

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

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

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

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

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

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

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

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

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.

Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Wrinkled pages may film slightly out of focus.

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

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

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

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Showthrough/
Transparence

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

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

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

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

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

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

THE CHRISTIAN.

No. 12. }

SAINT JOHN, N. B., MAY, 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*.

(From the *Trumpet and Universalist Magazine*.)

To the Rev. W. W. EATON, Saint John, N. B.

DEAR SIR,—Through the politeness of the Editor of the "Trumpet," I have received "The Christian" for February. In this paper I find a letter purporting to have been originally addressed by you to the "Trumpet" containing some strictures upon a part of a narrative I published of my journey to Nova-Scotia in September last. You undertake to say, that the account I there gave of my interview with the Rev. Mr. Howard is not entirely correct. You observe, "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! This extract appears to me designed to deceive the reader. "I happened at one of the meetings mentioned by Mr. Taylor. Having learned *directly*," &c. The obvious impression intended to be conveyed here, is that you were present at the meeting at which my interview with Mr. Howard took place, and consequently could speak from actual knowledge in the statements you were going to make in regard to that interview. But I believe you were *not* present that evening—on the contrary, I think you held a meeting some miles distant. Neither have I the least recollection of your attending any meeting at which I preached. The interview at Br. Starr's of which you speak, took place before the conference with Mr. Howard. But perhaps you will say the above extract does not assert that you were present at any of *my* meetings, but only at one "*mentioned*" by me in the account I published. True; and that meeting, I believe, was the one held between Mr. Howard and Mr. Somerville, to discuss the subject of baptism. But how could your being present at *that* meeting qualify you to speak touching the correctness of my narrative? It of course could not. Why then did you mention this circumstance in

the connection you have above, unless it were intended as an ingenious contrivance to deceive the reader? As, then, you were not present at my interview with Mr. Howard how do you know that "Mr. Taylor told only *part* of the truth in relation to the proposed discussion with Mr. H.?" Perhaps you will say, that Mr. H. has informed you in regard to the circumstances, and has told you that my published account is not correct. Well, supposing he has, may it not be that *he* has neglected to state the whole truth? But according to your own story, you have not consulted Mr. H. on the subject. You say in the last paragraph of your letter, "I have written this without consulting Mr. H. since seeing Mr. Taylor's article." Perhaps you will say, that you saw Mr. H. before the appearance of my narrative. Suppose you did,—how could he tell you *before* my article appeared, I "had told only part of the truth?" It seems to me Br. Eaton, that fix it as you please, you have placed yourself in rather an unenviable situation; and that you would have appeared much better, if you had let Mr. H. step forth in his own defence instead of setting yourself up as the guardian of his theological reputation.

Suffice it to observe, that the conversation between me and Mr. H. was entered in my journal the next morning after it took place, and that every word I have published in regard to it, is literally correct, without addition or abatement. I will not, therefore, take up room to go over the matter anew. Mr. H. evidently shrunk from the discussion, and I have no doubt a majority of the persons present on that occasion, viewed the matter in the same light that I did.—Even one of his communicants, who called on me at Br. Starr's the next morning, had the frankness to confess it.

But it seems from your letter, that Mr. Howard has all at once grown as bold as a lion. He now comes forward, (or, rather you do for him,) and like the Philistine of old, defies the armies of the living God. After stating the following questions. 1. "*Will all mankind be saved with an eternal salvation?*" 2. "*Will a part of the human family be eternally lost?*"—you proceed to say, "Mr. Howard will discuss these questions with Mr. Taylor yourself, [editor of Trumpet] 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." Why did you not add New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and New Orleans? Perhaps some zealous brother in the South, who is possessed of considerable moral courage, might be induced to meet you in New Orleans. Or, "If you are not desirous of going so far," it may be that New York would turn out a David, I cannot speak, however, for every Universalist clergyman in America (!) nor for any besides myself. I have therefore only to say in relation to the above, that I shall not take the trouble, nor be at the expence, to visit any of the places you have named on purpose to hold a discussion; but if Mr. H. or yourself should see fit to visit this village, and the meeting-house in which I preach should not be otherwise

engaged at the time, I presume you could have the use of it; and I would endeavour, if I were at home, to pay you every attention, by way of discussion or otherwise, consistent with my other engagements.

But if you are really desirous to have a discussion on the subjects proposed, I think I can suggest a better method than to travel to either of the places you have named for the purpose. The plan I would propose is the following:—That the controversy be carried on through the columns of “The Trumpet,” and “The Christian,” both sides to be published in each paper. Although I have not consulted the Editor, yet I think I may venture to say, that he will allow you as much room in *The Trumpet*, as you will permit me to occupy in *The Christian*. You will readily see that this is much the superior way of conducting the discussion, when you reflect that instead of reaching the understandings of, at most, of a few hundred persons, as would be the case in an oral controversy, we shall, by the method proposed, communicate our arguments to probably fifteen or twenty thousands. Should you assent to this proposition, you will have the goodness to insert this letter, or at least that part of it which follows the conclusion of this paragraph, in *The Christian*, and send the paper containing it and your reply to me. I will prepare my rejoinder, and forward both to *The Trumpet*.

In order to prevent misconstruction and useless debate, it may be well to have a definite understanding in the outset in regard to the number of letters to be written upon the respective questions, as well as the precise meaning to be attached to the questions. I would propose, that we write six letters each upon the first question, and the same number upon the second. If you prefer any other number, however, it will make no difference to me. In regard to the meaning of the questions, I would state, that by all mankind being saved with an eternal salvation, I understand their being delivered from sin, misery and death, and made holy and happy in an immortal life beyond the grave. By a part of the human family being eternally lost, I suppose you to mean that they will *not* enjoy such salvation, but will be doomed either to a state of ceaseless suffering or of endless unconsciousness. It will of course belong to me to commence the discussion on the first question, and to you to close it; it will then devolve on you to commence on the second question, and on me to close.

Presuming that the above propositions will meet your approbation, I will now proceed to offer a few remarks on the first question:—“*Will all mankind be saved with an eternal salvation?*” I answer, they will, 1st. Because God *wills* it. “Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.” (1 Tim. ii. 4.) That this is a *will of purpose* is evident from Eph. i. 9–10: “Having made known unto us the mystery of his *will*, according to his good pleasure, which he hath *PURPOSED* in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him.” Here we learn that *his will* is a will of *purpose*; and we are also told that this will of purpose is to gather together in Christ all things in heaven and earth—

by which we are to understand the universe. Professor Stuart says "all things in heaven and earth," is a common *periphrasis* of the Hebrew and New Testament writers to denote all intelligent creatures. That this will of purpose shall be accomplished, I think it certain; for God "worketh all things after the council of his own *will*."—(Eph. i. 11) "He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth."—(Dan. iv. 35.) "The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have **PURPOSED**, so shall it stand." (Isa. xiv. 24) "Because God has purposed the salvation of all men agreeably to the council of his unchanging will, the Apostle was enabled to say "We trust in the living God who is the saviour of all men especially of those that believe." (1 Tim. iv. 10.) God who is the saviour of all men, in the sense that he "calletth those things which be not as though they were." (Rom. iv. 17.) The verb stands in the *present tense*, bringing to *present view* what God has made *sure* in his plan of grace. He is the special Saviour of believers, inasmuch as by believing this truth, they "enter into rest," and "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." Unless it be an admitted truth, that God is the saviour of all men, there would be no propriety in calling him the *special* Saviour of those who believe.

Because God *wills* and *purposes* the salvation of all men, the apostle could pray for all "without wrath or **DOUBTING**;" (1 Tim. ii. 8); knowing, "that if we ask any thing according to his **WILL**, *he heareth us*;" and if we know that he hears us whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him."—(1 John v. 14, 15.)

Should you be pleased to say, that the will of God under consideration, is not a will of purpose, but simply a wish or desire to have all men saved—I reply, 1st. That I have shown, I think, conclusively, that it is a will of purpose; and 2nd.—That "the desire of the righteous shall be granted." (Prov. x. 24.) If God sincerely desires the salvation of all men, and is almighty in power, I think it will be a difficult task to prove that a part will be endlessly lost, leaving Him to mourn through-out eternity over his ungratified desires. But all men will be saved.

