

# BAPTISMAL IMMERSION

NOT OF GOD.

ARGUMENTS PRO AND CON.

---

EDITED BY

WM. SOMMERVILLE, A. M.,

*Reformed Presbyterian Minister,*

WEST CORNWALLIS, NOVA SCOTIA.

---

ST. JOHN, N. B.:

PRINTED FOR THE EDITOR BY McKILLOP & JOHNSTON, CANTERBURY STREET.

1876.

## PREFATORY NOTE.

---

THE following pages are merely a reprint, with correction of typographical errors and the addition of a short note, of certain articles on Baptism, which appeared in the *Messenger*, the *Witness* and the *Westonian*, of Halifax. The design of the re-publication, in this connected form, of the articles referred to, is to afford a facility to Baptists or Pedobaptists, which they might not otherwise enjoy, to learn what has been written on both sides in the present argument: and to introduce a series of tracts, if God will, in vindication of the claims of the Divine Word, Old Testament as well as New, to be heard and accepted, in respect to all things which pertain to life and godliness, in the family, the church, or the world. I have the most unbounded confidence in submitting to the examination of Baptists my appeal to Scripture, of old or in the present case, in opposition to their professional tenets on Baptism: and I am more than willing that Pedobaptists should read and ponder what the *Messenger* or his allies have to advance against my argument.

I have, in the discussion, studiously confined myself to the consideration of the *mode* of Baptism, while the replies have mixed up the questions of the mode and of infant baptism, which are so entirely independent that a thorough Immersionist might be an advocate of infant baptism, and one opposed to infant baptism might be in favor of baptismal sprinkling. It may be that the *Messenger* and his fellow-labourers have the two things so blended in their minds that they cannot separate them, and seem to think that *immersion* involves infant exclusion, and *sprinkling*, infant baptism: or it may be that they cherish the vain hope of dragging me from my position: or it may be that they desired, when their supercilious assertions respecting infant baptism are disregarded, the impression might be made on the minds of Baptist readers that their assertions were too formidable to be met.

The *Messenger* chuckles over the fact that I am left alone in this argument, and accepts it as an evidence that other Pedobaptists believe me to be in error or that the argument is inconclusive. He was never more mistaken than in supposing I am disappointed in that I had not the co-operation and support of others. I neither sought, nor expected, nor desired their co-operation or aid. My appeal is to the divine testimony, and to that alone, and I accept its dogmatic statements and any inference legitimately drawn from its statements as sufficient and decisive in all matters of which it treats.

baptism included, and against all merely human testimony, against all uninspired history, against all ecclesiastical practice not regulated by direct inspiration. A thousand Pede-baptist witnesses could add nothing to the strength of the evidence which it supplies, nor detract from its validity. The only infallible interpreter, without ignoring his use of human instrumentality in discovering his mind, is the Spirit who takes the things of Christ and shews them to us, and who guides into all truth.

Still, I confess to a disappointment—a painful disappointment—existing and felt before the present discussion commenced, to find men accepting, confessing, and pledged by their ordination vows to the acceptance of infant baptism, and baptism by aspersion as of divine institution and divine warrant, sitting silent when those ordinances, which they profess, preach and observe in the name of the Lord, are ridiculed, denounced and contemptuously spurned. Is it possible that Pedobaptists are so completely prostrated by the *Union Epilemic* that they are incapable of one vigorous effort in support of a single article of scriptural truth which is impugned, satisfied with that fraction of revelation which all parties, who repose under the shade of Evangelical liberalism, accept?

There is no difficulty in dealing with Baptist logicians. Bind them down to *what is written*. Accept nothing but what the *Word* testifies. Grant nothing but what the *Word* demands. One source of weakness in Pedobaptists is allowing themselves to be drawn into the indefinite region of uninspired history and human testimony, which cannot speak with authority.

For the sake of many in the Baptist churches, who desire to know the truth, and to work out their salvation with fear and trembling in all simplicity, I would be delighted to use all "meekness, instructing those that oppose themselves, if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth:" but with respect to such as the *Messenger*, whom I hold responsible for the sayings of his nameless and unknown assistants, who is resolved to adhere to his position at any sacrifice of candour and truthfulness, it remains only to "rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith."

*All* Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is *profitable*; and I cheerfully go out, bearing what reproach I may, without the camp of those who refuse the Old Testament as a rule of faith and practice, and of those who think they can cull out of the Scripture what is *essential*, and hand back to the author the rest as well-meant and useless trifles, which may not interfere with the confederation of the States of Christendom.

# BAPTISMAL IMMERSION NOT OF GOD.

---

## ARGUMENTS PRO AND CON.

---

["MESSENGER," July 28, 1875.]

### THE VOICE OF HISTORY ON BAPTISM.

---

It is curious to observe how various and contradictory are many of the arguments taken up by the advocates of Infant Baptism. The bold affirmations of some obscure Pedobaptists as to what history says on the subject, fade away into thin air, when men who ought to know, and do know, speak. We have one just at hand, an account of which comes to us in the last No. of the *N. Y. Examiner & Chronicle*. It is, as follows, under the title

#### STUDYING HISTORY TO SOME PURPOSE.

The Professor of Church History in the Bangor (Me.) Theological Seminary (Congregationalist) must be a man who is more thoroughly imbued with the historic spirit than many who teach in theological seminaries. He has the sense to see that his function is to report, not make history, and the candor to report what he finds. And it appears that his finding is to the effect that "the apostles and all the church until four or five hundred years ago understood by baptism immersion, and never sprinkled anybody except the sick." Such, at least, was the substance of what was recited by students at the last Annual Examination, and was not called in question by Professor Paine. But the Rev. A. L. Park, of Gardiner, was stirred up to write us follows to the *Christian Mirror* : —

At the anniversary of our Theological Seminary at Bangor, a few days since, the class under examination in Church History gave some answers which struck me as extremely remarkable. The questions of the Professor and replies of the students were substantially as follows :

Q. What was the apostolic and primitive mode of baptism ?

A. — By immersion.

Q. Under what circumstances only was sprinkling allowed ?

A. In case of sickness.

Q. When was the practice of sprinkling or pouring generally introduced ?

A. Not until the fourteenth century.

Q. — For what reason was the change adopted ?

A. — As Christianity advanced and spread in colder latitudes, the severity of the climate made it impracticable to immerse.

The Professor of Church History approved the answers, which faithfully represented his teachings, and none of the clergymen present seemed to call these statements in question. Yet if such are the facts, the Baptists are historically correct, and we as a denomination are wrong, both in our literature and our practice. Our Publishing Society has issued a good deal of chaff about the broad interpretation of *baptizo*, and the impossibility of immersing thousands of people in a single day in Jerusalem, and all other familiar argu-



ments in favor of sprinkling or pouring as the primitive and Scriptural method of baptism, if it be true that the Apostles and all the church until four or five hundred years ago understood by baptism *immersion*, and never sprinkled anybody except the sick. Our usages need reforming, for nearly all our ministers have a decided preference for the unscriptural and unhistorical method of affusion, even in the summer months, when immersion in any river or pond is attended with no pains or perils. The vast Orthodox Church of the East, which has over sixty million communicants in the rigorous climate of Russia, contrives to immerse all its men, women and children, and that thrice, and no doubt our ministers can find means to bestow the rite properly upon the few persons who are received into our churches during the winter months.

If the Baptists are *historically* right, and we wrong, let us discontinue our disputes with them as to the meaning of Greek verbs, and give due honor to the original mode of baptism both by our preaching and practice. Let us administer by immersion as the rule, and use methods only in cases of necessity. If not, will some one tell us why not?

If Professor Paine teaches that *the Apostles* sprinkled sick persons as a mode of baptizing them, he has need to examine still more critically into the evidence. But apart from doubt on that point, he must be reckoned to have done a valuable service to so much of the rising Congregationalist ministry as it falls to his lot to instruct during their novitiate. And it may be safely assumed that others besides his critic in the *Mirror* will ask further questions, and draw inferences.

[“WITNESS,” Aug. 21, 1875.]

### “THE VOICE OF HISTORY ON BAPTISM.”

BY REV. WILLIAM SOMMERVILLE.

It is storied that a gentleman, passing along the street, found a little boy attempting to throw a load of coals into a cellar with a fire shovel, and asked him how he hoped to accomplish his task with that tiny tool. He replied, “By keeping at it.” Our Baptist brethren seem to have taken a lesson from the boy, and expect to secure universal assent to the exclusive claim of *immersion* to be called *Baptism*, by *keeping at it*. Fanaticism was never positive with less evidence than is the Baptist that immersion, and *immersion only*, is *Baptism*. Even after they would have us believe that the question has been conclusively settled, they still *keep at it*.

My attention was *invited* by the writer to an article expected to appear in the *Messenger* of July 28, the one, I presume, which came out under the above caption. I understood the invitation to be a sly challenge, and I accept it all the more cheerfully that the Champion appeared on the ground very destitute of armour.

It appears that the Professor of Church History, (Paine) in the Theological Seminary of Bangor, has been teaching his students, in effect, that “the *Apostles* and all the Church, until four or five hundred years ago, understood by baptism *immersion*, and never sprinkled anybody except the sick.” It further appears that the “Rev. A. L. Park, of Gardiner, was stirred up to write as follows to the *Christian Mirror*,”—after giving some particulars of the examination of the students, whose statements, in answer to questions put to them, fully agreed to the doctrine of their teacher,—“that none of the

clergymen present seemed to call these statements in question.—If the Baptists are *historically* right, and we wrong,—Let us administer by immersion as the rule, and use (other!) methods in cases of necessity. If not, will some one tell us why not! Prof. Paine, teaching such doctrine in a *Congregational Seminary*, is not an honest man, and his historical report cannot be accepted without examination. History furnishes proof of strange doings in the Church.

The appeal to the testimony of Paine and Park, and to the silence of the other clergymen present at the examination, is prefaced by the following statement:—"The bold affirmations of some obscure Pedobaptists, as to what history says on the subject, fade away into thin air, when men who ought to know, and do know, speak." We have here a specimen of that contemptible trickery which is not uncommon with our immersionist friends. This closes the ears of Baptists to all that may be said on the opposite side, no matter by whom. He is an *obscure Pedobaptist*. And weak-kneed Pedobaptists will allow themselves to be frightened into silence, lest they should be counted *obscure*. I am perfectly contented to be numbered with *obscure Pedobaptists*, and, as Luther said when he was represented as possessed with the Devil, "come, hear the Devil's arguments against the mass," I say, "come, hear the obscure Pedobaptist's arguments against Baptismal immersion." The writer of the article in question cannot have read the replies of Prof. Wilson, late of the Royal College, Belfast, and of Dr. Halley, to Dr. A. Carson, or he would not have made such an assertion. These were not *obscure Pedobaptists*. If he read Wilson on the *historical* argument, he will begin to suspect that Paine may be more dogmatic than learned, that Park is too easily cowed by the bold dicta of professorial greatness, and that the other clergymen were too timid to express an opinion in the presence of their *superiors*.

But, *so far as argument is concerned*, (no farther), I am willing to give the Baptists the history. The mystery of iniquity was at work in the Churches before the Apostles died,—has been developing in various forms till now, and at the present hour a far greater number, comprehending men of superior intellect and erudition, maintain the infallibility of the Pope—not *obscure Papists* at all—than all the immersionists in the world: they are as positive they are right as Baptists are: are as much irritated as Baptists are, when their peculiar views are called in question, and are as zealous to bring disciples into their fold as Baptists are. It seems to be pretty well authenticated that there were persons in Galatia who were so zealous for the spiritual interests of Christians in that region, so anxious to attach them more closely to themselves, that they sought to *exclude Paul and his fellow-laborers*: that others, in the sphere of John's labors, *refused to receive him and his brethren*, and turned them out of the Church who were willing to own them. Must it then appear impossible that there should arise, even under the eyes of the Apostles, men who, dissatisfied with Jewish *sprinklings*, thought this advanced dispensation demanded something more grand and imposing, and insisted that the disciples should all be *dipped*!

No man, who believes that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, will accept uninspired history as *necessary* to the correct *interpretation* of Scripture. We place the Bible with all confidence in the hands of men who know little or nothing of history, as able to make wise unto salvation,—profitable to the extent of making the man of God *perfect*, thoroughly furnished *unto all good works*: and are we to hold up history as a supplement to the *Word* without which it cannot be intelligently applied? To believe Paine, or Park, even when they speak truth, is not to believe the Word of God. History may teach us what men from age to age have believed, professed, taught: but we must come to the *Word* to learn whether their doctrine is *correct*. History may inform us what Professors did; but we must come to the *Word* to learn whether what they did was *right*. If the Scripture does not shew us, not only that we are to be baptized, but what baptism is, and how it is to be administered, we can know nothing assuredly about it. If we are to be *divinely* taught, the *Word* must show us the import of the ordinance, whether we are to be immersed in water or to have water sprinkled on us, or whether either will do. It is a gross imposition practised on unsuspecting man to lead away their minds from the *Word* to history. The faith of God's elect rests on *divine* testimony. History can add nothing to the strength of their faith.

The whole of the Baptist system rests on the denial of two *facts*, of which we have ample evidence in the Bible.

1. One fact is that — *Baptism is an ordinance of the former dispensation*. Of this we have the most direct and unequivocal evidence. Baptism was divinely administered and divinely enjoined hundreds of years before the appearance of John Baptist. The Apostle is writing to a Christian church whose members had all been baptized, and of course knew what baptism was and *how* they had been baptized; and he informs them that the Israelites, having come forth from Egypt, were all *baptized* in the cloud and in the sea. When he writes to the Hebrew christians, he reminds them that the instituted rites of the former age comprehended *divers baptisms*. To assert then that baptism is peculiar to this dispensation is to deny the *inspiration* of Paul, or to *make God a liar* because the record which He gives concerning this matter is not accepted. With no levity, with a solemn present sense of responsibility, do I bring against the leaders of a confiding people the heavy charge of imputing to the Holy Spirit a blunder or an error. With no spirit of bitterness do I bring the charge, but to lead to serious consideration in the light, not of man's testimony, but of the Divine word. Once brought to accept the testimony—the plain and decisive testimony of the Spirit, we are near an end of the assertion of the baseless and fanatical ceremony of *immersion*.

2. The second fact is that,—*We can never learn the design or form of an ordinance from the name given to it, unless baptism is an exception to what is otherwise universally true*. There are Circumcision, Sacrifice, Sin-offering, Trespass-offering, Passover, Meat and Drink offerings, Lord's supper. Let the Baptists select the name which God has attached to any one of these ceremonial institutions. Let him tax his ingenuity or his literature. Let him call into play the vivid imagination by which he can combine the waters of the Red Sea and a pillar of cloud or fire to construct a baptistry, in which



the fleeing tribes may get, as Carson says, a dry dip. And let him demonstrate from the *name*, the nature or the material, or the form of the prescribed service. The thing is impossible. As little can he determine from the word *baptism* the design or mode of the ordinances so-called. Linguists are not agreed about the exact signification of *baptize*. It is true, Dr. Cramp tells us, No learned man will risk his reputation by affirming that its primary meaning is not *dip, plunge, immerse*. This is quite characteristic, as noticed already, of the Baptist style of argumentation. It is a fearful *risk*, yet I will venture to *affirm* that the sea-coast is not *dipped*, or *plunged*, or *immersed* in the ocean as often as the tide flows in upon it, although Aristotle, as reported by Conant, says it is *baptized*.

According to the rule in respect to every other ordinance, we have to learn from the *Divine Word* what constitutes baptism, and then, and not till then, we are able to discover why that particular name is appropriated to it. And we have a special right, we are under a special obligation to appeal to the Old Testament, as it is an Old Testament ordinance.

We find the communication of all the blessings of the Covenant associated, in the Scriptures, with *sprinkling*, whether by a natural or prescribed process. When the Levites are to be set apart to their office or the leper to be cleansed, the water of separation is to be *sprinkled* upon them. Speak of the blessed efficacy of the divine word. "My doctrine shall *drop* as the rain; my speech shall *distil* as the dew." What of the Mediator's work? "He shall come down like *rain* upon the mown grass; as *showers* that water the earth." What of his blood that cleanses from all sin? It is "the blood of *sprinkling*." The saints are elect "unto obedience and *sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus Christ." What of the communication of the Spirit? "He shall *sprinkle* many nations." "I will *pour* water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will *pour* my spirit upon thy seed and my blessing upon thine offering." "I will *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." Will some *learned man* among the Baptists shew us where, in the whole Bible, a blessing temporal or spiritual is represented as communicated in the way of *dipping, plunging* or *immersion*? *God sprinkles. Baptists dip.* Let the *Word* alone. Give us History. Never mind Moses or Isaiah, Paul or Peter. Give us Paine, Park, and their silent companions of Bangor.

[ "MESSENGER," Aug. 25, 1875.]

#### "THE VOICE OF HISTORY ON BAPTISM."

Rev. W. Sommerville, in the *Presbyterian Witness* of last week, expresses much dissatisfaction with the teachings of Professor Paine, of the Bangor Theological Seminary, on the History of Baptism. It will be remembered by our readers that in the *Christian Messenger*, July 23, an article appeared giving the examination of Dr. Paine's class on Church History.

Mr. Sommerville ventures to affirm that "Prof. Paine, teaching such doctrine in a *Congregational* Seminary, is not an honest man, and his historical report cannot be accepted without examination." This is a short cut to the end of controversy, almost as effectual as the treatment served upon Roger Williams and others who in earlier days were sent adrift because they ventured to say what they believed on this subject. There must have been a great many Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and other Pedobaptists who, in

Mr. Somerville's estimation, were not honest men, seeing that they have said the same things.

One of the visitors at the examination of the class in Church History, at Bangor, where these facts were brought forth, wrote, asking Prof. Paine "whether if that they were the truthful teaching of Church History, a good deal of the argument against the Baptists must not be given up?"

Professor Paine in his reply says: -

It may be honestly asked by some, Was immersion the primitive form of baptism; and if so, what then? As to the question of fact, the testimony is ample and decisive. No matter if church history is clearer. The evidence is all one way, and all church historians of any repute agree in accepting it. We cannot claim even originality in teaching it in a Congregational Seminary. And we really feel guilty of a kind of anachronism in writing an article to insist upon it. It is a point on which Ancient, Medieval and modern historians alike, Catholic and Protestant, Lutheran and Calvinist, have no controversy. And the simple reason for this unanimity is that the statements of the early Fathers are so clear, and the light shed upon these statements from the early customs of the church is so conclusive, that no historian who cares for his reputation would dare to deny it, and no historian who is worthy of the name would wish to. There are some historical questions concerning the early church on which the most learned writers disagree— for example, the question of infant baptism; but on this one of the early practice of immersion the most distinguished antiquarians, such as Bingham, Augusti (Coleman), Smith (Dictionary of the Bible), and historians, such as Mosheim, Gieseler, Hase, Neander, Milman, Schaff, Alzog (Catholic), hold a common language. The following extract from Coleman's Antiquities very accurately expresses what all agree to: "In the primitive church, immersion was undeniably the common mode of baptism. The utmost that can be said of *sprinkling* in that early period is that it was, in case of necessity, permitted as an exception to the general rule. This fact is so well established that it were needless to adduce authorities in proof of it." As one further illustration we quote from Schaff's "Apostolic Church:" "As to the outward mode of administering this ordinance, immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original, normal form." But while immersion was the universal custom, an abridgment of the rite was freely allowed and defended in cases of urgent necessity, such as sickness and approaching death, and the peculiar form of sprinkling thus came to be known as "clinical" baptism, or the baptism of the sick. It is somewhat significant that no controversy of any account ever arose in the Church on this question of the form of baptism, down to the Reformation. And hence it is difficult to determine with complete accuracy just when immersion gave way to sprinkling as the common church practice. The two forms were employed, one as the rule, the other as the exception, until, as Christianity travelled northward into the colder climate, the exception silently grew to be the rule.

As late as the thirteenth century immersion still held its ground, as is shown in a passage in the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas, where the arguments in favor of the two modes of baptism are compared, and the conclusion is drawn that immersion is the *safer* because the more *common* form (quia hoc habet communioem usus). Three centuries later, in the time of the Reformers, sprinkling has become common, and even quite universal; though Calvin speaks of the different forms of baptism in a way which seems to imply that immersion was by no means obsolete. So that Dr. Schaff puts the date quite early enough, we think, when he says that "not until the end of the thirteenth century did sprinkling become the rule and immersion the exception." It is to be remarked, also, that this change occurred only in the Western or Latin Church. In the Greek Church immersion has remained the rule to the present day.

Mr. Somerville makes strange work by his attempt to formulate two propositions which he regards as facts, on the denial of which he affirms "the whole Baptist system rests." They are 1st—*Baptism is an ordinance of*



the former dispensation, and 2nd— *We can never learn the design or form of an ordinance from the name given to it.* The first of these is, of course, designed to support the long exploded idea that Christian Baptism is a substitute for Jewish circumcision. With regard to the second proposition, perhaps the New Testament itself is the best expositor of what is the design or form of Baptism. We have much respect for Mr. Sommerville, and are sorry to see him place himself in a dangerous position. In the warmth of his zeal to disprove that immersion is baptism, he says, "It is a fearful risk, yet I will venture to affirm that the sea coast is not *dipped* or *plunged*, or *immersed* in the ocean as often as the tide flows in upon it, although Aristotle, as reported by Comant, says it is baptized." Mr. S. must believe himself to be a very clever manipulator of language, to think he could make other people believe what he thus affirms. If the sea coast is overwhelmed by the rising tide, it is surely immersed, submerged, or baptized.

Baptists are so often supplied with ammunition by those who differ from them that they are not required to do more than present it to public view in the defence of their practices. Other Pedobaptists should surely accept such testimony in preference to that from Baptist authors.

Another author of no mean position in the Church of England, has recently appeared: Canon Lightfoot of St. Pauls and Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, in his commentary on the epistle to the Colossians, writes as distinctly as if he were a Baptist in practice. He recognizes baptism as belonging only to believers, and immersion as the only christian baptism:

In the summary of his argument in ii. 8—15, he writes:

This circumcision (wrought by the Spirit, &c.) ye have, because ye were buried with Christ to your old selves beneath the baptismal waters, and were raised with Him from those same waters to a new and regenerate life through your faith in the powerful working of God, who raised Him from the dead.

On ii. 12, he remarks:

Baptism is the grave of the old man, and the birth of the new. As he sinketh beneath the baptismal waters, the believer buries there all his corrupt affections and past sins: as he emerges thence, he rises regenerate, quickened to new hopes and a new life. This it is, because it is not only the crowning act of his own faith, but also the seal of God's adoption and the earnest of God's Spirit. Thus baptism is an image of his participation both in the death and resurrection of Christ.

On ver. 3:—

The apostle's argument is this:—When you sank under the baptismal waters you disappeared for ever to the world. You rose again, it is true, but you rose only to God. The world henceforth knows nothing of your new life and (as a consequence) your new life must know nothing of the world.

Perhaps that will do for the present. There is one American Congregationalist Theological Professor, Dr. Paine; and one Church of England Canon, Dr. Lightfoot, either one of which will be quite equal to Mr. Sommerville's affirmations and appeals to the Old Testament in support of a New Testament ordinance.

[“MESSENGER,” Sept. 15, 1875.]

### “ANSWER HIM NOT.”

In the *Presbyterian Witness* of Aug. 21, there is an article on baptism by “the Rev. William Sommerville,” written in his accustomed style. If Mr. Sommerville were a fair disputant, it might be fit and proper to answer him. But he is not. He can charge us Baptists with “contemptible trickery.” He can crowd his paper with sly insinuations and sophistical reasonings. He can dogmatise. He can slander. He can say “God *sprinkles*, Baptists *dip*.” But he is not a man to be met on a fair field of honorable controversy on the subject of baptism, being under the power of uncontrollable prejudice. “Answer him not.”

*We know* that in apostolic times believers were “buried with Him in baptism,” and in that ordinance did “put on Christ.”

*We know* that infant baptism is inconsistent with the spirit and design of Christianity, and therefore is not mentioned in the New Testament.

The great Neander said truly that "we have all reason for not deriving Infant baptism from Apostolic institution." That is enough.

*Pisgah, Sept. 1875.*

HEZEKIAH.

Since receiving the above we find the following in the *Presbyterian Witness* of the 11th:—

**"THE VOICE OF GOD ON BAPTISM."**

BY REV. J. BROWN, BAPTIST MINISTER.

*Dear Editor*,—Some years ago Mr. Spurgeon was assailed by an elderly lady shortly after the service, as follows, "Mr. Spurgeon, I think you were a little too high in your doctrine this morning." "What was it," Mr. S. replied, "that you didn't like?" She told him. "Why," said he, "that was a quotation from Paul's epistle to the Romans." "Ah well," she answered, "Paul was a little too high sometimes, too." Would it not be well for those who find fault with Baptists to be sure first that they are not finding fault with Paul, or perhaps Paul's Lord? I think if Rev. Mr. Sommerville (whom I have not the pleasure of knowing) had carefully read those passages in the New Testament that refer to Baptism, and the 17th chapter of John, particularly verses 21, 22, 23, he would have hesitated before committing what he has to print, and such unhappy expressions as, "contemptible trickery," "baseless and fanatical ceremony of Baptism," &c., would not have found place among his remarks. I fear Mr. Sommerville has taken upon himself a greater responsibility than he is aware of. If he is *sure* of his own ground, and if Baptists are so very guilty, contemptible and fanatical as he thinks, should he not be a little more gentle and forbearing and try to shew them the more excellent way?

Now as Mr. Sommerville professes to take the Bible for his guide, and with the motto of the *Witness* before him, viz.: "The Bible is our great church directory and statute book," would it not be well for him to shew his consistency with himself by giving from the Bible, and not from history, proof or proofs for the doctrine and practice of Infant Baptism? If he will do this he will bestow a great favor on thousands who are anxious to find it there, as well as on

Yours very respectfully,

*Cow Bay, Aug. 31, 1875.*

J. BROWN.

[WITNESS, Sept. 25, 1875.]

**"THE VOICE OF HISTORY ON BAPTISM."**

MR. EDITOR,—If I had nothing else to do, the Editor of the *Messenger* would have heard from me sooner in reply to his remarks on my communication of August 21st. What a shame that the writer of the articles on which I offered a few strictures should leave the burden of his defence on the Ed. M.! He might have told us the names of those *obscure pedobaptists* to whom he refers, —whether they denied that *immersion* was very early and very generally practised in the Churches, —denied that the candidates for baptism were dipped *three* times, —denied that they were dipped in a state of perfect nudity, (one *obscure pedobaptist* at least, the late Dr. Samuel Miller of Princeton, has stated that "We have the *very same evidence* in favor of immersing *divested of all clothing*, that we have of immersing at all.") He might have also informed us why, when Baptists appeal to history, they do not carry out the evidence to its full issue, but give us a mere *abridgement* of the baptismal ordinance of the ancients; for certainly a *single dip* is a meagre *compend* of their baptism. The information would be curious, and, in many respects, useful. Yet no man, who believes that all Scripture is given by inspiration

of God, will accept uninspired history as *authority* respecting any point of Christian doctrine or Christian practice.

When, some years ago, I published a small work on Baptism, I omitted all reference to the historical argument, and the Ed. *M.* generously insinuated that the omission was owing to a fear of meeting that aspect of the question. He had my reply, with which he may have been more than satisfied; and I will not now submit to be dragged from the firm ground of Apostles and Prophets, where both Baptists and Pedobaptists can stand by me and examine all my statements, and plunge into a labyrinth where comparatively few can follow me, and from which when I come out, having made my report, they must *take my word* for what I have learned. I am willing to go to the Scriptures with the most talented and distinguished Baptists, with the Ed. *M.*, if he chooses to occupy the humble office of a screen "betwixt the wind and their nobility." One *with God* is a majority. A child *with God* is almighty.

