


27-2

**THE GOSPEL  
....STANDARD  
No. 1. ....LIBRARY**



**VALID —  
CHRISTIAN  
BAPTISM**

BY  
ELDER W. J. HAWORTH.

“One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism.”—*Eph. 4: 5.*

PUBLISHED BY THE BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF THE  
AUSTRALASIAN MISSION OF

THE RE-ORGANIZED CHURCH OF JESUS  
CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY-SAINTS,

60 THOMAS ST., WALLSEND, N.S.W.

And Printed at the  
Federal Printing Works, Bolton & King Streets, Newcastle.

1902.

[www.LatterDayTruth.org](http://www.LatterDayTruth.org)





VALID  
CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

BY

ELDER W. J. HAWORTH.

---

“One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism.”—*Eph. 4: 5.*

---

PUBLISHED BY THE BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF THE AUSTRALASIAN MISSION  
OF  
THE RE-ORGANIZED CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY-SAINTS

60 THOMAS STREET, WALLSEND, N.S.W.

And Printed at the Federal Printing Works, Bolton & King Streets, Newcastle.

1902.



# Valid Christian Baptism.

---

## CHAPTER I.

---

### BE BAPTIZED? HOW?

WATER baptism is looked upon by all Christians as a God-appointed ordinance—a sacrament. Nevertheless, it is a subject upon which christendom is sadly divided. All accept as truth Paul's statement in Ephesians 4: 5, that there is only "one baptism;" but still there are three different baptisms taught by the Christian world. One party teaches that immersion alone is valid Christian baptism. Another class teaches sprinkling as the ordinance appointed by God. Others contend for pouring as scriptural baptism. The advocates of sprinkling and pouring, however, allow that immersion is legal, but think that sprinkling or pouring will do just as well. In other words, they recognize not one, but three baptisms; but how three baptisms can be conjured into "one baptism" is a conundrum we would like to have explained.

Here is a plain statement of the facts in the case: All Christians agree that immersion is proper baptism, but some believe that sprinkling or pouring will do just as well.

Since all agree that immersion is legal baptism, we will not waste time and space in proving what is already conceded, but our endeavour will be to prove that immersion is the "one baptism," by showing that neither sprinkling nor pouring are God-appointed ordinances, and are therefore not valid in His sight. In order to do this, we will examine the several arguments used by pedo-baptists in support of the claim made by them.

First and foremost comes the claim that the word *baptize* is a generic and not a specific term. We are informed by them that when Jesus, in the great commission, told His apostles to "baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," He did not by the word *baptize* direct just how the baptizing was to be done. For example, a man might direct his servant to "go to the city and buy some goods," and the servant would be at liberty to walk, run, or ride in a train, just as he pleased, because the word *go* is a generic term and not specific. This argument would be perfectly logical if our friends could only prove that the word *baptize* is indeed a generic and not a specific term. In support of this claim we are referred to Webster's dictionary, which defines the word *baptism* thus:—

Baptism: The application of water to a person, as a religious ordinance, commonly performed by sprinkling or immersion.

If the word *baptize* were an English word, and Webster the proper one to define its meaning, we would have to give up our side of the case right here. Webster gives us the meaning that *English custom* has attached to the word: but seeing that it is not an English word, but the Greek word *baptizo* slightly modified, and transferred (instead of being translated) into our English bibles, the proper place to look for its meaning is in a good Greek lexicon. We submit extracts from several.

JAMES DONEGAN (a lexicon which was supervised by the faculty of a Presbyterian seminary):—

*Baptizo*: To immerse repeatedly into a liquid, to submerge, to soak thoroughly, to saturate. *Baptus* or *baptismos*: immersion. *Baptos*: immersed, dyed. *Bapto*: To dip, to plunge into water.

DR. JOHN JONES (Greek and English lexicon):—

*Bapto*. I dip, I dye, stain. *Baptizo*. I plunge (in water), dip. *Baptize*: Bury, overwhelm.

BASS:—

*Baptizo*: To dip, immerse, to plunge in water; bathe one's self; to be immersed in sufferings or afflictions.

JOHN GROVES:—

*Baptizo* (from *Bapto*, to dip): Dip, immerse, immerge, plunge, to wash, to cleanse, to purify, to baptize, depress, humble, overwhelm.

The above are four leading lexicographers, the extracts from which prove, beyond reasonable question, that the word *baptizo* is a specific term, and that when Jesus said "baptize" He meant immerse (or dip), and said so quite plainly, for the word means to dip, immerse, plunge, soak, saturate, wash.

Lest anyone may think we have chosen lexicons to suit ourselves, we append the following from one of the greatest scholars of our age.

DR. CONANT, when asked, "Does any respectable lexicon define *baptizo* to sprinkle," replied:—

My dear brother, no respectable lexicographer gives or ever has given 'sprinkle,' or 'besprinkle,' as a definition of *baptizo*. I have all the Greek lexicons of any name.—Hardy-Wilkinson debate, p. 42.

The following testimony will also show the true significance of the word:—

R. PENGILLY, on baptism, pp. 9, 10:—

The (Greek) radicle: *bapto*, to dip; *ranei*, sprinkling; *ekkei*, pouring.

BRETSCHNEIDER:—

An entire immersion belongs to the nature of baptism; this is the meaning of the word.—Theo. Cip., vol. 2, p. 681.

WILLIAM SMITH:—

Baptism properly and literally means immersion.—Bible Dictionary, p. 73.

BEZA:—

Christ commanded us to be baptized; by which word, it is certain, immersion is signified.—Epistolato in Marc 7: 4.

SALMASIUS:—

Baptism is immersion, and was administered in former times according to the force and meaning of the word.—De Cess, vii., p. 699.

VITRINGA:—

The act of baptizing is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the force of the word. Thus, also, was it performed by Christ and His apostles.—Aph. Theo. Lane. Aph. 884.

RICHARD FULLER:—

In commanding His disciples to be baptized, Jesus knew what act He enjoined, and He could have been at no loss for a word clearly to express His meaning. Did He intend sprinkling? The word was *rantizo*. Did He require pouring? The word was *keo*. If wash, *nipo*; if bathe, *lono*; if immerse or dye (the word having this latter meaning, because dyeing is by immersing), *bapto*. If Jesus meant immerse, and nothing else, the word was *baptize*. This is the word He has used, and which the Holy Spirit always employs when the rite of baptism is mentioned.—Spiritual Baptism, p. 36.

PROF. CHARLES ANTHON:—

The primary meaning of the word *baptizo* is to dip or immerse. . . . Sprinkling, etc., are entirely out of the question.—To Dr. E. Parmeley, March 27, 1843.

Those who have studied mathematics will remember that it is an axiom, that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. The same is also true with regard to logic.

Dr. Barnes tells us in his commentary that the Hebrew word *tabal*, which is rendered by the Greek word “*baptizo*,” occurs only fifteen times in the Old Testament. Following are the quotations: Leviticus 4: 6; Leviticus 14: 6, 51; Numbers 19: 18; Ruth 2: 14; Exodus 12: 22; Deuteronomy 33: 24; Ezekiel 23: 15; Job 9: 31; Leviticus 9: 9; 1 Samuel 14: 27; 2 Kings 5: 14; 2 Kings 8: 15; Genesis 37: 31; Joshua 3: 15. It occurs in no other place, and an examination of the texts will show that in fourteen of the cases it is rendered “dip”; in the remaining one, *dyled*, which can only be done by dipping. When the Jews, in translating their scriptures into Greek, came to this word *tabal* they rendered it “*baptizo*,” and when our translators came to this same word, they rendered it by the English word *dip*. It therefore follows, that since *dip* in English, and *baptizo* in Greek, are both equivalent to *tabal* in Hebrew, they must be equivalent to each other. Therefore, the word *baptizo* means to dip.

The Rubric (Church of England ritual) provides that after a child has been named, the priest shall dip it in the water discreetly and warily; but adds that, should the parents certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it.

MR. JOHN WESLEY, the founder of the Methodist Church, thus records a genuine immersion as required in the Rubric:—

Mary Welsh, aged eleven days, was baptized according to the custom of the first church and the rule of the Church of England, by immersion.—John Wesley’s Journal, vol. 3, p. 20.

On page 24 of the same volume he says:—

I was asked to baptize a child of Mr. Parker’s, second bailiff of Savannah; but Mrs. P. told me, neither Mr. P. nor I will consent to its being dipped. I answered, if you certify that the child is weak, it will suffice (the Rubric says) to pour water upon it. She replied, Nay, the child is not weak, but I am resolved it shall not be dipped. This argument I could not confute, so I went home and the child was baptized by another.

