

# THE "ONE BAPTISM:"

## ITS MODE, SUBJECTS, PRE-REQUISITES AND DESIGN.

### WHO SHALL ADMINISTER?

Published by the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, Lamoni, Iowa.

#### THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

PAUL, in his letter to the Ephesians, mentions, among other principles of the doctrine of Christ, that of "One Baptism." The religionists of the present day, though they differ widely as to what constitutes this one baptism, and its mode of administration, yet professedly, accept Paul's testimony.

One class affirms that sprinkling, another that pouring, another that immersion—or submerging of the whole body in water—is the scriptural mode; while a fourth party, with better show of pleasing the largest number, graciously admit that all or either are right, but assert that none are essential to salvation. And, indeed, upon this point many agree, who nevertheless hold most strenuously to their respective theories as to the mode.

Can each of these various forms of administering this ordinance be correct? Does not the term itself imply or express the manner of administration? These are legitimate queries, and it becomes us to candidly and critically consider them. The main point at issue is, what does the term itself mean? If that can be determined, the case is settled so far as the mode is concerned.

Is the term baptism an English one or not? The propriety of this question is evident from the fact that if it is a common English word, common custom and usage will determine its meaning, and this meaning will be generally admitted. Sprinkling, pouring and immersion, in the English language, have each their own signification, and their

distinctiveness is recognized wherever that language is spoken. Is it a word from another language? If so, we must learn from the custom of the language it belongs to the application of it, to determine its signification.

The word is not primarily an English one, but a Greek term anglicised—a transfer, and not a translation. The New Testament was originally written in the Greek language, and our common English Testament is a translation of the text of Erasmus, which is a version of the Latin vulgate compared with the Greek text. However, as it is a translation indirectly of the Greek, we turn to that language for an explanation of the term *baptizo*.

Elder D. Millard, who traveled extensively in Greece some years ago, stated that there the uniform practice in baptizing was by immersion, and that without exception. The Greeks defined *baptizo* to immerse, and baptism—immersion. Prof. Stewart, of Andover College, Drs. Campbell, Doddridge and McKnight,—Mr. R. Barclay, a learned Quaker, and others of Pedo-Baptist views translate the original, and its derivatives, immerse, immersion, immersed. Various versions of the New Testament, among others 'McKnights,' 'The Emphatic Diaglot,' and the 'American Bible Union,' a late work brought forth by various learned men of different persuasions, render *baptizo* to immerse. The common version called King James', translates the root from which the derivations *baptizo*, *baptisma*, *baptismos*, &c., come;—dip, dipped, dippeth.

"And he answered and said, He that *dippeth* his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me."—Math. 26: 23.

"And he answered and said unto them, *It is* one of the twelve that *dippeth* with me in the dish."—Mark 14: 20.

"Jesus answered, he it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have *dipped* it. And when he had *dipped* the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon."—John 13: 26.

"And he cried, and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may *dip* the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame."—Luke 16: 24.

"And he was clothed with a vesture *dipped* in blood; and his name is called the Word of God."—Rev. 19: 13.

If the root of the word is correctly translated, dip, dipped, dippeth, why not the derivations be rendered immerse, immersed, immersion, &c.

The translations as an Anglo-Saxon definition of Greek words are not given; but the Greek words are transferred, and anglicized terminations added, instead of preserving them in the Greek form.

It is generally admitted that immersion was practiced by the early church for the first few centuries; and that the mode was changed, not in the days of the purity of the church, but in her degenerate and apostate condition. The examples of baptism, as that of the Savior, of the Eunuch, the practice of John, the use of language as employed by Paul, are here by urged as arguments in favor of immersion.

"And Jesus when he was baptized, *went up* straightway *out* of the water; and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him."—Matt. 3: 16.

"And John also was baptizing in *Ænon*, near to Salim, *because there was much water there*; and they came, and were baptized."—John 3: 23.

"And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and 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 Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the Eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing."—Acts 8: 38, 39.

"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 up from the dead by the glory of the father, even so we also should walk in new-

ness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection."—Romans 6: 3-5.

"*Buried with him in baptism*, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."—Col. 2: 12.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.—It is assumed that the word rendered 'into,' in the cases of the baptism of Christ and the Eunuch, from the Greek preposition *eis* is also translated *to* and *unto*; and they went to or unto the water.

Admitting that the word is sometimes thus rendered, and that it should read to or unto the water, how does that affect the argument in favor of immersion; for they would of course go to or unto the water, to be immersed *in* the water; and with far more propriety than for the purpose of being sprinkled *with* the water, or having some poured *upon* them. The argument does not depend so much upon the use of the words into or unto, as upon the expression of the act performed when at the water.

In the case of the Eunuch, Philip baptized him. Baptized is a past participle, expressive of action done. That which in this case is actively used is the person baptized. In immersion the Eunuch was actively used in being applied to the water; but in sprinkling or pouring, the water would be actively used and applied to the man. The term "Philip baptized him," would be incorrect in the latter case; but it is proper in the former case.

The preposition *into* is the commonly used translation of *eis*, and one of its primary significations. Surrounding circumstances determine too the appropriateness of this rendering in the case referred to, and we certainly should not discard valid and plain conclusions. If an incorrect translation of *eis*, could be shown, and that into was not a proper translation at all, there might be some show of argument, but as into is one of its primary renderings, this is impossible.

It is assumed that "the reason John baptized at *Ænon*, was because there were plenty of springs and fountains, so that the great multitudes who came could

have plenty to drink." To this it is replied, that there is no evidence of this being the case, but even if it were so, it would not invalidate the argument for immersion. Ænon was at the junction of a river with the Jordan, and therefore a place well adapted for baptismal purposes.

In a country so well watered as Judea was, it would seem strange that John should go so far as Ænon to find water for the multitude to drink. His journey can be better accounted for. The banks of the Jordan, from the Sea of Tiberias to the Dead Sea, are in many places perpendicular cliffs; and the water ranges from six to eight feet in depth, and is often very rapid. In other places the stream is too shallow. But there were, nevertheless, several places suitable for baptism. Of these, Ænon was one; hence John went to Ænon.