I am thankful for the Editor's expression of respect; doubly thankful that he has warned me that I have placed myself in a *dangerous position*; and would be superlatively obliged had he told me in what the danger consists. If my article in the *Witness* admits of no more direct, ingenuous, and effective reply than he has supplied, the danger cannot be great. Most people are familiar with the action of the tides; and to expect Baptists to believe that, because Aristotle says that the sea coast it baptized at flood, it is not overflowed but *dipped*, or *plunged*, or *immersed*, is to expect them to sacrifice their common sense on the altar of their profession. To say that the coast is *dipped*, or *plunged*, or *immersed*, as often as the tide flows in upon it, is unqualified nonsense; and the Editor knows it, and when he would contradict my statement, quietly drops the words *dip* and *plunge*, and to the more equivocal word *immersed* adds *submerged* and *baptized*. If this is not deliberate and dishonest *manipulation* of language, I know not what dishonesty is. He dare not put the declaration that the land is *dipped* or *plunged* into the ocean when the tide covers it, before his most credulous readers. Dr. Carson, whose theory is that *baptize* always signified *dip* and nothing but *dip*, expresses *mode* and nothing but *mode*, knew that the literal application of Aristotle's words would contradict his position, and elaborates a figure out of a very unadorned narrative of a plain matter of fact. But so long as Baptists are content to be blindfolded, cabletowed, and swear what they are told, there is no hope. I am very unjustly represented as accusing Prof. Paine of not being an honest man "because he ventured to say what he thought on this subject" of baptism. I never called Prof. Paine or any other man *dishonest* because he said what he thought on Baptism or any other subject. What I meant to say, and *did in effect say*, was that Prof. Paine, in a Congregational Seminary, and supported, as I suppose, by the money of Congregationalists, *teaching the students—the probable future ministers of Congregational Churches, principles contrary to the doctrine and order of those Churches*, is not an honest man. All this is indicated by emphasising the word *congregationalist* in my statement. For the same reason, I would call a Professor in Acadia College a dishonest man who would take advantage of his position to inculcate upon his students Pedobaptist principles. Had Prof. Paine confined himself to the exhibition of the practice of the ancient and mediæval



churches, he is free of blame, but he is represented as teaching that "the Apostles and all the church until four or five hundred years ago understood by baptism *immersion*, and never sprinkled any body except the sick." We don't go to uninspired history to learn what was the practice of the Apostles. We go to their own writings which are as open to the members of the Church as to Prof. Paine. We are willing to hear what he has to say as a teacher of history, but it would be very unwise to accept his historical report without examination, especially if it has a bearing on Christian faith or practice. Even Dr. Carson who never, I am persuaded, made an incorrect statement intentionally, has so represented the views of Cyprian as to call forth the following from Prof. Wilson:—"A statement more completely at variance with ancient record we have seldom detected in the works of any author of character, and we are not, therefore, surprised at the strong language of Dr. Halley, when he says, 'Either the writer of these assertions is not a reader of Cyprian, or he is not an honest man.'" Paul commended the Berians because they would not take *his* word without examination.

To return to Aristotle's baptism of the African coast. I *affirmed* in a jocular mood never supposing that any one would be ridiculous enough to contradict it, that the sea coast is covered by the tide, not by being *dipped*, or *plunged*, or *immersed* into it. How does the Ed. M. meet this? He opposes to me the testimony of Paine that *immersion* was the practice of the ancient Church! and of Canon Lightfoot who expounds Paul's word to the Colossians (buried with him in baptism, &c.) as *emptying immersion*! Had I stated that Saint John is not the Capital of N. Brunswick, there would be as much sense in opposing to me the testimony of Lord Dufferin and Gov. Archibald that Halifax is the Capital of Nova Scotia.

In my letter to the *Witness*, I *expressly* stated that *as far as argument goes* the Baptists are welcome to the history, yet as if history was the sheet anchor, a great part of the reply consists of a historical statement of Paine. It is this likely that has deceived poor J. Brown of Cow Bay, who has fallen into the mistake that I was leaving the Bible to found on history, when I am pleading against an appeal to history in favor of the Bible and in opposition to Baptists. Suppose all Paine states to be true, except that the term *primitive* used by himself and Coleman, and the terms *original* and *normal* used by Schaff, might be understood to make the Apostles responsible for the aberrations of the ancient Church, we are no nearer to the solution of the questions—What is baptism?—How is baptism to be administered? Suppose that it is fully ascertained and admitted that *Baptism by sprinkling* was ridiculed by the Devil's ministers, who transformed themselves into the Apostles of Christ, and opposed Paul at Corinth, or by Diotrophes, loving pre-eminence, who rejected John, and that through their activity, compassing sea and land to make proselytes, it was universally abandoned and *immersion*, with all its superstitious and shameless appendages, substituted in its room, we must still come to the Scripture to learn whether the practice of the Church has the sanction of her divine Head. The Israelites had not dwelt in Booths at the feast of tabernacles from the time of Jo-hua till the end of the Babylonish captivity, but the practice was revived under Nehemiah and Ezra, because "they found *written in the law which the Lord had commanded by Moses*, that the children of Israel should dwell in booths in

the feast of the seventh month." But concerning this incessant appeal to *man* and to *tradition* I shall have something to say in a future communication. We cannot allow the thief to escape by the artful dodge of mingling with the crowd and shouting "stop thief" louder than any body else.

But what of my two facts? The first is that *Baptism is an ordinance of the former dispensation*. Does the Ed. M. deny this? He does not. He knows that the terms of the sixth commandment are not more plain than those in which the Apostle states that the divinely instituted rites of the Old Testament dispensation comprehended *divers baptisms*, and that to deny it is to *make God a liar*. What is his reply? "The first of these is, of course, designed to support the long exploded idea that Christian baptism is a substitute for Jewish circumcision" "of course." Then there can be no doubt of the correctness of his statements. But how did he know my design? He could not. I never once thought of the relation which baptism has to circumcision. If I had been speaking of *infant baptism*, I might have thought of that relation. The Abrahamic covenant hath nothing more to do with the *mode of baptism* than the deed of a farm has to do with the mode of its cultivation, whether it is to be a sheep-walk, a wheat field or an orchard. He turns away the minds of his readers from the question by asserting what he could not know to be true, and which is in fact untrue. His concluding sentence might lead the reader to disbelieve the fact which he dare not directly deny. "Mr. S. appeals to the O. Testament, in support of a N. Testament ordinance." I do not. I appeal to the O. Testament respecting an O. Testament ordinance which is perpetuated under this dispensation. Nobody denies that Baptism is a N. T. ordinance. The Baptist doctrine is that it belongs *exclusively* to this dispensation. "The long exploded idea that Christian baptism is a substitute for Jewish circumcision." It may be very convenient to have Baptists think the idea long exploded. But it is amazing that one occupying the place of a guide of public sentiment should be so ignorant as not to know, that the idea that baptism occupies the room of circumcision has not yet been exploded. I blame the writer's intelligence to save his integrity.

The second fact is that *we can never learn the design or form of an ordinance from the name given to it*. Does the Ed. M. attempt to meet this by the demonstration of the nature and form of any one ordinance from its name? No. He modestly states that "Perhaps the New Testament is the best expositor of the design and form of Baptism." The N. Testament does not *expound either*, but furnishes various references to the ordinance which imply an antecedent knowledge of both.

After warning me benevolently of dangers ahead, the Editor glides away into the study of Canon Lightfoot, Prof. of Divinity at Cambridge—head quarters of orthodoxy—to get a supply of ammunition, and finds—a parcel of figs.

My time is limited and I would not trespass unreasonably on your columns. But you will permit me to add a grand idea borrowed from the *C. Messenger* of Aug. 1, not altered, but differently applied. "The fear of offending those who favour the practice" of immersion, "or any other not having the sanction of the Bible should not be allowed to hinder us from a faithful declaration of God's truth. While we esteem it no part of our duty to offend our neighbours,



we must be careful not to offend God by keeping back his word to please men."

W. SOMMERVILLE.

"MESSENGER," October 6th, 1875.]

### "THE VOICE OF HISTORY ON BAPTISM."

By a letter in the *Witness* of the 25th ult., on this subject, from the Rev. Mr. Sommerville, it appears that there is some fiction in his mind about some person having written in our pages in connection with an article which we quoted some time ago from one of our exchanges. It gave an account of Professor Paine's teachings, and what he, a Pede-baptist, had learned from history, respecting primitive baptism. The examination of his students, it will be remembered, developed that the result of his extensive acquaintance with history was that baptism is essentially an immersion of the believer. We made a few introductory remarks, and added a few more. But what does Mr. S. mean by saying, "What a shame that the writer of the article on which I offered a few strictures should have the burden of his defence on the Ed. *M.*?" What writer? In his first letter in the *Witness*, Aug. 21st, also he spoke of "the writer of an article expected to appear in the *Messenger* of July 28th." We neither had, nor expect, any article from any writer. He must have got hold of some notion which requires explanation. Will he rise and explain?

And yet, after all, that is perhaps of but little moment, compared with the main question, by which Mr. S. is so deeply stirred. We might perhaps take our friend "Ezekiah's" advice, and "Answer him not," but whilst we may not hope to succeed in removing his pre-conceived opinions, we may perhaps be of service in preventing him from doing injury in "the fearful risk" into which he appears willing to plunge (immerse) himself.

Mr. Sommerville pays the Baptists a compliment, yet not intentionally, in his little anecdote. Their task is to be accomplished by "keeping at it." We have "kept at it" for many centuries, and are as fresh as ever. We are not in haste, while God tarries. But so long as we have the Bible, may the God of the Bible help all christians "to cry aloud and spare not," "to lift up their voices like trumpets," against the soul-destroying figment—infant baptism and its appended delusion—sprinkling.

Mr. Sommerville states that he was informed by "the writer," of the appearance of Dr. Paine's teachings. *The writer* did not speak to Mr. S. on the subject, consequently Mr. Sommerville received no "sly challenge" from "the writer." But if this was the only mistake that Mr. S. had fallen into, we might pass it over in silence; but he proceeds to make some other guesses, touching the baptismal question, which he must not be permitted to do with impunity. He undertakes to guess how immersion originated! 'Men arose under the eyes of the Apostles, who were dissatisfied with sprinklings, and demanded that the disciples should be dipped.' The man who complains of the Baptists for following—that is what they actually do—pedo-baptists through the history of the church, to ascertain the facts relating to baptism, sails right off, without any apology, upon the open sea of conjecture! Mr. Sommerville guesses that immersion had its origin in the mystery of iniquity that worked in Paul's day. It is bad, for that guess, that there was no disciple in that day who had been sprinkled. If the guess should be inverted, and allowed a century or two of time for its field, then the fact might be reached. Let the guess be, that the mystery of iniquity was dissatisfied with immersion, because it was not convenient, in the case of invalids, to sustain the lie of baptismal regeneration, and then the guess and sober history shake hands. Mr. S. should not guess that people were dissatisfied with a matter in the christian church, although they were "the devil's ministers" when that matter was not in the christian church. This is an injustice, even to "the devil's minister." There is no necessity for conjecture here. God tells us where christian baptism, by immersion, originated, and by whom it originated. Jesus was immersed in the Jordan by John—immersed at his own request and by his own command.

"The whole of the Baptist system rests on the denial of two facts," dogmatize Mr. Sommerville. His dicta here are like his guess above. Baptism is an ordinance of the former dispensation. Yes, Mr. S., we do deny it, and it is for you who affirm it to give the proof. You have not given one fact or sound inference yet in proof of your long ago exploded fiction—figment.

There were divers baptisms in the old dispensation! Just so. We "bring against the leader of a confiding people the heavy charge of" teaching what God's word does not teach. Let us strip away the flimsy fallacy from this assertion, that "Baptism was an ordinance of the former dispensation." What do you mean by Baptism, Mr. Sommerville? You mean, or you would have the people to understand you that *you mean*, the Baptism of the New Testament—Christain Baptism! Was that an ordinance of the former dispensation? There were divers baptisms no doubt; but were they New Testament Christian baptism? Mr. S. ought to know they were not. Was the other ordinance—the Lord's Supper—an ordinance of the old dispensation? "Supper" was an ordinance, the supper of the paschal lamb, but was that the New Testament, the Christian's Lord's Supper? Mr. S. knows it was not. The Lord tells us when he institutes it. He ate the Supper himself, and thus it had its origin. John, his servant, began baptism, Jesus the Master was baptized; thus he made it his own, and commands his followers to obey him. After Mr. S. has proved that the Lord's Supper was an ordinance of the old dispensation, because there were suppers in it, then he may try his hand at Baptism. "Once brought to accept the testimony—the plain and decisive testimony of the Spirit—we are near an end of the baseless and fanatical ceremony"—popish ceremony of sprinkling and infant sprinkling.

The second fact—"the Baptists affirm that the design or form of an ordinance can be learned by the name given to it." No Baptist ever said that! Mr. S. should not construct these straw-men for antagonists, when the solid facts and arguments from God's word are before him.

We have the name of the Supper in the Word of God; we have the "design" of the Lord's Supper; we have also an account of the taking of the Lord's Supper by its Author, and those who first took it with him. We have the name—Baptism;—we have also the design of Baptism—we have different accounts, even to particulars of its administration. The bible tells us who the subjects are, their qualifications; it also tells us what the fluid is in which the person is baptized; it tells us, moreover, how the act was performed—*the modus operandi*. Why should Mr. S. try to defend his Romish figment with a figment of his own begetting? The Baptists do not say the "designs or form" of an ordinance can be learned from its name. Neither do their views rest upon this assumption. The Spirit does not give us, in the teachings respecting the ordinances of Christ, riddles and enigmas. He has told us plainly all that it is necessary for us to know of these matters.

Mr. Sommerville affirms, at "a fearful risk," "that the sea coast was not dipped or plunged or immersed in the ocean as often as the tide flows in upon it." Was it sprinkled? Heavy sprinkling!! Sprinkle babies as heavily and no Baptist will complain about an unscriptural paucity of water.

And here is the twin argument of the above. Sprinkling monopolizes the honour in Scripture of symbolizing "all the blessings." Does it? Was there no blessing connected with the dipping of the bird in blood and water? Was no blessing connected with the dipping of Naaman in Jordan? Alas, one of the examples that Mr. S. gives to prove his assertion is the blow from his logical axe that cuts the branch off on which he stands, and down he comes, arguments and all. Here it is: "I will *pour* water upon him that is thirsty, and *floods* upon the dry ground." Mr. S. italicised *pour*, we italicise *floods*. POUR FLOODS. Heavy sprinkling again for Mr. S.

This is a bit of religious delusion which has taken possession of "poor" Mr. Sommerville's brain, and he having used it for years, as an argument, doubtless, he has come to think there is some weight in it. The counterpart is, that immersion is the universal symbol of judgment. Was Aaher's



blessing, Deut. xxxiii. 24, a judgment? because he was to "dip his foot in oil." Was it a curse to Nauman that he was commanded to dip himself seven times in Jordan. Seven curses, according to Mr. S., because there were seven dips!! Really it is un-<sup>der</sup> the intelligence and learning of Mr. S. to be dealing in such unsub-<sup>stantiated</sup> facts. "God sprinkles, Baptists dip." God did sprinkle, but now he is dot. By it, God did dip, and still dips, and so do Baptists, and so do Pedobaptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Lutherans, Congregationalists, and the Greek and Roman churches either practically or theoretically are dippers. Mr. Sommerville is a *sprinkler* and nothing but a *sprinkler*. Against him there is the Word of God, the Christian world, of the past and the present, but still he holds out. He will sprinkle the stray Baptist that asks admittance to his fold. Let every man have his due. Here is rare daring but praiseworthy consistency.

"What is Baptism? How is Baptism to be administered?" These are pointed fair questions, put by Mr. S. Alas, he begins to guess again! Again he would deal in hypothesis. Put aside the foolish conjecture, fancied by Mr. S., but no one else, that the "Devil's ministers ridiculed baptism by sprinkling in Paul's day?" There were Devil's ministers then, no doubt, but alas for the guess, neither bible nor history tells us of any sprinkling for baptism as early as that. After getting himself through this tangle of guess-work, Mr. S. asks, "Does the editor of the *Christian Messenger* deny that Baptism is an ordinance of the former dispensation?" It was no more of the old dispensation than the Lord's Supper was the Lord's Supper in the O. T. dispensation. Christian baptism was not in the Old dispensation. There were dippings, "divers washings"—but they were not divers Christian baptisms—there was a supper, but it was not the Lord's Supper. There were meats, drinks, and divers dippings—yes, eatings and sprinklings, but no christian baptism, no Lord's Supper of the New Testament.

But to the question, "What is Baptism?" Let God answer. 1 Peter iii. 21. "The like figure whereunto even Baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Now, for the other question, "How is baptism to be administered?" Let God answer again. Rom. vi. 3, 4. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Col. ii. 12, "Buried with Him in Baptism." &c. What is done in baptism? An additional question! "For as many of you as have been baptized into Jesus Christ have put on Christ." Another question! And let God answer that also. How many Baptisms are there? Ephes. iv. 6. "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." And still another question! Who are to receive baptism? Mark xvi. 11. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

The Word of God answers all the questions on the subject that require replies. Here God tells us how the act is performed; what is meant by the act; that there is only one baptism, and who are qualified for it.

The subject is to be "buried." And still another question! Buried in what? *Water*. Acts viii. 36. "See here is water." No infants, no sprinkling. *Believers buried in water* and raised up to *walk*—infants don't walk in any sense—"in newness of life." God "dips" believers, Mr. Sommerville sprinkles unbelievers.

[ "WITNESS," Oct. 9, 1875. ]

### "THE VOICE OF HISTORY ON BAPTISM."

MR. EDITOR After the *Christian Messenger* has given a broad challenge on the mode of baptism, finding it met by blows too hard not to be painfully felt, his friends are coming forward to extricate him, and, leaving the ground of contention to descend to slanderous personalities, recommend him to quit the field. This is wise. To protract the controversy, with refer-

once to what appears in the *Witness*, might lead Baptists to examine what is said in your paper, and perhaps lead to a conviction that it has more Scripture to support it than would appear from the replies. But *why* should the *C. M.* retire? Hezekiah says, "Mr. S. is not a fair disputant." Let him show wherein I am not. "He can charge us Baptists with *contemptible trickery*." I have given two examples and can furnish more. "He can crowd his paper with sly insinuations and sophistical reasonings." Let him point them out. When the man, who is favoured as Moses to stand on Pisgah, assumes the name of Hezekiah, and adopts his words—"Answer him not"—it looks very like a *sly insinuation* the Mr. S. is as bad as Rabshakeh. And when Mr. Brown says, "If Mr. S. had carefully read those passages in the N. T. that refer to baptism he would have hesitated before committing what he has to print," it smacks of an insinuation that I have not carefully read them. Perhaps it was not intended. His letter is on the whole respectful and contrasts favourably with Hezekiah's, and had I known who he was, I should not have spoken of him so lightly in a former article, for which I ask his pardon. Hezekiah goes on, "He can dogmatize." Let us have examples. "He can slander." Shew examples. "He can say, God *sprinkles*, Baptists *dip*." Of course I can. God has of old *commanded sprinkling*. It is promised that Christ would *sprinkle* many nations, and that to cleanse his people he would *sprinkle* clean water upon them. I defy Hezekiah to shew that God has promised to bestow a spiritual blessing on any human being in the way of *dipping*, yet Baptists *dip*: would have all nations and all individuals *dipped*. "He is not a man to be met on the fair field of honorable controversy on the subject of baptism, being under the power of uncontrollable prejudice." How does Hezekiah know this? But pursue not this subject further. I leave the vindication, or reformation, or condemnation of my personal character with the searcher of hearts, before whom both Hezekiah and I must one day stand.

The *C. M.*, Mr. Brown, and Hezekiah, all appear anxious to bring *infant baptism* to the front. I may offer some remarks on that by and by: but in the mean time I am occupied about the *mode of baptism*, and from that I am not to be diverted by side issues. The radical error of Baptists in their reasonings on the subject of Baptism in general, and the mode of baptism in particular is that they found on human testimony. There is a shrinking, it may be unconscious, but a shrinking from a direct, an unequivocal and exclusive appeal to the Divine word. It is *man, man*, this *great* man and that great scholar. When they think they have found some inconsistent Pedobaptist, who professes one thing and practices another, he is worth gold. He is, of course, a great and good man. The *C. M.* answers me by an appeal to Profs. Paine and Lightfoot. No matter what evidence the *obscure Pedobaptist* of King's Co. brings from Scripture, it is worthless, for Paine and Lightfoot are against me. Hezekiah expects the readers of the *M.*, to comparatively few of whom I am known, to believe, on *his naked word*, all he has said about me. Bringing his letter to a close, he introduces these words,—"We have all reason for not deriving infant Baptism from Apostolic institution." Are these God's words? No. No. They are the *true* words of the "Great Neander," and then adds "That is enough." The *Messenger* of Aug. 4, after introducing the *Baptist* of Memphis in evidence that, in 1874,

fifty-four ministers of other denominations had renounced their "errors and united with the Baptists," expresses his own conviction that 10,000 lay members from various sects were baptized into the Baptist Churches last year." Here are 10,000 witnesses that the Baptists are right. What shall we think of thousands that leave Protestantism for the Church of Rome, talented, learned, sincere, many of them? Are these to be accepted as so many proofs that Rome is right? It is not strange that the two processes should be going on simultaneously. There is a strong bond of sympathy, reliance on human testimony. With Rome honest and pronounced reliance on human dictation. With Baptists more covert and indirect, but not less real.—By the way, are Pedobaptist denominations not *Churches*? The various *sects* are contrasted with Baptist *Churches*? This is almost, some one would say altogether, as illiberal as a statement which I once made, not however without assigning a definite reason and that reason was *not* that they dipped,—"Their Churches, (the Baptist), as corporate bodies form no part of that Church which the Mediator will recognize as his own."

The article to which I refer closes with the following two astounding sentences. "This (the thousands added yearly to the Baptist churches from other sects) to the thoughtless is amazing, but to the thoughtful it is stranger that every regenerated person in those societies do not leave men and traditions and follow Christ and his word. These results should encourage us to preach Christ and his word. These results should encourage us to preach and write still more faithfully, that the number may each year increase who acknowledge no king but Jesus." Hear, all ye Methodists and Presbyterians, all pedobaptists. You are following *men* and *traditions*, and not Christ and his word. You have another king than Jesus. None follow Christ and his word, none have no king but Jesus, except Baptists. Rome goes, can go no further. Is it a hearty concession that there are regenerated persons in those societies? They are a strange kind of new creatures. Are they regenerated at all, they must have heard and learned of the Fathers and yet they have another king than Jesus, follow men and traditions. What idea can the writer have of regeneration, when those who are born of the incorruptible seed of the word don't follow the word, when those who, taught of God, come to Christ and yet do not follow Christ?

But we look particularly at the charge that Pedobaptists follow *men* and *traditions*. This looks very like the thief crying, "stop thief," for the accusation, in respect to the mode of baptism in particular, lies demonstrably against Baptists. We have seen the *Messenger's* appeal to Paine and Lightfoot to silence me, and Hezekiah's appeal to the *Great Neander*. These are not exceptional cases. What is the starting point with Baptists in treating of the mode of baptism? It is the *meaning of the word baptize*. How can the thousands and tens of thousands in their churches, who are not Greek scholars, know anything about it? They must take the word of some Greek scholar or more frequently the report of it, by those who know as little as themselves. There is no reference to Scripture to learn the application of the word baptize. They are taught to repudiate the only portion of Scripture that is adapted to give light on the subject. Paul tells them that there were *divers baptisms* commanded of God under the former dispensation, and the



Baptist leaders close the Old Testament against them. They must take the word of Dr. Carson or Dr. Cramp or of some other great and learned man. Let them be as great and learned and *pious* as you will, they are men, uninspired men, and their testimony is human not divine testimony. Here the evidence begins and ends—baptize means *dip* and nothing but *dip*. The New Testament is virtually closed, and as peremptorily, as the Old Testament: for every reference in the N. T. must be interpreted on the assumption that baptize means dip, expresses *mole* and nothing but *mole*. No matter where the water is to be found, no matter where the operators, the three thousand who were baptised on the day of Pentecost must have been immersed, for *baptize means to dip or immerse*. Those who go down into the water to be baptized must have been immersed for *baptism is immersion*. Not only cups, pots, and brazen vessels, but *tables* or *beds*, which were baptized must have been immersed, for *baptism is immersion*. When disciples are buried with Christ by baptism into death, the burial must be immersion, for *baptize signifies immerse*. So say the Doctors Carson and Cramp. Now the superstructure can be no more stable than the foundation. If the foundation is human testimony, the whole building rests on human testimony. Baptists may just at once as well take Dr. Carson or Dr. Cramp for their Bible, on the subject of Baptism, for approach the ordinance they cannot *in the faith of God's elect* which rests exclusively on the witness of the Holy One.

I am now prepared to return with interest the compliment paid by the *C. M.* to Pedobaptists, that they have another king than Jesus. As far as baptism is concerned, Baptists have many kings,—Doctors Carson and Cramp and their learned companions. O that I could deliver the multitudes of sincere, unsuspecting, and confiding Baptists from the bonds that their rulers lay upon them, and lead them to form an independent judgment in the white light of the good word of God. The Lord will break their fetters in due season.

Sometime, if God give me leisure and strength, I may turn the attention of Baptists and others to the processes, by which *immersion* is professedly extracted from the reluctant and recalcitrating N. Testament.

It seems to me highly probable that the *C. M.* will take the advice of Hezekiah, and decline any farther notice of the Pedobaptist Rabshakeh. When Baptists are left to occupy an uncontested field, they can boast themselves not a little. The *C. M.* may conclude to have done with me, but I beg to tell him I have not done with him and his correspondents.

When Mr. Brown, who would have me more gentle, has been a little longer in Nova Scotia, he will be better able to appreciate the *sharpness* I use. He will find himself far removed from the Christian liberality which ranges round Mr. Spurgeon and his school. Spurgeon is a decided *Baptist*, with the large heart of the *Christian*.

Somerset, Sept. 21, 1875.

W. SOMMERVILLE.

[“MESSENGER,” October 13, 1875.]

We promised the editor of the *Wesleyan* some further attention this week. He seemed anxious to have “the question of Baptism settled.” Now here we have what we think ought to settle it in the mind of any reasonable person so far as the meaning of the word is concerned, and as to the practise of the early christians. Here are the

## TESTIMONIES OF TEN CYCLOPEDIAS.

The following extracts from ten well-known literary and scientific encyclopedias upon the subject will be interesting to those of our readers who may not have met with them before:—

*The Edinburgh Encyclopædia* says:—"In the time of the apostles the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel, with the words which Christ had ordained, and, to express more fully his change of character, generally assumed a new name."

*Hetzel's Cyclopædia* says:—"Baptism (Greek *bapto*, I dip,) was originally administered by immersion, which act is thought by some necessary to the sacrament."

*Chambers' Cyclopædia* says:—"Baptism, in theology, formed from the Greek *baptizo*, or *bapto*, I dip, or plunge." "Some are of opinion that sprinkling, in *baptism*, was begun in cold countries. It was introduced into England about the beginning of the ninth century."

*National Cyclopædia*:—"The manner in which the rite was performed appears to have been at first by complete immersion." In regard to the early custom of the English Church it says:—"It was the practice of the English, from the beginning, to immerse the whole body."

*The Encyclopædia Britannica* describes the process of changing from the primitive custom. It says:—"Several of our Protestant divines, flying into Germany and Switzerland during the bloody reign of Queen Mary, and returning home when Queen Elizabeth came to the crown, brought back with them a great zeal for the Protestant churches beyond the sea, where they had been sheltered and received; and having observed that at Geneva, and other places, baptism was administered by sprinkling, they thought they could not do the Church of England a greater service than by introducing a practice dictated by so great an authority as Calvin."