We will now consider another argument often made by those who advocate sprinkling and pouring. We are informed that when John came baptizing, he made a very emphatic statement, which clearly shows how he baptized. He said, “I indeed baptize you with water.” From this statement the argument is made that the word *with* implies that the water was applied to the person, as in sprinkling; and not the person to the water, as in immersion.

Suppose I were to say, "I filled the fountain pen, with which I am writing, with ink," could you tell whether I had poured the ink into it, or whether I had dipped it into an inkstand, and filled it in that way? No, you could not tell how I had filled it, even though I had used that very conclusive word *with*. The reason you could not tell, is because the word *with* was not used to make known how the act was performed, but simply to make the fact clear that the pen had been filled with ink, and not with water, or paint, or any other fluid. So with the statement made by John; the word *with* only serving to make the fact clear that he was baptizing with water, and not with a mixture of water and oil, or water and blood, such as was employed in many of the washings under the law. How it was done was conveyed independently of the word *with*. The word *baptize* tells how it was done, for we have already shown that the word means to immerse or dip. And now we want to enter our solemn protest against the rendering which makes that verse read, "with water."

Our reason for protesting is that in the Greek New Testament, this statement of John's, repeated so many times, reads in every instance, "I indeed baptize you in water." It is in no case rendered "with."

Having given a valid reason for dissatisfaction with the authorized rendering, we will proceed to show that the primary meaning of the word employed is *in*.

The Greek prepositions *en* and *eis*, correspond in their primary meanings to the English words *in* and *into*, respectively. In the Greek Testament, John 1: 26 reads: "Baptizo *en* udati" (I baptize in water); also in verses 31 and 33. In Mark 1: 9, the preposition is not *en* but *eis*, and says that Jesus was baptized (dipped) into Jordan. The two words *en* and *eis* are the only words by which the Greek language can convey the idea of going into or being *in* a thing or place; so as these are the words used, we think we have ample reason for our complaint.

*En* means "in," in Greek as much as *in* means "in," in English; and although it has secondary meanings, it is a bad rule to discard the primary meaning of a word in favor of its secondary meaning, when the meaning of that word is under discussion.

As the word *en* occurs 2,720 times in the Greek Testament, in only about forty of which it necessarily means "with," the chances are, that as 2,720 is to 40, an argument based on the word *with* (where it stands for *en*) will lead to a false conclusion, and vice versa. So although the word *with* only signifies that water was the liquid John baptized in, and not a mixture of water and oil, or blood and water, we believe that "in water" is the true rendering, and until convinced otherwise, will stand by the Greek Testament.

By the way, we might mention that the Greek Church (the people best calculated to understand the meaning of all these disputed words) recognizes only immersion as Christian baptism.



A further argument, based on the word *with*, is that as the disciples were baptized with the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, so did John baptize. Well, we admit it! and say, "Bring forth your strong reasons." Our attention is called to Acts 2: 17, wherein Peter says that the Holy Ghost had been poured out on that day. But why not read the second verse of that same chapter, wherein it says that the Holy Ghost came as a "rushing, mighty wind," and "filled the whole house where they were sitting?" Why go seventeen verses down the chapter to find out how the Spirit came preparatory to that great baptism? If you were to read that one of your friends had been baptized in the baptistery of a certain church, into which the water had been poured by the deacon, would you say that he had been baptized by pouring? And yet that is just what people do when they say the disciples were thus baptized by the pouring out of the Holy Spirit. Verse 2 tells us that the Spirit came into the room (baptistery) with a sound like a "rushing, mighty wind," until it filled the whole house.

If that was not immersion, will some one tell us what it was? Why fill the whole house if it was not to be an immersion? Yes, John baptized in the same way as the apostles were baptized in the Holy Ghost; and that way was immersion. Although the record tells us plainly in several places that the persons baptized "went down into the water," "came up out of the water," and were baptized by John "in Jordan," some have had the assurance to tell us that there is no evidence to prove that any of them were *dipped* in the water. As this is not an argument, but simply an extremely desperate assertion, we will not meet it by argument, but will simply say that aside from the fact that the word *baptized* tells us plainly that they were dipped, the inference is at least strongly in favor of our side of the question.

Where does it say they were not dipped?

Again, we are sometimes told that the record has been wrongly translated where the phrases "in Jordan" and "into Jordan" occur; such places should read "and were all baptized by John *at* Jordan." Well, we know of one text at least, in which the difficulty cannot be "translated out of" in this way. It will be conceded by all that Naaman, the Syrian leper, dipped himself in Jordan. The text says, 2 Kings 5: 14 (in the Septuagint), "*Ebaptizato en to Jordane*,"—"he dipped himself in Jordan," and it is a remarkable fact that this corresponds precisely with the text in Matthew 3: 6, which says, "*Ebaptizonts en to Jordane*," and had Matthew's reference to baptism been translated instead of being transferred, it would read, "they were dipped by John in Jordan." This coincidence is too remarkable to admit of the rendering, "they were dipped by John *at* Jordan."

Another argument for us to answer is, that although the word is only transferred where it refers to baptism as a religious ordinance [for the acknowledged reason "that the Church of England might reap good fruit thereby"\*], there are several places in which the

\*See Preface King James' Translation.

word *baptizo*, or some of its derivatives, where it does not refer to the ordinance of baptism, has been translated. We are informed that in most of these places immersion would be absurd.

Our attention is first called to Mark 7: 4, wherein we read:—

The washings [baptisms] of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and of tables [or couches].

“Is it not absurd to say that the Jews immersed their tables or couches? Would it not be more feasible to believe that they washed them, as we do, by putting water on them?” If the tables referred to were like our massive cedar and mahogany ones, and the couches like our heavily built and upholstered ones, it would seem that our way was at least the easiest; but even then, we know that the Pharisees did not study ease and comfort in performing what was to them a sacred duty, especially when some one else would have to do the work. When we remember that the little stool which was placed at the head of each guest, while he reclined upon the floor, was called his “table,” and that the mat between him and the floor was called a “couch,” we can see that immersion is not at all absurd. One thing is certain; the cups, pots, and tables were all washed in one way, and as the Old Testament tells us just how they were to be washed, we will settle the matter by appealing thereto. In Leviticus 11: 32, we read:

Whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be, wherein any work is done, it must be put into water, and it shall be unclean until the even; so shall it be cleansed.

Again, in Hebrews 9: 10, Paul speaks of “divers washings” (baptisms) under the law, and pedobaptists indulge the thought that he refers to divers modes of washing (baptizing). Paul does not say one word about the mode of washing; that was settled by the word *baptize* which we have shown means to dip or immerse. What, then, did Paul mean by divers washings? Why, he evidently used the term “divers washings” as we often speak of different washings known to day. We have “hair washes,” “sheep washes,” “face washes,” etc., in common use among us, and we speak of the application of these things as “divers washings.” True, these washes can be applied in different ways, for our word *wash* is not as distinct and exclusive a term as the words *baptizo* and *tabal*. The word *baptizo*, in its radical form, is never translated “wash,” in the New Testament; and when any of its derivatives are rendered “washings,” the washing is signified as a consequence of dipping. By “divers washings” Paul evidently meant such things as the washing of vessels by putting them into water, that they might be cleansed (Leviticus 11: 32); dipping in blood; dipping in blood and running water; dipping in oil; dipping in the water of purification; etc.

We are next directed to examine Mark 7: 4, which says of the Pharisees, “Except they wash, they eat not.” Pedobaptists claim that it is absurd to think that the Pharisees dipped themselves in water, simply because they had been to market. When we read in the law that persons touching unclean things should not only wash themselves, but in some instances their clothes, we would not be

surprised at a Pharisee washing himself "all over," after being to market, the very place where he would be likely to come in contact with things "unclean." But, supposing only the washing of hands was meant (though we firmly believe it referred to the whole body), that would necessitate the dipping of the hands in water.

But our friends argue that this was not the manner of washing hands in Bible times. We are told that "the water was poured on the hands by a servant."