#### SPRINKLING.

The word from which sprinkling is translated is *rantizo*, and is nowhere rendered baptizing; and as it expresses an entirely different action, it can not lawfully be rendered baptize, nor applied properly to the same act. It is used to signify cleansing, or purifying: and if applied to the spiritual nature of man, would indicate a purifying from sin. The advocates of sprinkling are very far from admitting that a person is cleansed from sin by the act of sprinkling. Some of them oppose the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and claim that before baptism (sprinkling) can be administered, the party must have become Christian, regenerated, born anew or again, by the converting power of the Holy Spirit. Yet the quotations so often made from Ezekiel (a) so clearly indicate a purifying or cleansing process, that it is marvellous that men can not see the force of the word sprinkle in these connections. Some, however, do see and claim that when the infant is sprinkled it is made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.

The text in Ezekiel refers solely to the Jewish nation, and he who is to perform the sprinkling is God, not man; and as a result of this sprinkling, it is said they should be clean. It would seem singular for a converted, sanctified or purified nation to be cleansed by sprinkling, after they had been made pure by the power and action of the Holy Spirit, as it is assumed men are to be before baptism.

Sprinkling in Hebrews refers to purifying, and that of the heart. (b)

The advocates of sprinkling claim that all except infants (and some do not except them), must be converted—born again—cleansed from sin, before they can be sprinkled. How can this sprinkling refer to the application of water to the head, if the heart is sprinkled or cleansed before by some other power? For if sprinkling here refers to water, then certainly the heart is made pure by it; but this will not be admitted. Isaiah refers to an act of Christ, an evident purifying of nations, by his atonement, through their obedience (c). However, other translations give the word *gather*, instead of sprinkle. "So he shall gather many nations," &c., which is in accordance with numerous prophecies. How any one can hold to sprinkling and reject baptismal purification, is a mystery, for that is its evident signification, if sprinkling has reference to a form of baptism at all. See Hebrews, where sprinkling of the blood of Christ, and under the law, the blood of animals was for a purging or purifying purpose (d).

The reader should bear in mind that the advocates of sprinkling reject the main, if not the only design of sprinkling, the purging away of sin.

The design in sprinkling the blood of animals was to show forth that through that means the sins of those for whom it was shed would be forgiven, through their faith, repentance and obedience.

If sprinkling with water sustains the relation to this dispensation that sprink-

(a) Ezek. 36: 25; Heb. 10: 22; Isa. 52: 15.

(b) Heb. 10: 22.

(c) Isa. 52: 15.

(d) Heb. 9: 13, 19, 22; 12: 24. 1 Pet. 1: 2.

ling with blood did to the Jewish Church, then it follows that sins are forgiven through that means, which believers in sprinkling will be very loth to admit.

Sprinkling of blood was the procuring cause of remission of sins, "for without the shedding of blood, is no remission." Christ shed his blood for this purpose, that through it we might be sprinkled or purified from sin. Remember it is God who does the sprinkling of our hearts, and the nation, and always by their obedience.

An assumption is made that the three thousand baptized on the day of Pentecost "could not have immersed, as time would not admit." To which we reply, that any one who understands immersing can perform the ordinance in three minutes, after the preliminary exercises are attended to. The apostle Peter began to speak at nine o'clock a.m., or the third hour of the day; his discourse did not take more than an hour in delivery, in all probability—or till ten o'clock. There are 20 times 3 minutes in an hour, or 240 an hour by the whole twelve—or 3,000 in about 12½ hours—or till about half-past ten o'clock at night, and in that salubrious climate no barrier to evening services could be offered. But there were seventy other disciples of equal authority to baptize with the Twelve, making eighty-two in all—all of whom if need be could baptize. Allowing therefore longer time than before suggested—say five minutes to each person, or 12 in an hour, 82 multiplied by 12 equals 984 in an hour, 2,952 in three hours, leaving but 48, or one each for the same number of administrators. The word says "about three thousand," so we may say that by one o'clock in the afternoon they could have all been baptized.

While considering this theme we will notice briefly its adjunct.

#### INFANT BAPTISM—OR SPRINKLING.

One argument employed in defense of infant baptism is that it is a substitution under the Christian dispensation for cir-

cumcision under the Jewish Church.

Against this assumption it is fairly urged: 1, That as circumcision was limited to one sex (males), if it were a type, it would exclude female children; 2, It was a national as well as a spiritual sign; 3, It can not be shown that baptism was introduced as an ordinance to take the place of circumcision—it is simply an assumption.

It is said that as the Abrahamic and the Christian Covenant is the same, that as children were admitted under the Abrahamic Covenant, so they should be under the Christian.

Circumcision was the 'token' or sign of the Abrahamic Covenant (e). If the Christian Covenant is the same, the same sign should continue, unless it can be shown that it was done away and sprinkling adopted in its stead, which we aver can not be done.

We argue that this was a national sign or a token of the adoption of Gentiles into the Covenant of Abraham, which Covenant was that of the promise of the Land of Canaan for an everlasting inheritance, and also a sign that the children of Abraham, according to the flesh, are partakers of the Covenant. As the uncircumcised child was cut off from among the people; so if infant baptism takes the place of circumcision, an unchristened or unbaptized child fails to be a recipient of the blessings of Christ, or of salvation. How this conclusion can be avoided we can not see. Yet some hold this idea; hence we have heard of 'infants in hell,' &c. This view is founded on the theory that baptism is essential to salvation; for if not, there is no need of infant baptism.

The divine Master says, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Again: "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye can in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." That is, children who have not reached the age of accountability are held to be in a state of justification, or

(e) Gen. 17: 9-14.

as not being under condemnation. "For where there is no law, there is no transgression," and "Sin is the transgression of the law." Again: "He that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." If children are totally depraved sinners, or are children of wrath by nature, they must be admitted into the Church of Christ by baptism, as our infant baptizers claim. For by this ordinance they are either made worthy of a blessing to which they were not entitled before, or they are not. If they are, and this blessing is membership in Christ's Church, which is necessary to salvation, then baptism is essential to salvation, and infants can not be saved without it. If they are children of wrath by nature, and become children of grace when admitted to the church, and by baptism they are admitted, it follows that baptism is the means of their conversion, or change, or regeneration from 'nature to grace,' and they must be thus regenerated, or born again, if the doctrine of their natural depravity, and consequent unfitness for the kingdom of God is true. But, surprising as it may appear, the advocates of sprinkling, pouring, and some who even believe in immersion, hold that baptism is not essential to salvation; and yet many claim that infants must be baptized, or else are not entitled to church membership. Every one who is in Christ is certainly a member of his body; for if Christ's, they are partakers of his Spirit, and "by one spirit are ye all baptized into one body"—the church; "and if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." If adult sinners must be converted and become as little children in order to be saved, as Christ affirms, or to inherit the kingdom of heaven, why should little children be baptized?