*The Edinburgh Encyclopædia* described the change still more in detail. It says:—"It was not till 1531 that the Legislature, in a council held at Ravenna, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent. In this country (Scotland), however, sprinkling was never practised in ordinary cases before the Reformation. From Scotland it made its way into England, in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the Established Church. In the Assembly of Divines, held at Westminster in 1643, it was keenly debated whether immersion or sprinkling, should be adopted; twenty-five voted for sprinkling and twenty-four voted for immersion; and even that small majority was attained at the earnest request of Dr. Lightfoot, who had acquired great influence in the Assembly." Speaking of ancient baptisteries, it says:—"Baptistery, in ecclesiastical writers, a place in which the ceremony of baptism is performed." "Baptisteries were anciently very capacious; because, as Dr. Cone observes, the stated times of baptism returning but seldom, there were usually great multitudes to be baptized at the same time, and then the manner of baptizing by immersion, or dipping under water, made it necessary to have a large font likewise."

*Ree's Cyclopædia* says of baptism:—"In primitive times this ceremony was performed by immersion."

*Young Cyclopædia*:—"The manner in which it was performed appears to have been at first by immersion."

*Encyclopædia Metropolitana*:—"We readily admit that the literal meaning of the word baptism is immersion, and that the desire of resorting again to the most ancient practice of the Church, of immersing the body, which has been expressed by many divines, is well worthy of being considered."

*Encyclopædia Americana*:—"Baptism (that is dipping, immersing, from the Greek *baptizo*) was usual with the Jews, even before Christ." "In the time of the apostles, the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel with the words which Christ had ordered, and to express more fully his change of character, generally adopted a new name."

We might multiply these testimonies to almost any extent, but these are standing authorities for other words and subjects, and we are not aware that one of them has the slightest leaning towards Baptists, but rather the reverse. Perhaps, however, our brother will still say, "We cannot see that the question is settled as to the real meaning of baptism." We are quite content with the New Testament history. Its teachings are for us quite sufficient. There we find the persons baptized were believers, "men and women," disciples, and those who had repented, but nowhere infants. Not content with the arrangements made by our Lord himself that believers should be baptized, (immersed,) our brother, and those who agree with him, must bring unconscious and unwilling infants, and instead of baptizing them, baptize their own fingers, and sprinkle the little innocents.

As our contemporary has taken up our friend Mr. Sommerville's case, we may perhaps be permitted to suppose that in dealing with him, we also meet the case of Mr. S. He will perhaps have the kindness to excuse our giving separate replies. It appears to be a piece of Bro. Nicholson's policy to come in with his captiousness and try to produce confusion. We cannot write for both the *Witness* and *Westcylan* and must simply address our own readers, and at the same time endeavour to tell both of these gentlemen, the views our people take of their lucubrations.

The editor of the *Wesleyan* says "the Baptist Church is a combination of Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, and Methodism." That is to say, we suppose, the Baptist Churches (not Church) have the best part of each of these denominations—the New Testament part. Brother N. returns to the subject in his last, by quoting from our columns, but says nothing of any consequence; we may therefore await his return from the Upper Provinces, when he may "reply if necessary."

A few thoughts may still be of service to our brother on the modest (?) suggestion he ventures to make that "when *baptizo* is disposed of, the entire ecclesiastical structure (Baptist Churches) might as well resolve into its original elements!"

Rev. Mr. Sommerville has his third letter in the *Witness* of Saturday last. Most of the points which he raises are met, by anticipation, in our article of last week. We do admire his great respect for "the white light of the good word of God," and could wish that it were possible for him to read over the Acts of the Apostles for the first time, and we do not think he would then find in that book much evidence for making baptism a sprinkling process.

He promises, "Sometime, if God give me leisure and strength, I may turn the attention of Baptists and others to the processes, by which *immersion* is professedly extracted from the reluctant and recalcitrating N. Testament."

Now suppose he, at the same time, should 'turn the attention of *Pedobaptists* and others to the processes by which sprinkling of infants is professedly extracted from the reluctant and recalcitrating New Testament,' especially in such texts as Acts viii. 12, 13, 26-40; Romans vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12. We fear it would be long before he would find sufficient time to do it effectually.

Mr. Sommerville says "the idea that baptism occupies the room of circumcision has not yet been exploded," and for our asserting that it has, he "blames the writer's intelligence to save his integrity." Perhaps he will tell us how it came to be that circumcision was observed, even by the Apostle Paul, long after Christ had instituted the New Testament rite of baptism. Acts xvi. 3.

Mr. S. ought to know that Professor Stuart, Dr. Emmons, Dr. Bushnell, and Dr. Halley, all representative Pedobaptists, all declare that "the covenant of Circumcision furnishes no ground for Infant Baptism."

[WITNESS, Oct. 30, 1875.]

### "THE VOICE OF SCRIPTURE ON BAPTISM."

MR. EDITOR,—I cannot entertain the thought that the letter of Hezekiah would be subscribed by the Editor of the *Messenger*, or that he did not insert it with reluctance. But it comes from *Pisgah*. It is the utterance of a great king, who may not be refused. The *command* must be *obeyed*,—"Answer him not." Baptists are well pleased to keep us always on the defensive, and too often we accept the situation. They would not consider it *fair* to oblige *them* to assume a defensive position. If God will, in whose hand my life is, I will give them something else to do than to fight one Pedobaptist against another, while they stand and look on, especially as the means employed to set them at variance are often neither *fair* nor *honourable*.

There is something very peculiar in Hezekiah's letter. While he would exhibit my photograph, he leaves it quite doubtful whether his own features do not stand out more prominently than mine. It is not the production of an uneducated man. He is probably numbered among those who are highly educated. There is a precision, an epigrammatic sententiousness, and, withal



a precaution, which is quite distinguishing. He speaks like one who is heard with deference, expects to be believed say what he will, would not be contented to occupy a situation where he is not accepted as master, and would avoid that where his real strength might be tested. I have said hard things, have heard and read them, but a more finished specimen of imperious assumption and cool condensed malignity I have never met. Is this my *dangerous position* to which the Ed. *M.* refers, that, if I dare to controvert Baptist statements or Baptist logic, I shall, by his assistance, be *blackguarded* over the length and breadth of Nova Scotia, by somebody who is ashamed or afraid to put his real name to his revilings. I am too *obscure* to be met in open debate, but of sufficient importance to be *honourably* slandered. However, whatever is the danger, I will venture to meet it in the name of him who was called a deceiver, a demoniac, a blasphemer, was crucified as a rebel *but raised from the dead*, who said many hard and provoking things, which, when his enemies could not meet, they had recourse to the last resort of all who are silenced without being satisfied,—“He has a devil and is mad, why hear ye him?”—“Answer him not.”

Does Hezekiah hope to crush? He cannot. Does he hope to silence me? It is vain. Does he hope that, if he can do neither, he shall seal up the ears of all Baptists? This is his only safety and of the cause he advocates. You, Mr. Editor, are not afraid to place before your Presbyterian readers what Mr. Brown has to say in reply to me. That is saying the Presbyterians are not afraid to look an opponent in the face and hear what he has to say. I thank you; and will be well pleased to have you reproduce the letter of Hezekiah. I request you to give it a place in the *Witness*. The Ed. *M.* will not imitate the example, not he.

There are two sentences in H's letter introduced by an emphatic *We know*. To the latter I may advert at my leisure. The former is as follows:—“*We know* that in Apostolic times believers were ‘buried with him in Baptism,’ and in that ordinance did ‘put on Christ.’” This is a wise sentence—a very wise sentence, because nobody denies it. It is as wise as mine, that the shore is not *dipped* into the tide but is *overflowed* by it, when it is baptized, which nobody denies except a wag, or one under “uncontrollable prejudice,” or one who has a purpose to serve. Hezekiah, of course, assumes that here we have *immersion* clearly expressed; but have we not here a *sly insinuation* that we, baptismal sprinklers, *deny this*, or a *contemptible trick* to leave the impression on the minds of Baptists *that we do deny it*.

The statement of the Apostle to which H. alludes I intend to analyse, to ascertain whether there is any immersion in it. Meantime there is an important matter to be settled, that we may know what is the extent of the ground we occupy in common, and on which we may contend. All are familiar with the allegation that Baptism is exclusively a New Testament ordinance, and that we cannot *fairly* appeal to the Old Testament in treating of it. But I want to know whether the Baptists of Nova Scotia own the Old Testament as a *rule of faith and practice at all*. I have a strong opinion *that they do not*. I do not say that all members of Baptist Churches refuse to own it. I am fully satisfied that thousands and tens of thousands hold it as precious as the New Testament. I speak of the *professional* standing of

Baptists as a denomination. It is not denied that the Old Testament is inspired and *was* a rule of life to saints in the former age. It is not denied that it contains very important and various and truthful information on the subject of which I treat; but that it is *now* a rule of faith and practice, being superseded by the N. Testament. Notwithstanding Hezekiah's imperious command, twice repeated, "Answer him not," I *demand* of him or of the Editor of the *Messenger* who has assumed his responsibilities, whether he accepts the O. Testament as a rule of Faith and Practice, or to what extent. I *demand* this in the name of all Baptists, who ought to know the ground occupied by their leaders, and their creed;—in the name of all other denominations, who are entitled to know their relation to Baptists, especially as the *Canadian Baptist* says, "Our country cannot do without Baptist influence;" and if, according to the same witness, "We (Baptists) are a very retiring people," it may be necessary to draw them out for the public benefit. I hope, in replying to this demand, that there will be no evasion, no equivocation, no storming that such a charge as denying that the Old Testament is a rule of faith and practice to Christians should be imputed to honourable men, while a denial or affirmation is avoided.

Lest some Baptists or Pedobaptists should regard this charge as the result of "uncontrollable prejudice," I shall give my authority. Wayland speaks for all Baptists. The title of the book from which I quote is, "Notes on the Principles and Practices of Baptist churches." His words are (P. 92. Note) "The New Testament is referred to as our only guide in matters of religious faith and practice."—He "believes the New Testament to be the standard by which the precepts and teachings of the former revelation are to be judged, and that, thus, it is our only rule of faith and practice." "Thus it is our only rule of faith and practice." This places the Old Testament on the same footing with the writings of Dr. Cramp or Dr. Guthrie. The doctrinal articles of the Baptist Churches of Nova Scotia speak what is in harmony with this, but with less directness. In my work on Baptism I adverted to this, and I have no recollection of any notice of it in the Baptist criticisms on that production. Dr. Cramp (*C. M.* Sept. 29) reports an English Association as holding "The divine inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament and their absolute sufficiency, as the only authorised guide in matters of religion." This is altogether satisfactory unless there be something equivocal in the word *religion*, which might be intended to rule out the important duties arising out of the social relations of the life that now is. The Doctor states that "the plan differs in some respects from our own," that is, of the Baptists of Nova Scotia; and as he has not specified the particular differences, it is fairly supposable that one difference is, that the Baptists of Nova Scotia do not, as the English Baptists, definitely place the Old Testament on a level with the New. When the comparative claims of the Old Testament are settled, we shall be in an easier position for discussing the various questions that may come up between Baptists and Pedobaptists; for the topics of the *modes* and *subjects* of Baptism are merely the salient points of systems of doctrine, one of which must be antagonistic to the Scripture and subversive of true religion.

While I was closing the *C. M.* for Oct. 6, came into my hands, which honours



me with nearly three columns, and to which I hope to respond in due time. The reply is so easy that it shall be pleasant to furnish it, but not unmixed with sadness.

Somerset, Oct. 8, 1875.

W. SOMMERVILLE.

### THE VOICE OF GOD ON BAPTISM.

DEAR EDITOR,—I have been hesitating whether or not to reply to Rev. Mr. Sommerville's communication of Sept. 25. He is so abusive and disdainful, and mixes so much gall with his remarks, that one feels somewhat diffident about replying. Mr. S. appears to be troubled because having written a work on Baptism he should be classed among "obscure pedobaptists." Now he should excuse the ignorance of the man who did so, or if having read it, in not being acquainted with that work, he then classed Mr. S. among the obscure he ought to be forgiven his folly. If Mr. S. really deserves to become prominent and if he has failed in his first effort, then

"If at first you don't succeed,  
Try, try, try again."

Will Mr. S. be good enough to copy into his note-book the following words of Cromwell:—"I beseech you in the bonds of Christ, think it possible you may sometimes be mistaken," and then those of Paul, "I say through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think." And would it not be well if he would write as a Christian gentleman, and not speak of a large number of Christians, among whom he may possibly have some personal friends, as "content to be blindfolded, cabletowed and swearing to what they are told." Such remarks do not become a Christian or a gentleman, for they are neither true nor civil. If Mr. S. knows anything of Baptists or Baptist history, he must also know that they are among the last to be blindfolded, cabletowed or take anything on trust, to say nothing of *swearing* to it.

I shall leave Mr. Selden (if he thinks fit) to reply to what refers to him, and as Mr. Sommerville perceives that "poor J. Brown of Cow Bay" is deceived and mistaken in a certain part of Mr. S's letter, in which, by the way, Mr. S. is deceived and mistaken, I will try to put my question again in a form that will not be mistaken. Will Mr. Sommerville please supply Scripture proof from the Old or New Testament for the practice of Infant Baptism? As a public teacher and having studied the question and taking the Bible for his guide he should be able to give an answer that will require but little time or space.

Yours truly,

J. BROWN.

[*"WITNESS."* Nov. 13, 1875.]

### THE VOICE OF SCRIPTURE ON BAPTISM.

MR. EDITOR,—I congratulate the Editor of the *Messenger* on his independence. I was mistaken in supposing he would take Hezekiah's advice, "Answer him not." If I was as much given to guessing as he says, I might guess that it is not independence but abject fear which impelled him to answer; guessing that both Baptists and Pedobaptists might draw an inference, from his silence, unfavourable to his power and his principles. But I will give him the credit for *independence*, and that he will not be commanded even by his *friend*, speaking from Pisgah's top.

Before entering on a reply to his editorial of Oct. 16th, I would premise, that I will not allow him to prescribe to me the *kind* of evidence to be ad-

duced to show how, and to whom, baptism is to be administered, or the form in which my argument is to be presented. If I did, he might deny that female members of the Church have a right to come to the Lord's table, that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath, and demand of me an express warrant in support of female rights and the change of day. It is enough that I produce *sufficient* evidence in support of my position in my case, and that I present my argument lucidly.

It seems that an explanation is required for imputing the article, to which my first letter was a reply, to another than the Ed. *M.*, and I am happy to give it. In conversation with a Baptist minister, with whom I am well acquainted, he wished me to look into an article on baptism which he expected to appear in the next *Messenger*. From the conversation, the impression was left upon my mind that he claimed to be the writer, and that impression was not removed, when, at the close of our interview, I said, smiling, that I supposed he was reading his recantation, and with an answering smile, he replied, *yes*, a reply which I did not misunderstand. However, the Ed. *M.* claims to have been the writer, and, in this purely personal matter, I cheerfully accept his word, and confess to a misapprehension, for I am sure my friend would not *intentionally* lead me into a mistake. Still the impression is not less decided that, in bringing the matter under my notice, he considered I would find a nut too hard for me to crack. Now that we know the writer, and his admiration of the baptismal ceremonial of antiquity, he will be pleased to tell us by what process of spiritual chemistry Baptists have discovered that *one dip* is the essential element in Baptism, to the exclusion of blowing the Devil out of the water, and to avoid vulgar Saxon, *exorcism, unction, three dips*, and the performance of the ceremony, the candidate being, whether male or female, *cutirely naked*. Baptists appeal to the fathers and will not follow them.

I had glanced very hastily at the editorial now before me, when I expressed my anticipation of pleasure, mixed with sadness, in replying to it. I have now read it carefully, and find nothing but unmixed sorrow, notwithstanding the facility in answering. I am represented by the editor as saying, *guessing* he calls it,—"Men arose under the eyes of the Apostles, who were dissatisfied with sprinklings, and demanded that the disciples should be dipped." Here we have, in inverted commas, what professes to be my words. *I never used these words*. I never used words intended or calculated to express the idea which these words convey. They are not even a correct exhibition of a part of a sentence which I wrote. *They are an untruthful representation of both my words and my ideas*. I will not encumber your columns with a bald repetition of what has been already printed. The readers of the *Witness* can recur to them. The statement of the *Messenger* is intended for Baptist eyes and Baptist ears,—for persons, not one in a hundred, perhaps not one in a thousand of whom ever see the *Witness*. After this I would not accept the word of the Ed. *M.* concerning anything that a Pedobaptist has said about the subject of Baptism. In such a case I hold him utterly unreliable. I would not be surprised to find him come out, quote my words, and coolly ask, "Is there here anything different from what I said?" Let him place my statements fully and fairly in the columns of the *Messenger* side by side with his own. There are among his readers intelligent, honest, and

honourable men, able to compare them, and who will rise from the discovery of the injustice done to me, and the imposition practiced on his Baptist readers, with no less indignation than I feel, and do not affect to repress or to conceal. Presently we shall see that he quotes the Bible with as little honesty as he did my words.

But if I have sadly blundered respecting the origin of *immersion*, the Ed. M. will tell us all about it. His words are:—"There is no necessity for conjecture here. God tells where Christian baptism, by immersion, originated, and by whom it originated. Jesus was immersed in the Jordan by John—immersed at his own *request* and by his own *command*." Here you have the whole in a nut-shell—and *from God*. I have not read of the *command*, but the *request* of Jesus is as good as a command. I have not read that Jesus came to be *immersed*, asked to be *immersed*, or *was immersed*. I read that he came to be *baptized*, asked to be *baptized*, and *was baptized*, but in what mode I *do not read* in the history of the transaction. This is the question to be settled, and the Ed. M. assumes the thing to be proved,—and makes God responsible for his dogmatic assertion.—"*God tells us*" But the newest information—to me at least—is that here "Christian baptism by immersion originated." Christian baptism originated years before the Christian dispensation! Luke tells us that "*When all the people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also being baptized and praying, the heaven was opened.*"—I have a strong opinion that Jesus was the last person whom John baptized; but I would not *dogmatize*, as there is room for doubt. But it is certain that many, perhaps thousands, were baptized by John *before* Christ's baptism, and of course none of these were *immersed*, but were all baptized after the Jewish mode, or rather Divine mode, by sprinkling, for baptism by *immersion originated* with the baptism of our Lord. I do not overlook the magic word Christian, which is so carefully kept in the front, and which introduces a distinction of which the inspired writers are perfectly innocent. *Christian* baptism could not possibly exist, if it must be considered distinguishing, before the christian dispensation was introduced. *Jewish* baptism was baptism administered by a Jew. *John's* baptism was baptism administered by John. *Christian* baptism is baptism administered by a Christian. But of this we have more to say anon.

We must bring the C. M. to closer quarters. Hard work. I have stated that *baptism* is an ordinance of the former dispensation and challenged him to deny it; and he answers: "Yes, Mr. S., we do deny it." WE DO DENY IT! He calls it a *guess*, a *flimsy fallacy*. Let us see. Paul informs us that the divinely instituted rites of the Mosaic economy comprehended "divers baptisms." These were, of course, ordinances of the former dispensation. What have I said? "Baptism is an ordinance of the former dispensation." He that denies this denies the word of the spirit and *makes God a liar*. But after a little he admits, in terms which indicate great reluctance, "There were divers baptisms no doubt." To his above denial he adds,—"*It is for you who affirm it to give the proof. You have not given one fact or sound inference yet in proof of your long ago exploded figment.*" Now this is all mere banter, an insult to the intelligence of every Baptist,—to every one of common sense who reads what has passed between us. He seems desirous of insulating me from every Pedobaptist in the universe. He talks as if I was the only one



who holds and teaches that baptism was an ordinance of the olden time, as if the doctrine has been long ago exploded *by all Pedobaptists*, except the humble Reformed Presbyterian of King's. Say I stand alone, do I need any additional proof to the *unequivocal testimony of an inspired writer*, which the Ed. M. is anxious to push aside?

I am not ignorant or unobservant of the door by which he would escape the charge of impiety and infidelity. I saw, when reading his former contributions, the door ajar: and now it stands wide open. He asks, "Were they (the divers baptisms) New Testament Christian baptism? And again,— "Was that (the Paschal supper) the New Testament, the Christain's Lord's supper? Mr. S. knows it was not. The Lord tells us when he instituted it. He ate the supper himself, and thus it had its origin. John, his servant began baptism. Jesus, the Master was baptized; thus he made it his own." A little below he says,— "We have an account of the taking of the Lord's supper by its Author, and those who first took it with him." The questions above are so singular and betray such confusion of thought that it is painfully embarrassing to frame a grave answer. But he is profoundly serious, and I shall answer him seriously. There is no difficulty in discovering what he would be at. The statements which follow the questions are still more extraordinary because inconsistent with the fact. With much christian benevolence and courtesy, he wishes it possible I could read the Acts of the Apostles the *first* time. I have been reading the gospels which come before the Acts, (I shall read the Acts shortly for his benefit,) and I find that it is *not true* that our Lord "ate the Supper himself." We have *no* account of the "taking of the Lord's supper by its Author." In that ordinance the Lord put into the hands of his disciples bread and wine, but addressing their *faith*, and assuming his death as an accomplished fact, he gives himself, his *broken body*—"Take eat: this is my body"—and *his blood shed*—"Drink ye all of it; this is my blood of the New Testament," but, no more in the world, he does not partake with them: he did not eat himself in symbol or in fact. It is their privilege to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man.

The idea runs through the whole argument of the Ed. M. that a change has been made, not only in the circumstances in which it is administered, but in the ordinance of baptism itself. "God did sprinkle but now he is done with it." This implies a fair admission, if he has not spoken at random, that baptism of old was administered by *sprinkling*. "John began baptism, Jesus was baptized; thus he made it his own." Of course baptism, according to the Ed. M. is *immersion*. What then became of the constant assertion that *baptize* always signifies to *dip* and *nothing but dip*? What becomes of all the rant about baptizing in Jordan, in Enon where was much water, going down into the water and coming up out of the water? No immersion *before* the baptism of Christ, according to the Ed. M.

The argument by which the Editor would prove the change from *sprinkling* to *immersion* seems to be this. At least I can make nothing else of his analogies. Because the *Passover*—an ordinance which could not as a divine institute, possibly outlive the O. T. dispensation, as the paschal lamb represented Christ *to come* and put away sin.—has given place to the Lord's Supper—*an ordinance which necessarily belongs to the N. T. dispensation, as both its institution and observance presuppose the death of Christ, who has come*

and put away sin, therefore a similar change has passed on *baptism*, and *sprinkling* has been superseded by *immersion*. "God did sprinkle, but now he is done with it," so says the Ed. M. Now, as I cannot see the connection between his premises and conclusion, what I desiderate is an equally unequivocal evidence of a change in the mode of baptism as we have a transition from the Passover to the Lord's Supper. He does say, "We have different accounts even to particulars of its administration.—The Bible tells us how the act was performed—the *modus operandi*." This is all news to me except he refer to the Old Testament, and I will be thankful if he will tell me where to get the information, in the New Testament. I can find it in the Old myself. But the Old Testament knows no immersion of persons.

The Ed. M. considers it "a bit of religious delusion" that I have represented immersion in Scripture as universally an emblem, not of mercy but judgment, not a blessing but a calamity. I never said that "immersion is the *universal* symbol of judgment." He asks, "Was there no blessing connected with the dipping of the bird in blood and water?" I answer, *yes*: there was a blessing connected with the dipping of the bird but no blessing in the dipping of it, more than there would be a blessing in the death of Christ separated from the application of his blood by the Spirit. The blessing was in the *sprinkling* of the mixture on him who was to be cleansed. This was the *baptism*. Again, "Was there no blessing connected with the dipping of Naaman in Jordan?" I answer, I cannot tell whether he was *immersed* or not. He says, "Naaman was commanded to dip himself seven times in Jordan." This is "handling the word of God deceitfully." Naaman was *not* commanded to dip seven times, or *once* in Jordan. We have seen that what Paul explicitly asserts, the Ed. M. as plainly denies; and now he says that was *commanded* which was *not* commanded. It is painfully manifest that the word of God or man may be trampled under foot, but immersion must be upheld. The prophet commanded Naaman to *wash*. When Naaman indignantly repels the claim of Jordan over Abana and Pharpar, he thinks to *wash* in them would do as well. When his servants remonstrate with him, it is to persuade him to *wash*. The mode of washing is not prescribed. He is at perfect liberty to perform the ablution as he pleased. He might have dipped himself under the stream. He might have dipped the part affected, for the disease appears to have been local. He might have laved the water over the diseased part. He might have learned something of the Mosaic ritual and sprinkled himself seven times. But to *prove* that he dipped himself after Baptist fashion is nothing to the purpose. He might have erred through ignorance or recklessness; the character of the God of Israel may not suffer because of his sin. Moses was commanded to *speak* to the rock. Through inconsideration or irritation he smote it twice and for his sin is excluded from the promised land. But Israel had been promised water, and Moses' sin cannot bring the faithfulness and power of Israel's God into suspicion.

Two or three fragments of the editorial are yet to be thrown into the fire: and then to the stronghold of Baptists. W. SOMMERVILLE.

P. S.—I have just read Mr. Brown's second letter. He has mistaken the subject. It is *Baptism* and not the *character* of Mr. Sommersville. He is making rapid progress in the school of scandal. Whether Mr. S. is deserving

of a coronet or a gibbet does not affect the question of Baptism. He has my answer.

[“WITNESS,” Nov. 27, 1873.]

“THE VOICE OF SCRIPTURE ON BAPTISM.”

MR. EDITOR,—I am not well stored with anecdotes, but take another. Two men, in company and sitting on opposite sides of the table, got into a keen discussion. One of them, feeling hard pressed, threw a glass of wine in the other's face. He took out his handkerchief, wiped his face, and coolly replied, “That was a digression, now for the argument.” The Editor of the *Messenger* and his friends may be as personal, as disrespectful, as insulting as they please; to their personalities, rudeness, and insults, my reply is,—“That is a digression, now for the argument.” Let him be as amiable, excellent, and honourable, personally as his fondest admirers could wish, I have to do with him as a logician and an accepted exponent of the spirit, the principles, and the order of the Baptist Churches, and I will not spare him. He shall have no honeyed words from me, as I heartily adopt the sentiment of Dr. J. C. L. Carson, whom I highly esteem and admire, not less that he is a Baptist:—“For my part, I have no idea of passing a practical censure on the conduct of Christ, by attempting, or pretending to improve upon the infallible example which He has set us. Jesus never said—‘ye *darling* hypocrites; ye *beloved* liars; ye *well-meaning* Pharisees; ye *glorious* serpents; ye *dearly beloved* generation of vipers;’ and neither will I.”