In order to establish this theory they direct us to examine 2 Kings 3: 11, where it is said of Elisha, that he "poured water on the hands of Elijah." And we are asked to believe that this was the way the Pharisees washed! Even granting that this was the manner of washing the hands (and we do not question it), that kind of washing cannot be applied to the phrase, "Except they wash, they eat not." In the third verse there is a reference made to the washing of hands by all Jews, before meals, on ordinary occasions. Here the word used to signify the washing of hands is *nipsonti*, and in this case the hands may have been washed by pouring; but in the fourth verse the word is *baptisonti*, and means to dip or immerse, for the purpose of washing. It is quite easy to find washings spoken of in the New Testament, wherein is contained not only the idea of washing by pouring, but also by sprinkling; but the trouble from a pedobaptist point of view is that the Greek root *bapto* is not contained in any of these references. For instance, in Luke 7: 38, we have it recorded that Mary washed the feet of Jesus with her tears. Surely this was washing by sprinkling; but here, as in Mark 7: 3, the Greek root *bapto* is absent. In Mark 7: 4 it is present, and means to dip, while the termination given conveys the idea that the dipping was for the purpose of washing. We believe the Pharisees dipped the whole body when they washed after coming from market.

A learned Jewish Rabbi, vouched for by Dr. Adam Clarke, and named MAIMONIDES, tells us:—

If the Pharisees touched but the garments of the common people, they were defiled all over, as if they had touched a profous [leprous?] person, and needed immersion, and were obliged to do it.

Again, he says:—

Every person baptized or dipped, whether he was washed from pollution, or baptized unto proselytism, must dip his whole body at one dipping, and wheresoever in the law washing of the body or garments is mentioned, it means nothing else.

Luke 11: 38 is sometimes pointed out as another place in which the washing of hands is referred to:—

And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner.

A careful reading of the next verse will show that a washing of the whole body was meant. Jesus compared the washing expected of Him to the washing of cups and platters. Verse 39 reads:—

And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. They washed the outside of their bodies, but neglected the cleansing of the heart.

Before me is a treatise on this subject by a Church of England clergyman (Brookes), in which the following appears:—

There are four places in the New Testament where the word *dip* really does occur. Matt 26: 23: "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish." Luke 16: 24: "That he may dip the tip of his finger in water." John 13: 26 (twice): "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."

He then proceeds to argue that since the word translated "dip" is not *baptizo*, but *bapto*, *baptizo* cannot mean to dip; but he destroys any force there might be in this argument by trying to prove in the next paragraph that the phrase in Mark 7: 4 "Except they wash, they eat not," refers to the washing of hands. He admits that where the washing of hands is mentioned in verse 3 the Greek word is *nipsonti*, and that in verse 4 the Greek word rendered wash is *baptisonti*. Now if *baptizo* cannot mean "dip," because *bapto* means "to dip," how can *baptisonti* mean the washing of hands when *nipsonti* fills the bill? We are affirming just the opposite of what is claimed by the writer referred to; so both of us cannot be right. In verification of our claim we present the following testimony from the Greek lexicon of M. WRIGHT:—

*Bapto*: I dip, plunge, immerse, wash, etc. *Baptizo*: I dip, immerse, plunge, saturate, etc.

We consider this ample testimony to establish the harmony between these two words.

*Nipsonti*: To wet, wash; wash the hands or feet. *Baptisonti*: Immersion in water; ceremonial purification.

With the above information, and a request to "search other lexicons and be satisfied," we leave the readers to judge for themselves as to who is right in this matter.

1 Corinthians 10: 2 is often pointed to as proof of "baptism" by aspersion. The strong "East wind" is said to have sprinkled the Israelites, when they "all passed through the sea; and were all baptized . . . in the cloud and in the sea." A careful reading of this text will reveal the fact that the baptism did not take place while they were passing through the sea. The language shows that they were baptized after they had passed through the sea. Two separate acts are recorded; first: "they all passed through the sea;" second: "and were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea." Note: "in the sea;" how then could it have occurred while they passed through "dry shod?" (Ex. 14: 29; Isa. 11: 15, 16.)

Again: It is argued by some that Paul was sprinkled, because Ananias said to him: "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." The Greek word "*anastas*," here rendered "arose," might also be rendered "standing up;" and, if so, Paul must have been baptized "standing up."

We could as consistently say that David "fled standing" when he arose and fled for fear of Saul; or that the young men who buried Ananias and Sapphira were "standing still" all the time they were wrapping up the bodies, carrying them out, and burying them, for it reads:—

The young men "arose," wound them up, carried them out, and buried them.—Acts 5: 6.

Paul leaves no room for doubt as to how he was baptized, for he tells us plainly, in Romans 6: 4, 5, that he was "buried with Christ by baptism into death," and that he was "planted in the likeness of Christ's death."

How was Christ buried? Reader, you are interested in knowing this, for in like manner you must be "buried in baptism," or to use another figure, "planted in the likeness of His death." Jesus was buried in a tomb—a cave-like hole in the rocks—and the entrance sealed up by a stone. Thus He was separated from the world—hidden from view—entirely covered up. But it was only, as it were, a plunge into the tomb; for in three days He came forth once more; risen by the glory of the Father. Paul says to the Romans:—

Therefore we [himself included] 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.—6: 4,

What a beautiful illustration? Jesus was buried in the tomb, entirely covered up, and in course of time arose again. So the believer is buried beneath the liquid wave, and comes forth again to walk in newness of life. This was how Paul was baptized.

We are now informed by our friends that the water supply of Jerusalem would not permit of such large numbers being baptized as are mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. That the reader may be able to judge of the merit of this argument, we present the following evidence: In 2 Kings 18:17, we read of the "upper pool." 2 Kings 20: 20 speaks of the "pool that Hezekiah made." Nehemiah 2: 14 also mentions a "fountain and the king's pool." Isaiah 22: 9 tells us of the waters of the "lower pool." John 5: 2 makes mention of "the pool of Bethesda." And John 9: 7 refers to "the pool of Siloam."

Dr. ROBINSON says:—

Immense cisterns, now and anciently, existed within the area of the temple, partly supplied with rain water and partly with the aqueduct. Almost every house had a cistern in it.—Robinson's Res. in Pal., p. 480.

Again, he says:—

With reservoirs Jerusalem was abundantly supplied, to say nothing of the immense pools of Solomon beyond Bethlehem, which were no doubt constructed for the benefit of the Holy City.—Ibid., p. 483.

Again:—

There are on the north side of the city, outside the walls, two very large reservoirs; one of which is over 300 feet long and more than 200 feet wide, and the other 600 feet long by over 250 feet wide. . . . Within the walls are the pool of Bethesda 360 feet long by 130 feet wide, and the pool of Hezekiah 240 feet long by 144 feet broad. . . . There are also aqueducts and numerous fountains.—Ibid., p. 480-516.

Another objection against immersion, as the "one baptism," is that the twelve apostles could not have baptized the three thousand converts on the day of Pentecost, if "baptize" means to immerse, and nothing else. By reading Acts 1: 13-15, we find that 120 persons belonging to the church were present on that day. I am sure no one will affirm that none of the "seventy" whom Jesus sent out under the twelve were present on that occasion. But we will suppose

that the twelve apostles alone attended to the baptisms. This would give two hundred and fifty persons to each administrator, which, calculated at the rate of one person per minute, and with fifty minutes added for a service at the water side, would occupy just five hours. Let us see if there was time for this on the day of Pentecost. While Peter was speaking, it was the "third hour of the day,"—nine o'clock in the morning. (Acts 2: 15.) This would leave nine hours between then and six o'clock in the evening. We will allow Peter two hours in which to finish his speech. That will bring us to eleven o'clock. Supposing it took them an hour to walk to the water, it would then be twelve o'clock—noon. If they devoted fifty minutes to another service and then began to baptize at the rate of one person per minute, they would be finished at five p.m., and would be able to walk back home by six o'clock. These time allowances are extremely liberal, for modern preachers have demonstrated that they can baptize faster than that.

In 1888 it was published in London, England, that in July, 1878, in India, at Velumpilly, two miles north of Oongole, 2,222 were baptized in six hours, by six administrators; only two baptizing at once.—Bapt. Immersion, R. C. Evans, p. 55.

Having examined the main arguments used in favour of pouring and sprinkling, we now call the attention of the reader to a brief summary of the proofs adduced.

1. All Christians agree that immersion is proper baptism, though some call sprinkling and pouring also legal baptism.

2. That the Greek words *bapto* and *baptizo* convey exclusively the idea of dipping, or immersing, and therefore "baptize" is a specific term.

3. That the Hebrew word *tabal*, which in English is rendered "dip," is in the Greek *baptizo*; and that as both the English word *dip*, and the Greek word *baptizo*, are equal to *tabal* in Hebrew, they must be equal to one another.

4. That the Church of England ritual provides for the dipping of infants in the font, with pouring and sprinkling as alternatives in case of weakness.

5. That John's reference to baptizing "with water" does not show how the act was performed, but only that he baptized with water, and not with water mixed with oil or blood.