2. Because God *promises* it. The promise was made to Abraham, Gen. xii. 3: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Again, Gen. xxii. 18: "and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Gen. xxviii. 14: "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Lest you should say the blessing here promised is temporal, I take the liberty to certify you that by seed is meant Christ. Gal. iii. 16:—"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, *And to thy seed, which is Christ*." And furthermore, that the way or manner in which all families are to be blessed in Christ, is by being turned from their iniquities. Acts iii. 25-26: "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him *to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities*." Here you will perceive very distinctly that the blessing under consideration, is not

a temporal, but a spiritual blessing, a salvation from sin. And I trust you will not fail to notice the extensiveness of this blessing—"all nations," "all families," "all kindreds" of the earth are to be blessed in Christ by being turned from their iniquities.

Looking at the blessing in this light—considering that it is spiritual in its nature, and universal in its extent, we see at once the propriety of the apostle's calling the promise to Abraham *the gospel*, (Gal. iii. 8,) and of this gospel being denominated "good tidings of great joy, which shall be unto ALL PEOPLE." All mankind will be saved,

3. Because God has not only promised it, but he has *sworn* to accomplish it. "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear, surely, shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength." (Isa. xlv. 23-24.) Here then we are distinctly informed, that God has pledged himself, yea, sworn, to accomplish the subjection of every rebellious creature, and clothe them in the righteousness and strength of the Lord of hosts. This agrees with Phil. ii. 9-11. You will observe, that the confession which the apostle here says shall be made by every tongue, is to be offered with the understanding and in sincerity of heart, and therefore will be *to the glory of God the Father*. Hence the declaration, "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." (1 Cor. xii. 3.) If any are endlessly lost, either by being doomed to a state of ceaseless suffering, or by being blotted out of existence, I am unable to understand how these passages can be fulfilled, inasmuch as it would be out of the power of such persons to say, that in the Lord they had *righteousness and strength*, or to confess that Jesus is Lord *to the Glory of God the Father*.

4. All men will be saved because the mission of Christ was designed to save all. "And thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins." (Mat. i. 21.) You will notice, that it is here expressly declared that Christ shall save *his people* from their sins; and hence, if we can only ascertain who are Christ's people, we could find no difficulty in deciding how many will be saved. Who then are Christ's people? I answer, *sinners*. This is evident from the fact, that he is to save them from their sins. If Christ's people were not a *sinful people*, how could he be said to save them from their sins? This agrees with the general tenor of scripture. He came to save *sinners*. (1 Tim. i. 15.) While we were *yet sinners* Christ died for us." (Rom. v. 8.) How many sinners belong to Christ? David can probably inform us. "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the *heathen for thine inheritance*, and the *uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession*." (Ps. ii. 8.) John says, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given *all things* into his hand." [John iii. 35.] "As thou hast given him power over *all flesh*, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." [John xvii. 2.] Thus God has given "all things," "all flesh," "the heathen and the uttermost parts of the earth" to Christ for a possession; therefore, "all men, the heathen," &c. are *Christ's people*. What is the consequence? He shall save them from their sins. This harmo-

nizes with the declaration of John, "Behold the Lamb of God, which *taketh away the sin of the world.*" [John i. 29.] "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." [1 John iii. 8.] Sin is the work of the devil; sin will therefore be destroyed.

It is because Jesus is to save all men from sin, that he is called the *Saviour of the world.* "We know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." [John iv. 42.] As all mankind are to be finally delivered from sin, agreeably to the foregoing testimony, the apostle was inspired to say, "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, (Christ) then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." [1 Cor. xv. 28.] As the kingdom of Christ is a moral kingdom, of course a universal subjection to him will be a universal subjection to *moral good*, and consequently, salvation *from moral evil.* And when all mankind shall have become subject to the spiritual kingdom of the glorious Redeemer, having been raised from the dead, immortal, incorruptible, glorious, and in the image of the heavenly, (1 Cor. xv. 42-49,) then will God who is love, be ALL IN ALL. Then will a ransomed and blood washed universe unite in singing the transcendent and never-dying song of victory—"O death where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. xv. 55-57.)

I might adduce much other Scripture testimony to substantiate the affirmative of the question under consideration, but do not wish to occupy too much room either in "The Trumpet" or "The Christian." The above will suffice to begin with.—Communications of ordinary length are more likely to be read, and are generally better pleasing to editors, than very long ones.

Respectfully your's,

T. K. TAYLOR.

Mattapoisett, March 3, 1840.

REPLY.

Mr. TAYLOR,—*Dear Sir,*—About a week after our last number was printed, the "*Trumpet*" containing your letter addressed to me, came to hand; to which I shall reply as briefly as possible. On first seeing it, I partially concluded to publish only that part which was particularly requested; but some readers of the *Trumpet*, like readers of other productions, conclude that if a writer makes a mistake in a narrative, he must necessarily be wrong in every thing he believes and practices.

You labour extremely hard to convince the readers of the *Trumpet*, that my remarks were "an ingenious contrivance to deceive the reader." If my account of your interview with Mr. Howard was incorrect, why did you not point out its errors? I did not accuse you of publishing any thing absolutely false, but of stating only *part* of the truth! If you intended to give an impartial account of your interview with him, why did you not say that Mr. H. invited you to discuss the question, "Will all men be saved?" but this you declined! Why

did you not inform the readers of the Trumpet that to the last, Mr. Howard stood ready and prepared to discuss the question, "Will all men be saved with an eternal salvation; or will a part of the human family be endlessly lost?" and that because he would not open the debate and reverse the question, so as to give you the last speech, you withdrew and would have no discussion! If this had been added, with some other matters which I have not time to pen, you would have given the readers of the Trumpet other impressions than those which they received, either from reading your journal or your letter to me. The most common reader of the Trumpet would then have asked,— "Why was Mr. T. unwilling, as he visited Nova-Scotia to preach salvation to all, to make an effort to prove his own darling system?" But instead of this you endeavour to fix the stigma of inconsistency on my version of the affair; and suppose you had proved my account erroneous, which you have not attempted to do, that would not have proved your's correct; "two wrongs will never make one right." But have I not stated facts fully, and without any disguise? Was I not in Nova-Scotia on a "preaching excursion" at the same time? Did I not have a short interview with you at Mr. Starr's? Did you not mention Mr. Howard's and Mr. Sommerville's meeting; and was not I present? Did I drop an intimation that I was present at your conference with Mr. Howard? Whether you will believe me or not, Sir, when I wrote that letter the thought that any person would conclude that I was personally present at the time never came into my mind. If any person received such an impression, I very much regret it. You, Sir, must think me the greatest simpleton living to have intended any such thing! I have more than *fifty* subscribers in Cornwallis, and perhaps five or ten times as many readers, and when that was printed in the Christian, I was well aware that they all knew that I was not present! With this fact before you, you will not for a moment suppose that I had any such intention. Any reader of common sense ought to have known that if I had been personally present I would have said so; and not have written, "Having learned directly." Is there no difference between personal knowledge, and "learning directly?" I cannot think, Sir, that any reader of the Christian unacquainted with the affair thought that I was present.

But how did I get my information so correctly? *Answer.*—From those who heard and saw the whole, and could remember and relate the circumstances as correctly as yourself. This I call "learning directly."—What do you call such information, Mr. Taylor?—*Indirect!*

That my narrative is substantially correct, the following certificate sent to me unsolicited, will prove:

"This may certify, that the following is an exact copy of what Mr. Taylor wrote in Jonathan Wood's Testament, for debate between himself and Elder Howard.

'1. Will a part of mankind remain endlessly unholy and lost; or will they finally be saved, and made ultimately holy and happy?

'2. Will a part of mankind remain endlessly lost; or will they all be finally saved?

(Signed)

'B. HOWARD,
'JONATHAN WOOD.'

You wrote your "journal the next morning after it took place;" but the above was written at least twelve hours previous!

On the above, Mr. Howard remarks: "Here is what stands in the blank leaf of J. Wood's Testament—written by Mr. Taylor's own hand. First, I offered that if Mr. Taylor would take the affirmative of the salvation of all men, I would take, Secondly, the affirmative—that a part of mankind would be eternally lost. He then reversed it as you see first. I then took the pencil to put it as I agreed, and began to write; but he took the pencil again, and wrote as you see the second question stated; altering my words a little; but placing my proposition first again; knowing that as we had but one evening he would have nothing to do but to find fault without undertaking to prove his own proposition. I then told him that if he would reverse the order, and place the proposition as I agreed, I would meet him. This he would not do; but withdrew from the meeting. As to backing out, it is a crime of which I never yet was guilty; and the public may judge from Mr. Taylor's refusal to meet me in any of those places named by the editor, who it was that has backed out!"