A few words more respecting the *Messenger's* “bit of religious delusion” that as the paschal supper, which must cease with the former dispensation, is very different from the Lord's Supper, a corresponding change has passed on *Baptism*. GOD DID SPRINKLE BUT NOW HE IS DONE WITH IT. In attempting to establish a parallelism between *immersion*,—his form of *Christian* baptism as opposed to sprinkling, the O. T. mode,—he has perpetrated two blunders. 1. He teaches, in terms too plain to be misunderstood, that *immersion* originated with the baptism of Christ, *which he does not believe*, and did not intend to teach: and 2. That Christ partook of his own supper, *which is not a fact*. There is no evidence of such a change as he supposes. There is *one Spirit*, common to both dispensations. “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law,—that the *blessing of Abraham* might come on the gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the *promise of the Spirit* through faith.” There is *one hope*. The O. T. saints desired a *heavenly country*, and their God had prepared for them a city; and our citizenship is in heaven and we look for an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that faileth not away. There is *one Lord*. The Church of old is addressed with reference to her Divine Saviour, the *Christ* of God,—“He is thy Lord, and worship thou him.” There is *one faith*. The gospel was preached to Abraham. He believed, and his faith is imputed unto him for righteousness. The gospel was preached to the Israelites, and believing, righteousness was imputed to them also. They which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. There is *one God*. The God of the Jews is the God of the Gentiles. There is *one baptism*. If there is any consistency or coherence in the Apostle's language, the baptism here spoken of is common to both dispensations. And are we tamely to connive at a gross perversion of



the Word, and to have this *one baptism*, bound up with one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one God and Father of all, frittered down to *immersion*, which confessedly did not belong to the former age, as distinguished from any other form of the application of water? Of this baptism, baptism with water is a sign, and if nothing more than a sign it is *nothing at all*. But as the thing signified is common to both dispensations, so is the sign. All the differences in the surroundings of Baptism, of old and now, are referable to the difference between Christ *to come* and Christ *already come*.

Has God done with sprinkling? So says the *C. M.* "He will *sprinkle* many nations." This points to the New Testament dispensation. "I will *sprinkle* clean water upon you." This refers to these last days. Does this look like God having done with sprinkling? Where does the Scripture indicate that a change was to take place in the mode of baptism, or has taken place? Nowhere. When the Jews sent Pharisees to John, they have no question to ask about a new rite introduced by him. With the baptism which he administered they must have been perfectly familiar. They ask, "Who art thou?—why baptizest thou?" That is all. When Christ commanded the Apostles to baptize all the nations, does he give them any hint that they were to administer the ordinance differently from that with which, as Jews, they had been familiar? Not the slightest. When Paul speaks to the the Corinthians or Hebrews about the baptisms of the former age, does he teach them that these baptisms were different from that of which they had been the subjects?

I read with no little surprise in the *C. M.*, "The Baptists do not say that the design or form of an ordinance can be learned from its name." And again, "No Baptist ever said that." Here again he mis-quotes my words. My second fact he puts thus:—"The Baptists affirm that the design or form of an ordinance can be learned from the name given to it." Very likely, "No Baptist ever said that." But *I never said it*. My second fact is that—"We can never learn the design or form of an ordinance from the name given to it." I never said or supposed that Baptists, reckless as are many of their statements, would say that the design or form of any ordinance whatever may be demonstrated from its name; but it is too notorious to be denied that their main argument in support of *immersion* is derived from the meaning of the word *baptize*, and that Dr. A. Carson has laboured, in the greater part of his work on baptism, to prove that it has but one meaning,—to *dip*,—that it expresses *mode* and nothing but *mode*; and having, as he supposes, proved this, he considers that he has fully and finally settled the *mode of baptism*.

The *Ed. M.* makes very merry over the baptism of the coast by the tide and says, "Was it sprinkled? Heavy sprinkling!! Sprinkle babies as heavily and no Baptist will complain about an unscriptural paucity of water." Now after all, we have here the real distinction between *dipping* and *baptism*. To *dip* is to plunge the subject into, say water, and *baptize* is to apply the water to the subject to be baptized. Cattle on the brink of a river may be overflowed by a sudden freshet, and are *baptized*. An inflated bladder on the surface of the water does not sink, but the waves may dash over it, and it is *baptized*. It may please him to say, and I do most cheerfully say that, so far as the word *baptize* is concerned, the object baptized may be as completely covered with water as if it were plunged fifty fathoms deep. The word expresses covering, wholly covering, but still covering, as opposed to dipping,

or immersion. The Ed. M. may now prepare himself for some rare fun. How will Mr. S. reduce the overflowing tide to a few drops sprinkled on the object to be baptized? The process is perfectly simple. *When water is symbolically applied, a partial application, a few drops, the spray dashed from a bunch of hyssop, will as fully answer the conditions of baptism, in its widest sense, as all the water of the Atlantic.* The whole man is purified or baptized by the sprinkling of a few drops—a very partial application. “He (the priest) shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times and shall pronounce him *clean*.—The man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation, because he has defiled the sanctuary of the Lord: *the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him.*” When our Lord washed the disciples’ feet, and Peter wished his hands and his head washed also, he said in reply, “He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is *clean every whit.*” The laugh must now be turned against the God of Israel and the Lord Jesus. As for the cleansing process which followed the sprinkling by the priest or by any clean person, such as shaving off all the hair, bathing the whole person, and washing the clothes, with due respect to decency and shamefacedness, which fanaticism always disregards, the person cleansed was left to perform the operation on himself.

The Ed. M. must put in capitals **POUR FLOODS**. I emphasised *pour*, and he seems to think that I had some misgivings in omitting to underscore *floods*. Blessed be ignorance! It saves a man often from a red face. If he does not understand Hebrew, some of his learned friends could tell him that the word here rendered *floods* would apply to *showers of rain, dews, streams of water, or the flowing tide*. Let him ask any farmer whether parched ground is to be rendered productive by showers and streams, or by a tidal inundation. His learned friends can also tell him whether the word rendered *flood* or *floods* in our translation, is ever the same with the word in the verse before us, except in Ex. xv. 8 and Ps. lxx. 44. I do not know that it is. My recollection may be in fault. Under correction of his learned friends, I would translate the verse thus:—I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and *showers* upon the dry ground.

I hope to survey the Baptist stronghold in my next.

W. SOMMERVILLE.

Somerset, Nov. 19, 1875.

[“WITNESS,” Dec. 4, 1875.]

### BAPTISTS AND THE RULE OF FAITH.

MR. EDITOR,—In your paper of the 30th ult., Rev. William Sommerville says, “I want to know whether the Baptists of Nova Scotia own the Old Testament as a *rule of faith and practice at all*. I have a strong opinion that *they do not*.”

Please note the words emphasized with italics.

From the Articles of Faith and Practice of the Nova Scotia Baptist Churches, I now quote the 3rd Article. Here it is:

“The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, in which he hath given us our only rule of faith and practice. 2 Timothy, iii. 15—17; John, v. 39.”

Further on in the same letter, Mr. S. refers to some statements of Dr. Way-

land, in his "Notes on the Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches," in justification of his remarks.

Mr. Editor, with your permission, I will put the utterances of that distinguished scholar and writer before your readers more fully, lest from the partial statements already given, some of them may infer that the Old Testament is placed by him "on the same footing with the writings of Dr. Cramp or Dr. Guthrie."

On page 85 and 86, Dr. Wayland says, "The fundamental principle on which our difference from other evangelical denominations depends, is this: We profess to take for our guide, in all matters of religious belief and practice, the *New Testament*, the *whole New Testament*, and *nothing but the New Testament*. Whatever we find there we esteem binding upon the conscience. What is not there commanded, is not binding." Then follows about a page of disavowal, on the ground of New Testament authority, of the unauthorised teachings of traditions,—Councils, Fathers, and Churches.

At the close of the chapter from which this extract is made, Dr. Wayland inserts the following note, from which Mr. Sommerville makes his quotation:

"In this and a following number, the New Testament is referred to as our only guide in matters of religious faith and practice. It was intended by this assertion, as the context will show, to exclude the authority of tradition and of all uninspired men claiming the power to legislate for the church of Christ. Several writers, in commenting on these remarks, have thought it their duty to state that the author denies the divine inspiration of the Old Testament. To such an imputation he does not think himself called on to reply. He, however, believes the New Testament to be the standard by which the precepts and teachings of the former revelation are to be judged, and that, thus, it is our only *rule of faith and practice*. Its relation to the Old Testament is very different from its relation to the doctrines and traditions of men. In the one case it is the relation of the meridian sun to the preceding twilight, in the other, the relation of the meridian sun to perfect darkness. It is my intention to discuss this subject at length, so soon as previous engagements will permit."

On page 133, Dr. Wayland further remarks:

"We (the Baptists) have always held to the perfect sufficiency of the Scriptures to teach us in all matters pertaining to religion. We, moreover, believe that the New Testament, the word spoken by the Son of God from Heaven, and by the Apostles whom he himself inspired, was given, not to one nation but to the whole human race for all coming time. And that by this word we are to decide upon the *obligatoriness of every part of the divine revelation*. It is therefore in this sense our *only rule of faith and practice*. To every precept of it we bow implicitly as God's last, best, and final revelation of his will to mankind."

Of the four words italicised, I am responsible for the first three, the author himself emphasized the fourth.

Mr. Sommerville says, "The doctrinal articles of the Baptist Churches of Nova Scotia speak what is in harmony with this but with less directness."

He also makes this strong statement,—*"This places the Old Testament on the same footing with the writings of Dr. Cramp or Dr. Guthrie."*

I may further add that in his "Scriptural Theology" Dr. Cramp says: "The inspiration of the Old Testament follows from that of the New, since it is always appealed to as divine authority by our Lord and his Apostles."

Doctor Hovey, principal of Newton Theological Seminary, states in his printed "Outlines of Theology," that "The Old Testament Scriptures were declared by Christ and his Apostles to be the Word of God."

After discussing the above declaration, Dr. H. concludes by saying "That the sacred writers were moved and assisted by the Holy Spirit to put on record all which the Bible, apart from errors in the text, now contains. As to the Old Testament, this is taught by the Saviour and his Apostles, and as to the New Testament, it is established by evidence previously given."

Adolph Sapher, a converted Jew, is reported to have said "That the New Testament is the Holy Spirit's Commentary on the Old Testament." Baptists, in common with other denominations of evangelical Christians, profess to regard and use it for this purpose; and by it they are enabled, to use Dr. Wayland's exact words, "to decide upon the obligatoriness of every part of the olden revelation."

Truly yours,

E. M. SAUNDERS.



DEAR EDITOR,—It was only last evening that I saw my second letter in the *Witness* of Oct. 30, and Mr. Sommerville's reference to it. I am obliged to you for its insertion, as I had thought it found its way to the waste basket, and seeing that Mr. S. has quite misunderstood it as an attack upon his character, I should not have been sorry if it had, as I do not wish to hurt his feelings. He says I am "making rapid progress in the school of scandal." I hope that it is not the case. If it be really so, I am very sorry, and I will try to be a better boy in future. Mutual recrimination is scarce ever productive of any good, and I cannot help saying, Mr. Editor, that it seems to me one of the saddest things under the sun to see standard-bearers fighting among themselves. The "Church militant" is a term that is becoming sadly true in a most undesirable sense, and no less strange and sad is it that around the two ordinances of Christ there has raged more religious discord than around any other two things. "I was wounded in the house of my friends" bears a terrible signification in these days, and the very followers of Christ himself are in great danger of "crucifying the Lord afresh and putting Him to an open shame" through their bitterness toward each other. In any further communications on either side, "let all bitterness and wrath be put away," and let the matter in hand be considered coolly and calmly with a view to God's glory and not our own. I regret that my letter hurt Mr. S.'s feelings, there was perhaps too much acerbity in it, and henceforth I will dip my pen in honey instead of gall if it be possible.

Yours faithfully,

Milton, Queen's Co., Nov. 24, 1875.

J. BROWN.

[*"MEEKNESS,"* December 8th, 1875.]

Ever since it became so publicly known that Professor Paine, of the Congregationalist Seminary in Bangor, taught his Theological students that the voice of History shewed that immersion was the original and proper mode of Christian baptism, our venerable friend the Rev. Mr. Sommerville has, nevertheless, been endeavouring to demonstrate that the voice of Scripture is opposed to such teaching. If he alone were concerned in this matter we might let all he has said pass without a word of remark, but lest his bold affirmations and his confident tone should lead any person to suppose that his teachings are as correct and consistent as he seems to suppose they are, we may devote a little space to examine what he has said during the discussion, our reader may then judge for themselves as to what is the true value of his views and arguments.

#### MR. SOMMERVILLE'S CONSISTENCY IN COURTESY.

Here it is, "Poor John Brown of Cow Bay;" there it is, "Had I known who he was I should not have spoken of him so lightly." "I ask his pardon."

Mr. Brown complains of Mr. S.'s style and asks him to produce, from the Old Testament or the New, proof for infant baptism; Mr. Sommerville replies by telling him that "he is making rapid progress in the School of Scandal." Referring to a Baptist Minister, but mistaken in his man, he asperses him with the charge of "contemptible trickery;" and the elegant simile of "stop thief" is made, *by the Rev. Mr. Sommerville*, to do duty in characterizing us, yet the same Mr. Sommerville complains that it is insinuated that he is Rabshakeh, and that he has not yet read the Acts of the Apostles carefully; yes, it is the same Mr. S. who makes these complaints, that charges Baptists with being "blindfolded, cabletowed, and swear what they are told."

#### WHAT MR. SOMMERVILLE DOES SEE, AND WHAT HE DOES NOT SEE.

He sees that Jesus did not command John to baptize him, as we had said, by the way, and not critically. When the Saviour applied to John for baptism, "John forbid him," and, on Jesus saying, "Suffer it to be so now"—a verb in

the imperative --he baptized him. To sift all the imperative out of this is sharp, we will not say hypercritical exercise in exegesis; and it is also notably superfluous; as the matter of its being a command out and out, or a request partaking of the nature of a command, does not touch essentially the matter in hand.

We had inferred that the Lord took the Supper with his disciples, and so expressed ourselves; not, however, grounding on the statement that the fact we had undertaken to establish, and did indeed establish. Our inference that our Lord participated by eating and drinking, in the Supper, was drawn from the expression, "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine," etc., an expression used by our Lord at the close of the Supper. Mr. S. "finds that it is not true." Here again is evidence of nice and laboured discrimination on a matter that in no way affects our argument. Our statement was, by the way, Mr. S. declares his decision as the decision of a critic after critical examination. He is positive. In fact, as Hezekiah says, "He can dogmatise." As a mirror, in which to see the arrogance of his own *ipse dixit*, we will hold up to his eyes the opinion of no less a man than the distinguished and scholarly Abbott—Pelobaptist—of Harvard University, who says on the point, "His (Christ's) own partaking of the Eucharist gave still further sanction of His injunction that his disciples," etc. As we cannot be trusted, we refer not to our impartial and intelligent readers, but to Mr. Sommerville, who says, "I hold him (Ed. of *Mess.*) utterly unreliable," we take the liberty of directing the attention of the Rev. Mr. S., that he may verify our extracts, to the article on Baptism by Mr. Abbott in Smith's Bible Dictionary.

We may also take the occasion to remark that we do not feel certain which of the two learned gentlemen is correct in this matter.

Furthermore, on the authority of God's word, 2 Kings v. 10—"Go wash in Jordan seven times," and 14th verse, "Then went he down and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God," we stated that Naaman was commanded to dip himself seven times in Jordan. Mr. Sommerville says, Naaman *was not commanded* to dip seven times, or once, in Jordan." He surely did dip himself, and it was done according to the saying of the man of God—*i. e.* according to God's command. We fully agree with Mr. S. that all human assertions should be tried by the Word of God. He shall have the full benefit of it in this case.

According to the saying of the man of God, Naaman *dipped*; according to the saying of Mr. S., "He is at perfect liberty to perform the ablution as he pleased." According to the saying of the man of God he dipped *himself*; according to the saying of Mr. S., "He might have dipped the part affected." How does Mr. S. know that the disease was local? According to the saying of the man of God he *dipped himself* seven times in Jordan; according to the saying of Mr. S., "He might have laved the water on the diseased part." According to the saying of the man of God, he *dipped*; according to the saying of Mr. Sommerville, "He might have *sprinkled* himself seven times." What he did do was "according to the saying of the man of God;" according to the saying of Mr. S., "He might have erred through ignorance or recklessness."

For saying that Naaman was commanded to dip in Jordan we are charged by Mr. S. with "handling the Word of God deceitfully." Mr. S. will have Scripture interpret Scripture. He is shy of human literature, especially for the sake of the people. We object not. Here God commands Naaman to do something. King James' scholarly servants dress the command, as given, in the word "wash," the command as obeyed, in the word "dipped." Mr. S. gets out on the "FLOODS" of these translators by going into the "showers," a rendering of his own. We might suggest "bathe" for "wash" in the case in hand and perhaps be more correct than Mr. S. is in his attempt to get rid of "FLOODS:" but we shall leave things as they are, and remind Mr. S. that he ignores God's definition of the command given to Naaman, for the obeying of it is graphically described and endorsed by God, and substitutes in its place a series of conjectures, having not even reason, but simply fancy as



their author. Mr. S. does not see that God commanded Naaman to dip himself.

#### DICTUM FIRST PERISHES BY AN OPPONENT.

Naaman dipped and was blessed; the priests dipped the birds and blessings came. Asher's foot was dipped in oil and his house was blessed. Priests dipped themselves, in the temple-service, and were blessed in it. Alas, Mr. S., for a score or more of years, has, we are informed, been ringing out, in private and in public, from the chimney corner and from the pulpit that immersion is a *symbol of irremediable destruction*; hence these desperate efforts to divorce dippings from blessings, and yoking them with judgments and cursings, and, under the Pedobaptist lash of "sprinkle forever," to drive dipping into outer darkness!

This dictum however old, however dear, is gone, let us hope to be heard of no more: and it would be far better for Mr. S. to bid it adieu, than to try to hold it by quibbling about the blessing not being "in" the dip, but connected "with" the dip.

#### WHAT WE DID TEACH AND WHAT WE DO TEACH.

Mr. S. says we teach 'that immersion originated with the baptism of Christ which he (we) does not believe, and did not intend to teach?' Mr. S. states what he cannot substantiate.\*

Again we are compelled to confront Mr. S. in his huge efforts to escape the pressure brought to bear upon him. We cut all his ancient dippings, washings and sprinklings from the gospel-day church baptism, and we challenge him to bring from God's word a command, an example or authority of any kind by which to link the baptism of John and Christ with anything that went before; and he finds himself face to face with a hopeless, impossible task. We are not at a loss to understand the veiled meaning of those dexterous exploits in interpretation of such matters as to whether Christ ate the Supper himself, or whether he requested or commanded John to baptize him—matters that touch not the vitals of the question. The main question must not be trifled with: it must not be evaded.

Again, we affirm that the Lord's Supper of this dispensation did not exist in either of the old economies. Mr. S. admits this. Again we affirm that Christian baptism, the baptism of Christ's church of this dispensation had no existence in the old dispensations. God ordered, for the tabernacle and temple-service, sprinklings, dippings, anointings and various performances; but the baptism of the Christian church is not there. We do not deny that the Jews had a dip unto Moses, that birds were dipped, that priests were dipped and sprinkled; but what we say is that, in the old dispensation, there is no baptism recognized, of which John's baptism is a recognized and accredited extension; of which the baptism of Christ by John, and the baptism of Christ's disciples by Christ's disciples are declared repetitions. Here we are pleased to hold Mr. Sommerville to his own terms—Keep in the Bible. Will Mr. S. give us from God's word baptism such as John's and Christ's before the days of John and Christ? Mr. S. must remember these baptisms were away from the temple, ignored the temple-service, and were, in the one case, unto repentance and for the remission of sins, and, in the other, when

\*I can. As in subsequent letters it is not particularly noticed, I now meet this assertion. October 6, 1875, we read:—"God tells us where Christian baptism originated, and by whom it originated. Jesus was immersed in the Jordan by John." Compare with this:—"He ate the supper himself, and thus it had its origin." He is attempting to indicate an analogy between the origination of immersion and the Lord's Supper, and thus *unintentionally* teaches that immersion had its beginning in Christ's baptism. Without confessing his mistake he tries to rectify it on December 8. "Baptism was instituted by Christ—to prevent the opportunity of quibbling—let us give the whole space, from the first dip of John to the first dip on the day of Pentecost as the time in which Christian baptism originated." The wisdom of the wise:!



fully developed, were in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

In his letter of November 19th, Mr. S. attempts to prove by some sort of analogy between "one hope," "one Lord" and "one faith," which stretch away back over the old dispensation, that "one baptism" synchronizes with them. But his baptism is sprinkling here, and it is circumcision when he deals with infants. Here are two. Which one does Mr. S. give up on the 19th of November, 1875? Show us that either of them has come to Christ's church.

*Does Mr. S. know what he himself believes, what he does teach, and what he does not intend to teach?*

From the Bible we try to hold him obligated to show where there was baptism in the Mosaic dispensation of which the baptism of John and the baptism of the Christian church is an extension?

The Lord's Supper was instituted by Christ on the eve of his crucifixion. Baptism was instituted by Christ—to prevent the opportunity of quibbling—let us give the whole space, from the first dip of John to the first dip on the day of Pentecost, as the time in which Christian baptism originated. Back of that Mr. S. may show us, if he can, from the Bible, a man preaching as John did, men preaching as the apostles did, and, apart from temple and tabernacle-service, baptizing those who received their doctrines!! Will Mr. S. please dispose of that bit of labor, before he goes into the scenes of bleeding beasts and sprinkling priests, to find the definition of a rite that did not have an existence in that day.

#### DICTUM SECOND PERISHES BY THE HAND OF ITS AUTHOR.

This is the one ruled out by its author as useless. Here it is. "We can never learn the design or form of an ordinance by the name given to it." We denounce it as unbaptist. Mr. S. says he does not state that Baptists, "reckless as are many of their statements," ever held to such a doctrine. Who does hold it? Do Pe-lo-baptists? Mr. S., taken as a representative, does not admit it. Why lay it down then? Why write a long paragraph of challenges to Baptists to prove immersion in this way? Mr. S. seems unwilling to reveal his design. The attempt was to leave the impression that Baptists obtain their views of baptism from the name of the ordinance; for Mr. S. says, "it is too notorious to be denied that their main argument in support of *immersion* is derived from the meaning of the word *baptize*." To ascertain the meaning of *baptize* in all its actual relations and uses, where it is used in scores of places, many of which are detailed and graphic descriptions, and to get the meaning from the simple name of the ordinance, Mr. S. himself will not fail to see, are quite different things. We flung back the insinuation; Mr. S. pleads innocence, and so pronounces by implication, the dictum itself useless; and so the insinuation and the thing that insinuates go out of existence.

#### WHAT MR. SOMMERVILLE DID SAY, AND WHAT WE DID SAY.

Here are the words of Mr. S. in his first article, "Must it then appear impossible that there should arise, even under the eyes of the apostles, men who, dissatisfied with Jewish *sprinklings*, thought this advanced dispensation demanded something more grand and imposing, and insisted that the disciples should all be *dipped*?" In another article Mr. S. says, "Suppose that it is fully ascertained and admitted that *baptism by sprinkling* was ridiculed by the devil's ministers \* \* \* abandoned, and *immersion* \* \* \* substituted in its room."

In referring to this and giving the substance, not the exact words, we said, "He (Mr. S.) undertakes to guess how immersion originated." "Men arose under the eyes of the apostles who were dissatisfied with *sprinklings*, and demanded that the disciples should be *dipped*."

These words, says Mr. S., "Are an *untruthful representation of both my words and my ideas*." But this Mr. Sommerville, who, on account of the above, makes

sweeping charges, does not fail to display rare courage in an attempt to make the readers of the *Presbyterian Witness* believe that Baptists do not accept the Old Testament as divine authority; and, to sustain this audacious and heavy charge, adduces a garbled extract, wrung from its connection, from Dr. Wayland's writings, and a bare reference to the articles of the Baptists of these provinces, but does not give even a garbled quotation from them. The Rev. Mr. Saunders, in the *Witness* of last week, gives some full extracts from accepted sources, which rolls this unwarrantable and monstrous charge back upon its author.

A HALF ADMISSION. HALF A LOAF BETTER THAN NO BREAD.

"The word," (baptize) says Mr. S., "expresses covering, wholly covering, but still covering as opposed to dipping or immersion." Then he adds, "The Ed. M. may now prepare himself for rare fun." In the same connexion he undertakes, having in mind the overflowing of the shores by the tide, to express which Aristotle uses the word baptize, to show how sprinkling can come into the place of the word that means "covering and wholly covering."

He thinks it is easy and simple. This is the solution. "*When water is symbolically applied, a partial application, a few drops, the spray dashed from the branch of hyssop, will as fully answer the conditions of baptism, in its widest sense, as all the waters of the Atlantic.*" Mr. S. did the *italicsing*.

To justify this Mr. S. refers to the ordinance of sprinkling by the priest to cleanse the leprosy. But the word directing the priest meant *sprinkle*, the word that directs Mr. S., according to his own definition, means *to cover, to wholly cover with water*. Now we shall ask Mr. S. two questions and he will deny neither their pertinence nor their importance. Would the priest have obeyed God, had he covered the leprous person with the fluid instead of sprinkling him? If not, does the Rev. Mr. Sommerville obey God, when, instead of covering the subject of baptism, he only applies to it a few drops of the fluid?

Neither the priest of the old dispensation, nor the preacher of this dispensation has any authority for adding to or taking from God's word. Out of his own mouth, we convict Mr. Sommerville of departing from the plain literal instructions, received from the highest source in the universe, and received in connexion with the greatest matter that engages the mind of God, angels and men. It is futile for Mr. S. to further attempt to darken counsel by vain reasonings; and we hope, in the light of the following fact, he himself may be convinced:—Rev. Mr. Boggs, one of our missionaries in India, states that while on a tour to a distant part of that field, a young man was found who had obtained the Scriptures, and by them had been led to Christ. He asked for baptism. Rev. Mr. McLaurin enquired how he wished to be baptized. He was confused and did not understand. Mr. McL. explained to him that some Christians baptized by sprinkling, etc. It had never entered his mind. He saw in God's word that it was his duty to be baptized, and that immersion was the mode. He was baptized.

Had Mr. Sommerville been there he would have felt it his duty to have led this converted heathen back to the old dispensation, through a dark forest of unsubstantial reasonings to show him that what he had plainly seen in God's word did not exist there, and that he must be sprinkled.

[*"WITNESS,"* Dec. 10, 1875.]

THE VOICE OF SCRIPTURE ON BAPTISM.

MR. EDITOR,—It may have been observed that in my last letter I have taken a stand in direct opposition to Dr. Cramp's pompous and dictatorial assertion respecting the mode of baptism. He puts the question, "*What do the Lexicons say about BAPTIZO?*" They all say that its primary meaning is to *dip, plunge, immerse*. No learned man will risk his reputation by affirming the contrary." A good Oriental scholar, well learned in Hebrew and Greek,

in a tract headed, *BAPTISM versus IMMERSION*, says, "I really do not know any heresy (which word I use in its proper original sense, *i. e.*, opinion), in the Christian church that has less to base itself upon than that of *immersion*, yet its advocates are found using the most reckless statements, which have gained ground among critics and lexicographers—(who generally follow each other like a flock of sheep)—entirely by the boldness of the assertion." To say that Dr. Cramp, as a linguist, is inferior to the author from whom I quote, is not to disparage his literary reputation.

There has been a great deal said respecting the concessions which Pedo-baptists have made to Baptists on the subjects both of immersion and infant baptism. This is a department of controversial literature to which I have paid very little attention for several reasons. (1.) Pedo-baptists, as well as others, have said foolish things; some from ignorance; some from inconsideration; some because others have said the same things before them. I have said many foolish things myself!! and probably would have said many more, only that I have had the privilege of being carefully watched. (2.) I am not to be held responsible for what other Pedo-baptists have said. (3.) There is still another reason. My library has not been so extensive as to enable me to verify the quotations made from Pedo-baptist writers, and inverted commas are not sufficient evidence that citations have been fairly made. "We have no hesitation in saying that such fatal concessions as our opponents pretend to adduce have never been made by Pedo-baptists, and that the authors referred to have been unfairly treated." (Thorn.) I accept this testimony more readily because the Ed. *M.* has ascribed to me words, placing them under inverted commas, which I never used. He has ascribed to me sentiments which I never uttered. He has represented the Saviour as commanding John to *immerse* him, when he did not *command* him even to baptize him. His mind was so preoccupied with the conceit of an analogy between the origination of the Lord's *supper* and *immersion*, that he completely forgot himself, and taught that Jesus was the *first person* immersed, and that, then and there, God ceased to sprinkle and substituted immersion. He has misquoted the Bible by representing Naaman as commanded to *dip* himself when he was only commanded to *wash*. I can easily excuse the addition of *himself*, as in 2 Kings, v. 14, the word is supplied by the translators without being printed in italics. He has stated twice that our Lord partook, with his disciples, his own supper, of which there is not a particle of evidence in Matthew, Mark, Luke, or Paul, or anywhere else, except in the *Christian Messenger*.