6. That in the Greek Testament John's statement reads, "I indeed baptize you in water."

7. That the baptism of the Spirit at Pentecost was immersion; the pouring out only being preparatory to the immersion.

8. That the cups, pots, etc., of Mark 7: 4, were dipped for the purpose of washing.

9. That the "divers washings" (baptisms) of Hebrews 9: 10, were not divers "modes" of washing, but divers washings; for instance, "dipping in pure water," "dipping in blood," "dipping in blood and running water," "dipping in oil," etc., etc.

10. That the phrase, "Except they wash, they eat not," in Mark 7: 4, referred to dipping of the whole body, for the purpose of washing, and not merely the washing of hands as referred to in the preceding verse.

11. That the Greek word *bapto*, which is translated "dip," in Matthew 26: 23, Luke 16: 24, and John 13: 23, corresponds (in its meaning) to the word *baptizo*, which is rendered "baptize."

12. That the Israelites were baptized *after* they had passed through the sea, and not by the east wind as they passed through, "dry shod."

13. That the water supply of Jerusalem was quite equal to the demand that immersion would make upon it.

14. That the twelve apostles alone could easily have performed the task of baptizing the three thousand.

We now submit for your consideration: 1. That neither sprinkling nor pouring are God-appointed ordinances, and, therefore, cannot be valid in His sight. To say they are "just as valid as immersion," gives the case away. God made immersion valid; who made the others "just as valid?" Who? 2. That John, and all the apostles administered the ordinance of baptism by immersing the candidate in water. 3. That immersion is the genuine coin cast by Jesus, and upon which is the official stamp—"one baptism."

How is it, then, that there is another coin in existence, bearing the motto, "Three baptisms?" In order to show by whom this false coin was cast, we refer to some of the historians.

Our first witness will be that celebrated ecclesiastical historian, Dr. JOHN L. MOSHEM, Chancellor of the University of Gottingen. Of the first century he says:—

The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed, and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font.—Eccles. Hist., cent. 2, part 2, chap. 4, par. 8.

Of the second century, he says:—

The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the Devil, and his pompous allurements, were immersed under water, and received into Christ's kingdom.—Ibid., cent. 2, part 2, chap. 4, par. 13.

Our next witness is Dr PHILLIP SCHAFF, a professor in a pedo-baptist seminary, Mercersburg, Pennsylvania. He says:—

Immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original normal form. This is shown by the very meaning of the Greek words, *baptizo*, *baptisma*, and *Baptismos*, used to designate the rite. Then, again, by the analogy of the baptism of John, which was performed in the Jordan ["en"], Matthew 3: 6, compare with 16;—also *eis ton Jordanan* [into the Jordan], Mark 1: 9; furthermore, by the New Testament comparisons of baptism with the passage through the Red Sea, 1 Corinthians 10: 2; with the flood, 1 Peter 2: 21; with a *Bath*, Ephesians 5: 26 Titus 3: 5; with a burial and resurrection, Romans 6: 4; Colossians 2: 12; and, finally, by the general usage of ecclesiastical antiquity, which was always immersion, as it is to this day in the Oriental, and also in the Greco-Russian Churches, pouring and sprinkling being substituted only in cases of urgent necessity, such as sickness and approaching death.—Hist. Apost. Church, p. 568.

NEANDER, in a letter to Judd, says, speaking of the early centuries of the Christian era:—

The practice of immersion was beyond doubt prevalent in the whole church. The only exception was made with the sick—hence called *Baptisma clinicorum*

THOMAS STACKHOUSE says, in his "History of the Bible" :—

We nowhere read in Scripture of any one's being baptized but by immersion, and several authors have proved, by the acts of councils and ancient rituals, that this manner of immersion continued as much as possible to be used for thirteen hundred years after Christ.

Space will not permit us to bring forward more testimony from history, to show that the true coin—immersion—was current in the church for several centuries after Christ, although there is much that has been written on this subject, both by the historians and the early fathers. We will therefore begin to call up the witnesses to the casting of the counterfeit coin.—Our first witness is Dr. WALL, vicar of Shoreham, Kent, England, who on February 9, 1706, received a vote of thanks from the general convocation of the Church of England clergy, for the excellent book he had written on infant baptism. He says, speaking of "baptism" by aspersion:—

The most ancient of which is that of Novatian, who (A.D. 251) while lying in bed from sickness, received what they called clinic baptism. This is the most ancient case on record.

Our next witness is EUSEBIUS. Speaking of Novatian, he says :—

Who, aided by the exorcists, when attacked with an obstinate disease, and being supposed at the point of death, was baptized by aspersion, in the bed on which he lay; if, indeed, it be proper to say that one like him did receive baptism. But neither when he recovered from disease, did he partake of other things, which the rules of the church prescribe as duty, nor was he sealed [in confirmation], by the bishop. But as he did not obtain this, how could he obtain the Holy Spirit?—Eccles. Hist., p. 266.

Our next witness, DIONYSIUS, says :—

We justly cherish an aversion to the Novatian, by whom the church is split asunder, and some of the brethren have been drawn into impiety, and blasphemy, and most nefarious doctrine has been introduced respecting God, and our most gracious Lord and Saviour, Christ, has been calumniated as devoid of compassion; which also, beside all this, sets aside the holy baptism, and overturns the faith and confession that precedes it.

Although this is the first instance on record of "baptism" by aspersion, it was not countenanced by the church except as clinic (sick) baptism. When the man recovered, church privileges were denied him, by reason of which a split was caused in the church. It was not for many centuries after that that the church declared immersion and pouring indifferent.

The Edinburgh Encyclopædia, edited by the learned Sir DAVID BREWSTER, in the article on baptism, says :—

The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner. Pope Stephen II., being driven from Rome by Adolphus, King of the Lombards, in 753, fled to Pepin, who a short time before had usurped the crown of France. While he remained there the monks of Cressy, in Brittany, consulted him whether, in case of necessity, baptism performed by pouring water on the head of the infant would be lawful. Stephen replied that it would. But though the truth of this fact should be allowed, which however, some Catholics deny, yet pouring or sprinkling was admitted only in cases of necessity. It was not till the year 1311 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 till after the Reformation; and in England, even in the reign of Edward VI., immersion was commonly observed. But during the persecution of Mary (Queen of Scots), many persons, most of whom were Scotchmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there greedily imbibed the opinions



of that church. In 1556 a book was published at that place, containing the form of prayers and ministrations of sacraments, approved by the famous and godly-learned man, John Calvin, in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand and lay it on the child's forehead. These Scottish exiles, who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of John Calvin; and returning to their own country, with John Knox at their head, in 1559, established sprinkling in Scotland. From Scotland this practice made its way into England in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorised by the established church.

Let us recall DR. WALL:—

France seems to have been the first country in the world where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily to persons in health, and in the public way of administering it. It being allowed to weak children (in the reign of Queen Elizabeth) to be baptized by aspersion, many fond ladies and gentlemen first, and then by degrees the common people, would obtain the favour of the priest to have their children *pass* for weak children, too tender to endure dipping in the water. As for sprinkling, properly so called, it was at 1645 just then beginning, and used by very few. It must have begun in the disorderly times after forty-one (1641). They (the assembly of divines at Westminster) reformed the font into a basin. This learned assembly could not remember that fonts to baptize in had been always used by the primitive Christians before the beginning of popery, and ever since churches were built; but that sprinkling, for the purpose of baptizing, was really introduced (in France first, and then in other popish countries) in times of popery, and that, accordingly, in all those countries in which the usurped power of the Pope is, or has formerly been owned, have left off dipping of children in the fonts; and that all other countries in the world, which have never regarded his authority, do still use it; and that basins (to sprinkle out of), except in cases of necessity, were never used by papists, or any other Christians whatsoever, till by themselves.—Hist. Inf. Bapt., part 2, chap. 9.

Again, he says:—

The way that is ordinarily used, we cannot deny to have been a novelty, brought into this church (the English) by those that had learned it at Germany or at Geneva; and they, not content to follow the example of pouring a quantity of water (which had been introduced instead of immersion), but improved it (if I may so abuse that word) from pouring to sprinkling, that it might have as little resemblance to the ancient way of baptizing as possible.—Def. of Hist. Inf. Bapt., p. 403.