We will briefly examine the cases cited as evidences of infant baptism.

"And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river Jordan."—Mark 1: 5.

It is said that "all" includes children. But all children are not infants, and these were baptized, confessing their sins."

Could infants do this? And if so, why should John refuse to baptize them if they could believe his preaching, and confessing their sins. (f)

**LYDIA'S HOUSEHOLD.**—To the supposition that infants were included in her household, we object:—1, That she was a saleswoman, and said to be of Thyatira, and if this was her home, it is not likely she would be encumbered by infants, so far from home, and while engaged in a mercantile pursuit. Her household was evidently composed of assistants or servants. 2, There is no evidence of her being a married woman, and the fact of her being engaged in business would suggest that she was unmarried. 3, Many households are composed of parents and children, all of the latter being old enough to believe and obey the gospel.

**THE PHILIPPIAN JAILOR'S HOUSEHOLD.**—(g) If infants were here baptized, they were old enough to rejoice and believe in God, for it is just as much declared that 'all his house' rejoiced and believed as that they were baptized. The word of the Lord was preached to all that were in the house as they must believe before obedience; and no evidence is furnished of any but believers being baptized.

#### POURING.

The advocates of this mode obtain their main argument from some phrases that are applied to the baptism of the Holy Spirit, where the word "pour" is used. They say, therefore, that as the Spirit is "poured out," shed forth, &c., that water may be similarly applied. To this we reply that the word *bestow* gives the full and proper idea of the baptism of the Spirit, and that word is the leading definition of the Greek *ekcheo*. If the word had been *baptizo*, and it had been translated to read like this: "Saith God, I will baptize my Spirit upon all flesh," (h) there would have been some show of argument, if it could be shown that it came upon them as water is applied in pouring. But how was the Holy Spirit poured out, or bestowed, on

(f) Acts 16: 15.  
(h) Acts 2: 17.

(g) Acts 16: 33.

the day of Pentecost? We read that when the church met together,

"They were with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."—Acts 2: 1-4.

Thus was the word of John and the promise of Christ fulfilled, and they were baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire. There came a sound,—a noise, a report from heaven,—as of a rushing mighty wind. This was the Spirit of God,—“and it filled all the house,” “and they were filled.” If the room was filled, and they were filled with the Spirit, it looks very much more like immersion than sprinkling or pouring. Again it is evident that the phrase “poured out” (s) is the same as bestowed or given, and signifies a liberal bestowment of the Spirit. Further, it is argued that the term “with water” (j) would imply pouring. To this we suggest that the preposition ‘with’ denotes the means used, and the contrast is between the baptism that John performed and that which Christ would perform. “I baptize you with water”—“he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” The idea of John is to show the difference in the instrument or means used in baptism. While John’s work was to baptize with water, how did he baptize? Answer: in water, or “in Jordan.” If sprinkling and pouring are terms interchangeable with baptism, or if they are synonymous definitions of baptism, then it should make sense to use them when reading the scriptures, instead of the words baptize, baptized, or baptism. Let us try a case or two as illustrations, and use the word “pour” instead of baptize. “And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye poured? And they said unto John’s pouring. Then said Paul, John verily poured with the pouring of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on

Christ Jesus. When they heard this they were poured in the name of the Lord Jesus.” (k) Or try the word sprinkle: “Buried with him by sprinkling.”—“Buried with him in pouring.” (l) A singular kind of burial to stand a dead person on his feet and sprinkle a handful of earth, or pour a cup full on his head.

The commission of Jesus to his disciples was: “Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing,” &c. The verb baptize is a transitive verb, and expresses an action to an object. In view of this, the thing actively used is that baptized. They were commanded to baptize men and women. They could immerse them, but could hardly sprinkle or pour them. The word baptize is always in harmony with immersion in the use of the preposition “in,” but sprinkle or pour could not be followed by “in,” for it would not do to say that John sprinkled or poured people in Jordan. It is proper to say sprinkle upon, or pour out of, but it would hardly read correctly to say baptized upon, or baptize out of. These remarks are based upon the idea that if sprinkling or pouring is baptism, the words could be used interchangeably; but from the foregoing we observe that the idea is inconsistent.

#### THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

We need not spend much space on this part of the subject, for it is generally admitted that belief of the gospel is pre-requisite to a valid baptism, and that believers of the gospel are proper subjects of baptism. The argument in favor of these propositions is:

The fact that “without faith it is impossible to please him, for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.” If faith is necessary to please God, and he who comes to him must believe in his existence we reason that a baptism not accompanied or preceded by faith would not be acceptable to God.

The words of Christ, that he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.

(s) Acts 4: 31.

(j) Matt. 3: 11.

(k) Acts 19: 2-5. (l) Rom. 6: 4. Col. 2: 12.

(m) "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (n)

The examples found in the New Testament:

"Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls."—Acts 2: 41.

"But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women."—Acts 8: 12.

"And the Eunuch said, See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized. And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest."—Acts 8: 36, 37.

Lydia, "whose heart the Lord opened that she attended on the things spoken of Paul, and when she was baptized and her household," &c.—Acts 16: 14, 15.

"And they said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house, and they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes and was baptized, he and all his straightway."—Acts 16: 31-33.

"And many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were baptized."—Acts 18: 8.

The case of the Ephesians, whom Paul baptized after they had believed in the Lord Jesus. (o)

Infants being incapable of exercising faith in the gospel, can not be lawfully baptized. For can a baptism without faith please God?

#### THE PRE-REQUISITES TO BAPTISM.—FAITH.

We have just learned that faith is required; but faith in what?