Will the Ed. *M.* come out and fairly, fully, and honorably confess that he has done me injustice by misquoting my words, and misrepresenting my sentiments; that he has sinned against God by a false translation of his word, and ascribing to the Lord Jesus actions which he never did? We shall see. A frank and full confession, such as the case demands, he dare not make. It would shake the confidence of his Baptist readers too much to be soon recovered, if ever. Hezekiah says I am an unfair disputant. Is it because I cannot accept Baptist assumptions as *facts*; because I point out the fallacy of their reasonings, detect blunders and call things by their proper names?



If not, let H. point out in what I am unfair. I have challenged him, but he makes no sign.

Before entering on the N. T. references to baptism, I presume (1) that I do not expect to find a direct statement of the mode of baptism. A 16 Ed. *M.* has been forced to admit, it is an ordinance of the O. T., and to that we must come to learn its nature, design, and form. Still, if the N. T. furnish conclusive evidence, direct or inferential, in favor of immersion, I hope to be enabled to accept it unhesitatingly. (2). Symbolical ordinances are addressed to the *understanding*, not to the *imagination*. The ancient church must have a pictorial representation of spiritual things, and therefore immersion was in favor; and candidates for baptism must be divested of all clothing, be dipped, and put on new garments, to represent the putting off the old man and putting on the new. And Rome, destitute of spiritual senses, must have her images, crucifixes, pictures of the mother and child, and of the saints. Chambers of imagery are always acceptable to those who are strangers to the simplicity of the gospel, and love sensational and exciting scenes. The present prevailing love of excitement and *parade* will explain the modern rage for *dipping*.

Noah and his family were saved by water. Their salvation was a figure, *not of a figure*, but of the baptism which saves us by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. They were *saved* by escaping immersion. The world was immersed and *perished*. To this *fact* we may have to refer in connection with infant baptism. We *know* that the Israelites, after leaving Egypt, were *baptized* in the cloud and in the sea, and we *know* that there was not one of them *immersed*.—Dr. Cramp says, “Neither did they *enter* the cloud, nor were they *wetted* by the waters of the sea; but they *passed* under both.” Paul says the Israelites were all *in the cloud*, when they were baptized.—How they could be *in* the cloud without *entering* into it is above my comprehension. The Apostle says also, they were *in the sea* when they were baptized. I cannot understand how they could be immersed in the sea and not *wetted* by its waters. Then John might have immersed *in Jordan*, and yet none of the people been *wetted* with its waters. This is a notable and very pleasant discovery, if it could only be reduced to practice. Paul says, all *passed through the sea*. Dr. C. says they were *under the sea*. This is new. The waters must have been *tunnelled*. But the plain prosaic language of the Apostle is all a figure,—an *allegory*; but “the allegory is obviously not to be pressed minutely.” This is the sword by which the Baptist controversialist cuts every gordian knot which he cannot loose. “The Israelites were not literally baptized,” says Dr. C. Then, it follows, they did not literally eat manna, did not literally drink the water from the rock. I prefer the testimony of the Apostle to Dr. C.’s. Their *baptism* was literal. Their *food* was literal. Their *drink* was literal. And all these have spiritual import. It is a fact, as well authenticated as that the Israelites passed through the sea, that, when that event took place, “*the clouds poured out water*.” “*God* did sprinkle” the Israelites—he baptized them. If Dr. C. had recollected this he would have been spared much embarrassment, but he would have lost his *dip*.

John baptized in Jordan; and in Enon because there was much water there. Not to dwell on the prepossession in the Jewish mind arising out of their familiarity with the ceremonial law in favour of living water,—water from

the river or the spring,—if water was needed for no other purpose than baptism, the selection of Jordan or Enon might furnish a plausible, though not decisive, evidence for immersion. We must give John, or rather the Spirit by whom he was directed, credit for a measure of common sense. When thousands were attending his ministry it would have been worse than madness to choose a place where the people could not find water to drink, or for purposes of personal ablutions. John, however, was not the only baptizer. During our Lord's ministry he, (or his disciples,) as reported to the Pharisees, made and baptized more disciples than John. But *where* they baptized we are not told in Scripture. *The Baptists will tell us.* After Pentecost we have reference to baptism in *Jerusalem*, in *Samaritan*, in a *prison*, in a *private house*. Whenever persons are brought to a knowledge of the truth they are baptized. There are no difficulties, no preparations to be made, no want of water, even inauinated. All are ready. The baptism is immediate. How do Baptists reconcile all this with immersion? *By adding to the word of God.* If that word is not sufficient for its own interpretation, it is not a lamp to the feet and a light to the path. Nothing can be more absurd, improbable, and arrogant, than the suppositions that Baptist advocates introduce to explain the records of baptisms consistently with their practice; nothing more presumptuous than their additions to the Divine narrative. Assuming the permanence of the instituted mode of baptism, everything is plain, simple, and the scripture narrative is sufficiently full and intellectual. If Baptist reasoners are justified in introducing uninspired records and bold and baseless assertions to make the Scriptures teach their doctrine, why should Rome be denied her apocrypha and traditions? "Deceiving and being deceived," they proclaim the perfection of the Divine word, and are not satisfied to be limited by its facts. They *begin* by assuming that *immersion* is the mode of baptism—is baptism, and *God* must accept the assumption.

A very popular, but not very conclusive, evidence in favor of immersion, is derived from going down into the water and coming up out of the water. I give the Baptists the full benefit of the authorized translation *into* and *out of*. It is manifest that going into the water is not the baptism. That is something which takes place *between* the going into the water and the coming out of it. "They went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water --." The argument is this: if baptism is administered by *sprinkling* there was no need of going into the water, or even to it, and therefore baptism must be *immersion*. A hasty inference, certainly.

Most people think that to *drink* means to swallow some liquid; but this is a great mistake. The word may mean that sometimes, but sometimes it means to be *immersed*. A horse goes into the water, he *drinks*, and then comes out of the water. But as a sufficient quantity of water, to quench his thirst, might have been given him in a pail, therefore, when he goes into the water it must be to be immersed, and drinking means in that case *immersion*. Q. E. D.—Some may say, O, Mr. S., this is all nonsense. I know it is—nonsense—unequalled nonsense; but this is the nonsense that Baptists are expected to accept as scriptural teaching and sound logic. This may be called *ungentlemanly*, has been so called. It seems a gentleman may talk nonsense and be a *gentleman* still, but to hint that he has talked nonsense is *ungentlemanly*. A

*nonsensical gentleman!* There are *lying gentlemen—dishonest gentlemen—swearing gentlemen—drunken gentlemen—impure gentlemen—accepted as gentlemen* by professing Christians and in a Christian land. Pugh! If Jesus were to appear in Nova Scotia as he appeared in Palestine he would not be accepted in the ranks of *gentlemen*. You might find him dining at the table of a rich Pharisee, but he would not get a second invitation. His impudence and rudeness would exclude him.

*Baptismal burial* in my next, and unless something new come up that will close my argument on the mode of baptism for the present.

Somerset, Dec. 3, 1875.

W. SOMMERVILLE.

[“WITNESS,” Dec. 18, 1875.]

### “THE VOICE OF SCRIPTURE ON BAPTISM.”

MR. EDITOR.—Not having seen three or four of the last *Witnesses*, I do not know when Mr. Sommerville changed the title of his letters on the above subject from “History” to “Scripture,” and for the same reason do not know what Scripture he advances in favor of infant baptism. With your permission I will say a little on his letter of Nov. 27th; and as I am told Mr. S. is “along in years considerable,” and as Paul says, “Rebuke not an elder, but outreat him as a father.” I will be as gentle as possible and follow Paul’s advice, for while in some things “it is more blessed to give than to receive,” in others it is more blessed to receive than to give such appellations as are sadly abundant in Mr. S.’s letters, to wit, when falsely applied. The Saviour has a word on that subject in Matt. v. 11, 12. But this is a digression, now for an argument:

1. “One Baptism,” Eph. iv. 5. The connexion in which these words stand show that *mode* is not at all referred to, but the thing itself. Paul is for *union*, and uses this among others as an argument, “baptized into Christ,” Gal. iii. 27, 28. If this be correct all that Mr. S. has built on the meaning he gives it comes to nothing.

2. Mr. S. quotes Isa. lii. 15, “He shall sprinkle many nations,” adding, “This points to the New Testament dispensation.” Does he mean by this that we are therefore to sprinkle children! Whatever he may mean, that verse, according to the LXX. has nothing about sprinkling. The word translated sprinkle is ——— thauma-ontai, so that it might read thus, “So shall many nations wonder at him, and kings shall shut their mouths,” etc. In Coverdale’s Bible. (1535), it reads, “Even so shall the multitude of the Gentiles *loke* unto him.” Parkhurst puts it, “So shall he cause many nations to leap (. . . . for admiration and holy astonishment).”

3. Mr. S. quotes Ezek. xxxvi. 25, “I will sprinkle clean water upon you,” adding, “This refers to these last days.” The word here is ——— rano not ——— baptizo, and does *not* refer to these last days. Reading that chapter and forgetting baptism, it will be easily seen that the “House of Israel” is meant. Verse 33 reads, “In the days that I shall have cleansed you from all your iniquities, I will also cause you to dwell in the cities, and the wastes shall be builded.” Read from verse 25 to the end, and I think it will be pretty clear whether Mr. S.’s conclusion is right or not.

4. Mr. S. says again, “Their main argument in support of *immersion* is derived from the meaning of the word baptize.” For my part the meaning of the word itself is enough, but whatever strength there is in that, *my main argument* is founded on the adaptation of immersion to what it is intended to represent, as shown in Rom. vi. 3–11: Col. vi. 12, 13.

5. The quotation from Isa. lxiv. 3, “I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and showers upon the dry ground; I will pour my spirit upon thy



seed," etc., according to LXX. reads, "I will give water in (their) thirst to those travelling in desert land, I will pour," etc.

I do not profess to be among Mr. Selden's *learned* friends, nor do I write in his defence, that he is himself well able to do if he please, but I presume he is acting on Hezekiah's advice. I have a wish, however, to be among Mr. S.'s *friends*, especially in the light of the first paragraph of the letter referred to, particularly the end of said paragraph.

Yours truly,

J. BROWN.

[*"WITNESS,"* DEC. 25, 1875.]

DEAR EDITOR.—Before you finally decide to stop the discussion on baptism will you do me the favor of presenting for the benefit of all whom it may concern, a few passages bearing on the subject. I should then be obliged if Mr. Sommerville will present those bearing on Infant Baptism, and let your readers judge for themselves who should be baptized and how. We profess to take the Bible for our guide, and I do not think there is anything unfair in my proposition. Here they are without note or comment, Matt. iii. 5-17. Mark xvi. 15, 16. John iii. 22, 23; iv. 1, 2. Acts ii. 37-42; viii. 12-16. 35-36; ix. 18; x. 44-48; xvi. 13-15, 40; xvi. 32-34; xviii. 8. 1 Cor. i. 16, 17; xvi. 15. Romans vi. 3-5. Gal. iii. 27. Col. ii. 15.

I have omitted some for the sake of your space; your readers can find them by their reference bibles.

Yours, faithfully,

Milton, Queen's Co., Dec. 14, 1875.

J. BROWN.

[*"WESLEYAN,"* JAN. 1, 1876.]

DEAR SIR,—I thank the editor of the *P. Witness* for the insertion of my previous letters. But as he thinks the arguments not likely to do any good, and wishes to close his columns against the discussion at the end of the year, you will oblige me by giving a place in *your* columns to the following intended for the *Presbyterian Witness*.

#### BAPTISTS AND THE RULE OF FAITH.

MR. EDITOR.—As the Rev. E. M. Saunders, in his letter of Dec. 4th begins with a repetition of my words, adorned with all their *italic* flowers, so do I. "I want to know whether the Baptists of Nova Scotia own the Old Testament as a *Rule of Faith and Practice at all*. I have a strong opinion that *they do not*." If I had a *strong* opinion before having read his letter, I have a *stronger* opinion now,—one amounting to full conviction—that THEY DO NOT. Accustomed to look upon my old friend, Mr. S., as possessed of a large measure of "simplicity and godly sincerity," I am inexpressibly pained to find that he is breathing an atmosphere unfavorable to the maturation of either, and that he is capable of subscribing a communication so evasive, so unscrupulous, and so deceptive. His letter is a specimen of evasiveness as perfect, as if he had been educated in the best equipped school of Ultramontaniam.

The editor of the *Messenger* has blundered so excessively, and committed himself so fully, that an effective vindication of his position is *impossible*, and to confess his errors would ruin his reputation and influence. The probability however, is that he will, some of these days, attempt the impossibility, and make brass do duty in the absence of argument. For the meantime, Mr. S. volunteers, or is stimulated, to make a diversion in his favor, and give him leisure

to recover his composure, or call in his distant auxiliaries. Let him do what he can; let him secure what assistance he may; he shall not escape. The unscriptural, and semi-Infidel Baptist system is before me; obstacles thrown in my way I fling aside; to calls on the right hand and on the left, I reply by an answering call: my eye is fixed on my object. I owe this to thousands of candid Christian Baptists who never are taught to look beyond the questions of immersion and infant baptism as distinguishing. The present tactics are too obvious to be disguised. This argument must be confined, as far as possible, to the *P. Witness*, to which Baptists seldom have access, and if they had access, they would not care to read it. They must not see any thing but the trenchant replies of the *Messenger*. To know the charges preferred against them, and the evidence by which they are sustained, might excite a spirit of inquiry. The manœuver will not do.

Mr. S. would leave the impression upon the minds of his readers, that I have given a false statement of the doctrine of Baptists, respecting the place assigned to the Old Testament; yet I have sought in vain, in his letter, for a definite declaration that the Baptists of Nova Scotia do own the Old Testament as a Rule of Faith and Practice. Such a declaration is the least that we would expect, in the circumstances; but that little we do not find. We must be satisfied with a reference to the *third* of their Doctrinal Articles. "Here it is." "The holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the word of God, in which he has given us our only rule of Faith and Practice." I never thought that the Baptists deny the *inspiration* of the Old Testament although from the place they assign to it, whether it is inspired or not is of little moment. Let the word "IN," with which the second clause of the Article begins, be left out, and mark how differently it reads: "The holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, which He has given us our only rule of Faith and Practice." Here the Old Testament, as a rule of faith and practice, occupies as high a place as the New, and every Presbyterian, Methodist, or Congregationalist, will cheerfully accept the whole: but let the word "IN" be retained, and the way is open to deny that the Old Testament is a *rule*; and every Rationalist in Germany or elsewhere will accept it. The Rationalist denies that the Scriptures are the word of God, but admits that the word of God is *in the Scriptures*, and his reason will separate the gold from the ore. Baptists, while owning *all* Scripture to be *inspired*, do not say that all Scripture is the rule of faith and practice, but the rule is *in the Scripture*. Here, then, by the introduction of the little word "IN," which not one in a thousand would notice, we have an example of the "deceivableness of unrighteousness."—*Jesuitism, Jesuitism*. The compilers of the Baptist Articles did not want their own people or others to know the degraded place to which they relegate the Old Testament. Mr. S.'s letter is completely deceptive. The *third* Article, which he has brought in to contradict my assertion, is perfectly consistent with this,—that NOTHING BUT the *New Testament* is a rule of Faith and Practice to the Baptists of Nova Scotia.

Mr. S. is very unscrupulous, when he represents me as giving "partial statements," by which readers would be led to form incorrect ideas of Dr. Wayland's views. I deny that I have kept back a single word necessary to show this doctrine of the claims of the Old Testament. His words are these: "We

profess to take for our guide, in all matters of religious belief and practice, *the New Testament, the whole New Testament, and nothing but the New Testament.*" These words need no comment. They are too plain to be misunderstood. They exclude "Councils, Fathers, Churches;" but they exclude the Old Testament as decidedly as they do the Tridentine and Vatican decrees. Mr. S. favors us with a large extract from Dr. Wayland, and so far from convicting us of error or injustice, he has only made the Doctor's case worse. We read: "We believe that the New Testament, the word spoken by the Son of God from Heaven, and by the Apostles whom he himself inspired, was given not to one nation, but to the whole human race for all coming time." There is here a sad amount of darkness that may be felt, and confusion. Can we learn any word spoken by the "Son of God from Heaven," except by the report of the writers of the New Testament? Our Lord never wrote anything. Did Dr. W. really think that the words spoken by the "Son of God from Heaven" were more *divine* than the words of any *inspired* writer? Did the *Son of God* "*himself*" impart a higher inspiration to the Apostles than others enjoyed who spake by the Spirit? Did he inspire any one by *himself* and not by the Holy Ghost? Did the Dr. not know that the Old Testament prophets spake by the *Spirit of Christ*? Did he not know that *all Scripture, O. T. as well as N. T., is profitable now, that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works?*

To both parts of the above sentence I put in a decided negative. I deny that the Old Testament was given to *one nation*, to the exclusion of the interest of the whole human race. It was not *given* at all to Jews, in the current sense of *give*. It was a *trust committed* to them for all-coming time and for all nations. From the first days of their national existence, Israelites had been instructed that in Abraham and his seed *all nations* would be blessed. To the Prophets it was "revealed that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the Gospel unto you." The Old Testament was no more given to the nation of Israel of old, than it is given to the "Commonwealth of Israel" which now is. I *deny* that the New Testament was given to the whole human race. It is not yet given to the whole race. It is a *trust committed* to the church as the Old Testament was and is for the nations for all coming time. With the exception of Matthew, Mark and John the whole New Testament is *expressly* addressed to persons in covenant with God, whether churches or individuals.

Dr. Wayland has placed the Old Testament 'on the same footing with the writings of Dr. Cramp or Dr. Guthrie.' Mr. S. does not wish Baptists or Pedobaptists to think this, but if he is capable of understanding Dr. W.'s very precise language he knows this; and as he has expressed nothing but a hearty approval of the Doctor's doctrines he seems to have no higher opinion of the Old Testament than the Doctor has. Dr. W. "believes the New Testament to be the standard by which the precepts and teachings of the former revelation are to be judged." And again,—"*By this word (N. T.) we are to decide upon the obligatoriness of every part of the olden revelation.*" The writings of Drs. Cramp and Guthrie are put into my hands. I read, examine, it may be



with interest, pleasure and profit, but do not accept them as *authoritative*. I judge of their *obligatoriness* by the Bible, and accept or reject their teachings as I consider them in unison with the Word or against it. This is precisely the place assigned to the Old Testament. Its "precepts and teachings" are to be brought to the *standard* before we decide.

As according to Dr. W. all "the precepts and teachings of the Old Testament are to be *judged* by the New Testament, before we can decide whether they are obligatory on us, or how far, the quotations, which Mr. S. has made from Drs. Cramp and Hovey, go to show that Baptists do not accept the *inspiration* of the Old Testament without an antecedent knowledge of the inspiration of the New Testament. It is true that if the inspiration of the New Testament be assumed, a clear and cogent proof of the inspiration of the Old Testament can be derived from it; but the inspiration of the Old Testament was established, proclaimed, and accepted *before* the Apostles wrote or Jesus Christ appeared. I defy any D. D. in all the Baptist Churches to produce from the New Testament one passage where our Lord or his Apostles refer to the Old Testament for the purpose of *teaching or confirming* its inspiration, and *not* (its inspiration assumed) for confirming the *truth of the doctrines which they taught* by an appeal to the testimony of an accepted inspiration.

Baptists differ from all who are accounted evangelical in the very essential article of the Rule of Faith and Practice. The rule of Methodists, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians is—'The Scripture of the Old and New Testaments;—of Baptists, "NOTHING BUT THE *New Testament*."

Somerset, Dec. 17, 1875.

W. SOMMERVILLE.

P. S.—I had finished a rough draft of this letter before the *Messenger* of Dec. 8th came to my hand. I cannot say I have yet read the editor's criticisms, but, if God will, he shall have a *reply*. In the meantime there is an important point to be discussed. I have *guessed* right this time. Mr. S. has stepped in to give the editor time to recover himself. He is what Dr. Jas. C. L. Carson would call a "slippery customer."

The Rev. W. Sommerville, a veteran minister of the Presbyterian (Reformed) body, and a skilled controversialist, has sought our columns for the completion of a series of letters begun some time ago in the *Pres. Witness*. We are quite sure the termination of this discussion will be pursued in a right spirit. The great object of all such argumentation is a fair apprehension of the truth as it affects the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. Any one versed in history can see the effects of spirited discussions in which our forefathers took part. The Churches are more tenacious of sound doctrine to-day because of landmarks erected generations ago. Our pioneers sleep, but their successors are awake and vigilant. Our confidence in the judgment of those now waging this paper war, as well as our own youth and experience, both restrain us from adding a single word of either advice or caution.

[ "MESSENGER," Jan. 3, 1876 ]

MR. EDITOR,—As the editor of the *Witness* wishes the controversy on Baptism to close in his columns with the closing year, out of deference thereto I will ask you to insert what I should otherwise have sent to the *Witness*, viz: a few remarks on Mr. Sommerville's letter in the *Witness* of Dec. 18.

In his reference to the concessions made by Pedobaptists, in quoting from

Them, he says virtually that such concessions as have been quoted by Baptists from Pedobaptists, they made themselves, the words of Them are, "We have no hesitation in saying that such fatal concessions as our opponents pretend to adduce *have never been made by Pedobaptists.* (italics mine,) and that the authors referred to have been unfairly treated." Mr. S. knows this is not true, (or he is much more ignorant of his side of the question than he seems to be) although he adopts the sentiment, and even if what he says of the Ed. *Messenger* is true.

On the same subject he says, "I have said many foolish things myself;" that is true, very foolish things; and very naughty things; and very unkind things; and very ungentlemanly things; boast of his gentlemanliness as he may; and he adds, "and probably would have said many more, only that I had the privilege of being carefully watched." I hope he is duly thankful to those who have protected him from himself. That he needs watching, especially in his treatment of Scripture (as I may show by and by) is very obvious.

He has told us that the modern rage for dipping is to be accounted for by "the present prevailing love of excitement and parade." Why does he not shout "Eureka, Eureka!" And as he has made this valuable discovery, will he next discover to us the reason for the modern rage for sprinkling infants? I know he cannot, still I should like to see his attempt.

Mr. S. generously informs us that Noah and his family were saved by escaping immersion. (O for Priscilla and Acquilla). The world was immersed and perished. Does Mr. S. really mean that Noah and his family were saved because they escaped immersion, and the world perished because they were immersed? No, he does not, for he knows or ought to know his Bible better; and I may remind him that according to his own showing in a recent letter, in which he sought to prove that the shore was not immersed when the tide rose over it, no more were the people of the old world immersed, because the water rose over them. But any one can see the grave insinuation contained in Mr. S.'s remarks; still if he persist in such soft arguments and hard words, he will find in Gen. xix. an account of a man and his family who were saved by escaping sprinkling; but the thing is too childish to waste time over, and the dark ungenerous "sly insinuation" could have emanated from no pen but Mr. Sommerville's. We are not going to believe that God destroyed the world and saved a few in order to show the mode of baptism.

Hezekiah says, "He can dogmatize." Yes, Hezekiah, he can. For instance, he says, "It is a fact as well authenticated as that the Israelites passed through the sea, that when that event took place the clouds poured out waters." "God did sprinkle the Israelites, He baptized them." He quotes from Ps. lxxvii. 17. The word is plural *clouds*, it was a "cloud" that accompanied Israel. Moreover, is Mr. S. very sure that the passage refers to the crossing of the Red Sea, and not the crossing of the Jordan? If he will read Josh. iii. 14-16 and Psalm cxiv. he will get a little light, and for his further help I may tell him that in the original it is "The waters overflowed." The crossing of Jordan took place at the overflowing of the river (Josh 3. 15). The LXX render it "the great sound of waters."

Referring to the same subject, in quoting Dr. Cramp (who seems to be much in his way) "the allegory is obviously not to be pressed minutely." Mr. S. says, "This is the sword by which the Baptist controversialist cuts every gordian knot which he cannot loose." Would Mr. S. believe me if I told him that Dean Alford, one of the most eminent of modern critics and scholars, and a Pedobaptist, used that same sword to cut the same knot on 1 Cor. x. 2. and were all baptized unto Moses, he says, "The allegory is obviously not to be pressed minutely." I think Mr. S. will now find the sword

turned against him. I have not the Dr.'s work on Baptism so I cannot tell whether he has been fairly treated in that reference.

Barnes (a Pedobaptist) very properly says it is to be taken in "the sense of dedicating, consecrating, initiating into, or bringing under obligation to, and it is evidently in this (latter) sense the word is used here, as denoting that they were devoted to Moses as a leader, etc."

There is no more evidence that the cloud that accompanied the Israelite ever let down water than that it showered frogs, and any one who argues from Ps. lxxvii. 17, or 1 Cor. x. 2 for infant sprinkling must be very hard up on argument.

Mr. S. charges us with *adding to the word of God* (his are the italics). He should then have quoted Rev. xxii. 18. Alas, Mr. S. is terribly guilty of this very thing; he declares that to be scriptural which is unscriptural and that unscriptural which is scriptural. I commend to his careful study the words of Isaac Pennington. "He that giveth any other meaning of any Scripture than the true, proper meaning thereof, he both addeth and diminisheth; he taketh away the true sense, he addeth a sense that is not true." And those of Bunyan in "Grace Abounding:"—"Now also I should labour to take the word as God had laid down, without restraining the natural force of one syllable thereof," and the almost last words of Inspiration in the passage just referred to. And as I hope to meet Mr. S. in "the holy city," notwithstanding his infant opinions, I recommend him to amend his ways; to seek forgiveness for what he has done; give up adding to and taking from the word by giving up unscriptural infant sprinkling and taking up scriptural believers' baptism, and doubtless, as he is doing it in ignorance he will be forgiven.

To save Mr. S. any further labour in this matter I may tell him what he cannot do. He cannot prove that the sun does not shine, nor that believers' immersion is not in the Bible, toil at both as long as he please. He cannot stop the course of the Mississippi, nor the progress of the truth of believers' baptism. He cannot see children in the moon, nor anything in the whole Bible to justify either sprinkling or baptizing such, search as long as he like.

Yours,

J. BROWN.

P. S.—I had promised to dip my pen in honey, if possible, but Mr. S. upset my jar.

["WESLEYAN," Jan. 22, 1876.]

### THE VOICE OF SCRIPTURE ON BAPTISM.

MR. EDITOR,—It seems to be impossible to bind down the *Messenger* to the Divine Word, in the exposition of the Doctrine of Baptisms, and to the acceptance of that Word as its own interpreter. The old Testament affords no countenance to the baleful superstition of which the Baptist leaders are the advocates, and the people are the victims; and, therefore, as a rule of faith and practice it is wholly repudiated. A perspicuous declaration to that effect is evaded, for it would be dangerous to place before the great body of Baptists that they are professionally pledged to reject the Old Testament, as a rule, while they admit its inspiration.