Any of our readers who may desire to read more about how the current coin of baptism came to be counterfeited, would do well to read the articles on baptism in the "Edinburgh Encyclopædia," the "British Encyclopædia," and the "Encyclopædia Americana." In those volumes you will read that by the determined efforts of Dr. Lightfoot, the Westminster assembly of divines, after a warm discussion regarding the adoption of sprinkling, decided by a majority of twenty-five over twenty-four to adopt sprinkling as the rule of the (English) church. This was in the year 1643; and in the next year an act of Parliament was passed, requiring the parents of all children in the realm to have them sprinkled. In the year 1648, an Ecclesiastical Council, held at Cambridge, Massachusetts, adopted sprinkling in the place of immersion; and in May of that year, the legislature of that state passed a law making it a penal offence for anyone to *say* that infant sprinkling was not good and valid baptism.

Reader, our task is done. We have shown that sprinkling was legalized by the authority of the Roman Church at Ravenna, in the year 1311. John Calvin, the reformer, did not reform the practice of

the Roman Church, but rather adopted it. This was also done by the Presbyterians under John Knox. Then by the Church of England in 1643, enforced by Act of Parliament, and also in America in 1648. The coin is here. It bears the inscription: "Three Baptisms." The power that issued it declared sprinkling, pouring, or immersion to be indifferent. But on the same coin there is another figure, the impress of the authority that issued it. In our Saviour's words we ask: Whose image and superscription is this? And echoing down through the pages of history comes the answer: Cæsar's (Rome's).

Dear reader, whom do you wish to honor? If you desire to do honor to Cæsar [Rome], "then render to Cæsar [Rome] the things that are Cæsar's" [Rome's]; but if you wish to do honor to God, "Render to God the things that are God's."



## CHAPTER II.

### BE BAPTIZED? WHO?

Who are proper subjects for baptism? All persons who have heard the gospel of Jesus Christ and have been converted to a belief in its precepts, are fit subjects for baptism. Such persons will believe in God the Eternal Father, and in Jesus Christ His Son. They will also realise that they have "sinned and come short of the glory of God." They will repent of their sins; or, as Paul puts it (Romans 6: 6), will crucify the old man with his evil deeds, and will by the act of baptism, bury him in the likeness of Christ's death. Then, like Christ, who rose from the dead "to the glory of the Father," they will come forth from the watery grave to walk in newness of life.

In the "great commission" given by our Saviour to His apostles, He told them to preach the gospel, and to baptize those who believed. They were true to this command, for we read that Peter preached to the people assembled at Pentecost, till they were "pricked in their hearts," and made known their belief by saying, "men and brethren, what shall we do?" That the people of Samaria "believed Philip and were baptized;" that Paul and Silas told the Philippian jailor to believe on the Lord Jesus, and then baptized him; that Paul taught the necessity of belief in Jesus to the twelve men at Ephesus, and then baptized them; that Philip said to the eunuch, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." Like Philip, we say to all, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest."

But some reader may here inquire, "Does not the doctrine that belief must precede baptism preclude the baptism of infants?" Yes, for infants have not the capacity to believe; but if it were necessary for infants to be baptized, we believe that the great God, who has furnished a supply to meet every other demand, would have supplied the infant with the necessary intelligence, to fill the demand that belief must precede baptism.

We understand that Jesus "came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance" (Matt. 9: 13). He also taught, "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick" (Matt. 9: 12).

To which class do infants belong?

Are they righteous, or are they sinners—sick or whole?

The Church of Rome classes them with the sinner, believing that they are "totally depraved," "wholly corrupt," and "heirs of hell."

We are pleased to notice that although the above doctrine once held a place in all the popular creeds, it is now being eliminated from most of them. It is wrong to presume that children are "totally

depraved," "wholly corrupt," etc., simply because David said, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity; in sin did my mother conceive me." The iniquity or sin was upon his mother's head, not upon his. Sin is the transgression of law! What law does a baby transgress that it can be classed among sinners? None; for Jesus has said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." Angels are not sinners; neither are babies.

But we are asked, "Does not Adam's sin rest upon the little ones still?" No; for the Lamb of God has taken away "the sin" of the world. The death of Jesus has removed that curse from all mankind. Since then, we have the assurance "That every man will be judged according to his works" (Rev 20:13), and not because of Adam's transgression. The doctrine that babies are sinners is the parent of infant sprinkling. As sure as the parent doctrine is sinking into oblivion, among the great mass of people who have shaken off the fetters of priestcraft, so must its child go the way of all things earthly—like its creators, it is mortal. Jesus forever settled which class they belong to when He said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." A learned minister once said, "If a child is fit to enter the kingdom of God—the church triumphant—it is fit to enter the church militant." That all depends upon which class you consign the infant to. Such reasoning would be perfectly consistent, if it came from a person who classed the infant with the sinner; but it is just the reverse of consistent when it comes from one who classes the infant with the angels—those who need not a physician. A person who classes the children with the angels in heaven, cannot logically make such a statement as the above one, unless he believes it necessary for the angels also to become members of the church militant. If all belonged to the same class as infants and angels, there would be no need for the church militant. The church was not established for the righteous—those who had not sinned—but for the sinner. Hospitals are not built for the treatment of those who are whole; neither was God's spiritual hospital—the church—established for the treatment of those who had not contracted the soul-destroying disease of sin. The church is indeed God's spiritual hospital for the treatment of the disease of sin; and Jesus came to the world to invite those who were sick with that disease into it; but until the disease manifests itself, there is no need for treatment.

As pedobaptists often assert that infant sprinkling is apostolic in origin, we will notice some of the arguments made by them in support of this claim. Some of them inform us, with assurance, that the children of believers have a natural right to baptism, but that the children of unbelievers have no such right. If this is so, it is very unfair, for a child cannot choose its parentage. Such teaching also strikes at one of the grandest attributes of God—impartiality. It rears its dragon head against the principle which God especially revealed to Peter, "That He is no respecter of persons." But let us examine the proofs presented. Acts 2:38, 39 is first presented for our consideration, wherein the apostle Peter says: "Repent, and be

baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ ;” and in which he continues to say, “For the promise is unto you, and to your children.” We are asked to accept this as proof that the apostles taught infant baptism, as a privilege of believers’ children. Let us examine the scripture quoted, and see if there is really any reference to infant baptism there. Peter’s words were these :—

Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and [Peter is now making a promise] ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise [the promise of the Holy Ghost] is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.

The promise was not baptism, but the gift of the Holy Ghost. If the promise had been baptism, that would have been no evidence in favor of infant baptism ; for though the children mentioned waited till they were grown men and women, they would still be the children of those whom Peter addressed. To argue (from the words “unto you and to your children”) that they would have to be baptized at once would be absurd, for Peter further said the promise was “to all that are afar off.” To at once baptize all those that are mentioned would necessitate the baptism of the majority before they were born ! The first part of that memorable sentence must be interpreted in the light of the concluding phrase, “Even as many as the Lord our God shall call.” Let us see—whom does God call ? Hear Jesus :—

I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.—Matt. 9 : 13.

No babies were baptized on that day, for we read that only they “that gladly received His word were baptized.” (Acts 2:41.) They also “sold their possessions,” and did break “bread from house to house,” eating “their meat with gladness and singleness of heart,” “praising God.” (Verses 45-47.)

The case of Cornelius and his household is next cited, and the assertion made that there must have been infants in that household. But when we read, in Acts 10 that Cornelius feared God with all his house (verse 2) ; that when Peter arrived the household assembled to hear the word of the Lord ; and that they all received the Holy Ghost, and spake in tongues and magnified God, we are quite satisfied that they were all adults, whom Peter commanded to be baptized.

We will next consider the case of Lydia and her household, cited by pedobaptists as an instance of infant baptism. (Acts 16:15.) We fail to notice here even the slightest hint of babies. In fact, verse 40 shows us they were all men ; for after Paul and Silas were liberated from prison, they entered into the house of Lydia, and saw the “brethren” and “comforted” them.

The case of the Philippian jailor is often cited as an evidence of infant baptism. Acts 16:32 tells us that the apostles spake unto “all that were in the house ;” verse 33 says that all were baptized ; and verse 34 informs us that all believed and rejoiced. Babies cannot intelligently hear, neither can they believe, and as all in the jailor’s house both heard and believed, we can say with assurance that no babies were among those baptized.

1 Corinthians 1:16 is the only other instance of household baptism. Paul says therein:—

And I baptized also the household of Stephanas.

There were no babies in this household, either, for Paul gives us to understand that they were all adults. He says of them:—

They have addicted themselves to the ministry of the Saints.—1 Cor. 16:15.

Fancy a baby addicting itself to the ministry of the Saints!

For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.—1 Cor. 7:14.