In God.—"He that cometh to God must believe that he is,"—that he exists. This would seem to require an understanding of, or belief in, his nature, as far as this can be understood from revelation. No one can believe in the existence of God who imagines him to be a something "without body, parts, or passions." The God of the Scriptures has a body, has parts, has passions. We refer the reader to the scriptures, (p) where the Lord appeared to and talked with Abraham; (q) where he appeared to Jacob; (r) where

the Lord hid Moses in the cleft of the rock, and permitted him to see his back parts, but not his face. The manifestations of passion; as anger (s), hate (t), pity (u), rejoicing (v), love (w), has a form (x), Jesus the express image of the Father (y), man the image of God (z), Christ the image and in the form of God (a), his location—heaven (b).

HIS REWARD.—"That he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him" (c). This includes, besides the belief of the fact, that of the character of the reward, which is the remission of sins. This requires an understanding of the manner of obtaining it, which is by faith, repentance and baptism (d).

FAITH IN THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.—(e) But what is it to believe on the Lord Jesus? To recognize his character as the Son of God (f). And here we may remark that a scriptural view of this relation of Christ to the Father must be observed. Theories, as that Jesus is the natural son of Joseph, or that he is the same being as the Father are irreconcilable with the scripture teaching. While discussing these views, and disproving them, we will by the same quotations show the true scriptural doctrine. To prove his pre-existence and his Divine birth, please read (g). That he is distinct from the Father, read (h). To believe on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ is required.—See the importance of the name (i). We inquire what is the meaning of the name Jesus?

"Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins."—Matt. 1: 21.

It is synonymous with the name Joshua in Hebrew, signifying a Savior. "His people" evidently refers to the Jews; to them he preached, from them he chose

- (s) Ezek. 5: 13; 7: 3. (t) Isa. 61: 8.  
 (u) Joel 2: 18. (v) Isa. 62: 5; 65: 19.  
 (w) Isa. 53: 9. (x) John 5: 37; Heb. 1: 3.  
 (y) 1 Cor. 11: 7. (z) 2 Cor. 4: 4.  
 (a) Col. 1: 15; Phil. 2: 6.  
 (b) John 6: 36; 17: 1. Luke 11: 2. Acts 6: 55.  
 (c) Heb. 11: 6.  
 (d) Acts 2: 37, 28. (e) Acts 16: 31.  
 (f) Acts 8: 37. John 20: 31.  
 (g) John 1: 9-14; 6: 38-48, 51, 62; 7: 29; 8: 23, 40, 42, 56; 13: 8; 17: 5, 8. Heb. 11: 9, 14, 1 John 1: 13.  
 (h) Matt. 3: 17; 11: 27. John 10: 15; 14; 28.  
 (i) Acts 7: 56. Heb. 1: 3. Phil. 2: 5.  
 (j) Phil. 2: 9.

- (m) Mark 16: 16. (n) Matt. 28: 19.  
 (o) Acts 19: 1-6. (p) Gen. 1: 26, 27; Gen. 18  
 (q) Gen. 35. (r) Exo. 33: 18-23.

his apostles, and to them he first sent the apostles exclusively. "Salvation is of the Jews," and by their rejection of the offer of the kingdom and of Christ as their king, they were rejected as a nation from its blessings, as administrators of its laws and government; because of this the Gentiles are now eligible to its blessings (j).

"He came to his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." —John 1: 11, 12.

He came to save them,—the children of Israel (k). He will save them individually and nationally. Individually, by their acceptance of the terms of salvation; namely: Faith, repentance, and obedience to every command (l). Nationally, by restoring them to their own land (m). His name, Christ, from the Greek, *Christos*; Hebrew, Messiah; English, Anointed. The Messiah, or the Christ, is the Deliverer of Israel, the Prince of the house of David, or the heir of David's throne (n).

To believe on Jesus is, therefore, to believe in a Savior of Israel, both individually and nationally; individually by redeeming all from the curse of the law; nationally by gathering Israel to their own land, and saving them from the power of their foes. To believe in the Christ is to believe in the coming and reign of the Messiah on the throne of David, and in his reign over the world. Further, to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, is to believe and trust in his authority and power, and to obey every command as he commanded, and for the purpose prescribed (o).

Believing on the Lord Jesus is to understand and believe the word of the Lord. The word of the Lord produces faith (p). By the "word of truth" we are begotten (q). Or born again (r) It is the

gospel (s). The gospel is the glad tidings of the kingdom of God (t). Also called "the word of the kingdom," or "good seed" (u). The kingdom of God is the Church of Christ (v). The officers and powers of the kingdom (w). The kingdom of God in its physical form is the kingdom of Israel (x). Also the dominion and government of the world (y). The time of its establishment as a physical kingdom (z).

Having thus demonstrated what measure and kind of faith are essential to the validity of baptism, it is inquired: What else is necessary? We answer

### REPENTANCE.

But few words need be said upon this point, as none but those who deny the possibility of sinning at all, who say "there is no such thing as sin," but will admit the necessity of a "ceasing to do evil and learning to do well;" "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thought." "Repentance from dead works" is one of the principles of the doctrine of Christ (a).

Repentance comprises the sentiment of godly sorrow for sin, and a reformation of character. "Except ye be converted and become as a little child, ye can in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven," said Christ. "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord," said Peter.

Scripture teaching on this subject might be largely presented, but these will suffice, with the remark that there is certainly a grave error in the view of many, that repentance necessitates a long and intense season of bitter mourning and anguish of soul, even days and weeks of 'seeking' for forgiveness of sins. The examples of conversion, as recorded in

(j) Rom. 11: 2, 12, 15, 19.  
 (k) Matt. 15: 24, compare Luke 19: 9, 10.  
 (l) Rom. 11: 23, 24, 25.  
 (m) Rom. 11: 26, 27. Isa. 59: 20, 21. Ps. 14: 7.  
 Jer. 3: 12-19; 23: 1-9; 30: 7-11, 16-21; 31: 27, 37; 32: 37, 41; 33: 14-26.  
 (n) Isa. 9: 6, 7. Ps. 132: 10, 11. Acts 2: 30.  
 Luke 1: 31-33.  
 (o) Acts 16: 31, 32. (p) Rom. 10: 17.  
 (q) Jas. 1: 18. (r) 1 Pet. 1: 23.