Testimony in favour of *immersion* extraneous to Revelation is greedily seized. When our Lord was on earth, he appealed to his works as his Father's testimony, and to the Old Testament, in vindication of his claims and of his doctrine. He would not accept the testimony of devils even when they spake the truth; and Paul followed the example in dealing with the girl possessed by a spirit of divination. They commanded them to be silent. To have accepted their witness might have excited a suspicion that there was



some Masonic or Oddfellows' communion between them. But the editor of the *Messenger* is willing to accept concurring testimony, come from what quarter it may. In the *Messenger* of Dec. 15, the testimony of CARDINAL MANNING in favour of *immersion*, and that *sprinkling* was introduced by ecclesiastical authority, is very ostentatiously paraded before us. Now who is *Cardinal Manning*? He is the sworn slave of that "man of sin,—whose coming is *after the working of Satan*, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish." The Cardinal's testimony is the *devil's* testimony, which Christ or an Apostle would have peremptorily refused. The editor of the *Messenger* earnestly begs the attention of his *Pedobaptist* brethren to the *Cardinal's* words, and he will now see that I have not turned a deaf ear to his earnest petition.

Among Christians the complete sufficiency of the Divine word should be tenaciously held. We have no more right to add to it than to subtract from it. That man should be ashamed to call himself a Christian, who will not give as high a place to the *Old Testament* as to the *New*, in the determination of all questions of a religious belief and life, knowing that in expounding to disciples the things concerning himself, the Lord leads them to Moses, the prophets and the psalms; and that Paul, in demonstrating the character, the offices, and the work of Christ, and the way of salvation by him, constantly appeals to the *Old Testament*. *Pedobaptists* should press on *Baptists* the necessity of an explicit declaration that they own the *Old Testament Scriptures* to be a rule of faith and practice to *Christians*. The testimony of Mr. Saunders is not enough. That is a personal testimony. Let us demand a plain, full, unequivocal and uncontradicted statement to that effect in the *Messenger*. More still is wanted—a change in the *third* doctrinal article of the *Baptists* of *Nova Scotia*, to make it speak an unequivocal language. *Pedobaptists* are profoundly ignorant of the mass of error and infidelity involved in the *Baptist* system. I firmly believe the great body of *Baptists* themselves are ignorant of it. The current idea is that the only difference between the parties is in respect to the *subjects* and *mode* of *Baptism*. This idea I once entertained and often expressed, till I had examined the matter more closely.

The *Old Testament*, in being shut out of doors, when it speaks with authority, is treated with more respect than the *New*, which is invited, with a smiling countenance, to come in, only to be placed in the rack and tortured to compel it to speak like a *Baptist*, and cry out *immersion, immersion!* Come in here, Mr. Editor. The *Messenger* has been putting the question, and we will read the minutes of the examination. "The subject is to be buried. Buried in what? *Water*. Acts 8. 36. "See here is water." No infants, no sprinkling. *Believers buried in water* and raised up to walk—infants don't walk in any sense—in newness of life." (Oct. 6, 1875.) *Buried* is not used in connection with baptism, in the gospel or in the *Acts*. *Buried in water* is not once found in the whole *New Testament*. "Buried in baptism" is found in *Colossians*, and "See, here is water" is found in *Acts*. The editor of the *Messenger* drops the word "in baptism" and substitutes "in water," and reports the *New Testament* as saying "*believers buried in water*." He is a smart man, and affects to say smart things. *Believers* are raised up in baptism to "walk in newness of life," and he says, "infants don't walk in any sense." In any

sense? "The children of Israel *walked* upon dry ground in the midst of the sea." Either there were no infants among them or they *walked* in the midst of the sea *in some sense*. The man who wrote the sentence I have quoted above from the *Messenger* ought to be ashamed to walk the streets of Halifax, or to lift his face among honest men. A viler attempt to impose upon the credulity of readers I have never met. I would not have stooped to criticise it were it not that I fear there are many of his readers, as Henry Alliene is said to have described one of his converts, who would swallow boots with spurs on them if he preached them.

There is *burial in baptism* or *by baptism*. Every Christian *sprinkler* admits it with reverence and gratitude, with joy and praise. Not one of them would wish to have one word altered in the God-given phrase, "buried with him in baptism." The editor *Messenger* considers it decisive in support of *immersion*; so much so that he does not judge it necessary to add a word of comment. Let the Word be its own interpreter,—not Dr. Chalmers, not Canon Lightfoot.

There is baptism *with water*, and there is baptism *with the Holy Spirit* perfectly distinct, but sustaining a precise relation to each other. To which of these does Paul allude, in the Epistles to the Romans and Colossians? We need not occupy much time on Col. 2: 10, 12. The Apostle spoke of a "circumcision made *without hands*." This is not the circumcision executed by Abraham or Moses, but that which God performs; it is "the circumcision of Christ." To this we find an allusion in Rom. 2: 28, 29. "He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew that is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter." Next we are told that "the circumcised are buried with him (Christ) in baptism, in which also (they) are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." There is here set before us the gracious truth that the Apostle in another place more directly teaches us, that the same exceeding great power by which Christ was raised from the dead is put forth in the resurrection of every saint who has been buried with him in baptism. But if our friends are still determined to find here an allusion to the *mode* of baptism, a demonstration of the scriptural character of *immersion*, I pray them not to overlook the last clause of the 12th verse. The resurrection is not by the physical power of the administrator, nor of the person immersed, but by simple *faith*. It is no difficult matter to conceive of a crowd of curious or interested persons on the bank of a river or a pond, to witness the obscene ceremony of *immersion*, which familiarity and the avoidance of the nudity demanded by antique wisdom render only a little less disgusting. The operator addresses the candidates: "My dear friends, I am here to bury you with Christ in this watery grave, but with this my province ends. Expect no assistance from me in raising you out of your grave. The word *baptize* requires me to put you under the water, and to this the command limits me. Baptism is a positive ordinance, and I must do precisely what I am commanded, no less, no more. You must rise and come forth *by faith*." The candidates look at one another. One says, He shall not immerse me unless he promise to take me out of the water. A second, We might get drowned. A third, Let us go home—the man is mad. They move away. The idle and

profane disperse with shouts of derisive laughter; and sincere souls, who are mingled with them, return with shame and sadness.

The statement in Rom. 6: 3, 4, is more extended, but I quote it in full:—  
 “ Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in the newness of life.” Let us now consider, not what this or that man has said about it, but what the Apostle has said. Observe (1) he does not speak of *every* member of the Church. *All* members of the Church are *baptized with water*. They are thus, according to the command of Christ, added to the Church. But this does not necessarily imply that they are real Christians. Simon was baptized with water, yet still is in the bond of iniquity. He had never been baptized *into Christ*. Therefore the Apostle says, “ *As many of us as were baptized into Christ.*” This shows he is not speaking of *baptism with water*. Some may say, this is pressing the words of the Apostle too closely. I recognize no loose phraseology under the direction of the Spirit. I would not wish to overlook one jot or one tittle of what God has given. The same form of words is used in Gal. 3: 27, and with reference to the same subject, with a difference which not only shows that the Apostle speaks of the baptism of the Spirit, but that there is no reference to the *mode* of baptism. “ *As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.*” No two things can be more unlike than *death, burial and resurrection* are to *putting on a garment*, yet death, burial and resurrection with Christ occupy, in the mind of the Apostle, precisely the same relation to the baptism here spoken of as the putting on of Christ. In the mind of a Baptist, the former are involved in the ordinance, the latter is a remote result. The exigencies of the *immersion* doctrine demand this.

Observe (2) into what we are baptized. It is *into Jesus Christ*. We have here set forth, by the graphic pen of inspiration, that incorporation with Christ which makes him and his people one, in consequence of which he bears our responsibilities, and we enjoy all the blessings flowing from his fulfilment of all righteousness. This baptism, which no scenic representation could portray, no man was ever commanded to administer, no man could administer, no man, under the guidance of the Spirit, ever professed to administer. The frequency, the flippancy, and the blasphemous arrogance, with which Baptist ministers report that they have *buried with Christ* such and so many, make the flesh creep. When baptism into a *person* is spoken of, our attention is directed to a work of God. The Israelites were baptized *into Moses*. God administered the Baptism. *By one Spirit* we are all baptized *into one body*. So here and in Galatians. How different the language when Baptism with water, administered by man, is spoken of. Then we see nothing but the assumption of a name,—a professed acceptance of the Lord Jesus and subjection to him. The Apostles are commanded to baptize the nations “ *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*” (Mat. 28: 19.) Of the believing Samaritans it is said, “ *They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus.*” (Acts 8: 16.) Of the disciples of John, whom Paul met at Ephesus, we read, “ *They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus.*” (Acts 19: 5.) Paul asks the Corinthians, “ *Were ye baptized into the name of Paul?*”



and expresses his thankfulness that he had baptized so few, lest any should say he had baptized *into his own name*. The Divine word never represents an Apostle or Evangelist or any other as baptizing *into Christ*.

Observe (5) the change of state which originates in our union to Christ, by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. He who was dead *in sin* is dead *to sin*. He who was *of the world* is now separated from it, as the dead are buried out of our sight. He who walked *according to the course of this world* now walks *in newness of life*. How is all this to be theatrically represented, according to the Baptist theory,—so lucidly and fully represented, that all who are not stone-blind must see it? *By plunging a person into the water and pulling him out again!* To look at this imaginary picture more particularly. The baptized into Christ are baptized (according to the Baptist vocabulary, *immersed, buried,*) into his death. Then the burial goes before and death is the effect. To make the picture perfect, the *immersed* must be buried in the watery grave till they are *dead*. But the Apostle teaches that the baptized are buried *because* they are dead. They have been already *immersed* into death; there must be another plunge to represent the burial. To picture the burial of the dead and their resurrection, we have *a living body* put under the water and the *same living body* taken out of the water, not at all improved in appearance. Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, and the *buried with Christ* rise by the faith of the divine operation; but in the Baptist ceremonial, we must see, *if we can*, the glory of God and the faith in the strong arm of the *Immerser*.

What our friends call baptism is an impious caricature of the work of the Spirit set before us in Rom. 6. 3, 4.

But is there here no allusion to baptism with water? Yes! The language is borrowed from that ordinance. The Apostle's proposition is that real Christians have been baptized *into Christ*. What follows respecting death, burial, and resurrection, is all inferential. By baptism, by the institution of Christ, we are introduced to the church and the fellowship of its privileges, and therefore we are said to be *baptized into Christ* when the spiritual blessing of which baptism with water is the sign, is introduced. Sometimes, not here, the Spirit's work is spoken of in terms borrowed from the *mole* in which the water is applied, and accordingly we read of the Spirit being *shed forth, poured out, or falling on*. We look in vain for *immersion* in scripture, as descriptive of the baptism with water or with the Spirit. Is it "cool arrogance" in Cardinal Manning to *assume* Papal infallibility, as the basis of his reasoning in favor of Rome; and is it not "cool arrogance" in the Baptist to *assume*, the very thing to be proved, that baptism is *immersion* and nothing else is baptism? The Ed. M. was not prepared for the "cool arrogance" of the *Cardinal*, but I was fully prepared for *his* and *his fellows!* Hear, as reported in a paper which lately came to my hands, the words of Dr. Bright, at a convention in Saratoga:—"There can be nothing permanently salutary in the existence of any other denomination than the Baptist. I utterly deny that it is good for the world that there should be any other Church than the Baptist in existence." There's thunder for you.

W. SOMMERVILLE.

[“MESSENGER,” Jan. 26, 1876.]

The Rev. Mr. Sommerville has withdrawn from the *Presbyterian Witness*. The editor of that paper expressed himself dissatisfied with the prospect. This severe reflection induced Mr. S. to move into the columns of the *Wesleyan*. As ever, his contributions are liberal in the extent of space they cover.

We trust our venerable friend will not conclude, from our long silence, that we are neglecting him. We like for him to set up nearly all his nine-pins before we roll the ball of truth at them; for truth well directed will take down half a dozen just as easily as it will take down one. Alas for Mr. S., the Bible is against him in this matter. Nearly all Pedobaptists of reputation are more or less on our side. All that it is really necessary for us to do is to take a good Pedobaptist extinguisher and put it over Mr. Sommerville's candle and out it goes. We do not always avail ourselves of this easy method of meeting our Pedobaptist friends; but we lead him to the plain Word of God, trusting that God will enlighten his eyes, so that he may be enabled to abandon Infant Baptism—the worthy offspring of the Man o' Sin, brought forth in the dark ages to curse the churches; and, *mirabile dictu*, to be fondled in the bosoms of those who have an open Bible. Truth is eternal. Truth is omnipotent. Before it, Infant Baptism shows signs of increasing weakness. The beginning of the end can be discerned! May the time soon come when this delusion shall cease to blind immortal souls; when it shall no more lead those whom it has blindfolded into the ways of darkness; when it will be no longer available to the adversary for peopling the world of darkness.

[“PRESBYTERIAN WITNESS.”]

The *Messenger* says:—“The Rev. Mr. Sommerville has withdrawn from the *Presbyterian Witness*. The editor of that paper expressed himself dissatisfied with the prospect. The severe reflection induced Mr. S. to move into the columns of the *Wesleyan*. As ever, his contributions are liberal in the extent of space they cover.”

It is due to the Rev. Mr. Sommerville and to the *Messenger* that we should explain. We have a strong repugnance to long controversies, and we expressed a hope that the Baptist controversy in our columns would end with the year. We did not intend to interfere with the series of very able articles in course of publication by Mr. Sommerville, and we hope our readers may yet often have the pleasure and profit of reading the productions of the veteran Reformed Presbyterian minister, Rev. William Sommerville.

[“WESLEYAN,” Jan. 29, 1876.]

#### LETTER FROM REV. E. M. SAUNDERS.

MR. EDITOR,—About twenty years ago, over the signature “Roger Williams,” a series of articles appeared in the “*Examiner*,”—a New York paper—which were afterwards presented to the public in book-form, entitled—“*Notes on the Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches, by Francis Wayland.*”

Some newspaper-writers charged Dr. Wayland with denying the “inspiration” of the Old Testament. Particular statements in these articles were pointed out as affording the ground of this charge. This was the Dr.'s answer: “*To such an imputation he does not think himself called on to reply.*” The absurd charge dropped into its unhonoured grave, and has remained there, so far as I know, for about a score of years. And perhaps it might have rested undisturbed forever, had it not experienced a resurrection at the hands of the Rev. Mr. Sommerville.

As is usual, this frivolous charge has come forth in a new form; and is now not brought against a single individual alone, as at first, but against the whole Baptist denomination.

Mr. Sommerville, although a man somewhat advanced in life, will, most probably, outlive this charge he has brought against the Baptist body. When

first made against Dr. Wayland, it was dead, under the contempt of his dignified silence, almost as soon as the ink was dry that was used to make it.

The charge, as re-shaped in the hands of Mr. Sommerville, and sent out on the pages of two religious newspapers against the Baptists, is not that they deny the *inspiration* of the Old Testament, but that they deny it to be a *rule* of faith and practice.

It is not probable that any Baptist will regard it necessary to refute this charge for the intelligent public who have had, as well as Mr. Sommerville, the opportunity of knowing the truth in this matter.

I see, Mr. Editor, that Mr. Sommerville has occupied not a little of your space in giving your readers his views of Col. 2. 10, 12, and Rom. 6. 3, 4.

In Lange's Com. on Rom. page 202, in a note, Dr. Schaff states, referring to Rom. 6. 3, 4, "All commentators of note (except Stewart and Hodge) expressly admit or take it for granted that in this verse, (ver. 4) especially in *buried with* and *raised up*, the ancient prevailing mode of baptism by immersion and emersion is implied, as giving additional force to the idea of the going down of the old man and the rising of the new man."

As suggested by your correspondent, it may be better to set aside the opinions of Mr. Sommerville and all other commentators, and let the Divine Word interpret itself.

Truly yours,

Halifax, 62      en St.

E. M. SAUNDERS.

[*"MESSENGER,"* Feb. 2, 1876.]

MR. EDITOR,—Allow me to give expression, through the *Messenger*, to the surprise and grief with which I have read an article in the last *Wesleyan*, written as an attack on the Baptists, by a man whom a memory of the regard I once cherished for him forbids me to name. The spirit of it is such as never could have been expected by me from the writer. As far as I can understand his belief, he holds that in the Apostolic times Baptism never was performed by immersion. Now, if this is his view, why should he single out the Baptists and direct the violence of his arguments against them alone, while he must know that if they are in error in this matter, they hold the errors in common with nineteen-twentieths of the christian world! Is it because he loves us so much more than all the other benighted victims of superstition that he is so vehement in his exhibition of what he conceives to be our absurdities?

This prophet who comes to reclaim the Baptists, attempts to interpret the first verses of the sixth of Romans in harmony with his peculiar view, and to show that in the passage there is no reference to any mode of baptism. In this he is opposing the interpretation of many of the ablest men of his own denomination, and the general opinion expressed by writers of other denominations. We may take patiently all the buffetings of this eager controversialist who, in striking at us, first hits the leaders of his own church. But it is sad to think of this man, who has been a power for good in his day, passing into a gloomy old age, compelled, as he observes the growth of the Baptist denomination in his section of the province, to feel that a *cloud* of "baleful superstition" is gathering and settling over the people—sad indeed. Nevertheless, wisdom is justified of her children.

The want of candor on the part of the editor of the *Wesleyan* in admitting the article is about as conspicuous as the disingenuousness of the writer; for he must know that the doctrine of his correspondent, presented in his paper as if to brand with absurdity and indecency the belief of the Baptists, is opposed to the accepted teaching and common practice of his own church. Wesley distinctly says that the form of expression used in the first part of the sixth of Romans has reference to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion. Our brother of the *Wesleyan* has been writing some severe and unreasonable things about the Baptists; and, now, as if he felt the need of some assistance, when this ally comes in from a different denomination ready to fight a good fight, he leads him out into the crowd to strike right



and left, and in his desire to see the fray go on, does not mind being knocked down by his own champion, if only some Baptist can get a good rap.

And so the millenium of love and peace is coming,—is almost here? Well,  
N.

[“WESLEYAN,” Feb. 5, 1876.]

We do not usually notice anonymous writers, whatever may be their spirit: but one in this week's *Messenger* must have a moment's attention. Alluding to Mr. Sommerville's letter he says:—

“Our brother of the *WESLEYAN* has been writing some severe and unreasonable things about the Baptists; and now, as if he felt the need of some assistance, when this ally comes in from a different denomination ready to fight a good fight, he leads him out into the crowd to strike right and left, and in his desire to see the fray go on, does not mind being knocked down by his own champion, if only some Baptist can get a good rap.”

This is neither elegant nor truthful. The fact is—and we hesitate even now to avow it, and do so only because compelled in self-defence—we had reason for suspecting that Mr. Sommerville was right in respect to at least a portion of our Baptist friends. That they—as a Body—reject the Old Testament as a rule of faith and practice, we cannot believe: and yet a representative Baptist minister, in a celebrated discussion within a few years past, to our knowledge, *refused absolutely* to receive passages from *the Old Testament* bearing upon Baptism, as quoted by his opponent. And if there be a limit thus to the authority of the Bible in one thing, who knows where the line is drawn by our Brethren? We have not yet seen a direct denial of the charge.

[“MESSENGER,” Feb. 9, 1876.]

#### BAPTISTS INSULTED.

MR. EDITOR,—I was told the other day that there was a paper on baptism in the *Provincial Wesleyan*, signed “W. Sommerville,” in which baptism by immersion, as administered in the Baptist denomination, is termed an “obscene ceremony.” I was not disposed to believe it. I said, “No gentleman would use such an expression—and Mr. Sommerville has the reputation of being a gentleman; besides, a Christian minister is bound to be courteous and charitable, and he would not employ words which would convey offensive ideas to brethren of another denomination.” I felt disposed, therefore, to conclude that some one who knew Mr. Sommerville to be a monomaniac on this subject, had got hold of the paper and inserted the passage in which the above-cited words are found, feeling assured that the forgery would pass muster, because the style closely resembles that of other articles, bearing Mr. Sommerville's signature.

If my suspicion be well founded, Mr. Sommerville will disavow the paragraph. Should he not do so, let him not be surprised if Baptists henceforth treat him as the author of an insult to their denomination.

But what shall we say of the Editor of the *Wesleyan*? I understand that he is a minister of the Wesleyan denomination. He has permitted the insertion of a paper in the organ of that denomination in which baptism as practised by the Baptists—commanded in the Church of England—and observed in the Greek, the Armenian, and other churches, is stigmatised as an “obscene ceremony.” Should this pass unrebuked, or should there be no apology for it? Can the Wesleyans expect the Baptists to unite with them in prayer-meetings and other exercises? No, Sir! It cannot be! But be it remembered, we were not the aggressors!

Feb. 3, 1876.

A COUNTRY BAPTIST.

[“WESLEYAN,” Feb. 12, 1876.]

## THE VOICE OF SCRIPTURE.

MR. EDITOR,—The situation becomes alarming, and dark clouds are gathering on the horizon, which will burst in thunder some of these days. Journeying on Monday, preaching on Tuesday, and having to-day read more carefully the *Messenger's* editorial of Dec. 8th, I had sat down to reply; when lo! the *Messenger* of 26th Jan. comes in, uttering in loud tones a warning of danger ahead, foreboding not only utter ruin to me, but extermination to all the Pedobaptists in the universe.

He talks mysteriously of my setting up some *nine-pins*, and of his rolling the *ball of truth* to take down half a dozen of them, (why not the whole nine) at once. I have not nine pins in the world. There are some clothes-pins in the house; but what the ball of truth has to do with them I cannot tell. I suppose he alludes to some game or other which idleness plays to kill time. He is more intelligible when, “in great swelling words of vanity,” such as all readers of the controversial literature of Baptists must be familiar with, he threatens to put over my candle a good Pedobaptist extinguisher, “and out it goes.” He says, “Nearly all Pedobaptists of reputation are more or less on our side,” but I do not pretend to know what *all Pedobaptists of reputation* have said, and that *he* knows, I do not believe. A told B, B told C, and — Y told Z, and from Z he may have learned a great deal. He trades largely in gossip, as he *has been informed* of what I have “been ringing out, in private and in public, from the chimney corner and from the pulpit,” for more than twenty years!! But the concluding sentence of this editorial note should be in the hands of every Pedobaptist of Nova Scotia. It is in the form of a prayer. “May the time soon come when the delusion (infant baptism) shall cease to blind immortal souls; when it shall no more lead those whom it has blindfolded into the ways of darkness; when it will be no longer available to the adversary for peopling the world of darkness.” This is plain speaking. All Pedobaptists are led blindfolded into the ways of *darkness*. Pedobaptist ministers are instruments of the Devil in peopling the regions of eternal woe. Hitherto I have not suffered myself to be bantered or brow-beaten into mixing up *infant baptism* with the discussion of the *mode* of baptism. I have not written one sentence in defence of *infant baptism*. And if the *Presbyterian Witness*, the Pedobaptist Rev'ds and D. D.'s of Nova Scotia sit silent under this grave imputation on their *principles* and *standing* and *labors*, if they prefer their *ease*, and popularity, and character for liberality, to the vindication of the truth of the Gospel, the *Messenger* cannot be much blamed for insinuating or saying they do not believe what they profess and preach and practice. There is the infidelity that is bound up in the Baptist system creeping into the Pedobaptist churches. But I turn to the *Messenger* of Dec. 8th.

I will not contend with the editor on the subject of *courtesy*. If to ask pardon of a man of whom you have spoken disrespectfully be *uncourteous*, unless you take off your hat to every dog who barks at you as you pass along the road, then I hope to be ever found *uncourteous*. According to his own rule, the *Messenger* is a most *courteous* gentleman. He has ascribed words to me,

placing them between inverted commas, which I never used. Does he ask pardon? No. When he represents me as professing to determine the time, the manner and the person by whom *immersion* was introduced he gives an *untruthful representation* of both my words and my ideas. Does he ask pardon? No. That would be *uncourteous*. He gave the substance. And when he gives my words, they are so separated from the connection that my views are not fairly exhibited. At the cost of repetition, I shall state what I did say. Urging the exclusive authority of the divine testimony, as against the antiquity of *immersion*, and the general practice of the ancient church, I stated that, if it could be shown beyond the possibility of contradiction, that baptismal *immersion* was practised *in the days of the Apostles and before their eyes*, we are no nearer to the determination of the *mode of baptism*, unless it is proved that the Apostles themselves preached or practiced *immersion*. That there were in the days of Paul "False Apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ," *we know*. That there were in John's days an ambitious spirit who refused to recognize him, and forbade such as would, *we know*. I have no stronger conviction that none but a minister of satan was capable of changing the simple, expressive, universally applicable, and divinely instituted ordinance of *purification by sprinkling*, into *personal immersion*, for which there is no evidence in all the Bible. The phraseology of my former letter proceeded upon this knowledge and this conviction.

The *Messenger* is sorely troubled by my appeal to the *fact* that *immersion* in water is uniformly introduced in the Word, as an emblem or means of destruction; and he labors hard, recurring to it again and again, to find cases to neutralize the appeal. I took no notice of Asher dipping his foot in oil, (an example of *personal immersion*!) as I never supposed he was silly enough to recur to it. But he has again brought it up. Asher is *immersed* in oil for his *foot* has been dipped in it. Will the *Messenger* accept a person as really baptized, when he has dipped one foot in the water? If he roll his ball against this pin, I'll stop it.

The *Messenger* does not deny that "birds were dipped," but he is careful to suppress the fact that this dipping was not for its own sake,—the birds were not the *baptized*, the *blessed*,—but that the fluid into which they were dipped may be *sprinkled* for the *purification* of the unclean person. He was *baptized*.

He does not deny that "priests were dipped." What is the evidence? He says it. That is all. We know they were *washed*.

We turn to the case of Naaman, the only other case he adduces to prove that immersion is *not always* expressive of ruin beyond remedy; and here we discover a reckless trifling,—a deceitful dealing—with the divine word, which it is painful to contemplate. We are tempted to ask, Is he a Christian at all? does he fear God? does he tremble at His word? I had advised him that, in the narrative of the transaction, the word *himself* is supplied by the translators. Naaman is not commanded to wash *himself*; is not entreated by his servants to wash *himself*; is not represented as dipping *himself*. We have simple *wash, wash, and dip*. Yet has the *Messenger* twice emphasized *himself*. He seems to have had some glimmering that this word *himself* had a bearing on the making good his case; omit it, and the *command* and the *act* extend no farther than the diseased part. We have similar language in Jno. 9, 7.



Our Lord says to the blind man whose eyes he had smeared with clay, Go to the pool of Siloam and *wash*, and he went and *washed*. Will the *Messenger* say he *immersed* himself? or that he *washed* his eyes only? He will not say he *immersed*, but he might ask, "How does Mr. S. know he did not immerse himself? In such terms he asks, "How does Mr. S. know that the disease (of Naaman) was local?" By the clearest evidence Naaman was disappointed because the prophet did not "come out,--call on the name of the Lord his God, and *strike his hand over the place*, and recover the leper." There is another evidence. If the disease *had not been local* he is clean.

We have a few words more respecting Naaman's cure. The *Messenger* must have a fling at the translators of our English version of the Scriptures. "King James' scholarly servants dress the command, as given in the word 'wash.'" Here there is an insinuation against both their *scholarship* and their *integrity*. Here is a denial that the original word signifies to *wash*; and he has the ignorance or the impudence broadly to insinuate that if the translators had been honest men, the prophet would have been made to say, "Go and *dip* in Jordan seven times." His rule for fixing the significance of a word few scholars will adopt--to make the signification of a general term depend on a particular application of it. A man is *murdered*. He was *stabbed* through the heart. To murder signifies to *stab* fatally. Or, he is *poisoned*. To murder signifies to *poison*. Or, he is *strangled*. To murder signifies to *strangle*. Such is the process by which the *scholarly* servant of the Baptists proves that he was right in saying that Naaman was commanded to *dip himself* seven times in Jordan, and discovers his gross ignorance of Hebrew and the laws of languages, or--that he is determined to uphold the *doctrine of immersion* at the sacrifice of Scripture, literature, character, and common sense. I challenge any person who has any claims to be called a Hebrew scholar in Nova Scotia or elsewhere, to state over his own name that the *original word* used by the prophet does not properly and invariably signify to *wash*. I challenge such person to say that the *original word* implies any one mode by which the purification may be effected. *Washing* may be performed by *dipping*, *scouring*, *rinsing* or *sprinkling*, but *wash* does not signify either *dip*, *scour*, *rinse*, or *sprinkle*; and when the process is not prescribed, the person commanded to wash is at liberty to use what means he pleases adapted to the end, and is still acting according to the saying of him who laid his command upon him. I have just as good a right, upon the *Messenger's* rule of exposition, to say *wash* signifies to *sprinkle* as he has to say it signifies to *dip*; and the word of inspiration does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that Naaman did anything more than *dip the part affected*, or even lift the water with his hand and apply it to the part.