This is quite often cited as evidence for infant baptism. It is claimed "that if children are 'holy,' they have a right to baptism." In this text we fail to notice any allusion to baptism. It should be understood that the words *sanctified* and *holy* were used by the Jews in the ceremonial, as well as the moral sense. Paul evidently was not speaking of "holiness" or "sanctification" in the moral sense; for, in that case, not only the children would be made holy by the belief of one parent, but the unbelieving parent would also be sanctified by the believing one. If the child had a right to baptism because of this holiness, so did the unbelieving parent, and this our friends are loth to admit. In Ezra 10:3, the Jews were forbidden to continue in marriage relations with Gentile wives. The offspring of such marriages would be "unclean." This was evidently what Paul had reference to; and he was showing them that under the gospel things were somewhat different. Under the gospel the unbelieving parent was "sanctified," in the ceremonial sense, and the children were "holy," in the same sense.

The claim is sometimes made that under the gospel dispensation baptism takes the place of circumcision, and that as the Jewish children were admitted into the church when eight days old, by circumcision, so should our children be admitted into the Christian church at an early age, by baptism. We are surprised that in this enlightened age there are to be found a great many people who are just credulous enough to follow the above "cunningly devised fable." In the first place, the ordinance of circumcision was not the means of entrance into the Jewish church; for if such were the case, that church was composed exclusively of males!

Dear reader, do you believe that the Jewish female was such an insignificant being in the sight of God that He ignored her, by only making provision for the salvation of the males? God is not a respecter of persons, and under all dispensations the door into His church will be one bearing the invitation to all alike, "Knock and it shall be opened unto you." It is a historical fact that the means of admission into the Jewish church was by baptism. Paul tells us (1 Cor. 10:1, 2.) that the fathers "all passed through the sea, and were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea."

In Genesis 17:1-11, we read that God made a covenant with Abraham. Abraham's part of the contract was that he and the male portion of his seed should submit to the ordinance of circumcision.

God's part of it was that if the seed of Abraham were faithful in discharging this duty, He would reward them by "giving them the land of Canaan as an everlasting possession." Verse 7 calls this covenant an "everlasting covenant," and as such the Jews still recognize it. Although the Jews are now scattered over all the face of the earth, God has promised, by the mouth of His holy prophets, to restore again to them the land they love. He will not do this unless they fulfil their part of the contract, for the covenant is an "everlasting one," and His part of it is only as a reward of faithfulness in the discharge of their part. Since the Jews continue to follow the law of circumcision, under an everlasting covenant, how can baptism take its place? But, says one, it does not take its place; it only stands in the same relation. Well, my friend, how do you account for this: under the old covenant, although a Jew was circumcised at eight days old, he had to be baptized when he grew up. Under the gospel dispensation, the Jew, as well as the Gentile, is commanded to be baptized; but does that relieve him from being circumcised, and seeing that his sons are subjected to the same ordinance at eight days of age? No; for to be circumcised and have the same done for his sons, is his part of an "everlasting covenant," upon which the restoration of his loved land depends. Then, seeing that he has been commanded, under both dispensations, to be baptized in order to enter the church, and that by the terms of an "everlasting covenant," he must be circumcised under both, how can baptism stand in the same relation under the new covenant as circumcision did under the old? Under both, the Jew must be baptized to receive a heavenly reward, and under both he must be circumcised in order to receive an earthly reward.

We fail to see how an ordinance carrying a promise of heavenly reward can stand in the same relation as an ordinance having only the promise of an earthly reward.

One section of the advocates of infant baptism calls attention to 1 Corinthians 10: 1, 2:—

Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea: and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea,

as proof that infant baptism was carried on among the Jews. "Paul says all the fathers were baptized. Will anyone say no infants were among them?" It is very evident that there is some limitation to the number of "fathers" who were baptized, after the exit from Egypt. Many of the fathers had died before that time; many had not been born. To argue that all the fathers, without limitation, were baptized on that occasion would be a palpable absurdity. Since there must be a limitation, who shall say where that limitation ends? By using the term "fathers," Paul excludes from that sentence all the females in the Israelitish camp; and yet we know that the females as well as the males passed through the sea. If, then, the passing through the sea, and the baptism of the females, escaped the notice of Paul, when framing this sentence, would he be

likely to include in the same sentence the little unconscious male children? Why did he forget the female children if that text is an evidence of the baptism of infants?

To prove that there were no unconscious baptisms, we will ask you to consider another of the writings of Paul:—

Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness: when your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years.—Heb. 3: 8, 9.

Will our pedobaptist friends affirm that the little unconscious babes in the Israelitish camp actually hardened their hearts, tempted the Lord, proved Him, and saw His works forty years? If they will not affirm this, they must admit that the term “fathers” applies only to those who have attained to years of discretion and accountability. By conceding this, they hand us the key to their position, regarding the baptism of the “fathers” under Moses.

Again, Hebrews 4: 2, referring to these same “fathers,” says:—  
For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them.

Do you, dear reader, think that the gospel was preached unto little unconscious babes? and yet the record says that the gospel was preached unto the fathers; and the little ones—if they lived—would afterward be called fathers. We are forced to the conclusion that if the gospel was preached to any children that might be included in the term “fathers,” that the preaching did not occur until they had reached an age when they could intelligently hear and comprehend it. Why the preaching of this gospel? For no other reason than to call them to repentance and baptism. Preaching first, baptism after belief and repentance.

Having examined what are termed “the most positive scriptural proofs,” we leave the reader to judge whether the statements that “infant baptism” is “apostolic in origin” or “warranted in scripture” are true or not. Here are several candid admissions by leading pedobaptists writers, with reference to the scripturalness of infant baptism.

The most eminent of all, DR. WALL, says:—

Among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any infants.

DR. BURNETT says:—

There is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for the baptism of infants.

MARTIN LUTHER, the noted reformer, says:—

It cannot be proved that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or by the first Christians after the apostles.

ERASMUS, another reformer, says in his notes on Romans 6: 14:

The apostle does not seem to treat of infants. It was not the custom for infants to be baptized,

DR. HANNA, editor of *The North British Review*, says:—

The baptismal service [of the English Church] is founded upon scripture, but its application to unconscious infants is destitute of any express scriptural warrant. Scripture knows nothing of the baptism of infants.

NEANDER, the pedobaptist historian, says:

It is *certain* that Christ did not ordain infant baptism.



DR. MILLER, of Princeton Presbyterian Theological Seminary, says:—

The fact is that during the whole three score years after the ascension of Christ, which is embraced in the New Testament history, we have no hint of the baptism of infants born of Christian parents.

JOHN CALVIN says:—

It is nowhere expressed by the Evangelists, that any one infant was baptized.

DR. TAYLOR, of the Church of England, says:—

It is against the perpetual analogy of Christ's doctrine to baptize infants; for besides that Christ never gave any precept to baptize them; nor ever Himself or His Apostles (that did appear) did baptize any of them; all that He or His Apostles said concerning it requires the previous dispositions of baptism, of which infants are not capable.—*Liber. Proph.*, p. 289.

Let us see if any of the writers of the first and second centuries say anything about the baptism of infants

CLEMENS, who is supposed to have been a companion of Paul, says:

They are right subjects of baptism who have passed through an examination and instruction.

IGNATIUS, who was acquainted with Peter, Paul, and John, says:

Baptism ought to be accompanied with faith, love, and patience after preaching.

The other writers of this age (first century) were "Clemens of Rome," Polycarp, Hermes, and Barnabas (?), but we do not find any mention of infant baptism in their writings.

DR. F. A. COX, quoted by Orchard, says that the writers of the second century were: Justin Martyr, Athenagorus, "Theophilus of Antioch," Tatian, Minucius, Felix, Irenæus, and "Clemens of Alexandria," who, so far from speaking of infant baptism, never once utter a syllable upon the subject.

We also submit the following testimony from two of the leading historians.

DR. MOSHEIM, writing of the first century, says:—

Then none were admitted to baptism, but such as had been previously instructed in the principal points of Christianity, and had also given satisfactory proofs of pious dispositions and upright intentions.—Part 2, chap. 3, verse 5.

Of the second century, he says:—

The sacrament of baptism was administered publicly twice every year, at the festivals of Easter and Pentecost, or Whitsuntide . . . . The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the creed, confessed, and renounced their sins, and particularly the Devil and his pompous allurements, were immersed under water, and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation.—Part 2, chap. 4, verse 13.

CURCELLÆUS says:—

The baptism of infants, in the first two centuries after Christ, was altogether unknown; but in the third and fourth was allowed by some few. In the fifth, and following ages, it was generally received. The custom of baptizing infants did not begin before the third age after Christ was born. In the former ages no trace of it appears, and it was introduced without the command of Christ.