So much for that. Your story of Mr. H's endeavouring to get the question, so that he would have "one speech more" than yourself, you must be aware, that in no way, "fix it as you please," can that be made even *probable*.

As to your "better method" of discussing the question, than a public oral exchange of sentiments, I am not satisfied. If disputants would keep close to the question, it would be preferable; but generally there is too great a field occupied in written discussions. The expence of a faithful reporter would not be great, and the satisfaction and benefit of having the whole laid before the reader at one time is certainly superior to weekly or monthly parcels.

But notwithstanding this, if you persist in your refusal to meet Mr. Howard in a public oral discussion, if you can be patient until the press of matter at present on hand for the Christian is disposed of, you shall have a candid hearing in our publication, on the conditions specified in your letter. Although the Christian is too small for such a discussion, yet we oppose no system which we are not willing to lay before our readers in the precise language and style of its devotees. Our publication, however, as its name imports, is designed to act in the community the part of a *living christian*—to present the gospel fairly and fully before all, and to act consistently with its high and holy calling!

After this long introduction, permit me now to test the truth of your sentiments. It will be necessary first, however, to make a few general remarks on the system. Then we shall see whether your witnesses testify in favor of the endless happiness of all men or not.

No system so completely sets at defiance all the principles and rules of interpretation as Universalism. What I mean by rules of interpretation, is, that common sense which every man should call into exercise when he examines any production. In so doing, he asks, who is the writer? to whom is he writing? what were their characters? what are they now? On what subject was he writing? what was the grand

design of his communication? Did the people live under the Patriarchal, Jewish, or Christian dispensations? Universalism is the system which overleaps all these enquiries as things of minor importance.—Hell, the devil, and everlasting punishment are the obstacles in the way, and immortal bliss for the whole human family, whether they desire it or not, the grand point to be gained; to expel the former from the word of God, and to find the latter, scraps of testimony, garbled quotations from the oracles of truth, and often parts of a sentence are brought into requisition, to sustain their hypothesis. Literally they take the children's bread, and cast it to dogs; for those portions of the word of God which are applicable only to such as have experienced the regenerating influences of the gospel, are taken and eagerly given to those who neither know God nor obey our Lord Jesus Christ. How often are they detected in taking portions of the epistles addressed exclusively to those who had been "washed, sanctified, and justified," and using them as applicable to those who are enemies to God by wicked works! A Universalist clergyman, with a congregation before him, who should receive instruction on first principles, hears him exultingly quote the sublime language of Paul to the Romans, "Who shall separate us from the love of God?" And who are *his* us? A majority of them perhaps advocating Universalism, because it promises endless happiness to them in another world, without serving God here! And who were the *Apostle's* us? Those who had been buried with him in baptism—who had obeyed that form of doctrine delivered to him by the Apostles—who had been made free from sin—servants of righteousness—fruit unto holiness—and the end everlasting life.

It is this dislocating the word of God which makes it in any way difficult to meet and refute any system of Universalism. All the scripture quoted or referred to by you, Sir, having its proper application, is more against your system than for it. This may be deemed a loose assertion. The sequel will disclose its truth or falsity.

Many controversies have been very bitter and protracted in consequence of a misunderstanding of the parties relative to the meaning of the words used. As you have set me an example, by giving a definition of the questions before us, I shall follow and give a definition of one principal word which more than any other will set the question plainly before the reader. This word is SALVATION, [Gr. *soteria*,] literally meaning *deliverance from evil*. There are *three* salvations spoken of in the word of God; 1. The present salvation of the body from physical dangers; 2. The salvation of the soul from the guilt, the pollution, and domination of sin; and, 3. The future and eternal salvation of the whole person consummated at the resurrection and glorification of all who die in the Lord.

As a specimen we give a few passages where each is spoken of in the word of the Lord: 1. Acts xxvii. 34, Paul said to the ship's crew, "I pray you take meat; for this is for your health," (*soterias*). Heb. x. 7, "Noah prepared an ark to the saving (*soterian*) of his house." 1 Tim. ii. 15, "She shall be saved (*sothesetai*) in child bearing." Acts xxvii. 20, "All hope that we should be saved (*sozesthai*) was

then taken away." Moses "supposed his brethren would have understood how that God by his hand would deliver (*soterian*) them." In this sense, God is the Saviour of all men; and ever since the commencement of the creation God has exercised a particular providence over those who have loved and served him; hence the Apostle adds, "especially of them that believe."

2. Salvation from sin. Acts ii. 47, "And the Lord added the saved to the church daily." (See Griesbach,) "*should be*," is supplied.—1 Cor. i. 18, "To us who *are saved* it [the preaching of the Cross] is the power of God;" xv. i. "By which you *are saved* if you keep in memory what I preached unto you," &c. 2 Cor. ii. 15, "We are unto God a sweet savor of Christ in them that *are saved*, and in them that perish." 1 Peter iii. 21, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also *now save us*." Eph. ii. 5-8, "By grace *are you saved*." Titus, iii. 5, "He *hat*' saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Spirit." To this list might be added almost every occurrence of the words *save*, *saved*, and *salvation*, in the New Testament. These portions of the word of God will speak no other language than a present salvation, that is, a complete deliverance of the soul from the guilt, pollution, and dominion of sin. With reference to this salvation, the Apostle speaks when he says that "God will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth."

3. In relation to the ultimate and complete salvation, that to which your question refers, consult the following Scriptures:—1 Cor. v. 5, "Deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." Rom. v. 9, "Being justified by his blood we *shall be saved* from wrath through him;" xiii. 2, "It is high time to awake out of sleep for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed." Phil. ii. 12, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," &c. 2 Tim. ii. 10, "I endure all things for the elects' sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory." Heb. v. 9, "And being made perfect he became the *author of eternal salvation* to [the whole human family? no!] *all them that obey him*." Permit me here, Sir, to remark, by the way, that were there no other declarations in "the book" relative to the final destiny of the human family, this ought to set the question at rest. Here we have the only place in the volume of inspiration where the words *eternal* and *salvation* are united, and here we are informed who shall enjoy this blessedness—"all that obey him." Is not this equal to a positive declaration that none will enjoy this eternal salvation but those who obey him?

Here, then, it is proved beyond a doubt, that the word *salvation* has reference to a present deliverance from physical ills—from sin—and from threatened punishment to the disobedient and ungodly. Before, then, Sir, I touch your main pillars, may I be permitted to enquire, from what does "universal grace" save all men? Remember that men cannot be saved from that danger to which they never have been exposed. All men are not exempt from suffering at the present time—all men are not saved from their sins; and more than this, "universal

grace" teaches that God saves no man from his sins, but every man must suffer for every sin. According to your views, I see no use of the word salvation. Will you or some of your friends let me know what danger or evil man is exposed to from which God delivers him! If every thing is going on just as God wills it should, and has ever since God existed; and if before all worlds God determined the fate and condition of man, and that unending bliss; not one of the human family ever were in danger of any evil, and even if they have been, he saves no one; for every judgment must be meted out to man in accordance with God's purposes! Your Bible, Sir, needs not the word salvation. You have no use for it! What would you say to the astronomer who should be continually discoursing about the salvation of Mars or Jupiter? Would you not ask—are they now, or were they ever in danger? Would it not seem rather incongruous to talk about the salvation of any thing which is fixed in the adamantine chains of inexorable fate? If I am mistaken, correct me: for I was informed that you argued the salvation of all men from the fact that the planetary system was fixed and immovable, and no derangement could possibly occur. Hence the salvation of all, because mind is under the same controul as matter! But to your first argument:—"All men will be saved because God wills it." Your first witness is 1 Tim. ii. 4, "Who will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth." That this passage has reference to the deliverance of man from sin, I have no doubt. Do read the connection once more. Nothing is said about the future world in the chapter. That any thing in the chapter or connexion has any reference to man after this life, no one can prove. M'Night renders it "Who commands all men to be saved," &c. That it refers to salvation from sin in this life will appear certain from the fact that a similar sentence occurs in Matt. ix. 13, "Who will have mercy, and not sacrifice,"—that is, that deeds of mercy were more acceptable to God than sacrifice. 1 Thes. iv. 3, "For this is the will of God even your sanctification." I will not enquire, shall the will of the Lord ultimately be done, but is it *now* done? Then are all men now saved from sin—then do all men prefer mercy to sacrifice! Then are they all sanctified! That it is the will of God that every son and daughter of Adam should now be saved from their sins, is a doctrine in which I rejoice. But this argument goes on the hypothesis that the will of God is done—which resolves Universalism into a complete system of fatalism. Then all the sin and misery in the world is pleasing to the Lord, for it is his will and purpose that it should be so. But you may enquire, "why speak of sin and misery, if every thing is going on in accordance with his will—then is there neither sin nor misery in the world, for a God of love and mercy would not permit any such thing! and, therefore, the whole world is now happy!"