(s) 1 Pet. 1: 25. (t) Matt. 1: 23; 9: 35;  
 24: 14. Mark 1: 14. Luke 8: 1.  
 (u) Matt. 13: 19. (v) Dan. 2: 44. Matt. 13:  
 24-50; 16: 17, 18; 25: 1-30. Luke 11: 20;  
 16: 16; 17: 21. Col. 1: 13.  
 (w) 1 Cor. 12: 28. Eph. 4: 2-12.  
 (x) 1 Chron. 17: 11, 15; 29: 23. Luke 1: 31-33.  
 (y) Dan. 7: 13, 14, 27. Ps. 11; 8, 9. Zech. 14: 9  
 Rev. 2: 15.  
 (z) Matt. 25: 31-34; 19: 27, 28. 2 Tim. 4: 1.  
 Rev. 11: 15. (a) Heb. 6: 1.



the Acts of the Apostles, certainly and unmistakably teach that men were prepared for baptism, and 'worthy' thereof, immediately after they had heard and believed the gospel.

On the day of Pentecost about three thousand were baptized and added to the number of disciples the 'same day' that they heard, believed and repented. The Eunuch was baptized as soon as they came to a certain water upon confession of his faith in Jesus Christ (b). Paul was baptized after three days of blindness, and repentance (c). Cornelius was baptized as soon as he heard the gospel (d). Lydia was baptized while at the river side, where prayer was made (e). The Philippian jailor was baptized the same hour of the night that he believed (f). The twelve men whom Paul baptized at Ephesus, obeyed immediately upon hearing Paul's preaching.

From these we learn that the doctrine of some that a "Christian experience" must be had before baptism has no support from the word of God; for not only do these examples of conversion show otherwise, but we hold that there is no "thus saith the Lord" for it, therefore it may safely be set down as one of the "traditions of men" which are taught for the doctrine of Christ, by which the law is made void. Instead of a long period of waiting to prove whether the believer has truly repented and obtained an experience of the forgiveness of sins, and reception of the Spirit of God, they were commanded to be baptized, and even to make no unnecessary delay, which doubtless would have caused the tradition-teachers and formalists of the day to be filled with pious indignation at the unseemly haste. The Pentecostians were baptized the same day. The Eunuch, as soon as water convenient could be found, as they journeyed along, was baptized. Ananias seemed to be impressed that Paul should be in a hurry to obey the gospel, for he said: "And now why tarriest thou, arise and be baptized."—Acts 22d chapter.

DESIGN OR OBJECT OF BAPTISM.

By it the believer puts on Christ: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (g). Thus he becomes new; "for if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." The same idea is also taught elsewhere.

By it, in connection with a proper faith and repentance, sins are remitted. The convicted and believing Jews on the day of Pentecost were commanded by Peter thus: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins (h), accompanied with the assurance that they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Ananias declared to Paul that he should "arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (i). Plain as this language is, yet there are a vast number of persons professing to believe the word of God, who object to it, and endeavor to destroy its force and application, by giving it a signification that nothing short of a complete alteration of the whole language would warrant. Thus of the texts in Acts 2, it is said, that the Apostle meant that they should repent for remission of sins, and be baptized because of remission. If this is what he meant, he certainly could express himself in that way, and all efforts to distort the original; all criticism and efforts to find a warrant for a different translation are as yet in vain; for it stands "repent and be baptized for the remission of sins;" and by all known and recognized rules of grammar governing such a case, remission of sins is predicated upon repentance and baptism. Repent and be baptized says the Apostle; and if baptism is administered because of "sins remitted, so is repentance for the same purpose, they both are joined together as a means to a certain end. And it would seem strange that a person should repent because his sins are forgiven.

(b) Acts 8. (c) Acts 11. (d) Acts 10:44-48.  
(e) Acts 16: 14. (f) Acts 16.

(g) Gal. 3: 26, 27. (h) Acts 2: 38, 39.  
(i) Acts 22: 16

But, says the objector, "How can baptism wash away sins? "How can the act of going into the water wash away the sins of the soul?" We might reply in a few words, like this: That it matters not to any who really believe the Bible to be the word of God, how it is done, if the Scriptures require it; and if they do not mean what they say, when speaking so plainly, no figurative language being connected with it, where can we find any sentence that means what it says? Where is this system of interpreting, or we might with more propriety say, misinterpreting the word of God, to end?

What condition of things would obtain in this country, if the Constitution of the United States were treated in this manner? A score of interpreters would each give his view of its meaning and how he thinks it should be understood, and that to suit the purposes of his party. If so done, how could its objects be carried out, and its principles be enforced? For not more than one in twenty would accept the interpretation put upon the instrument by the executive officers, and would perhaps secede and set up independent governments, based on the principles of "my policy."

But the difficulty with many is owing to the fact that while they accept theories or doctrines that are at the most dependent upon inferences of an unreasonable and mysterious character, they can not accept baptism as a condition of forgiveness of sin, because they can not see how it is done, or the mode of operation, can not understand the relation between cause and effect, notwithstanding the ever present truth that God has commanded the duty, and promised the blessing. If this style of argument (if worthy the name) is valid, and was acted upon in other ages of the world, it would have made necessary a new creation of men and animals. For had Noah reasoned as the theologians do, and had concluded that some other size and form of the ark, or other material for construction than that given by God would do,

or had doubted the adaptation of the means to the end, he and his family would have found a common grave with the Antediluvian world.

Or if the Israelites, serpent-bitten and dying, had reasoned upon the probability or improbability of virtue being manifested by a brazen serpent, and had inquired into the philosophical relation between looking thereon and the healing of the bite of live ones, and found that simply looking at a brazen serpent possessed no curative powers as they could discover from medical treatises, nor in strict accordance with the laws of therapeutics, nor based upon any known principle of the *Materia Medica*, and therefore, impracticable and absurd, they would have perished as a reward for the exercise of learned argumentations.