If it was not introduced by Christ, nor taught during the first two centuries, what excuse can be found for its later introduction?

As an answer to this question, we submit the following from the great pedobaptist writer, NEANDER:—

Baptism was at first administered only to adults, as men were accustomed to conceive of baptism and faith as strictly connected. We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution, and the recognition of it [which followed somewhat later] as an apostolic tradition serves to confirm this hypothesis.

The following is also in point:—

Question: Why should not the scripture alone be the rule of faith, without having recourse to apostolic tradition?

Answer: Because infant baptism, and several other necessary articles are either not at all contained in scripture, or at least are not plain in scripture without the help of tradition.—Roman Catholic Manual of Controversy.

NEANDER voices the opinion of a large section of pedobaptists when he says:—

Infant baptism is not derived from apostolic institution, but from apostolic tradition.

How the apostles could hold and hand down to others a tradition of something neither taught, instituted, or practised by them, is indeed a conundrum we would like our infant-sprinkling friends to explain. Perhaps they have followed a precedent established by the scribes and Pharisees of old, who, when they desired to add something to the already written law, made the addition under the pretext of "the tradition of the elders" (Mark 7: 3.) In Mark 7: 9, Jesus denounced this policy by saying:—

Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition.

Let us be very careful how we receive vague traditions, lest we too be told at the last day:—

In vain they do worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.—Matt. 15: 9.

The testimony introduced has shown that the doctrine of infant baptism was not practised or taught in the first two centuries; but at the beginning of the third century a doctrine was being taught and generally received, which afterward led to the doctrine of infant baptism. This was the doctrine, that little innocent babes—sinless creatures—were by birth "sinful," "wholly corrupt," and "heirs of hell." As this doctrine began to gain ground and to be firmly believed in, maternal love began to assert itself. The loving mother could not bear the thought that the little one she loved (should it die in infancy) would be consigned to an endless hell. Her very soul revolted against it—and well it might. Such a doctrine denies the atonement of Christ, and dethrones the justice of God. If, like us, she could have taken her blessed Bible and read the words of a loving Saviour, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," she might have been reassured. But she had no printed Bible which she could read, and even if she knew of the Saviour's words, she could not take her Bible in her hands and be sure of them as we can. But of one thing she was sure, if the doctrine of the church was true—and I don't suppose she doubted this—her child would go to hell if it died in its infancy. Was there no way out of the difficulty? No way to purge the little innocent from its inherent corruption, and the sin which the church said was

upon it? Ah! had it not been a doctrine of the church right down from the time of Jesus, that baptism was for the remission of sin? Would not God remit her baby's sin, and purge its corrupt little soul, if it was baptized? And so about this time we have one of these mothers named Quintilla writing to Tertullian, the bishop of the church at Carthage, asking his consent to the baptism of her little ones.

In his reply to her, TERTULLIAN said, among other things:—

The Lord does indeed say "Forbid them not to come unto me," and let them come when they are growing up; let them come and learn, and let them be instructed when they come; and when they understand Christianity, let them profess themselves Christians.

TERTULLIAN, in another of his writings, says:—

Adults are the only proper subjects of baptism, because fasting, confession of sins, prayer, profession, renouncing the devil and his works, are required of the baptized.

This is the first writer who mentions infant baptism, and he in his capacity of bishop opposes it.

But some pedobaptists argue that,

Infant baptism must have existed, else there would have been no occasion for Tertullian to oppose it. If [?] it existed, then it must have existed from the first, because we have no evidence of its previous introduction, or of any opposition to it.

Irresistible logic!

Tertullian opposed it because a mother had written him asking his permission to the baptism of her children. The fact that such a high dignitary as a bishop of a church opposed it, is a strong proof that it did not exist in the church at that time. Why should a bishop oppose the practise of a doctrine taught by his church? How long would he retain his bishopric if he did so? We have no need to search for a previous introduction of the doctrine, or the opposition to it. Here was the introduction, and here the opposition to it—by Tertullian. Regarding its existence from the first, we refer you to the testimony of the leading pedobaptist writers which we have before quoted. After Tertullian's opposition to the introduction of this practice, the demand for infant baptism became so great that it was allowed in certain of the churches.

In the year 230 A.D., ORIGEN defended the practice, by writing:—

This is the reason little children are baptized, because by the sacrament of baptism the pollution of our birth is taken away.

By this time the corrupt doctrine of original sin had produced its child; for now the church had acceded to the requests for infant baptism made by the mothers, with a view to the eternal salvation of their little ones.

In the year 257 (A.D.), Cyprian, who succeeded Tertullian as Bishop of Carthage, received a letter from one Fidus, asking "how soon after birth it was proper to baptize." CYPRIAN called a council of sixty-seven bishops, who in answer to this question gave the "opinion":—

That the grace of God should not be withheld from any son of man, and that a child might be kissed with a kiss of charity as soon as it is born. They continued by saying, As no person is kept off from baptism and grace, how much less reason is there to prohibit an infant, who, being newly born, has no other sin save that being descended from Adam according to the flesh.

Forty years had passed since Tertullian so severely opposed the introduction of infant baptism; but what a change those forty years had brought! From that time on it has always been practised in the Roman church; but then, and ever since, it has always been taught in connection with the doctrine of "original sin." But why is infant baptism practised by those who accept the statement of Jesus, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," in preference to the Romish doctrine, that children are "totally depraved," "wholly corrupt," and "heirs of hell?"

Note what ORIGEN, the first advocate of infant baptism, has to say on this phase of the subject:--

Let it be considered what is the reason whereas baptism is given for the forgiveness of sins, infants are by the usage of the church baptized, when if there was nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them.

Dear reader, do you believe that there is really anything in a little innocent babe that requires forgiveness and mercy? Remember that Jesus said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven;" and don't forget that Origen, the original champion of infant baptism, has said, "If there was nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them."

We will now briefly answer several questions often asked us by those who have grown accustomed to present their children to the Lord in some way. "Is there any harm in baptizing an infant?"

Yes! for as at first it was instituted to cleanse the child from sin, the act is a blank contradiction of our Saviour's statement, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." Is there no harm in contradicting Jesus?

"But is it not right to dedicate a child to God in that way, if you do not believe in the doctrine of 'original sin?'"

If you do not believe in the doctrine of "original sin," it is a solemn mockery to have your child baptized for the forgiveness of sins it does not possess.

"But did not Jesus say, 'Forbid not the children to come unto Me?' Are you not forbidding the little ones to come unto Him when you denounce infant baptism?"

When Jesus said, "forbid them not to come unto Me," He did not utter one syllable about baptism. We read in Matthew 19: 13, that mothers brought their little ones to Jesus, not that He might baptize them, but "that He might put His hands on them and pray." This was how our Lord presented the little ones to His heavenly Father.

We follow His example to-day, and when we dedicate our children to the service of the Lord, the minister puts his hands on them and prays that God might receive and protect them, and henceforth assist the parents in the training of the child, that it might be always worthy to be called a child of God.

But there are those who forbid children to come to the Lord in His own appointed way. Those who baptize infants put up the ordinance of baptism as a barrier between Jesus and the little ones.

Dear reader, if you desire to present your child to the Lord, do it in His own appointed way.

We now submit a summary of the main proofs adduced in this division of the subject:—

1. Jesus told His disciples to baptize—those who believed. They baptized no one who did not profess belief.

2. Infants have not the capacity to believe.

3. Infant baptism was founded on the doctrine of “original sin.”

4. That doctrine is false; for since Jesus has been slain, we have the assurance that the Lamb of God has taken away “*the sin* of the world” (Adam’s sin), and that every man will be judged according to his works, and not because of Adam’s transgression.

5. Since infants have not contracted the disease of sin, it is not necessary for them to enter God’s spiritual hospital—the church.

6. That infant baptism was not instituted by Christ or His apostles.

7. It was introduced under the plea of “apostolic tradition.”

8. The apostles could not hold and hand down to others a doctrine neither taught nor practised by them.

9. Baptism does not take the place of circumcision.

10. Circumcision did not admit into the Jewish church.

11. That no unconscious children were baptized among the Israelities.

12. That we have no mention of infant baptism in the New Testament, nor among any of the writers of the first two centuries.

13. That it was first mentioned in connection with the doctrine of “original sin” at the beginning of the third century.

14. To baptize an infant for the remission of sins is to contradict Jesus.

15. It is solemn mockery to baptize an infant for the remission of sins it does not possess.

16. That the first pedobaptist writer says that if children have no sin, baptism is needless to them.

17. That those who baptize infants “forbid” the children to come unto Him in His own appointed way.

18. His own way of dedicating children to God is by the putting on of hands, and prayer, called blessing.

We will conclude this chapter by repeating our answer to the first question: All persons who have heard the gospel of Jesus Christ, and have been converted to a belief in its precepts, are fit subjects for baptism. Unbelievers should have no place in the church, even though the unbeliever is a little child.