The metaphysical question concerning the will and purpose of the Lord, I do not wish to agitate: but any premises, ever so plausible, if they lead to manifest absurdities, prove our propositions false. To say that the will of the Lord is done, is one of the most horrid ideas ever invented by man. It is at war with both reason, common sense,

and revelation. Reason says that those practices which are exactly antipodes cannot be in accordance with the divine mind; common sense declares that no man really believes any such thing; for if I am advocating the truth, you are not, and *vice versa*. Both of us cannot be pleasing the Lord. The system of fatalism sets God at war with himself, and must therefore be false. It is contrary to scripture. You will no doubt admit, without hesitation, that the commands of God are his will. If they are not, pray tell me how do you know any thing about his will. To say then that men are acting as God wills they should, is to say they are walking in accordance with divine revelation, and he who would assert that, we should consider a fit subject for the Lunatic Asylum. The shortest and best way, then, with these metaphysical disquisitions is the *reductio ad absurdum*.

Your second witness for this proposition is that it is a "*will of purpose*;" and quote Eph. i. 9-10. As the Apostle was writing to those who had "redemption through the blood of Jesus, even the forgiveness of sins," it has nothing to do with the whole human family. It is evident from the epistle, that the Church at Ephesus was made up of Jews and Gentiles. The Jewish disciples were opposed to the Gentiles coming under the government of Christ, without first coming under Moses. The Apostle's design is to convince them that it is the purpose and will of God not only to bring the Jews and Gentiles, but also the heavenly powers, referring to angels, I suppose, under the dominion of the Lord Jesus. When is this to be accomplished? "In another state," say you. But not so the Apostle. "In the dispensation of the fulness of time." And when was the fulness of time? Hear the same Apostle, Gal. iv. 4, "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son," &c. The whole scope and design of the Apostle is to convince the disciples that God had but one kingdom—that Jesus was Lord of all, and that all Jews, Gentiles, things in heaven and earth, should be under the dominion of the Lord Jesus.—But because God "works after the counsel of his *own* will," instead of the counsel of the will of others, in subjecting all to the dominion of Messiah, you think that his will must be accomplished! We have already seen that his will is not now done.

But to prove that his will *is* done, you quote the language of an ungodly king, with reference to kingdoms. The substance of this argument then is—if in fact it has substance—because God raises up and dethrones kings, *therefore*, he exerts the same influence over mind that he does over matter.

But your fourth quotation is a greater perversion of the word of God, if possible, than the above. Read it, Mr. Taylor, and finish the sentence before you close: "The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand." [Here you close, and if you had read that passage in the Bible, you knew you was perverting it! I scarcely know how to repress my astonishment that you would dare to handle the word of God in such a manner! But to the "thought" and "purpose" of God: what was it?] "That *I will break the Assyrian in my land,*

and upon my mountains tread him under foot," &c. God purposed to destroy the Assyrians for their wickedness—therefore God has purposed to save all men! Is this Universalist logic, Mr. Taylor?

But your fifth argument on this head is still more unfortunate.—1 Tim. iv. 10: "God is the Saviour of all men," &c. After the remarks above on the "three salvations," it will be unnecessary to add much more here. Your effort to turn the *present* tense into the *future*, is another proof that Universalism sets at defiance all rules of grammar, and principles of interpretation. Paul says, "God is the Saviour of all men." Mr. Taylor, in effect, says, "Paul, you are mistaken, he is not now the Saviour of all men, but he *will be* in the resurrection!" The Apostle Peter, who wrote to the same people with whom Timothy was then labouring, says—2 Peter, iii. 15: "And account the long suffering of our Lord, salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you." Here Peter alludes to the same salvation, and says, "the long suffering of God is salvation." Your sixth argument is, that good men pray for the salvation of all; and "the desire of the righteous shall be granted." And does not every righteous man desire the present happiness and holiness of men? No righteous person desires the future happiness of men only in accordance with the will of God. God never willed nor desired the happiness of men without holiness; and no man can be holy without serving God. When a good man prays for the salvation of all, he desires that they may be saved through the truth. Like his master, he prays not for these only, but for all them also who shall believe on the Lord through the Apostles' words. Good men pray for their "daily bread," but they expect it only through the use of means.

From the above it appears that the main pillar of Universalism is based on the hypothesis that men do not, nor can they act contrary to the will of Jehovah. That, since man became a transgressor until the present time, the great mass of the human family have been opposed to his will, and consequently unhappy, is a truth so obvious that to prove it I deem a work of supererogation. To make this long vexed question plain to every reader, I will here refer to a previous argument: The Bible is the *will and purpose* of God; men act in *opposition* to the Bible; therefore, men oppose the will and purpose of God.

To say then, that God has *willed and purposed* the eternal salvation of all, is to say that the bible has declared it; but the bible has promised only the eternal salvation of those who *obey* Jesus Christ; all men do not obey Jesus Christ; therefore all men will not be saved with an eternal salvation.

II. Your second proposition is, that God has "*promised*" to save all. Your proof; the promise to Abraham and others, that "in him and in his seed all the families and nations of the earth should be blessed," and that this blessing was spiritual. The utter uselessness of this argument will become apparent if we question the witnesses a few moments. Do they say all men will be eternally saved? No. But they say all men will be blessed! Well. *Where* and *when* will they be blessed? *Answer.* In Christ Jesus! The "seed," you argue, is

Christ. Are all men *in* Christ? No; he that is "in Christ is a new creature." "As many of you as have been *baptised* into Christ, have put on Christ." "If you be Christ's—that is, have believed and been baptised," "then are you Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." What promise? "*In* thee and *in* thy seed, shall all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth be blessed." You have properly remarked, that he blesses them "in turning away every man from his iniquities." Yes, Sir, this is the salvation announced by the Apostles. Those who turned from their iniquities, and were baptised *into* Christ were truly blessed, for they became heirs of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ. Can you, my dear Sir, or any of your friends, produce an instance of a person being found *in* Jesus Christ, since the commencement of the "dispensation of the fulness of times," who had not been "born of water and spirit?"

III. The third proposition is, that God has *sworn* to accomplish the salvation of all. Your witness is Isa. xv. 23–24. As this is a passage on which your fraternity emphasize with peculiar zest, I will quote both verses, and not break off in the middle of a sentence as you have done! Why stop your witnesses mouth before he delivered his testimony? Were you afraid he might say something which would contradict your exposition, or weaken his testimony? Hear him once more, and I hope if ever you call on him to testify again, that you will give him fair chance to testify the whole truth. "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength: even to him shall men come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed." What, Sir, shall any be *ashamed* in the immortal state of bliss and glory. A greater punishment cannot be inflicted on some persons than to *shame* them in the presence of their superiors. Ah! and will God be so cruel as to punish in the future world those who are incensed against him? You would have this confession made in another state of existence; and it appears that shame and confusion will follow on all those who are "incensed against him."

Be patient, Sir, and I shall show that this oft repeated and much abused portion of the Holy Book militates more against your system than for it. The Prophet designed to show that the time would come that men would all be compelled to acknowledge God instead of the idols which they had been long adoring. But on its application to the present dispensation, I choose to give the remarks of a young brother about *twenty-two* years of age:—"This prophecy, or rather prophetic decree, is applied to Christ by the Apostle, when he says, that 'God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.' Phil. ii. 9–12.

"The important point relative to this decree is to ascertain the *time* of its *fulfilment*. Now, it is well known that in this life, every knee has *not* bowed—every tongue has *not* confessed that Jesus Christ is

Lord. But God has sworn that they shall eventually ; we must, therefore look beyond the grave for the fulfilment of this decree. This Universalists not only grant, but insist upon. They affirm that it has not and cannot be fulfilled in this world. And they are right ; for so decrees an Apostle. In censuring some of the dogmatic Romans for making a difference of opinion a matter of censure, he gives this excellent reason why they should not be over hasty in judging such matters : ‘ For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ ; for it is written, as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.’ *So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God.*

“ You will perceive that the ‘ bowing of the knee,’—the ‘ confessing of the tongue,’—the ‘ judgment-seat of Christ,’—the ‘ rendering an account to God,’ are all coetaneous, or occur at the same time. If, then, the bowing of the knee be in a future life, so will be the ‘ judgment-seat of Christ.’ And if the confession of Christ’s Messiahship be after the resurrection, so will also the rendering of our account to God. What, then, will become of the Universalist no-future-punishment theory when this decree is fulfilled ?