Again, the Syrian leper came near remaining a victim of the loathsome disease because he failed to perceive any particular virtue in being washed in Jordan. His own Damascan rivers were as good and better. But his humble servant discerned the true way and said that simple obedience and trust were the operative cure, and appropriately remarked, that if "some great thing" had been required, his master would have done it. So, to-day, the proud human heart demands an effort that savors of merit for good works, rather than of obedience to a humiliating ordinance; and learned teachers talk of "impropriety" and "indecentcy." The ever to be remembered testimony of God in regard to Noah is, "That in all things whatsoever God commanded Noah, so did he."

What saved the Israelites from the serpent's deadly bite? Faith and obedience. They believed the brazen serpent was there; they believed that if they looked they would live, simply because God commanded them to look and pledged them salvation if they did; and thus believing they looked and were healed.

So of baptism for the remission of sins. God commands the believer of the gospel to repent and be baptized. He

obeys and honors God's word by simple child-like faith and obedience. Therefore God honors him according to promise, and forgives his sins.

It was obedience to God and trust in his promises that saved the first-born of the children of Israel from the destroying angel, through the sprinkling of blood on the door posts and lintels of the houses. Could not God have saved them some other way? Yes, if he had chosen to do so, but he did as he willed, and required them to obey his will, not their own. So baptism saves us, by our faith and obedience. The terms of reconciliation are his own; we are the rebels, and he has the sole right to dictate the terms by which we may partake of his clemency and favor. Or, if we refuse to comply, he has the right and may exercise it, to permit us to take the benefit of our stubbornness and reap the consequences of disobedience, even to fulfilling in us the truth that, "He that knoweth his Master's will, and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes."

Baptism forms an essential part in the work of regeneration, and of entrance into the kingdom of God (*j*). God is justified by the people's obedience to this ordinance (*k*). The counsel of God is rejected by not obeying (*l*). The baptism of John, and that of Christ and the Apostles, are the same in faith that precedes, and the object thereof. The kingdom of God was preached by all (*m*). Repentance also (*n*), and Baptism for remission of sins (*o*),

The phrase "Christian baptism," as used in contradistinction to John's baptism, is like many more sentiments, unscriptural and uncalled for. It is brought into existence by the assumption that the "Christian dispensation" (another unscriptural phrase) was begun after the resurrection of Christ, or on the day of Pentecost, and that the gospel began to

be preached on that day. But we read: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (Mark 1:1), and the record clearly shows that the preaching and baptism of John were the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ; then it was as much "Christian baptism" as that performed on the day of Pentecost. Some assume that the gospel,—Christ's death, burial and resurrection,—was not preached till the day of Pentecost. True, not as to accomplished facts; but as a prophetic truth, as a coming reality, it was. Christ taught it, and John evidently understood it, for when Jesus was coming to be baptized, he said: "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." It was the gospel before its accomplishment, it was the gospel afterward; and indeed it may be urged that there was more virtue in believing that he should die and rise again, than to believe he did die and rise again, according to Paul's definition of faith: (*p*) "Faith is the substance [ground, confidence, or assurance—other translations] of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." The Savior's declaration to Thomas after he had put his finger in the nail prints was: "Because thou hast seen thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, yet have believed." To believe in that which many eye witnesses can testify to, is not so meritorious as to believe in that which a few declare will be, and which exists as prophecy, not as history. That the prophets understood this matter and believed it, is evident (*q*).

It is a gospel truth that baptism is for remission of sin, before a person is baptized. It was gospel when Peter declared it on the day of Pentecost. It was gospel after some had obeyed and obtained the promise. To say that the gospel can not be preached until it is preached as facts, is unreasonable and contrary to facts. The baptism of John, we then assume, was for the reasons given, a gospel baptism. The difference between his authority and that of the Apostles

(*j*) John 3: 5. Tit. 3: 5. Eph. 5: 26.

(*k*) Luke 7: 29. (*l*) Luke 7: 30.

(*m*) Matt. 3: 2; 4: 17; 10: 7. Luke 4: 43; 8: 1; 9: 3. Acts 19: 8; 20: 23.

(*n*) Matt. 3: 2. Mark 1: 14, 15. Luke 24: 47. Acts 2: 38; 3: 19.

(*o*) Mark 1: 4, 5; 16: 15, 16. Luke 24: 47, compare with Acts 1: 1-3, and 2: 38.

(*p*) Heb. 11: 1. (*q*) 1 Pet. 1: 10, 11. Isa. 53.

seems to be only that John was an Aaronic Priest, and did not have authority to lay on hands for the gift of the Holy Spirit. And it was not given, as an abiding comforter and teacher, while Christ was on earth (r). The Apostles held a higher priesthood, and after receiving the baptism of the Spirit, could and did impart it to others by the laying on of hands, evidently recognizing the validity of John's baptism, for we do not read that they or any others who were baptized of John were baptized again. There is no proof that the twelve whom Paul baptized were administered to by John, but the reverse; for John assured those whom he baptized, that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire, which was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost to all who remained faithful. We can fitly close this part of the subject by the statement of Paul to the Ephesians:

"There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called, in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."—Eph. 4: 4, 5.

This one body is the Church of Christ, organized and in active operation, properly officered and empowered to act (s).

"And God hath set some in the church; first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that, miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues."—1 Cor. 12: 28.

And perfected, prepared to work, and edified by "apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers." A perfect and well organized building. (Eph. 4: 16.)

This "one baptism" can not refer to once being immersed, whether it was done by proper authority or not, or for the designated purpose: for Paul baptized some who had been immersed unto John's baptism, that is, in all probability, in the form of John, but not by John, for reasons before given (t). Paul did not recognize it. If it had been performed by John, he would. There is no evidence that the Apostles themselves were baptized after they had been by John, for some of them were baptized by him,

and probably all were (u). John's baptism being the "counsel of God, (v) and manifestation of righteousness, which is revealed through the gospel (w). The "one baptism" is that of immersion, preceded by a faith in "the things of the kingdom and the name of Jesus Christ," and is "for remission of sins," and is performed by one having authority; for the ordinance must be performed by one properly authorized.

#### PERFORMED IN THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

Peter commanded to "repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (x). "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord" (y). "They were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (z). "When they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (a). In the name of, evidently means by the authority of the Lord Jesus.