We may now look at that half loaf over which the *Messenger* chuckles. He is very ungrateful. I gave him a whole loaf, in stating that so far as the word is concerned, baptism will cover the whole person as completely as if he was plunged fifty fathoms deep. *In every case* baptism contemplates the purification of the whole person. The baptism of the leper, of any other unclean person, is the purification of the whole man. The prescribed mode is *sprinkling*. This is the symbol of *entire* cleansing. The editor asks me two questions which he considers both *pertinent* and *important*, but which I con-

sider an indication of great confusion of ideas. "Would the priest have obeyed God had he covered the leprous person with the fluid instead of sprinkling him?" *Certainly not*; for he had been otherwise instructed; but the leprous person was wholly cleansed, or he would have been *sprinkled* without being baptized. "Does Mr. S. obey God, when instead of covering the subject of baptism, he only applies to it a few drops of the fluid?" *Certainly I do*. My object is the *washing*—the *baptism* of the whole person, and God has ordained *sprinkling* as an adequate symbol of all this.

The *Messenger* challenges me "to bring from God's Word a command—by which to link the baptism of John and Christ with any thing that went before." THERE IS NONE; so he is right, it is *impossible* to bring it. My authority for linking the baptisms of the former age with baptism *now* is the *total absence of any such command*. When something *new*, as the Lord's Supper, is to be introduced, we have minute instructions; but where shall we find a command or other authority, such as we have in that case, for introducing *immersion*? *Baptism* was administered in the olden time; John *baptized*: the disciples *baptized* during our Lord's personal ministry; and the Lord after his resurrection, sent the apostles to *baptize*. Nobody is taken by surprise by a *novelty*. They have no information to ask and none is given. If baptism is *unto repentance*, we are told. If it is for the *remission of sin*, we are told. If it is with *pure water* as distinguished from blood and water, salt water, or water mingled with ashes, we are told. If *into the name of Christ*, we are told. But where is a hint given of a change in the ordinance of which *sprinkling* is the symbolic rite? No where. *Absolutely no where*. "We, affirm," says the *Messenger*, "that Christian baptism, the baptism of Christ's church of this dispensation, had no existence in the old dispensation." This is bold; but all resting on a false assumption. It is most true that *what he calls* "Christian baptism, the baptism of Christ's church of this dispensation," the Old Testament is perfectly innocent of. So also is the New Testament. *It is not from above*.

By their rite, Baptists cast in their lot with the old world who were *immersed* and perished, while Noah and his house were *baptized* and saved, with the Egyptians who were *immersed* in the Red Sea and died, while the Israelites were *baptized*, and saved. Whenever, wherever, by whomsoever introduced, the doctrine of *baptismal immersion* had its origin, as it has its perpetuation, in a rabid fanaticism, which is well described in the words of Robert Hall, speaking of a kindred evil—I quote from memory—"A thick-skinned monster of the ooze and the mire, which no argument can convince and no discipline can tame."

Mr. Editor, I shall trouble you with another paper, not, however, to *close* the argument.

W. SOMMERVILLE.

[*"WESLEYAN,"* February 26, 1876.]

A correspondent in this week's *Messenger* calls attention to a severe expression employed by Mr. Sommerville in one of his letters, regarding the custom of immersion, and asks whether Baptists can now unite in public meetings with Churches which hold their modes up to ridicule. It is very easy at any time to raise a cry of persecution. We could have done this long ago had we been disposed to treat with anything but pitiful silence the

allusions which have often been made by our neighbours to "baby sprinkling," etc. There is nothing gained by harsh words at any time; but if they are to be noticed at all, perhaps it would be as well to take the account to the Mercy-Seat, and, in the settlement between the Methodist and Baptist communions, if the balance which is found to the credit of the former be freely forgiven, the latter may meet them in public worship with abounding gratitude. We advise an entire Methodist forgiveness.

[*"MESSENGER,"* Feb. 16, 1876.]

### THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY.

MR. EDITOR,—I find the Editor of the *Wesleyan* refuses to insert my reply to Mr. Sommerville's last letter, which of course he has perfect right to do if he so please. His reason is that the matter lies between Mr. S. and Mr. Saunders, which is not the case; so far as I have observed all that Mr. Saunders took part in was the question whether the Baptists hold the Old Testament as a rule of faith and practice. In a former letter Mr. Sommerville spoke of me as his opponent. Mr. Saunders has shown more sense than I have by a good way in not replying to Mr. Sommerville, for I have already perceived that that would have been my wisest course. I presume it is the silence of Mr. Saunders and others who Mr. S. sought to drag into the controversy that has raised the ire of the latter gentleman to such a white heat. However as I followed him thus far I will try to follow him out, if Mr. Editor, I may obtain your permission to put my replies in the *Messenger*. The following is, in substance, the letter which Mr. Nicolson declined to publish.

Milton, Queen's, N. S., Feb. 7, 1876.

J. BROWN.

*To the Editor of the Wesleyan,—*

I thought by the slowness of Mr. Sommerville's long threatened attack on the "Baptist stronghold," that he was either unwell, or that in his survey of the said stronghold he had discovered it to be impregnable, and so altered his mind. I see however that it is neither one nor the other. I for one am obliged to you for giving room to his communications, and hope you will have the goodness to give him all the space he requires.

You ask, Mr. Editor, for some Baptist to speak *ex cathedra* in reply to Mr. S.'s question—Whether Baptists hold the Old Testament as of equal authority with the New. First, we have no *cathedra* (that institution is found at Rome) consequently we have no one to speak *ex cathedra*. We have no man who considers himself a mouthpiece for the Baptists, nor do we consider any one as representing the belief of the denomination. The question proposed is entirely new to me; and you, sir, virtually answer it for us by saying that you are "inclined to think that the Baptists generally would revolt at the charge of throwing the Old Testament overboard." Surely, sir, you do not mean to ask us the question after that. However, speaking personally, and you cannot get anything but a *personal testimony*, I refer you to 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17, for my answer. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable," etc. Or in words of Dr. Cramp (nomen memorabile et præclarum) in his Catechism on Christian Baptism, the very last sentence, "The Bible, the Bible only, the religion of Baptists." *Had we a cathedra*, no one would be more fit to speak therefrom than the worthy Doctor.

Mr. Sommerville says, "As a rule of faith and practice it is wholly repudiated," and then asks the *Messenger* to say whether it is so or not. Now isn't that cool? He, like yourself, Mr. Editor, has answered the question already, though differently.



May I here be allowed to ask whether Pedobaptists acknowledge the *New Testament* as a rule of faith and practice!!! Following the previous examples I will answer my own question:—In profession they *do*, in practice they *do not*. And here is another question which I leave themselves to answer to Him who first and still puts it. “Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?” (Luke vi. 46).

Mr. S. informs us that both Baptists and Pedobaptists are profoundly ignorant of “the mass of error and infidelity involved in the Baptist system.” Well, I can only hope and expect that he will set about enlightening both as soon as possible. I try to believe Mr. S. is sincere in what he says and believes, but I find it hard to credit that he really understands certain passages of Scripture as he interprets them. I have already shown both in the *Messenger* and the *Witness* several cases of sad perversion of the Word of God. It was done in ignorance no doubt, but that is no excuse, and Mr. S.’s silence is an admission of the fact. If I misinterpret any scripture and the same be pointed out I will at the earliest moment acknowledge it, and thankfully. I hope Mr. S. will henceforth try to shew what the scriptures he refers to *do* mean, or let it quite alone.

1. His explanation of Buried with Him in Baptism, &c., is entirely his own, and I am sure will be endorsed by no one. We are asked not to overlook the last clause of verse 12, (Cor. ii. 12). He says: “The resurrection is not by the physical power of the administrator, nor of the person immersed, but by simple *faith* ;” and then draws a picture which does very little credit to his power of painting. The Bible does not teach common sense, but takes for granted that men have that necessary commodity, and use it; if Mr. S. has it, he has certainly not used it here. Immersion or dipping all the world over means putting into, *and taking out of*.

2. The explanation of Rom. vi. 3, 4, is as false as the other. He says the apostle “does not speak of every member of the church.” Yes, Mr. S., he does. We can see with half an eye what you aim at but you miss the mark. Paul, I presume, understood as a matter of course that all who believed were baptized. If Mr. S. means that there were some unbaptized in the church to which Paul wrote, I want him to see that it was those who had been baptized into Christ, had *put on Christ*, the allusion being to the changing of garments. I take Paul’s *meaning* thus:—“We have believed in Christ and therefore died to sin, and have been baptized as a representation of the same, how shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into the likeness of his death, (v. 5.) Let us not live as those who have not believed and been baptized into Jesus Christ.” The Bible is clear enough on the subject of baptism to those who *really wish to know* either the *mode* or *meaning* of it.

3. In referring to Gal. iii. 27, Mr. S. remarks:—“There is no reference here to the *mode* of baptism.” This is true, nor in any other place does Paul refer to the *mode*, by way of distinction, but to baptism itself; he knew but one mode, neither is there now, nor will there ever be any other recognized by the Bible. It is well for Mr. Sommerville that Paul is living in Heaven and not in Somerset.

4. Mr. S. proceeds:—“The frequency, the flippancy, and the blasphemous arrogance with which Baptist ministers report that they have *buried with Christ* such and so many, make the flesh creep.”

Does the *frequency* of such reports trouble Mr. S.? Is he really sorry that so many are obedient to Christ’s commands? Fiercer opponents of the truth than he have been so reported of ere now, and I am not without hope that some day somebody else’s flesh will creep in reading of his baptism. When Paul was going to “bombard the stronghold” of the christians at Damascus the

Lord met him; who knows but Mr. S. may be near seeing a "light from Heaven" on the subject of baptism.

"Blasphemous arrogance" reminds one of a similar charge brought against our Lord. "This man blasphemeth," Matt. ix. 3. "He hath spoken blasphemy," Matt xxvi. 65. And the master has said: "The disciple is not above his Master, nor the servant above his Lord, if they have persecuted me they will also persecute you." It is not the first time that some of the professed friends of Christ have wounded Him in His own house, and fulfilled some sad prophecies. "But the Scripture must be fulfilled."

Just here allow me to say a word to the ministerial readers of the *Messenger*. Dear brethren, if you have any regard for Mr. Sommerville do not send any more reports of baptisms, why make the good man's flesh creep! And you, Mr. Ed. M. if they will send, then please don't print them, lest Mr. S. should see it, or if you must, then just leave a blank on Mr. S.'s copy of the *Messenger*, or if you will print them on every copy, then the only other remedy or rather preventive for that peculiar sensation is for Mr. Sommerville not to read them.

6. Mr. S. calls baptism an "obscene ceremony." The appearance of the ceremony will very much depend on state of the mind of the him who witnesses it. In six places in the Bible we read of "an evil eye," and "To the pure all things are pure." And we read, not in the Bible, "Honi soit qui mal y pense."

6. Mr. S. speaks of a person "being taken out of the water not at all improved in appearance." This may be so, but they have "the answer of a good conscience toward God." Mr. Sommerville "looked at the outward appearance but the Lord looketh on the heart." Were the priests of old improved in appearance when preparing the sacrifices!

7. We are next informed that:—"What our friends ('Friend, I thank thee for that word') call baptism is an impious caricature of the work of the Spirit set before us in Romans vi. 3, 4." When will Mr. S.'s immense fund of hard and bitter words be exhausted! However, when he gets more light, and becomes a Baptist, he will think and speak very differently of baptism, and possibly call it a Divinely appointed, and therefore fitting, representation of that work.

I hope Mr. S. in his bombarding will send some solid shot into our camp instead of mere smoke and sound, and, by the way, I wish he would hurry up with those few passages on Infant Baptism which I have asked for so often. Or, perhaps, as he has his hands full, some good brother will render him a little help in that direction. I commend to Mr. S. and all others unbaptized the first article in the *Messenger* of Jan. 26th.

Yours, very truly,

J. BROWN.

[*"MESSENGER,"* March 1, 1876.]

MR. EDITOR:—I sincerely hope that nothing that Mr. Sommerville has said, or may say, will cause any disunion between brethren of the Baptist and other denominations. Surely no one supposes that one in ten thousand endorses what Mr. Sommerville describes as the "obscene ceremony of immersion." And although the offensive term appears in the *Wesleyan*, I do not suppose the Editor himself approves of it, however he may seek to excuse it, which appears to be on the principle of an "eye for an eye." By no means let difference of opinion make difference of feeling, however harshly some may express those opinions. If our heads differ, our hearts must not. The letter in the *Messenger* from "A Country Baptist," will show Mr. S. the tendency of his bitter words. If he will read Prov. vi. 16, 19, he will see what is said of him that soweth discord among brethren. He may thus read *twice over*, Matt. 18, 7.—"It must needs be that offences come, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh,"—and then his first letter on this contro-

versy. He must be aware that he himself has stirred up all this strife and bitterness. Grace be with him notwithstanding, and as he is advanced in life, it would perhaps be better to lay down the weapons of war and be preparing for home, than to be firing poisoned arrows right and left. As an old soldier of the cross, and one who it appears has done some good service, he should be esteemed very highly in love, and should therefore be dealt with all the more faithfully.

In his letter in the *Witness* of Feb. 12th, he quotes from the *Messenger*, "May the time soon come when the delusion (infant baptism) shall cease to blind immortal souls; when it shall no more lead those whom it has blindfolded into the ways of darkness." To this I add a solemn and hearty 'Amen.' But Mr. S. gives this a dexterous twist and says: "all Pedobaptists are led blindfolded into the ways of darkness," and then utters a loud cry for help to the *Witness*, the Pedobaptist Rev'ds and D. D's of Nova Scotia. Is it not a *delusion*? Does it not blind immortal souls? Does not the enemy of souls avail himself of its help to people the world of darkness?

Look abroad and see how widely the doctrine of "baptismal regeneration" is taught, believed, and trusted in. But Mr. S. must not make us say that all who practice infant baptism "are led blindfolded into the ways of darkness." When from the Bible we can be shown it is of God, and therefore *not a delusion*; when that quotation can be proved to be untrue, I at least, will cancel my endorsement of it and teach and practice Infant Baptism. But there is not a man living, let his pretensions to learning be what they may, that can point to a single passage between the two covers of the Bible that teaches infant baptism unless it be that in Matt. 15. 9, "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." But why does Mr. S. cry so loud to the *Presbyterian Witness*, the Pedobaptist Rev'ds and D. D's of Nova Scotia for help, when the arrow struck him, and almost threatens to bombard *them* if they don't? Has he not *by himself* undertaken to bring the "stronghold of the Baptists" to the ground? Go on, Bro. S., all the greener will be the laurels that will encircle your brow when you will have won the victory, and then when standing on the ruin of "the stronghold" that some think is founded on the Rock of Eternal Truth,

You may wave your banner high,  
And like bold Caesar cry:  
(Shouting triumphantly)  
"Veni, vidi, vici!"

Perhaps Bro. S. forgets that his brethren are so anxious that he should have all the honors of victory that they hold back, or perhaps they can see he is chasing a comet.

Nearly a column is occupied in discussing Naaman the leper, 2 Kings, 5, and as usual, *as usual*, he handles scripture very recklessly. He says:—"Naaman is not commanded to wash *himself*: is not represented as dipping *himself*," and further on, "the word of inspiration does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that Naaman did anything more than dip the part affected, or even lift the water with his hand and apply it to the part," and then issues a challenge:—"I challenge any person who has any claims to be called a Hebrew scholar in Nova Scotia or elsewhere to state over his own name that the *original word* used by the prophet does not *properly and invariably* signify to *wash*." I take Mr. S. to mean *wash* in the sense of applying water to any object. If mistaken I am open to correction. I will now try to shew:

1. That Naaman was commanded to wash *himself*.
2. That he is represented as *dipping himself* and not the part affected.

I take my arguments principally from the Septuagint and the Hebrew scholarship of the LXX, Mr. S. will hardly question.

1. That Naaman was commanded to wash *himself*. The original word is \**verchetaeth* (*wash thyself*) from the root *rechets*. "To wash, cleanse the

(\* Mr. Brown gives the word in Hebrew characters, but as we have no Hebrew type, we have been obliged to omit them. † Mr. B. also writes the Greek characters, which we are obliged to omit.—Ed. C. M.)



surface with water." When used as a noun feminine, an instance of which is found in Sol. Song 4. 2, it means, "a bath, bathing, or washing." The LXX have translated it by the word *lousai*, from *louo*, which means, "To wash, especially to *wash the body*." When used in a middle sense "to wash oneself, bathe." (See Liddell and Scott.) Our word *lave* is probably derived from this. The German is "waschen dich," *wash thyself*.

2. That he is represented as *dipping himself* and not simply the part affected.

2. Kings, 5. 14. "Then went he down and dipped himself seven times in the Jordan." The word translated *dipped* is *ebaptisato*, from *baptizo*, to dip. (L. and S.) The word is in the middle voice, and therefore means, he *dipped himself*. Of course if this be proved it disproves that he only dipped or washed the parts affected. Mr. S. says that we have similar language (wash) in John 9. 7. "Go wash in the pool of Siloam."

The language is similar in English but *not in Greek*. In John the word is *nipsai*, from *niso*, "To wash especially the hands and feet. *Niso* is properly used of *washing part* of the body (*lonimai* of *bathing*). (The italics are Liddell and Scott's, which see.) The latter, as shown, is the word used in 2 Kings, 5, 10, and the former (*nizo*) in John 9. 7. This distinction is observed in other places; Exodus 2. 5. "And the daughter of Pharaoh came down to wash at the river," *lousesthai*, to bathe. 2 Sam., 11. 8. David said, "Go down and wash thy feet;" *nipsai*, to wash a *part* of the body. Many other cases could be produced if required.

So much for Mr. S.'s challenge, and I hope he will be a little more cautious henceforth in his dealing with Scripture and not manifest (to quote himself) such "reckless trilling and deceitful dealing with the divine word as is painful to contemplate," and show a little more brain and a little less boast, more sense and less sound. We are again told that "The Lord after His resurrection sent the apostles to *baptize*." Mark says, Ch. 16. 15: "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world and *preach* the *gospel* to every creature," and Paul the apostle says, 1 Cor. 1. 17: "For Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel." Has Mr. S. no conscience that he can make such statements? Or has he no friends to counsel and advise, it should not be left to a stranger to warn him of the evil of perverting the truth.

He is determined that all Baptists shall go to the bad place, "with the old world who were *immersed*." By Mr. S.'s own teaching in a former letter they were not immersed, by the teaching of Gen. 7. 4, "it *rained* upon the earth forty days and forty nights." I answer Mr. S. according to his folly. We are further told that "Noah and his house were *baptized* and *saved*." The Bible teaches us they were *saved* and Mr. Sommerville they were *baptized*. I have been told that the large rocks in the neighborhood of Milton and Liverpool are the ballast that was used for Noah's ark and the one is as capable of proof as the other. When will he have done with his 'sly insinuations' and perverse torturing of the Bible? Has he no friends? Does no one care for him?

Never have I seen such a number and such glaring perversions of Scripture as have appeared in the course of letters from Mr. Sommerville, and he grows worse as he proceeds.

One more quotation: "Whoever (says Mr. S.) wherever, by whomsoever introduced, the doctrine of *baptismal immersion* (whatever that may mean), had its origin, as it has its perpetuation, in a rabid fanaticism." Of Christ who gave the command to *baptize*, (Mark 16, 16.) it was said (Jno. 10, 20.) "He hath a devil and is mad." Mr. Sommerville and the Jews are of the same mind.

We are promised another paper, but "not to close the argument." Well, it is some relief to hear that, but why not finish what he has begun, his work is not half done yet, and after having made such successful attacks on the Baptist stronghold and levelled so many fortresses, it does really seem a pity to stop now when victory seems so near. But unfortunately for him and his cause he has been at a great disadvantage, for the Baptist stronghold is *inside* the Stronghold of the Rock of Eternal Truth, and when he succeeds in overturning the latter he may then perhaps succeed with the former.

Yours,

J. BROWN.

["WESLEYAN," Mar. 5, 1876.]

## THE VOICE OF SCRIPTURE ON BAPTISM.

**MR. EDITOR:**—Many thanks premised for the promptitude and generosity with which you opened your columns for three, or at most four letters. (I asked and now ask no more); I thank the Editor of the *Messenger* also for the first article of Feb. 2, copied from the *Watchman*. It has the true ring; and I am much mistaken, if the author is not the talented, educated, and noble Baptist wife of a Baptist minister in Boston; one who would scorn to drive an opponent from the fields by sneers, lies and slander, or evade an argument by the "let alone, things-are-well-enough" allegation. Things are not well enough. *Our denominational* christianity is not of God. Different churches, occupying different localities, *are* but different churches holding their several peculiarities in doctrine and discipline, *are not* recognized in Scripture. For this we should strive, to this we must come, that we all speak the same thing, that there be no divisions among us; but that we be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment. Professors in Galatia had turned aside to another gospel, and are addressed simply as the *Church of Galatia*.

Mr. Saunders has taken up his pen again, but, strange to say, has not even attempted to set aside the evidence by which I urged the charge against Wayland and the Baptists of Nova Scotia—that they deny the Old Testament Scriptures to be a rule of Faith and Practice under this dispensation. This is not the old charge raised from the dead, and reshaped; but a perfectly distinct charge. Dr. W., after declining to notice the imputation of denying the *inspiration* of the Old Testament, goes on to state precisely what he does believe; and in terms as definite, as lucid as the English language can supply, has stated that *nothing but the New Testament is a rule* to Christians in this age. And *Mr. Saunders has accepted his doctrine*. How does he propose to meet the charge? The charge against Dr. W., it seems, fell dead "under the contempt of his dignified silence," and Mr. Saunders would copy the example of *dignified silence*, as he thinks. "It is not probable that any Baptist will regard it necessary to refute the charge." This is quite a convenient way of *evading* a precise statement on the subject. The charge is not, as he says it is, *frivolous*, and it is founded; and a declaration of Baptist views must be eluded if possible. He seems to think, old as I am, "He (I), will most probably outlive this charge he has brought against the Baptist body." If I do live, I fervently hope to outlive it. Let us have a public, explicit, and authoritative declaration that the Baptists of Nova Scotia do own and acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old, as well as of the New Testament, to be their rule of religious faith and practice; and, although my judgment of Dr. W.'s views in that matter shall remain unaltered, I assure Mr. Saunders and all whom it may concern, that I will have more pleasure in withdrawing the charge than I had in bringing it. The withdrawal shall be prompt, hearty, and joyful; but if such declaration is proudly and contemptuously withheld, I shall still consider the charge as just, not however, because the declaration is kept back, but on the evidence on which it is grounded. How I am to out-

live the charge, if the Baptists refuse to speak out, is a *secret*. I am persuaded they are afraid to place their views of their allegiance to the God of the Old Testament before their own people or us.

The *Messenger* deals more *wisely* with the subject than Mr. Saunders, and with more of Jesuitical cunning; and he raises a new question, silyly introduced. Many readers would suppose it the same. He calls my charge against the Baptists "audacious and heavy." But what is it? According to him it is "that Baptists do not accept the Old Testament as *divine authority*. Observe *divine authority*. This is not the charge at all. I never charged them with not accepting the Old Testament as divine authority. I treat of the *extent* to which that authority is binding. If the Old Testament is inspired, of course it speaks with authority. The historical and biographical records contained in it are *divinely* authenticated. With divine authority it settles the civil and ecclesiastical polity of Israel; the constitution of the Church of old, its laws, ordinances, officers and discipline. In one word, it was *with divine authority*, the rule of faith and practice to Israel; but is it, in connection with the New Testament, *the rule of faith and practice to the faithful under this dispensation?* This is what I say the Baptists do not acknowledge; upon this point we have nothing but shuffling and evasion.

Mr. Saunders is not satisfied with my exposition of Rom. 6, and Col. 2: He thinks "it may be better to set aside the opinions of Mr. S. and all other commentators, and let the divine word interpret itself." This is a good flourish with which to close. This is precisely the rule I have adopted. Has he applied his own rule? No. Against my exposition, he does not appeal to *God's* word, but to *Dr. Schaff's*. How does "N." meet my argument? By a reference to *nineteen-twentieths of the Christian world*,—"the ablest men of his own denomination, and the general opinion expressed by writ. rs of other denominations." Does the *Messenger* dip his pitcher in the waters of the sanctuary to put out my candle? No. He proposes to use a *Pedobaptist* extinguisher. The same song all round. Not the testimony of God, but uninspired record; not the judgment of God, but uninspired opinions. According to the same rule of judgment, when I stated that our Lord did not partake of his own supper, the *Messenger* (Dec. 8) does not found his reply on an Evangelist or an Apostle, but on "the opinion of no less a man than the distinguished and scholarly Abbot, Pedobaptist, of Harvard University." I guess he has found out that I am right and Abbot and himself are wrong; for now the "matter in no way affects our argument," and "we do not feel certain which of the two learned gentlemen is correct in the matter," very different is the language he holds when the subject is introduced. He asserts *twice* that our Lord partook of the supper, and by that action *made it his own*, as he is supposed to have made immersion his own by being *immersed*. The reader who wishes to know the facts will learn all that the most learned can teach him, by comparing Luke 22: 15-20, with 1 Cor. xi: 23-30. The greatest men often talk loosely; and without thinking, even the *Messenger*, who sometimes provokes his readers to think he knows less of the Bible than of learned, elevated, and honored Professors, Doctors, and Historians.

But there is still *hope* that even I may be convinced "in the light of the following fact." What is it? Some fact from *inspired history* which I had



overlooked, and in the light of which any "further attempt to darken counsel by vain reasonings" must end. Is it from Luke, or Paul, or—? Nothing of the kind. It is an Indian story with which the Rev. Mr. Boggs, associated with the Rev. Mr. McLaurin, is credited. There is not a thought in my heart which would lead me to question the veracity of either Mr. Boggs or Mr. McLaurin. But I cannot accept the report of what they have said from the *Messenger*. I have so much evidence of his capability in that line, that I can suppose the story very carefully manipulated to suit his purpose. The story is this: "A young man in India had by the Scriptures been brought to Christ, and wished to be baptized. "It had never entered his mind" that there was any other mode of baptism than *immersion*. "He saw in God's word that it was his duty to be baptized, and that *immersion was the mode*." I shall take for granted that the story is true; and that this report of it is accurate. I have frankly and promptly answered two questions put to me by the *Messenger*, and now I have two to ask him. Had that young man received no previous instruction from a Baptist minister, or member of a Baptist church or other person holding Baptist principles, which might have created a prepossession in favor of *immersion*; or was he dependent on the Scriptures *alone* for his knowledge of Christ and of Christianity? What version of the Scriptures did he use,—the Serampore or Bengalee version, in which, by rendering the word *baptize* by one equivalent to *immerse*, God is made a Baptist whether he will or no; or a version in which the word is *transferred*, and the reader is left, by comparing passages where the word occurs, to learn the application of the term?