“ But again :—It is said ‘ all that are incensed against him *shall be ashamed.*’ How humiliating to those who die in their sins, to think that God has decreed that they shall do homage to his son—that covered with shame they shall stand before his judgment-seat, and confess him to be Lord of all. Yet is it as clear as human language can make it, and as unavoidable as fate.’ ”

But you say you cannot see how these Scriptures can be fulfilled, if any are doomed to ceaseless suffering, or blotted out of existence. The word does not assert that all shall say, “ In the Lord I have righteousness and strength ;” but “ surely shall *one* say,” and although *one* is supplied, yet those who say this are evidently contra-distinguished from those who are “ incensed against him.” But how can all this be “ to the glory of God the Father.” Mr. Taylor can certainly imagine a criminal whose crimes, according to the laws of the United States, subject him to capital punishment, so overpowered by the testimony presented against him, and the justice of his condemnation, as to confess to the glory and praise of the laws, that he is justly condemned !

IV. But Jesus came to save all—his mission will not be successful unless all are saved with an eternal salvation. This is your only remaining pillar.

This argument is based on the first, you having, it seems, taken for granted as an indisputable fact, that the will of the Lord is done. This is so far from the truth that all the sin and misery in the world has resulted from opposition to the divine will. But to your argument : He came to save *his people* from their sins ; sinners are his people ; all men are sinners ; therefore all will be saved. This is the strength of your fortress. Now for your defence. Are you certain that the phrase, “ his people,” refers to the whole human family ? There are, at least, two acceptations in which such language is taken, if not three. John, 11, “ He came to his *own*, and his *own* received him not, but to as

many as received him believing on his name, he gave them power to become the sons of God," &c. This refers to his own countrymen.—Again, John, viii. 44, "You are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." Here were others, that were not his, in some sense! Again: 1 Peter, xi. 10: "Which in times past were not a people, but are now the people of God." Here we see when they became his people—when they began to follow him; hence the emphatic language of the Apostle, Rom. viii. 9, "Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, *he is none of his.*" Now, Sir, for you to say, that in the sense of enjoying the benefits of Christ's mission, all are his people, is positively to contradict the Apostle. He says, that to be Christ's, *we must possess his spirit.* You say, that to be Christ's, we must be sinners! You may retort, "But he came to save his people from their sins." Admitted. "He came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." He saves from sins by being exalted to grant repentance and forgiveness to all those who turn to God and are "baptized for remission of sins." But "if you believe not that I am he, you shall die in your sins." Yes, to his *own* people (the Jews) he said—"You shall die in your sins: whither I go ye cannot come!"

If my space would permit, Sir, I think that not an argument in this proposition, but might be reduced to the same glaring inconsistency.—Ah! my dear Sir, there is as great an amount of sophistry in your reasoning on the last proposition as could be thrown together in the same space. How many hundred times have I heard the following argument for the system thrown into the this style:—"All are given to Christ, and all that are given to him shall be saved." To prove this, those scraps of scripture which you quote, are called on to testify; but just as the witness begins to speak you put your hand over his mouth!—This shall be made apparent after a few preliminaries: first, the Jews are called Christ's people—John, i. 2. Secondly, the whole world is his property—John, iii. 35. Thirdly, those who love, serve, and obey him, are his "peculiar people"—1 Peter, ii. 10. These he saves from their sins. Think of these facts a few moments, and then in the fear of the Lord take your Bible and refer to those "*texts*" which you have quoted; and be satisfied whether or not I have charged you falsely when I accuse you of withholding their testimony! See if you have not quoted even parts of a sentence to prove a system that cannot be otherwise sustained! Read the second Psalm, a part of which you have quoted and *italicised.* What you have quoted, is admitted as literally true, that Christ had all things given to him—not only human beings, but also beasts, birds, and reptiles! Will they be made immortal also! But does that Psalm say that he will save all? On the *contrary*, it declares that he "shall break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces as a potter's vessel." * * "Kiss the son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." Then read John, iii. 35, where, after it is said, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands," it is added, as though the inspiring spirit was preparing to refute your argument, deduced from this scrap of testimony, verse 36th, "he that believeth on the Son

bath everlasting life ; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life ; but the wrath of God abideth on him." Why, Sir, did you think that we "Blue Noses" had no bible ; that we were not able to expose such shameless perversions of the oracles of God ? Little confidence can that mind have in the volume of inspiration, who can thus deliberately select a few words here and there, to make up a theory, than which none other is more gratifying to an ungodly man !

This is another digression—now for the next argument. "Thou hast given him power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him."—John, xvii. 2. And who were those to whom he refers ? Hear him in the same chapter, v. 12, "Those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost but the son of perdition ; that the scripture might be fulfilled." This referred only to his Apostles.

Your argument from your favorite 15th chapter of Corinthians, is entirely lost, from the fact that the chapter is addressed exclusively to those who "were saved." See first three verses. The resurrection to incorruptibility—and the song of triumph is to be sung by the sanctified in Christ Jesus ; hence the Apostle closes that admirable chapter by saying : "Therefore, *my beloved brethren*, be ye steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord ; forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord."

But, to conclude ; for I fear that my readers, if not yourself, will become wearied with the length of this letter ; but to take any thing like a particular notice of your arguments I could not be much more brief. I have said but little about Universalist's reasoning. This kind of proof is, if possible, still more at fault than their arguments deduced from scripture.

There is none of the pure philosophy in the system. It has no connection with that reasoning which, more than any thing else, emancipated the minds of men from the absurdities of the schoolmen. It would be of much benefit to Universalist reasoners if they would read a few chapters of Lord Bacon's Philosophy ; and learn to reason from facts and not from *hypothesis*. Your logic is all from Aristotle, and the schoolmen of the darkest ages—reasoning from doubts to certainties ! You first form a character for God, and then reason from what *he is to what he will do*. This is an *a priori* argument ; when the only certain mode of reasoning, is, *a posteriori*, from what God *has done* to what he *will do*. He *has ever* exhibited his displeasure against sin and its votaries ; and he *never has* compelled any to love and serve him ; I therefore conclude that he always will be opposed to sin and disobedience ; and that as men are unwilling to serve and obey the Lord here, I expect they always will be ; and consequently must suffer the pains of "eternal damnation."

As I have given to the readers of the Christian all you have addressed to me, I expect in common courtesy, as you have been the first to propose a written discussion, you will see that this letter is published entire in The Trumpet.

With a desire that you may enjoy the present salvation so as to be

prepared for the immortal bliss of heaven, I subscribe myself respectfully your's,

W. W. EATON.

St. John, April 30th, 1840.

P. S.—You will excuse me for not appending "*Reverend*" to your name. I desire not the appellation. I dare not give it to any man, so long as it is written, "*Holy and Reverend is His name.*" W. W. E.

OBJECTIONS TO IMMERSION.

Mr. EDITOR,—As you had the kindness to notice my brief Note in your 8th Number, I will now give you my reason for giving you such trouble on that subject.

I was truly *surprised* at Mr. Carson's assertion and challenge; it being in opposition to all authorities to which I had access; and for the advancement of truth, as well as for my own satisfaction, desired to have the Lexicon and Greek authority pointed out. No such authorities being given in your 8th Number, I have patiently, though anxiously, waited for the 9th: but its appearance has not removed the difficulty. And now, in taking up my pen, in the defence of what I believe to be truth, I am aware of my own weakness; and hope your liberality will preserve me from sarcasm, as I only desire that truth may prevail.

To your question—"Will Sylvanus, or any other person, refer us to the Lexicon or author who gives *bapto* or *baptizo*, any other rendering than *dip*, or its equivalent?" I do not know that I can answer this question in the affirmative, according to Walker's definition of the word *equivalent*, namely, "a thing of the same weight or value—equal in value or excellence," because when those words are correctly rendered, and as I find *baptizo* by many Lexicons rendered immerse, pour, sprinkle, &c. then I say if this be a correct rendering, then are they equivalent or of equal value or excellence, each mode answering the great *command*. And though I have not yet been referred to that Lexicographer who says *baptizo* means to *immerse*, and nothing but *immerse*—by your kind permission, I will give a few out of the many names who give to *baptizo*, "other rendering," and you will be your own judge whether they are equivalent to *dip*.