The only argument we have heard against this phraseology is, that the word *in* should be rendered *unto*; for, says the party urging this correction, "*in* signifies by the authority of," tacitly admitting that they hold no authority to act in the name of the Lord Jesus. Suppose we apply this rule to a few passages where a similar phrase is used; for instance, how would it read:

"Lord have we not prophesied in [to] thy name, and in [to] thy name cast out devils, and in [to] thy name done many wonderful works."—Matt. 7: 22.

"But Paul being grieved, turned and said to the Spirit, I command thee in [to] the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her."—Acts 16: 18.

The disciples were commanded to preach, heal the sick, cast out devils, baptize, &c., in the name of Christ. This is admitted by all. But how were they authorized to preach, baptize, &c?

Answer: By Divine appointment.—They were either personally commissioned by the Savior, or called by his

(u) John 1: 35-42.

(v) Romans 1: 17.

(w) Acts 10: 42.

(x) Acts 19: 5.

(y) Luke 7: 30.

(z) Acts 2: 38.

(a) Acts 8: 16.

(r) John 7: 39. (s) 1 Cor. 12: 28. (t) Matt. 3: 11.

spirit in prophecy; or by prophets, as Paul, Barnabas and Timothy were called (b). To assume this authority will not do, for it may be asked in the great day of decisions, Who hath required this at your hands? Some will say in that day, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name?" But the response will be, "I never knew you," (or recognized you), or as otherwise translated, "you never knew me."

To assume the responsibility of acting in the name of Jesus without due and demonstrable authority, is certainly an act of daring assumption. For men to claim that they are "ambassadors of Christ," authorized to adopt men and women into his kingdom, and give them power over the property and goods of their Master, without justifying that claim, by preaching and practicing as the Apostles of old, and organizing his kingdom as they did, with the same evidence of their acceptance by their Master, by the reception of his Spirit in the signs following the believer; for men to claim this position, and yet their teaching and practice falsifying their claim, is no child's play, nor will the Lord "hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain."

Who can claim a call to the ministry as Paul, Barnabas and Timothy, or by direct command of Christ, as did the Twelve and the Seventy. A man has as good a right to the call to Noah to build an ark, and commence to build one also; or Abraham's call to go into a strange country to receive it for an inheritance; or Moses' call to leave the children of Israel, and go to Cuba, and lead the slaves out of Spanish bondage, as men have to take the New Testament record of a certain commission, given to and fulfilled by certain men, and apply it to themselves to-day. Yet those who do this neither preach nor practice as they did, nor labor as they did without purse and scrip; but settle down as salaried teachers over rich congregations, and twice or thrice a week, in rosewood or marble pulpits, read an essay; praised,

petted, and caressed by ease-loving people, having their reward from those they serve, and the friendship of the world. O, the painful, the saddening contrast between these and the hungry, foot-sore, poverty-stricken, hated and hunted, bonded and beaten, insulted and imprisoned, mocked and murdered preachers of a pure, uncorrupted gospel eighteen hundred years ago.

But what are the CALLS of to-day? One is called by a "small still voice;" another "heard a voice calling him to preach;" a third is called by a "dream;" a fourth by a "sense of duty to help save souls;" a fifth by "advice of friends;" a sixth by "vote of conference or synod;" a seventh by "law;" but who by the voice of God through a living prophet?

And to what are they called? To preach this ism and that, to build up this church and that, differing in faith, practice, and church order, as widely as extremes can differ.

For instance: one is called to preach that "a portion of mankind *never* will be saved."

Another, that "all *may* be saved."

A third, that "all *will* be saved."

Did God call men to teach all this? If so, can it all be true? If all men will be saved, is there any who never will be?

"No difficulty there," says a friend, "for God never called any one to teach that all will be saved."

"No trouble at all," says another friend, "for God never called any one to teach unconditional election and reprobation, or that some never would be saved."

"I say he did," says the first."

"I say he didn't," replies the other.

But, hold! The Scriptures say the "servants of the Lord must not strive;" and Christ says a kingdom divided against itself can not stand.

Again, another comes forward claiming that God sent him to preach the gospel, and to declare that "sprinkling is the gospel baptism."

"Nay," says another, "pouring is the Divinely appointed mode."

(b) Acts 13: 1-4. Tim. 4: 1, 14.

"You are both wrong," says the third, "for I am sent to declare that immersion alone is the true plan."

"And I affirm that all three are right," says a fourth, "and one is as good as the other."

"And I," as confidently cries a fifth, "affirm that neither is right; for water is not required at all; the baptism of the Spirit is the essential baptism."

Did God call them all? If not, which one? And as all give the same evidence, who can decide that one is not as much called as the other? If he called them all, and of course commissioned all, and all act in his name, do not his laws conflict? Are not his servants antagonistic, and his kingdom divided? And if so, will it stand? There is "one faith," says the Apostle. Is Calvinism a faith?

Certainly it is.

Is it *the* one faith?

"Yes," says the Calvinist.

Well; is Arminianism a faith?

Yes.

Is it *the* one faith?

"Yes," says the Arminian.

Again: Is Universalism a faith?

Yes.

Is it *the* one faith?

"Yes," says the Universalist.

But how can they all be *the* one faith, when they disagree on about every point?

Perhaps this is another "Trinity."

"Three in one, and one in three," we add, yet with each other none agree.

If God called Mr. C. to declare that adults alone are subjects of baptism, who called Mr. D. to assert as gospel truth that infants must also be baptized.

If God is unchangeable, in whom is no variableness, or shadow of turning, why has he inspired different men to contradict each other, and to teach different faiths and gospels as the foundation of their faith; and to divide his kingdom, and frustrate the desire of his Son, who prayed that his disciples might be one, that the world might believe that God had sent him.

These thoughts should not be laid

aside with a sneer, nor be laughed at, nor forgotten. Thinking men and women will ponder these things, and inquire where is the trouble? And if it would not bring upon our heads the execration of the kingdom of the clergy, we might whisper in their ears that perhaps the trouble might be with the call. An issue seems to be presented, that we must either doubt the wisdom and character of God, or question the divine authority of the call. On one side we endanger our salvation, as we begin to tread the road to Atheism; on the other hand we may receive the anathemas of all we may thus question. We ask, "By what authority thou doest these things, and who gave thee this authority." We are answered:

"Those who ordained us:" the Conference, or Synod, or Association.

