is called "an experience" from the candidate, as an evidence that their sins are forgiven, before they are baptised!! First exhort sinners to be baptised, that they may obtain pardon and the gift of the Holy Ghost, and then say, as you, my dear Sir, once did in our chapel—"Who can forbid water, that this person should not be baptised who *has* received the Holy Ghost, as well as we."

Now, Sir, I am not desirous of widening the breach existing between us and the baptists; but, on the contrary, I should rejoice to see consummated, a wish expressed to me by yourself, that "all who hold believers baptised in this City might be united."

My space in this number is quite limited, I therefore am unable to write more at this time; but in our next, the Lord willing, I shall notice some other things connected with the baptists, which I do not think are in accordance with *the book*. The opinion I have formed of you, my dear Sir, is so high—that I expect you will hear patiently all that I have to say on these subjects.

Yours, in hope of immortality,

W. W. EATON.

---

### MEETING HOUSES.

Brother Howard desires that we should expose the iniquitous course pursued by many in Nova Scotia, with reference to their Meeting Houses. Sectarianism exhibits its deformity at every opportunity. But with all deference to Brother Howard, on account of his age, experience, and superior wisdom, we would suggest the propriety of paying less attention to such unrighteous conduct, for the present. Perhaps in the end it would be better for the cause of truth to allow yourselves to be deprived of your rights, than to appeal to Cæsar for a redress of grievances. Brother Howard has been under the necessity of preaching in the Queen's highway, in small school houses and private dwellings, when many of his hearers had paid their money to erect "free" Meeting Houses, which were locked up by a small majority, and unoccupied part of the time. And this, too, by men who were accusing him of a denial of the spirit, A denial of the spirit!! What a miserable subterfuge. The man, perhaps, who circulates such slanders, does not know the meaning of the word spirit; and if he does, he never heard Brother Howard deliver a sentence on the subject! Such men would say he stole a horse, if they thought their deluded votaries would believe it. The first question, with many such men is, "Don't you know something against his moral character?" If they can blast the reputation of the man who is spending his time and strength persuading sinners to turn to God, so that they can get them into their

folds, all is well. I am fully satisfied that many of those opposed to the principles we advocate will say or do any thing the laws of the land will permit them, to add to their numbers, and to prejudice their followers and others.

But to the Meeting Houses. Brother Howard informs us that there are houses in Rawdon, Falmouth, Upper Cornwallis, Nictaux, and Bridgetown, which were built by subscription. The paper circulated stated that the house should be free for all preachers of good character, when not occupied by others. The house is built—a majority take the key, and lock the house against a minority who have as much right to it as they have. Yes, I have preached, myself, in a brother's dwelling house, and the Baptist Meeting House shut up on the opposite side of the road—a house too, built on the land belonging to the brother in whose house I held meeting.

Brother Howard has given a particular account of these transactions, with the names of several highly respectable men appended to it, which will yet be made public if he and the brethren in Cornwallis deem it necessary.

One good reason we would urge why the brethren had better be defrauded of their property rather than seek redress is, that none of these houses are fit for a congregation of primitive disciples. Boxes called pews may be suited for theatres and play-houses, but they are not fit for those who meet to remember that Jesus died and rose again for their salvation, and to unite as one family in the worship of God and the Lamb.

The disciples ought to sit together in the house of God; but it is impossible to prevent a distinction being kept up in a worshipping assembly, in a house where persons are "stalled up" like refractory horses in a stable. The rich must have the uppermost seats, and the poor pious disciple must sit behind the door!

The disciples, in order to attend to the order of the house of God as they should, ought to have a chapel in which to meet steadily every Lord's day. This they cannot expect in any of those meeting houses in which they own but a small part.

EDITOR.

[FOR THE CHRISTIAN.]

### HEAVEN.

"It hath not entered into the heart of man."—ST. PAUL.