Schrevelius, that great master and critic of the Greek tongue, whose Lexicon has been a standard work for nearly two centuries, gives four definitions of *baptizo*, to-wit: *baptizo, mergo, abluo, lavo*—to baptize; to immerse; to wash; to sprinkle, moisten, or wet." Here observe that only one of these four definitions denotes exclusive immersion.—The other three, especially two of them, denote the application of water in other modes than immersion.

Scapula, (see his Lexicon), defines *baptizo*, "immerse, wash, sprinkle, (*mergo, abluo, lavo.*")

Leigh, in *Critica Sacra*, defines *baptizo*, "a kind of washing, as by plunging; and yet it is taken more largely for any kind of washing when there is no dipping at all."

Cole, defines baptizo, "to baptize, to wash, to sprinkle."

Passor, defines it, to "immerse, wash, sprinkle."

Suidas, defines it, "immerse, moisten, sprinkle, wash; purge, cleanse; (mergo, madefacio, lavo, purgo, mundo.)"

Conlon, defines it, by "immersion, washing, sprinkling, or wetting; (mersione, ablutione, et aspersione.)"

Here we have a definition of a few of the most eminent lexicographers; and not wishing to intrude on your limits, I shall let these names suffice at this time—and give others when called for; not considering, Mr. Editor, that I am giving you information, but for the benefit of your readers.

You ask, "was there ever a man living who translated *bapto* or *baptizo*, by pour or sprinkle?" I do not wish, Sir, to evade this question by asking, was there ever a man before Campbell, who ventured to translate *baptizo*, by immerse, for christian baptism? Have our translators in any one instance in the New Testament, rendered baptizo, to immerse or dip, though the word is used about eighty times? Whenever they have translated it, (as they have done in some instances,) they have translated it *wash*, or some word that does not necessarily signify a total immersion. Generally they have only transcribed the word, giving it the English form *baptizo*. They have never translated it *immerse*. And why was this? Did they not *know* the meaning of baptizo? Then, they were not fit for their great undertaking. Did they know the meaning and not choose to give it? Then they weakly and wickedly shrunk from the duty they undertook. But the translators of the Bible were neither ignorant nor wicked men. They *knew* and *did* their duty. Why then did they not translate baptizo into English? Because there is no word in English that fully and precisely, and in all cases, answered it in signification. They did not translate it *sprinkle*, because they knew it did not always signify sprinkle; for the same reason they did not translate it, *pour*, *immerse*, *wash*, &c. They knew it signified the application of water or other liquid, either by *sprinkling*, *pouring*, or *immersing*; and as no English word expresses this signification, they judged it best generally, to give an English form, and leave it untranslated.

As to the word *bapto*, as you have very justly shown in your 9th number, it is a word generally used in the New Testament to express dipping. But I would ask, in how many cases is it used to express christian baptism? In cases of dipping, we find the Apostles have used the word *bapto*, and not *baptizo*; and if the only meaning of *baptizo*, is, to *dip*, why do the Apostles always use another word when they wish to convey the idea of total *plunging*? The fact that when they speak of *dipping*, they use another word, furnishes conclusive proof that they do not consider the only meaning of baptizo to be immersion.

If Christ and his Apostles had intended to confine us to one and the same mode of baptism, they might, and doubtless would have had words of the most definite signification. If they had intended to desig-

nate *immersion* as the only mode, they might have used the word *dup-to*, which signifies unequivocally, to *dip* or *dive under*. If they had intended to designate *sprinkling* as the only mode, they might have used the word *rantizo*, which signifies unequivocally to sprinkle. If they had intended to designate *pouring* as the only mode, they would have had the word *cheo*, which signifies unequivocally to *pour*—and *louo*, for washing. But when they speak of the ordinance of baptism, they do not use either of these words; they uniformly use the word *baptizo*, which as far as I have been enabled to gather from all Lexicons and standard authority, signifies to sprinkle, to wash, to immerse, to pour; and the irresistible conclusion from this remarkable fact is, that they did not intend to restrict the ordinance to any one mode of applying the water.

I would gladly make several more observations on the article, *Baptism—the action*, in your 9th number, but feel that I am now intruding. But please excuse one more observation—you named Professor Stewart, and a number of Greek historians, and his testimony from the examination of these authors. But observe, his testimony is not that *baptizo* means to immerse, and nothing but immerse. No, but see his testimony, *Bib. Repos.* pp. 337–338: after a full examination of the meaning of the word *baptizo*, he says:—“I do consider it quite plain, that none of the circumstantial evidence [in the Bible] proves immerse to have been exclusively the mode of christian baptism, or even that of John. Indeed, I consider this point so far made out, that I can hardly suppress the conviction, that if any one maintains the contrary, it must be either because he is unable rightly to estimate the nature or power of the Greek language; or because he is influenced in some measure by party feeling; or else because he has looked at the subject in only a partial manner, without examining it fully and thoroughly.”

Among the ancient historians whose opinions you speak of asking; and whose authority you bring, as examined by Professor Stuart, will you please refer me to that individual of them, or to any of their testimony which says *baptizo* means to immerse, and nothing but immerse? And please pardon me if I give the testimony of one of them, namely Plutarch, who in his life of Theseus, quoting the Sybilline verse concerning the City of Athens, says, “Thou mayst be baptized, O bladder, but it is not permitted to thee to go under the water.” (*Askos baptize, dunai de toi ou themis esti.*) See Pond, p. 30—Plutarch here used *baptizo*, to denote a partial wetting.

Be it observed that I am indebted to C. Fowler, A. M. for a number of extracts. SYLVANUS.

BAPTISM—THE ACTION. No. 4.

REPLY TO “SYLVANUS.”

Dear Sir,—In accordance with our usual liberality, we give your letter to our readers entire. We have, however, neglected noticing it until it is in type, which circumscribes our space, so that we shall be

unable to write as much as we choose ; and that which is done must be in haste.

If you had been patient a short time until you had read our Nos. 2 and 3, you would have been better prepared for your subject ; but as you have rushed into the arena with apparent confidence in your armour, we will, without further preliminaries, try our sword on your helmet.

1. Your first error is, placing too much confidence in Lexicographers. You ought to know, previous to criticising on "dead" languages, that the ancients have not handed down to us their dictionaries ; if they had, we should be able to refer to them, and controversies on words would be settled in a short time. The only way, then, which we have left to know the definition of a word in those languages is to compare the same words with each other, and the connection in which they are found. By thus examining for example, the words *bapto* and *baptizo*, in all their various occurrences and uses, we go to the fountain head of knowledge on this subject. This was what induced me to spend so much time in collecting all the principal words used in this controversy, and spreading them before the reader in one chapter.—Although this production of ours, in your estimation, "has not removed the difficulty," yet your admission has proved fatal to all your reasoning ; for you admit that *bapto* is "generally used in the New Testament to express dipping." Now all Lexicographers to which I have access, make *baptizo* the derivative of *bapto*. This, I presume, no one will question. But you are "surprised" that Mr. Carson should assert that *baptizo* means to immerse, and nothing but immerse. Can you for a moment imagine that any of your authorities will begin to compare with Mr. Carson ? Have they given as he has, criticisms on particular passages from sacred and profane authors ; or even had they access to the works of which he has proved himself master, how much had they to bias and warp their judgment in their productions ! But who are your authorities ? With one or two exceptions, they are obscure writers from the tenth to the seventeenth centuries ; and one or two of them are so obscure that not even their names have found a place in any biographical dictionary to which I have access ! And are these the men who are to give us instruction relative to the ordinances of God ? when we not only have access to the fountains of truth, but enjoy the benefits of the improvements in literature for about two hundred years ! Why, Sir, such men as Mr. PARKHURST, Dr. GEORGE CAMPBELL, Mr. ALEXANDER CARSON, or ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, are at least three centuries before a majority of those to whom you refer or can refer on your side of this question. But, Sir, I appeal to no human testimony where either my faith or practice is concerned. The Bible, the whole Bible, is the umpire in all such cases. How readest thou there ? This settles all disputes in my mind.

But while on authorities, I will say that I have before me a long list of Paidobaptists who testify that baptism means to immerse ; this however, you admit. These names I shall lay before the readers of the Christian at some future time, the Lord willing. Again, I fearlessly

assert that no respectable Lexicographer, who had a reputation to lose ever gave either sprinkling or pouring as the meaning of *bapto* or *baptiza*!! Why, Sir, four out of seven you have given, testify against you!

“SCHREVELIUS (Cornelius)—born at Haarlem—succeeded his father as Rector of Leyden in 1642, having previously taken his degrees in Medicine—his Latin and Greek Lexicon still deservedly holds a place in the schools.”