But who gave them the authority to ordain, or set you apart to the ministry? And we are answered:

"Those who ordained them."

It is resolved into this proposition: Mr. M's authority to preach, baptize, ordain, &c., comes by virtue of being ordained by regularly ordained men, who were in their turn regularly ordained men, till we trace it back to the source of all authority of this kind—Jesus.

But hold a moment! A line of Apostolic succession is established, and is that a truth? If so, does this line run outside of, or independently of the "Mother Church" of Rome; and if true, when has this discovery been made? If not outside of her, then inside or through her; and we humbly ask does she, or did she at the time of Luther's secession hold valid authority from Jesus Christ or his Apostles? If she did, then Luther and his associates, and all other dissenters, are apostates from the true church; and furthermore, they lost all authority received from her; for if she held valid authority, she had the "keys of the kingdom," with power to bind and unbind, and she certainly excommunicated Luther and all others, and took back all the powers conferred

on them by her. Was there any other church in existence that was the true church (if she was a false one) to whom Luther could go and get authority if he obtained none from her, as he could not, if she was false and corrupt as the Protestant world affirm? If there was such a church why did not Luther attach himself to it, and get authority instead of laying the foundation of a new church? If there was no such church, and the Church of Rome was the only church—pretending even to be the Church of Christ—where did he get his ordination after it was nullified by the powers that first gave it?

And if she was and is a false and corrupt church, as Protestants assert, what authority could she confer on Luther or any one else that God would sanction? If she was the true Church of Christ, she must have been properly organized, indeed perfectly organized, and in possession of a full and perfect faith, or she could not be the true church. And if she was thus organized, how could Luther reform her faith and practice? If they could institute reforms, then she was not the true Church of Christ, for that is a perfect organization as before shown (e). If she was a fallen and apostate church, where was or is her authority to represent the doctrine of Christ? If she became a harlot, then she was divorced from her husband—Christ; for his bride is pure, without spot or blemish. If she becomes otherwise, then he casts her off, and of course she can not hold his name, nor represent him in any sense. How a corrupt tree can bring forth good fruit; or a corrupt, unchaste woman, or church, bring forth a legitimate and pure child, is to be demonstrated by others (d).

Further; if these men were authorized by some divine power outside of the church itself, to reform her faith and practice, why did not they restore her or themselves to the primitive faith and order of the church? Why did not the affects named in Mark follow the preach-

ing? (e). Further, if they did not restore these things, and their departure from them, as in the case of the Church of Rome, is an evidence of apostasy and corruption,—(for the present state of affairs is the same as when Luther began his work, so far as the absence of the spiritual gifts, and apostles, prophets, &c., and the apostolic practice of baptism, and laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Spirit, is concerned)—has there not been another apostasy since Luther's reorganization of the Apostolic church? (Admitting that he did reorganize it, which no one claims.) If Luther restored the true apostolic faith, practice, and church order, then whichever of the hundreds of religious parties manifests that faith, practice and order, and is in possession of those spiritual gifts, (ever attendant upon the true church), then it is the Church of Christ, and holds solely and alone authority to administer the ordinances of the true church? Where is the true church? If Luther did not restore the ancient faith and order, did he re-establish the kingdom of God? If he did, where is it? If he did not, who did? Or is it restored? Or was it never lost, but continued on down uncorrupted in faith and government till now?

If Luther or any one else was authorized to establish a church not after the original pattern, did he receive a "revelation" from God as to how much of the original faith he was to preach, and how much of the original practices he was to restore, or to change their form and intention altogether; and how many of the old officers and spiritual powers he was to retain, and how many to lay aside, and what new officers to choose, and the new name he was to give the organization? If he did not receive a "new revelation," where did he find any such warrant to do as has been done? If he did receive such new revelations, then has God ceased to reveal himself, or speak to the children of men since John the Revelator? If it "pleased" God to

(c) 1 Cor. 12. Eph. 4. (d) Rev. 17 and 18.

(e) Mark 16: 17, 18.

put certain members or officers and powers in his church once, has it since displeased him? If so, is he unchangeable? If it has not displeased him, does it please him for men to institute a new and different order of things, and without revelation?

It is claimed by some, that baptism—immersion—for the remission of sins, in the name of Jesus, is valid baptism, upon profession of faith that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. We ask such: Is immersion, as "an outward sign of inward grace," or because that sins are remitted—not for remission, but simply immersion valid? If so; why then insist on the former alone? If the latter is not valid, then those who were so baptized are not lawfully baptized; and if so, are not baptized at all. If so, and a baptism performed by an unbaptized person is not valid, and there was a time when baptism was not performed for remission, then the first one baptized for remission was not lawfully baptized, inasmuch as the one who baptized him was not baptized for remission; and to trace the matter further, can any run immersion back to the Apostles uninterrupted? If not, then there was a time when sprinkling and pouring alone were practiced. If so, the first one immersed was so administered to by an unimmersed or sprinkled party. Was that baptism valid? If a fountain dried up can not send forth a stream, can baptisms by immersion, and for the remission of sins,

be valid, coming from such a powerless source? If it does not require that baptism, or immersion, be performed by a properly baptized person, then of course it matters not who performs it, whether saint or sinner.

"Yes," says one, "it must be a Christian."

But who is a Christian? It is replied: "A follower of Christ; one who keeps his commands."

Well; is an unbaptized person a follower of Christ,—one who keeps Christ's commands?

Certainly not.

Well then, baptism must be performed by a baptized person after all; and we ask our friends who hold to immersion alone, to the exclusion of all other forms, if immersion can be traced to the Apostles, without interruption, or not? If not, then the first case, after it ceased to be practiced in the few centuries after Christ, must have been performed by a party who himself must have been sprinkled, and according to your faith, an unbaptized man. If the true gospel order was lost, could it be restored short of divine appointment? And may not the angel who brings the everlasting gospel to preach to them who dwell on the earth, restore the ancient order and authorize men to preach and baptize as formerly? And if he has not come, will he not come? (*f*). Will he bring the same or another gospel? (*g*).

(*f*) Rev. 14: 6.

(*g*) Gal. 1: 8.