Who can paint the perfect vision  
Of that man who loves the Lord,  
When the last great day's decision  
Shall assign his bright reward?

Oh! what heart, with rapture glowing,  
Can describe that blest abode!  
Where the stream of blessing flowing,  
Cheers the city of our God!

Angels! can your anthems, rising  
While you strike your harps of gold,  
Tell in strains of joy surpising,  
What by man was never told!

Saint John, N. B. November, 1839.

The word of life from heaven descending,  
Has not told what glories shine  
Where those forms of brightness bending,  
Strike anew their harps divine!

I cannot know till life is ended  
What those scenes and glories are,  
When to heaven, with joy ascended,  
I have learned these glories there.

Death alone the scene revealing,  
Tells the raptures of the blest!  
O'er my heart the impulse stealing,  
Hushes all my woes to rest!

—K—



¶ We ought to have apologised to our readers for occupying so much of the last number with a part of one discourse, but we had not room. We could not, however, well divide Brother Raines' discourse, without perhaps injuring its effect. There were also some remarks relative to the "carnal mind," of which we did not altogether approve—as it savored some of the popular notion entertained of the 7th chapter of Romans—a chapter which we fear many are perverting to their eternal undoing—But the discourse, as a whole, we heartily recommend to our numerous readers.

If our readers desire that we should write more ourselves they must each get another subscriber, and then we shall be able to devote more of our time to writing—We attend eight meetings every week; besides the cares of a family—visiting the sick, waiting on our numerous friends, &c. which duties engross nearly all of our time.

Since our last notice of the State of the Church in this City, there have been three added—two baptised at the "same hour of the night."

SOME GOOD IN ALCOHOL.—A man was brought to this City a short time since, with his feet "frozen as hard as bricks!" They were immersed in spirits until the frost was all removed. He is likely to recover without his feet being sore!

---

### PROSPECTUS FOR A HYMN BOOK.

WHEN we were in Nova-Scotia, several of the brethren expressed a desire that we might have a collection of Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, suited to the doctrine and practice of the New Testament.

Mr. Avery will print one for us, in a neat style, on good paper, with new type—handsomely bound—containing 250 pages—and afford it for between one and two shillings. We purpose using the book printed by our brethren in the "West," with such additions and subtractions as the brethren may suggest. All who desire to have such a work will give their names to Brethren Howard, Doyle, and Garraty, or to the elders of the congregations, as is most convenient; who will let us know how many will be needed as soon as possible.

We have no desire to make money on any job of this kind. If the brethren will become responsible to the publisher for the work, they shall have our time of arranging and collecting Hymns, and correcting the press, gratis.

St. John, February 1, 1840.

---

TO CLERGYMEN, TEACHERS OF SABBATH SCHOOLS, AND BIBLE CLASSES, STUDENTS, AND HEADS OF FAMILIES—The Publisher of the BAPTIST ADVOCATE respectfully informs the christian public that he has made arrangements for publishing, every week, in the above paper, (to commence with the first number in January, 1840,) ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE BIBLE, consisting of Views of the most remarkable places and objects mentioned in the Old and New Testaments; also, Views of the principal Missionary Stations throughout the World, engraved by the first artists in the United States, after original sketches taken on the spot, by Laborde, Forbin, Monier, Le Bruyn, Ker Porter, McFarlane, and others.—The Advocate is published every Saturday, at No. 122, Nassau Street, New York City. Terms, \$2.50 per annum, in advance. Persons acting as Agents, and Postmasters, are allowed fifty cents commission for every subscriber they obtain, and from whom we receive a year's subscription—they remitting two dollars for each subscriber, with the name and post office address.

The paper is established on a permanent basis—being sustained by an Association with a Capital Stock of \$10,000.

All letters must come free of postage, or they will not be taken from the office.—Remittances may be made at our risk, through the Postmasters, who are authorised to enclose and remit payments for periodicals, free of expense.

ROBERT SEARS, PUBLISHER.