“SCAPULA (John)—a German Lexicographer, who was employed by Henry Stephens as his corrector; and while printing the “*Thesaurus Linguae Græcæ*,” Scapula extracted secretly the words and explications which were of most use, and published them in 1583, as an original work of his own. By this treachery, Stephens was ruined, and became a bankrupt.”

“LEIGH (Edward)—was born in Leicestershire, 1603. He was a lay member of the assembly of divines,—and in the Long Parliament whose violent measures he opposed [1648] for which he was expelled. He wrote *Critica Sacra*.”

“COLES (Elisha)—born 1640. He was author of several works—among which are a Latin English and English Latin Dictionary, and a *Harmony of the Gospels*.”

“SUIDAS, a Greek Lexicographer, of whom no particulars are recorded; he is supposed to have lived between 975 and 1025. The best editions of his works are in Latin”

“PASSOR (George)—Professor of Hebrew, first at Hebron, and next at Franeker, where he died in 1637; he composed a *Lexicon Græco Latinum in Nov. Test.*”—*Watkins' Biographical Dictionary*.

Here, then, are your witnesses that *baptizo* means something else besides immerse. Did all these men give their definitions in Latin? if so, I am at a loss to know how much credit to give even to your translations of *Latin* words, to say nothing of Greek! Only one to which you refer whose Latin definitions you have given, says a word about sprinkling! I have not access to these works, but I am rather of the opinion that they all wrote in Latin—if so, perhaps if you had given their own words, six out of the seven would have testified against you! To make this plain to the most common capacity, I will here insert the plain literal meaning of the Latin definitions given in your letter:—*Mergo*, to immerse; *abluo*, to wash clean, to clean away; *lavo*, to wash, to clean, to bathe. To these SUIDAS adds *madefacio*, to wet or moisten; *purgo*, to make clean, to cleanse; *mundo*, to clean, to make clean. But CONLON adds, *aspirgo*, to sprinkle. None add, *affundo*, to pour. The reader will begin to think now that it will be necessary to study Latin as well as Greek to know whether he is baptised or not. Now, Sir, with the exception of Conlon, I think that even your own authorities are against you. Re-examine them, my dear Sir. The only question now to be settled is, does this washing, the original of which is, *abluo* and *lavo*, refer to a *partial* or *total* washing? On pages 199 and 200 of the Christian, we proved that *nipito* was used when to express the washing of the body, as hands, eyes, feet, &c.; *pluo*, to wash clothes; and *lavo*, the whole body; and mark this, Sir, your La-

in *lavo*, which you imagine means to sprinkle, is derived from the Greek *louo*! Now, remember that where baptism is spoken of as washing, or when the whole body is said to be washed, *louo*, or its cognates, is the word always used. I will here give a few passages from the New Testament for you to think upon. John, xiii. 10, "He that is washed (*leloumenos*) needeth not save to wash (*nipsasthai*) his feet, but is clean every whit." Acts, xxii. 16, "Arise and be baptised, and wash (*apolousai*) away thy sins." I Cor. vi. 11, "But ye are washed," (*apelouthase*). Heb. x. 22, "Your bodies washed (*leloumenoi*) with pure water." I have neither time nor room to comment on these quotations. Indeed, they are sufficiently plain already. All these, except the first, unquestionably refer to baptism, and the total washing of the body is expressed as plainly as it is possible in the Greek language.

So much, then, for your authorities; but if every one had testified that *baptizo* meant to pour and sprinkle, it would only have been proof that they had no reputation as critics to lose! Not a passage has yet been found either in the Greek classics—the Old or New Testament, where *bapto* and *baptizo* do not either literally or figuratively mean to immerse. What would you say to me, if in an argument on this subject I should quote Baptist Lexicons to prove that "*baptizo* meant to immerse, and nothing out immerse." Your reply to me shall be mine to you at this time with relation to your Lexicographers. But know, Sir, that men of the first talents and erudition in the Paido Baptist ranks have given to *bapto* and *baptizo* no other definition than that of immerse, or its equivalent!

The unbelief of the Paido-Baptists in immersion reminds me of the reasoning of sceptics on the resurrection of the Lord Jesus. The latter will not take the testimony of those who believe in the resurrection, neither will the former take the testimony of believers in immersion as valid; but say, "give us a Paido-Baptist Lexicographer who declares that he does not believe in immersion, that will thus testify that *baptizo* signifies immerse, and nothing but immerse, and then I will believe in it." "Produce," says the infidel, "good credible witnesses of the miracles, or resurrection of Jesus, who were themselves unbelievers of those facts, and then we will believe." One would suppose that in both cases an impossibility was required of us, but such have been the concessions of Paido-Baptists on the one hand, and of sceptics on the other, that something equivalent to the above can be extracted from each.—Hear Professor STEWART again—that great critic to whom you refer with so much confidence: "*Bapto* and *baptizo* mean to *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerge*, into any thing liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this. My proof of this position needs not necessarily to be protracted; but for the sake of ample confirmations, I must beg the reader's patience, while I lay before him, as briefly as may be, the results of an investigation which seems to leave no room for doubt." He then refers to the authors mentioned on page 196 of the Christian. The reader, if not yourself, Sir, will perhaps be desirous of knowing how this learned essayist essays to *keep out of the water*.

Why, Sir, after such a candid and noble concession, admitting all

that we ask him to, viz. that *bapto* and *baptizo* mean to immerse, and nothing but immerse, he endeavors to sustain a tottering cause by circumstantial evidence! and thinks that he who would question the validity of sprinkling, must be "unable rightly to estimate nature or the power of the Greek language!" How shall we estimate the nature and power of language if not by its meaning; and he says that "all Lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this—that *bapto* and *baptizo* mean to *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerge*!" He then endeavors to clear himself of this admission:—1. By "the use of language in general." 2. By circumstances attending the administration of this rite." 3. Its "early history." 4. "Subsequent history." 5. Lastly, he enquires, "whether any particular mode of applying water in baptism is essential to the ordinance, and obligatory upon the churches of Christ in the present day." And by these circumstances he endeavors to raise a doubt on the meaning of Baptism. But you ought to know, Sir, that ten thousand probabilities never prove certainly an affirmative proposition. 2. You ask, "Was there ever a man before *Campbell*, who ventured to translate *baptizo* immerse for christian baptism?" I know not to what *Campbell* you refer, for Dr. Geo. Campbell, of Scotland, a Presbyterian clergyman, contends that "the primitive signification of *baptisma* is *immersion*; of *baptizein*, to *immerse*, *plunge*, or *overwhelm*;" and *Alexander Campbell*, of Virginia, in republishing Dr. Campbell's translation of the "Four Gospels," remarks in relation to the translation of *baptizo*, &c. that what *Campbell* and *M'Night* had "sometimes done we have *always* done." But to your question we unhesitatingly answer, *Yes*. MARTIN LUTHER gave his countrymen a translation of the word under consideration, on which he remarks, "I would have those that are to be baptised, to be wholly dipped into the water as the word imports and the mystery does signify." Accordingly, in his translation, he styles John the Baptist, *John the dipper*, (*der Tauffer*), and in the Dutch *John een dooper*, that is, John the dipper. But in opposition to this, Peter Jones, a Wesleyan Missionary to some of the Indian tribes in Canada—translated the Scriptures into the Indian language, renders baptism by a word which in that language expresses *sprinkling*! Has he, Sir, in your estimation, committed as great a crime as *Campbell*?

3. You ask, why did not the translators of the common English version translate *baptizo*? Had I room I would here write a few sentences on our present translation, and the circumstances which surrounded them when performing their sacred task; but I have not. In relation, however, to your question, I answer they *did* translate *baptizo* *once*, and I think only once, and then it was DR. 2 Kings, v. 14, "Then he (Naaman) went down and *dipped* (ebaptisato) himself."—What do you think of them now, Sir. Did they "weakly and wickedly" depart from their duty? Were they "unfit for their great undertaking?"

4. But your quotation from *Plutarch* is the most unfortunate reference in your letter, The greater part of your arguments has been decidedly in favor of immersion; but this passage is just what I should have quoted had I been seeking for classical authority. Why, Sir,

I fear that some of my readers will think that you are an advocate for immersion, and nothing else; and that you are endeavoring to show how weak the cause of sprinkling has become! But I must inform them to the contrary—that you are a public defender of the *sprinkling* and *pouring* “mode” of baptism.