Passing over many things evidently said for effect, there is only one matter on which I would animadvert. The *Messenger* has an insinuation to fling back. What is it? "That Baptists obtain their views of Baptism from the name of ordinance,"—*baptism*, as he explains it a few lines below, "in all its actual relations and uses." This I never said or insinuated. He seems utterly destitute of discrimination; or his prejudices have so blinded him that he cannot do justice to the plainest statement of an opponent; or he is a conscious sophist. My statement is limited to the *mode* of baptism. My words were before his eyes. He has quoted them in this immediate connection. They are, "It is too notorious to be denied that their main argument in support of *immersion* is derived from the meaning of the word baptize." This is true. Carson, p. 111. "He may call upon me to find a place sufficient to *immerse* a couch. But I will go on no such errand. If I have proved the meaning of the word, I will believe the Spirit of God, who tells me that the Pharisees baptize their beds," P. 272. "I care not where the water is to be found; if they were baptized they were immersed." P. 274. "The Jailor and his household were baptized, therefore they were immersed." Crawley, p. 126. "If this (the word *baptize*) be found to possess a single specific meaning, everyone of course perceives that this must set the question forever at rest." Will the *Messenger* refuse the doctrine of Carson and Crawley?

Though this is my last letter to the *Wesleyan*, let not the *Messenger* suppose the argument is closed. He has been itching to get at *baby-sprinkling*, and if not happily anticipated, I shall help him to a remedy.

I am sorry you have been exposed to reproach on my account. There is an

influence creeping abroad, not originating in any love to Baptists, or their principles, which from its character, is exercised "by the walls and in the doors of the houses," and which will, if possible, make Baptists the unconscious instruments of a revenge premeditated for years.

I would say to my Baptist friends,—and they are many, warmly attached to me, and to whom I am warmly attached,—“if you read only what the *Messenger* says in this controversy, you will never know what my views or sayings are.”

W. SOMMERVILLE.

P. S.—“A COUNTRY BAPTIST,” the sixth opponent with whom I have to do, has crawled behind the fence and raised a yell so fearful that folks are ready to start to their feet and ask, “Is any one being murdered? BAPTISTS INSULTED! Baby sprinkling is ridiculed. *Nobody insulted?* Infant baptism is *hateful*, a *delusion* leading to darkness. *Nobody insulted?* Pedobaptist ministers, as such are helping Satan to people hell. NOBODY INSULTED? The *P. Advocate* of Saint John (Feb. 12) is responsible for the following:—“By an overwhelming vote of the Baptist ministers of New York and Brooklyn, one must not only be immersed to be a Christian; he must also be a member of a regular Baptist church.” If this be true, then according to Baptist votes, there is not a *Christian* in all the Pedobaptist churches. But NOBODY IS INSULTED! When I represent baptismal *immersion* as a disgusting, indecent ceremony, the character of the right is transferred to the subject, and BAPTISTS ARE INSULTED. I am confident that there is not in Nova Scotia a Baptist lady of cultivated mind and refined sensibilities,—and there are hundreds such, pure in heart, pure in speech, pure in life,—who would have submitted to immersion, had it not been thundered into her ears, loud and long, that it is *necessary* if she would follow Christ fully. It is a *cross*, *felt* to be a cross,—*confessed* to be a cross. To my Baptist mothers and sisters, I would say with all affection: “This is not a cross which Christ has laid upon you. That Lord, who requires his female members not to appear in *Christian* assemblies *unveiled*, who enjoins *modesty* and *shamefacedness* as woman's ornament, does not stultify himself by requiring you, out of doors, in an undress, to put yourself in a stranger's hands to be plunged over head and ears, before a gaping crowd. Custom and fashion will reconcile us to anything. The person who would come into his friend's house and proceed to treat his wife or daughter with the freedom that, as I learn, is used in the waltz, would be turned out of doors.

W. S.

[“MESSENGER,” Mar. 15, 1876.]

### THE RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE.

MR. EDITOR:—I have read with no little interest the articles that have appeared in your columns and in those of the *Wesleyan*, respecting the question whether the Old Testament is held as a rule of faith and practice. And I have wondered that some one of your correspondents has not given a plain answer, and a decided answer in the negative, so far at least as the latter part of the proposition is concerned. Does not every one know that whatever be said in the heat of controversy, neither Baptists, nor Presbyterians, nor Methodists, nor Congregationalists, nor Episcopalians—to stop there—

consider the Old Testament a rule of "practice" for the Christian Church! And though all these denominations were to do so, the 15th chapter of Acts, and the epistle to the Galatians, to say nothing of Hebrews, would convict them of deadly heresy.

The books of Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus, are essential and fundamental portions of the Old Testament. Let us see a few of the practical injunctions these commanded: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" Read Leviticus chapters 1, 2, 3, and 4. Do the denominations referred to offer all those sacrifices! Read also Lev. 23. Are all these festivals enjoined upon all the Christian church? Do the Baptist keep them? Do the Presbyterians? Do the Methodists? Do the Episcopalians? Read from verse 10. "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying. Also in the tenth day of the second month there shall be a day of atonement: it shall be a holy convocation unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls, and offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord. And ye shall do no work in that same day, for it is a day of atonement, to make an atonement for you before the Lord your God. For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day he shall be cut off from among his people. And whatsoever soul it be that doeth any work in that same day, the same soul will I destroy from among his people. Ye shall do no manner of work: it shall be a statute forever throughout your generations in all your dwellings." See also chap. 16, for the sacrifices that were to be offered on that solemn day of atonement. Now would it not be idle to ask if the Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, &c., keep that feast, and at the exact time, and in the exact way in which the Old Testament Code of Laws enjoins it?

Again, take the rite of circumcision. No law, commandment, precept, rite or ceremony, is enjoined in the Old Testament, with more rigid severity than this rite. Here is the law on that subject: See Gen. 17, 9—14. Now read in Acts 15, what the decision of the Holy Ghost and the Apostles and elders of the Christian church, at Jerusalem, was, when this subject was then and there agitated and settled as also the whole question whether the Old Testament is to be a rule of practice, that is, whether the Gentiles should be circumcised and keep the Law of Moses. See also Acts 21, 25, "As teaching the Gentiles that believe, we have written and concluded that they **OBSERVE NO SUCH THING**" [as circumcision and the ceremonial law of Old Testament, see verses 21, 22, 23 and 24,] "**SAVE ONLY** that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood and from fornication."

Now another word from Galatians 5, 1—4. "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free, and be not entangled again with the **YOKE OF BONDAGE**. Behold I, Paul, say unto you **THAT IF YE BE CIRCUMCISED CHRIST SHALL PROFIT YOU NOTHING**. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law **YE ARE FALLEN FROM GRACE**."

Now I put the question in all candor to any man, or every man who claims that the Old Testament is "a rule of faith and practice" for the Christian Church, since the death of Christ in whom all the types and shadows had their fulfilment, and who is "the end of the law for righteousness to every one believeth," Rom. 9, 4—and I ask him *What can you mean by these terms?* and especially I would ask, *In what sense* can the Old Testament be considered a *rule of practice*? If the rite of circumcision has been set aside, and the sacrifices and festival days are no longer to be practised: and if even the law of the Sabbath is in a measure abolished, so that the **SEVENTH DAY** is no longer to be kept, nor the *death penalty* to be inflicted for its violation, as Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and I may say all others hold, and practice, and believe, and teach—I say again, since these things are so, *in what sense*—I am tempted to say, *with what face*, can any man of sense and know-



ledge of Scripture, and the practices and creeds of the aforesaid denominations, say that the Old Testament either is or should be held as a rule of "practice" for the christian church? Is there then no difference between the "ministration of death" and the "ministration of the Spirit"—that is between the law and the gospel? See 2 Corinthians iii. 7, 8. Was Paul wrong there? Are the Jewish and Christian dispensations identical? and so Paul wrong again in Heb. x. 1. Nay verily "Let God be true, but every man a liar."

Certainly there is no question as to the *inspiration* of the Old Testament. What is here denied may be summed up thus: 1. The Old Testament taken as a whole is not the Christian's Rule of *Practice*, for many of its precepts and doctrines have been abrogated by the same authority that enjoined them. 2. Neither Baptists, nor Presbyterians, nor Congregationalists, nor Methodists, nor Episcopalians, believe the Old Testament to be for them as professed Churches of Jesus Christ, a rule of practice in any sense that requires them to adhere to the letter of all the Jewish rites and ceremonies. And my question is this: Since you manifestly set all these aside, in *what sense* do you consider the Old Testament A Rule of Practice?

A CHRISTIAN.

[*"MESSENGER,"* March 22, 1876.]

FROM REV. JOHN BROWN.

*Mr. Editor,*—After waiting three weeks for Mr. Sommerville's last effort, it has at length appeared, and is like the wine in feasts in olden time, with this difference, that Mr. S.'s wine was *bad* and *sour* at the beginning, and his *worst* and *sourest* he has kept till the last. I expected a little work with this his final effort, and primed myself accordingly, but find that there is in fact no argument to reply to, inasmuch as there is not a single passage brought to refute Believers' Baptism or confirm Infant Sprinkling notwithstanding the caption, "The voice of Scripture on Baptism." He has taken my hint and is "letting Scripture alone." He talks of Mr. Saunders, Mr. Messenger, Dr. Wayland, Dr. Crawley, and some others, but we look in vain for Old or New Testament names. As "experience ought to teach," it is gratifying to find that Mr. S. is learning, inasmuch as he knows or might know, that the writers of the 'Book of the Law' are opposed to him as directly as the East is to the West.

He is still determined that the Baptists of Nova Scotia shall answer at his bar as to their belief in the Old as well as the New Testament as their rule of faith and practice. This is as if a sweep were saucily to ask a gentleman if he believed in soap and water. When Mr. S. pulls the beam out of his own eye, it will be time enough for him to seek to take the mote out of ours. His reasons for bringing the charge are about as distinct and sensible as Tom Smith's were of jilting Mary Jones. "Why somebody told me as how somebody said, how somebody else had somewhere read, in some newspaper as how you was dead." If Mr. S. should be tempted to refer to this charge again, I recommend him first to read a clause of three words towards the end of the tenth verse of the sixth chapter of Amos. And as a reason for the same, I will quote from his own letter:—"The greatest men often talk loosely and without thinking."

He says, "I would say to my Baptist friends, and they are many, warmly attached to me, and to whom I am warmly attached, if you read only what the *Messenger* says in this controversy, you will never know what my views and sayings are." We should not have known that Mr. S. loved *any* Baptists if he had not told us, I suppose that will account for the great trouble he has gone to to show them their error, as well as the gentleness of his lan-

guage towards them. And as regards the views and sayings of Mr. S. the readers of the *Messenger* know quite as much of 'his views and sayings' as they care for; especially the latter, and I hope he will give me some credit for informing them. Baptists are 'fanatical' enough to be content with the plain teachings of Inspiration on the subject of Baptism. I may here say to my *Perlobaptist* friends, "If you read only what the *Wesleyan* says in this controversy, you will never know the weakness of Mr. S.'s arguments, nor his ability to twist the Scriptures to mean what its author never intended them to mean."

He says the *Messenger* "has been itching to get at baby-sprinkling, and if not happily anticipated I shall help him to a remedy." I presume the remedy is *silence*. That is wise, *very wise* of Mr. S. I have been itching for it too, inasmuch as he promised twice to entertain us with his views thereon. If he is wise he will keep as *silent* as the Bible does on that subject; but he should *keep his promise*. Our good brother seems to bid for sympathy in his reply to "A Country Baptist" when he informs his readers that this is the *sixth* opponent with whom he has had to do. With *five* of these he has had something to do, and *no mistake* I am myself the favored one which he has *spared*. I am, I hope, thankful that he has let me say what I pleased without calling me into question. There is a *seventh* opponent which Mr. S. appears to have overlooked, from whom nothing has appeared in the religious papers of Halifax. "To my Baptist mothers and sisters," says Mr. S., "I would say with all affection—This is not a cross which Christ has laid upon you." Truth is sometimes told without intending it. It is *not a cross* which Christ has laid upon them. His commandments are *not grievous*. My yoke is *easy* and my burden is *light*. It is disobedient shoulders that *feel* the yoke.

"Love will make our willing feet  
In swift obedience move."

And now if I could only gain the ear of Mr. Sommerville I would give him this advice:

1. Never again write or speak on Baptism as you now view it, unless you wish the Baptist Cause and Scriptural Baptism success.
2. NEVER fight a Baptist. *Sure to get beat*. The Chairman of the Congregational Union of England last year said "he would never fight a Baptist." Wise man. *Bro. S. be as wise as he*.
3. If you *do* take this matter up again, don't spread it over six months. Let your letters be a little more regular. Controversy should be short, sharp and decisive.
4. Don't suppose that hard words will serve for hard arguments.
5. Don't fail to let me know when you bring on the subject of Infant Sprinkling.
6. Read Acts 5, 38, 39. *Be sure*.

In closing I beg to thank the Editor of the *Witness* for finding space for all my communications so long as the discussion continued in that paper, and to congratulate him on his wisdom in discontinuing it when he did and on escaping the letters of Mr. S. that have appeared elsewhere. Thanks too to the Editor of the *Wesleyan* for giving Mr. S. the space he needed, while I cannot help thinking that if he had known anything of the letters beforehand he would not have granted Mr. S. the favor of inserting them, and feel sure that it was with considerable reluctance he sent them forth to his readers.

I have only quoted, in the *Messenger*, a small part of Mr. Sommerville's revilings and scornful remarks. Worse things he could not say than he has said. I leave him in the hands of Him who judgeth rightly. The cause of the truth of Believer's Baptism will not suffer by anything he may say, and in his attempts to overthrow the truth he has injured his own cause and helped ours.

It is to be hoped that whenever he or any other Pedobaptist minister sprinkles a child, he will plainly and distinctly tell the people by what authority he does it; and if this is not done, that they will ask at the proper time and place for their authority and not be put off by such an answer as *a certain minister*, once gave when asked as *a learned man* what the word *baptize* really means in the original, replied, "If I tell you you will only have my word for it." When I see Mr. Sommerville I may perhaps ask him if he knows that gentleman, i. e. if he is in a good mood.

I am sorry if I have been thought to have any hard feeling toward Pedobaptists. I leave those who know me to judge. But against the doctrine and practice of Infant Baptism, or more correctly Infant Rantism, I am very decided. It is absolutely unknown in the Scriptures of Truth and this is admitted I suppose by a very large proportion of Pedobaptists. There are thousands who believe it is Scriptural no doubt, the responsibility of their belief must rest mainly on their *Instructors*, but there are, I presume, tens of thousands who *do not* believe it, but admit that only believers should be baptized. Some will say "It is not essential to salvation, and so does not matter;" which is another way of saying, "I will not obey Christ any more than I can help, so I can get to Heaven." "Baptists in principle," they are sometimes called, which in other words would be "Those who *know* their duty but do not *do* it." "Blessed are they that *do* his commandments." "If ye love me, KEEP my commandments. He that *hath* my commandments, and *keeth* them, he it is that loveth Me."

"To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."

Yours,

J. BROWN.

["MESSENGER," May 3, 1876.]

FROM REV. JOHN BROWN.

DEAR EDITOR,—It is interesting to observe the reports of *pedobaptism*, so called, in Pedobaptist churches. We frequently read of so many *adults* being *baptized*. It thus appears that they are becoming Scriptural as to the *subject*, and in the use of the word *baptized* they recognize that *adult baptism* is right. The misfortune, however, is, that the word is altogether misapplied inasmuch as it is used when the persons have only been *rantized* or sprinkled. Every minister of the gospel who has the slightest knowledge of the original might be supposed to know that in the Greek language the word *dip* is *baptizo*, for *pour, cheer*; for *wash or bathe*, *louo*; for a *partial washing*,—*nupto*; for *sprinkling*,—*rantizo*. Now for any one to say a man has been *baptized* when he has only been *rantized*, is exactly the same as saying he was *dipped* when he was *sprinkled*, which is certainly not the truth, whatever else it may be, and if I were to say that the moon shines by day and the sun by night, I should be as near the truth as those who say sprinkling is baptism. It is surprising that men who are public teachers, and therefore ought to know the meaning of words, especially such as that under notice, can make such statements as they do. *Baptize* means *sprinkle*, or it does *not*; if it does, why does not some one plainly say so and give the proof? and if it does *not*, then why in the name of common sense do they say it does. We say it means to *dip*, or *immerse*, and are prepared to prove it; will any Pedobaptist state the opposite, and say *baptize* means to *sprinkle*, and that he can bring proofs? If not, then let them use a word that means *sprinkle*, viz., *rantizo*, or to make usable, *rantize*, and not betray such disregard for truth in calling darkness light and light darkness, when they have been *immersed* with evidence from men of their own ranks that to baptize means to immerse, and that this was the primitive mode.

One of the most recent cases of obliquity in this matter is as follows:—"I have baptized five adults, none of whom desired to be 'buried under the waves of the Jordan,' but chose the most excellent and more Scriptural way of being baptized *with water*." (See *Wasleyon*, April 8.)

Now, all christians will rejoice that these believed in Christ. If devils are



cast out none of us should find the slightest fault with those who are the means of doing it, but rather pray that they may have greater success still.

Next, that these five did not desire to be "buried under the waves of the Jordan" shows great wisdom on their part, considering the hard times, as the journey would be a costly one. It has been suggested that the Liverpool river would have answered the purpose as well.

And next, it would be interesting to know whether the choice of being baptized *with* water was their own, or another's for them? But it is the statement I want to call attention to. *First*: there is *no such thing as baptism with water* in the sense of *sprinkling*. If it is baptism at all it is baptism *IN* water. And *second*, to say that sprinkling is "more excellent and more Scriptural" than immersion is simply monstrous, and when those words were penned I cannot conceive how the writer satisfied his conscience. If he knew better, or if he did *not* know better tells equally against him. It is very easy to make such statements, but we never find the proofs forthcoming. The "more excellent and more Scriptural" way is *as the Scripture teaches*, which all may know who wish, and the writer of that paragraph, if he look into the matter will find the doctrines of Purgatory, Mariolatry, Prayers for the Dead, Worship of Relics, &c., as "excellent and scriptural" as the sprinkling of either infants or adults, and if he or any other will find one case of infant or adult *sprinkling* in the New Testament, or one of both, I will undertake to prove that before it took place, the child was treated to a little of "Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup" to keep it quiet, and in the other case that the candidate was treated to a box of "Brown's Bronchial Troaches." That these articles are of modern date, does not matter, I will undertake proof for proof, the one is as easy as the other.

I have understood that my late remarks on this subject have given some offence to those who hold to Infant Sprinkling. To such, with all respect, I have only to say, "Repent (of this error) and *be baptized*, every one of you," and then our remarks will not apply to you; for although in my last I intimated my intention of stopping I have altered my mind since.

I have thought it well, Mr. Editor, to send you a list of passages on Baptism and would suggest that your readers copy them out on the fly-leaf of their Bible, or insert a leaf for the purpose. They can then be used for easy reference when needed. Let the reader see that they are correct before copying them. It would be a good plan if some one would send a list of passages on the other side of the question to the representative papers for the same purpose:—

*Baptism by John the Baptist.* Matt. iii. 5-12. Mark i. 4-8. Luke iii. 3-13. John i. 25-28.

*Baptism of the Saviour by John.* Matt. iii. 13-17. Mark i. 9-11. Luke iii. 21-23. John i. 29-34.

*Other passages referring to John's Baptism.* John iii. 23-26. Luke vii. 29, 30. John x. 40. Matt. xxi. 25. Mark xi. 30. Luke xx. 4. Acts i. 5, 22. x. 37. xi. 16. xiii. 24. xviii. 25. xix. 1-7.

*Baptism by disciples of Christ in His lifetime.* John iii. 22. iv. 1, 2.

*The Commission.* Matt. xxviii. 18-20. Mark xvi. 15, 16.

*Baptism on the day of Pentecost.* Acts ii. 37-42.

*Baptism of Samaritans.* Acts viii. 12-16.

*Baptism of the Eunuch.* Acts viii. 35-39.

*Of Paul of Damascus.* Acts ix. 16, 18, 22.

*Cornelius and household.* Acts x. 44-48.

*Lydia and household.* Acts xvi. 13-15, 40.

*Sailor and household.* Acts xvi. 32-34.

*Crispus and household.* Acts xviii. 8. 1 Cor. i. 13-15.

*Stephanas and household.* 1 Cor. i. 16, 17. xvi. 15.

*Baptism of Corinth.* Acts xviii. 8.

*Design of Baptism.* Rom. vi. 3-5. Gal. iii. 27. Eph. iv. 1, 3, 5. Col. ii. 12. 1 Pet. iii. 21.

*Figurative and other references to Baptism.* Matt. xx. 22, 23. Mark x. 38, 39. Luke xii. 50. 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. xii. 13. xv. 29. Heb. vi. 2.

The following may be of service:— Matt. iii. 15. Luke vi. 46. John xiv. 21. Rev. xxii. 16.

## AN OFFER.

To the one who finds the greatest number of passages in the New Testament, in proof of Infant Baptism, or Rantism, or Adult Rantism, with water as now practised, I will forward a complete set of 4 vols. of Alford's Greek Testament, advertised in the States at \$30. To the next, two vols. of Trench on the Parable and Miracles, value £1 4s. sterling. To the third, "Hodge's Theology" 1 vol. and to the fourth, "Barnes on the Acts." Others, if any, will be rewarded accordingly. As a temptation to our Pedobaptist (I mean Pedobaptist) brethren I may say that Alford and Hodge are *sublime* on Infant Sprinkling, Barnes is not far behind them. Now, brothers, you have a good chance of getting some good books cheap. They shall be forwarded free of cost. In forwarding your "proofs" send also name and address to

Yours,

J. BROWN.

P. S.—I use the word "Rantism;" in no offensive way, it means *sprinkling* as Baptism means *immersion*, and to call Infant Sprinkling, Baptism, is a compromise I cannot make.

["WESLEYAN," May 20, 1876.]

## REV. JOHN BROWN IN THE "CHRISTIAN MESSENGER."

John Brown is on the war-path, and, to judge from his letter in the *Christian Messenger* of the 3rd inst., he anticipates an easy and speedy extermination of the heresy of baptism *with* water. That Mr. Brown has fallen into the mistakes of many of his profession, who have preceded him from the Old Country, as to the character and intelligence of the people out here, is evident from his manifesto, which shows him to be yet in his A, B, C, as a controversialist on the baptism question. When Mr. B. makes himself familiar with the literature of this controversy in these Provinces, he will, no doubt, feel ashamed of having written such twaddle as he has put forth. His argument, if there is argument in his letter, is, I, John Brown, say baptize means to dip, and baptism cannot be administered without dipping, which I am prepared to prove; and all who dare dispute what I say, and teach contrary thereto, are untruthful—are calling darkness light and light darkness, and have departed from moral rectitude. The style savours greatly of braggardism; and as to the proof, men vastly Mr. B.'s superiors, in their acquaintance with the ancient languages, and in their mastery of those branches of education and study, which fit for controversy as to the mode of baptism, have laboured years to establish belief in the dogma of dipping, and they have been about as successful as the Pope of Rome in establishing belief in his infallibility; and it is just ridiculous that this new adventurer, in this wide field, poorly equipped as he is, should expect to receive serious attention from masters in this branch of theological literature. He will be more successful in advertising himself in some other way.

Without departing from my design in writing, which was not to attempt discussion with Mr. Brown, I may safely remark on the following expression in his letter: "First. There is no *such thing* as baptize *with* water in the sense of sprinkling. If it is baptism at all, it is baptism in water." Now I read in Mark 1, 8, "I indeed have baptized you *with* water, but he shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost;" also in John 1, 26, 31, "John answered, saying, I baptize *with* water;" and again, Acts 11, 16, "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized *with* water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." While I fail to find the expression baptized *in water* in the New Testament, and consequently I conclude that whatever may be the meaning of the original word rendered baptize in our translation, yet Mr. Brown's theory of baptism is unscriptural, and condemned by the portions of Scripture to which he calls the attention of Pedobaptists; and instead

of there being "moral obliquity" in the administration of the five baptisms *with water* to which he refers, the moral obliquity is all in himself. In view of this part I would urge upon Mr. B. the consideration of his own quotation, "reprint," and if he thinks another dipping is necessary to purification let him take it by all means. The shallow witticism attempted on the words "buried under the waves of the Jordan" has point only for those who advertise their baptisms in the *Christian Messenger*, and no doubt they will remember the unkindness. As to Mr. B.'s novel mode of advertising his extra supply of books, I would suggest the possibility of a "rainy day." He may live to want his books, or his money, quite as much as those to whom he offers them.

May 9th, 1876.

PEDOBAPTIST.

[*"MESSENGER,"* May 31, 1876.]

### FROM REV. JOHN BROWN.

MR. EDITOR, In the *Wesleyan* of the 20th inst., some one who signs himself "Pedobaptist" attempts to reply to my letter that appeared in the *Messenger* of the 3rd inst., although he says he does not desire discussion. Why does he fear? and why does he not put his name to his letter?

I beg to say in reply and as briefly as possible:—

*First.* I made no such mistake as P. asserts as to the character and intelligence of the people of Nova Scotia. My estimate was high before I came, and it has risen considerably since, and I give an honest opinion when I say that after two years' residence among said people, I consider they will not come one whit behind any people I know both for character and intelligence, but I must add that my estimate of the intelligence of some writers on Infant Sprinkling is very shaky, and many of the arguments used to establish that dogma have been the weakest I have ever seen or heard of, still I suppose they are as strong as the writers could find. What estimate of the intelligence of the people of Nova Scotia have they who advance such arguments for Infant Sprinkling as I have pointed out in the course of this discussion?

*Second.* P. does not like my dogmatism. That I cannot help, but I can assure him that baptize means to dip, only to dip, and nothing but to dip, and can never be made to mean anything else; that immersion is the only mode the Bible knows anything of; that of sprinkling it knows nothing, being a human invention and will therefore come to an end some day with all other false doctrines; and I repeat, that when any one who might know better, says that Sprinkling is more excellent and Scriptural than immersion, it is a clear case of moral obliquity.

*Third.* P. argues that baptize cannot mean dipping because learned men have failed to establish general belief in that doctrine. Would not this argument tell equally against Sprinkling? And if P. will open his eyes he will see that it will tell with equal force against almost any New Testament doctrine that might be named. P.'s argument seems to be this: Unless a doctrine be believed by everybody, it is false.

We are told, however, that Baptists have been about as successful as the Pope in establishing belief in his infallibility. Thanks to P. for the news, for we did not know we were so successful.

*Fourth.* P. quotes three verses to disprove the following statement, "There is no such thing as baptism with water in the sense of sprinkling; if it is baptism at all it is baptism *IN* water." The three refer to John's baptism, to quote one will be sufficient. "I indeed have baptized you *with* water," etc. To this we need only reply, John's baptizing *IN* water and *WITH* was one and the same thing, and if he had sprinkled, or poured, he would not have baptized *WITH* water. The word "with" has confused P. Perhaps an illustration of its use may help him. In a certain church a real baptism was to take place on a certain evening, it was found, however that the water-pipes were frozen the baptism therefore did not take place, because they had no water to baptize *with*.

*Fifth.* P. suggests that I keep my books in case of a "rainy day." I am



going to keep them, and still let the offer stand open for his advantage if P. like to try for them. I did not offer money as a prize, but if I had a thousand pounds to dispose of and had offered it, I should have as little fear of having to hand it over as I have of parting with my books.

Now, Mr. Editor, I have done, at least for the present, thanks for your kindness in giving me so much room, and commending the subject of baptism to the careful study of our friends who sprinkle; and trusting the discussion has tended to create interest therein, and that the time may speed along when the truth which is mighty shall prevail.

"Then let us pray that come it may  
As come it will for a' that."

I am, yours,

J. BROWN.