You made a gross blunder in your Greek of Plutarch—having left out two words, which, to save you from the smile of the scholar, I have supplied. Neither is your translation correct. This is the true rendering: “O bladder, (or literally, a leather bottle), thou mayest be dipped, but thou art not fated to sink.” There is nothing in the original which answers “to go under the water!” This is simply saying of a leather bottle or bladder that it might be dipped in the water, but that there was no danger of its sinking. Thank you, Sylvanus, for this quotation!

Were I not conscious of my own deficiency in literature, compared with my brethren of the editorial corps generally, I would advise you, my dear Sir, to confine yourself to plain English, and not wade into Greek and Latin.

“Vessels large may venture more,
But little boats should keep near shore.”

But you begged to be excused from “sarcasm.” Well, Sir, I have used you affectionately. I hope you will not take the last few sentences as even an effort at severity or ridicule. The advice given I think you need. That you may know the whole truth, and be enabled to teach it to others, is the ardent desire of your friend,

EATON.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

All who have not paid for *The Christian* should settle up immediately. The Printer is not yet paid. He has done his work well, and added four pages more than we promised in the Prospectus. Pay to our Agents, or send by mail, *post paid*.

Our beloved brother, Elder Benjamin Howard purposes spending another season in Nova-Scotia, proclaiming the Apostolic Gospel.

All who desire the continuance of *The Christian* must exert themselves to get new subscribers, and get pay from delinquents.

All who have failed to receive their numbers, either through the carelessness of the Post Office department, or our own, shall have them made good.

Elder SAMUEL ROBINSON, without dropping a line to us—and contrary to the expectation of all, has resorted to the *Christian Messenger*, a Baptist paper printed in Halifax, and attempted a reply to our letters, without quoting *two whole sentences* of what he pretends to oppose! Our readers will judge for themselves the cause! Will the Editor of the *Messenger* publish our letters to Mr. R. and will the Editor or Mr. R. inform us when the practice began of writing letters to individuals without sending them? for we have not yet received any addressed to us.

A list of receipts for the year was prepared, but is crowded out.

Letters received from James Wallis, Nottingham, (Eng.); J Mitchell, Norval, (U. C.); C Marsh, Onslow, [he will please act as Agent in his Town.] There are several interesting extracts which we purposed making from these Letters—but want of room prevented.

We had an interesting baptising season in Carleton since our last—three baptisms; one added to the Church previously baptized.

Elder Kilton baptised twelve in Eastport, and two on Deer Island, within a short time.

INDEX.--Volume I.

<p>A. Apostolic Church, 49</p> <p>B. Baptism—The Actor. No. 1, 193 " " " No. 2, 230 " " " No. 3, 254 " Criticism on, by Sylvanus, 282 " Objections to, 282 " The Design—by L. B. 95 " " " by Veritas, 157 " " " Remarks on Veritas, by L. B.—No. 2, 158 " Veritas, No. 2, 189 " Reply to Veritas by L. B. 207</p> <p>C. Cast thy burden on the Lord, (Poetry), 264 Christian Union, 207 " " " No. 2, 226 " " " No. 3, 250 Causes of differences of sentiment, 2 Church—Apostolic, 49 Corresponding Notices to, 144 Creeds—Human, 252 Cure of sin, 171</p> <p>D. Devotional, 119 Dialogue, 258 Disciples of Christ, or Christians, 114 Discourse by John Taffe, 25, 53, 81 " " A Raines, 145, 171 " " " " 72 Dying Boy—(Poetry), 72</p> <p>E. Essays on Man in his Primitive State, and under the Patriarchal, Jewish and Christian Dispensations :</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>No. 1, Primitive State, No. 1, 15</td> <td>No. 1, 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. 2, " " " No. 2, 33</td> <td>No. 2, 33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. 3, " " " No. 3, 58</td> <td>No. 3, 58</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. 4, " " " No. 4, 76</td> <td>No. 4, 76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. 5, " " " No. 1, 97</td> <td>No. 1, 97</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. 6, " " " No. 2, 121</td> <td>No. 2, 121</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. 7, " " " No. 3, 154</td> <td>No. 3, 154</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. 8, " " " No. 4, 186</td> <td>No. 4, 186</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. 9, Jewish Age, No. 1, 203</td> <td>No. 1, 203</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. 10, " " " No. 2, 221</td> <td>No. 2, 221</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. 11, " " " No. 3, 247</td> <td>No. 3, 247</td> </tr> </table> <p>Evidences Christian Character :</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>" " Internal, 46</td> <td>46</td> </tr> <tr> <td>" " External, 47</td> <td>47</td> </tr> </table> <p>That a person is a child of the the Devil,—Internal, 47 " " " External, ib. Self-deception, ib.</p> <p>F. Father Land—Poetry, 143</p> <p>G. Gospel—Modern, 100, 127, 159 " Remarks on, 100, 130, 162 " Success of, 163, 190, 264</p> <p>H. Heaven—(Poetry), 215 Howard, Elder B. 167 His propositions for a discussion, 168</p> <p>I. Indian—Anecdote of, 255</p> <p>K. Kingdom of Heaven. No. 1, 18 No. 2, 34</p>	No. 1, Primitive State, No. 1, 15	No. 1, 15	No. 2, " " " No. 2, 33	No. 2, 33	No. 3, " " " No. 3, 58	No. 3, 58	No. 4, " " " No. 4, 76	No. 4, 76	No. 5, " " " No. 1, 97	No. 1, 97	No. 6, " " " No. 2, 121	No. 2, 121	No. 7, " " " No. 3, 154	No. 3, 154	No. 8, " " " No. 4, 186	No. 4, 186	No. 9, Jewish Age, No. 1, 203	No. 1, 203	No. 10, " " " No. 2, 221	No. 2, 221	No. 11, " " " No. 3, 247	No. 3, 247	" " Internal, 46	46	" " External, 47	47	<p>No. 3, 63, 79 No. 4, 137</p> <p>LETTERS,—From "A Subscriber," 100, 127, 159</p> <p>John Doyle to Elder Manning, 134 George Garraty, 189 T. K. Taylor, 165 Sylvanus, 192, 232 To the Editor of the Trumpet, 210 To Elder S. Robinson, No. 1, 213 No. 2, 237 No. 3, 257 T. K. Taylor, 270 Lord's Prayer—Query on, 118 Remarks, ib. Love and Harmony amongst Church Members,—how to promote it. 217</p> <p>M. Meeting Houses, 214 Memorial of Mary,—(Poetry), 24</p> <p>N. Names—Distinctive, 73 No 2, 106 Natural Theology, 8 New-Year's Address, 169</p> <p>O. Opponents opinion of "The Christian," 253</p> <p>P. Poetry : 24, 72, 96, 143, 215, 264 Prospectus, 1 " Baptist Advocate, 192, 216, 240 " Hymn Book, 206, 240 Positive Institutions, 25, 53, 81 Providence—Awful, 96</p> <p>Q. Query—Important answered, 233 On the worship of God, 66</p> <p>R. Remarks—Miscellaneous, 22 " On "A Subscriber's" Letter, 103, 130, 162 Revelation—The Truth of, 30, 60 " Remarks on, 41 Religion (Poetry), 96</p> <p>S. Sin and its Cure, 145, 171 Societies—Religious in America, 113 Spirit's Influence, 241 Subscribers—Notice to, 48 Sylvanus' Letter, 192 " " " Again, 264</p> <p>T. Theory and Practice, 105</p> <p>U. Union—Christian, 207 " " " No. 2, 226 " " " No. 3, 250 Universalism, 210 " " " 265 " " " Examined, 270 Universalist Courtesy, 264</p> <p>V. Veritas' Letters, 157, 189</p> <p>W. Worship—Public, 48 Worsh.p of God—what constitutes it ? 66 When performed ? 89 At what time and place ? 124</p>
No. 1, Primitive State, No. 1, 15	No. 1, 15																										
No. 2, " " " No. 2, 33	No. 2, 33																										
No. 3, " " " No. 3, 58	No. 3, 58																										
No. 4, " " " No. 4, 76	No. 4, 76																										
No. 5, " " " No. 1, 97	No. 1, 97																										
No. 6, " " " No. 2, 121	No. 2, 121																										
No. 7, " " " No. 3, 154	No. 3, 154																										
No. 8, " " " No. 4, 186	No. 4, 186																										
No. 9, Jewish Age, No. 1, 203	No. 1, 203																										
No. 10, " " " No. 2, 221	No. 2, 221																										
No. 11, " " " No. 3, 247	No. 3, 247																										
" " Internal, 46	46																										
" " External, 47	47																										