## CHAPTER III.

### BE BAPTIZED? WHY?

We are often asked, "Why do you teach that all believers should be baptized?" 1. Because the ordinance of baptism is an indispensable factor in the new birth spoken of by Jesus in John 3: 5. 2. It is a command from Jesus. 3. Because by obedience to that command we receive God's reward in a remission of our sins (Acts 2: 38), and after the laying on of hands the gift of the Holy Ghost (Acts 8: 17; 19: 6):

THE NEW BIRTH.—Jesus said:—

Except a man is born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.—John 3: 5.

Dear reader, your Saviour here states that in order to enter the kingdom of heaven you must be born again. In that new birth the factors to be employed are water and the Spirit. To say that we can be born again without the instrumentality of either of these two elements is to set one's self up as an authority against the immaculate Son of God, who has said that we cannot enter the kingdom except in that way. We can no more set aside the law governing this new birth by asserting that we have been born again without "water and the Spirit," than was the law governing the natural birth set aside by the ignorant statement of that little girl named Topsy, whom we read of in Uncle Tom's Cabin, that she supposed she "just growed." Both laws came from the one great God, who inspired the wise man to write:—

I know that, whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever; nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it, and God doeth it, that men should fear before Him.—Ecc. 3: 14.

In the beginning God ordained the law which was to govern the natural birth; it was to operate for all time; He did it for ever. There has been no departure from the rule from the time of Adam to the present, and we look for none between now and the end of time. Nineteen hundred years ago Jesus revealed the law governing the new birth. Was this law to operate only for a time? No; for the word of the Lord says, "whatsoever,"—Yes; "whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever."

Reader, do you think that you have been born again in any other way than in accordance with the law prescribed by Jesus? Do you think you have been born without the water?

Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption: but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.—Gal. 6: 7, 8.

Sowing to the Spirit is sowing or doing what the Spirit, through Jesus and His apostles, has commanded; sowing to the flesh is sowing or doing what is enjoined in the doctrines of men. Be wise, and sow to the Spirit.

We are sometimes told that the "water" mentioned in John 3: 5 is the same kind of water as that mentioned in John 4: 14—spiritual water. Spiritual water would not be water at all; it would simply be the "spirit" itself. Then if Jesus meant spiritual water, John 3: 5 should read: Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man is born of the Spirit and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. Does this harmonize with the teaching of Jesus, "Use not vain repetitions?" (Matt. 6: 7.)

We are confident that when Jesus said "water and the Spirit," He said what He meant, and meant what He said; for the same Jesus has also said, "My words shall judge you at the last day." Yes, dear reader, His words will be there to meet us on that day, and not the many different interpretations given to them. How can He be your Saviour if you do not do as He commands you?

Some people believe that the ordinance of baptism has nothing to do with the new birth; but that we are born again when we are converted. There is as much difference between conversion and the new birth, regeneration, as there is between ordinary conception and birth. We are first begotten with the word of truth (James 1: 18), which takes place when we are converted. If we have been begotten by the word of truth—converted to a belief in the gospel—we will be regenerated or born again as the gospel or word of God prescribes; namely, "of water and of the Spirit."

In Titus 3: 5, Paul calls baptism "the washing of regeneration." He eloquently describes the new birth when he says:—

For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection.—Rom. 6: 5.

He makes this "likeness" clear in the fourth verse when he says:—

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.—Rom. 6: 4.

This "newness of life" is evidently Paul's manner of referring to the "new birth" spoken of by Jesus. They were to get rid of their old natures—be "planted together in the likeness of Christ's death." A "planting" always involves a death:—

Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die.—1 Cor. 15: 36.

Did the old natures of those who were "planted" die? Yes, for verse 6 says:—

Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed.—Rom. 6: 6.

**A COMMAND:—**In the great commission Jesus said:—

Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.—Matt. 28: 19, 20.

The apostles, and all evangelical ministers, subsequently called of God, were commanded to go into all the world and preach the gospel—and to baptize the believer. They were to teach the believers to observe *all things* which he had commanded them. It is therefore the duty of every minister called of God to teach believers to observe all the commands of Jesus. Baptism is one of those commands; and the minister who does not teach it, is not “teaching them to observe *all things*.”

In Mark’s account of that commission, the following appears:—

He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.—Mark 16: 16.

Will anyone dare to say that they can be saved without baptism, when Jesus speaks so plainly! To say that we can be saved without baptism is tantamount to saying: “He that believeth and is *not* baptized shall be saved.” Jesus says: “He that believeth and *is* baptized shall be saved.”

Reader, whom do you believe in this matter? We prefer to believe Jesus rather than any man or number of men who dare to contradict Him.

It is taught by some that water baptism is not necessary now, because when John came baptizing he said:—

I indeed baptize you with water, . . . . . but He that cometh after me . . . . . He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.—Matt. 3: 11.

It is urged that while the baptism of John was water baptism, that of Jesus was “the Holy Ghost;” and that people who receive the baptism of the Spirit have no need to be baptized in water. But suppose we find in the Scriptures an instance where people actually did partake of the Holy Ghost, and still were commanded to be baptized, will that not be sufficient evidence that all are commanded to be baptized in water, even though they first receive some manifestation of the Spirit? In the tenth chapter of Acts we have it recorded that after Peter had preached unto the household of Cornelius, and told them things whereby they might be saved, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake in tongues and magnified God. Surely this was a rich outpouring of the Holy Spirit. But was this sufficient to save them—all that was required of them? No; for in verse 48 we read that Peter commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. This is the only case on record where any manifestation (apparently the baptism of the Spirit) was received before baptism in water. We say apparently, because there is nothing in the case to show it was the Spirit of adoption. It was done to show Peter “that God is no respecter of persons.” Peter was a Jew, and believed that the gospel was to the Jews only. This was God’s method of demonstrating that it was to all. Peter saw the point, and said “What was I that I should withstand God?”

Reader, ask yourself the same question, and obey His commands.

REMISSION OF SINS.—In Mark we read:—

John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.—1: 4.



But the objection is made that John's baptism was not Christian baptism. We read in Acts:—

Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.—2: 38, 39.

We see that the object of John's baptism was exactly the same as that to be attained by the baptism of Jesus and His apostles—the remission of sins. Both also taught the doctrine of repentance. We are told “the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized” by John (Luke 7: 30). “There was a man sent from God, whose name was John.” Jesus was baptized by John. To say that John's baptism was not Christian baptism, is to deny that Jesus received Christian baptism. Both John and Peter taught baptism “for the remission of sins.”

Some Baptists preach that you must be saved, and have a remission of sins, before baptism. In order to reason up to this, they tell us to search our dictionaries for the meaning of the word *for*. We search, and find that it means “because of.” Now, say they, we are baptized, *because of* the remission of sins—because our sins have been remitted by the blood of Jesus Christ.

Let us apply this reasoning to Matthew 26: 28:—

For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

Was the blood of Christ shed because the sins of many were already remitted!—because our sins had been remitted? No! says all “orthodox” Christians, it was in order to obtain for us a remission of sins. Exactly; and we say, Why not obey the command of Jesus in order to obtain a remission of sins, through that precious blood? We have a more positive proof than these for baptism in order to obtain a remission of sins. In Acts 22: 12-16, Paul tells us that when the servant of the Lord came in unto him, after he had spent three days and three nights in prayer before the Lord, He said unto him:—

Now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.—Acts 22: 16.

This language often calls out the question, How can water wash away sins? Is there any virtue in the water? We do not claim that there is any virtue in the water of baptism by which sins can actually be washed out of a person. We reply:—

Baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God).—1 Peter 3: 21.

How, then, are sins remitted by baptism? To illustrate: In 2 Kings 5: 0-14, is recorded an account of the cleansing of a leper named Naaman. This man was commanded by one of God's prophets to go and dip seven times in Jordan. He did as he was commanded, and was cleansed of his leprosy. Was there any virtue in the water by which he was cleansed of his leprosy? No? Then if he had not dipped in the water, would he have been cleansed? No! Then since there was no virtue in the water by which he was cleansed, and he could not have been cleansed had he not dipped in the water, what

really did cleanse him? It was the power of God through obedience. God honored his obedience, as He will yours. So it is when we are baptized; God honors our obedience, and cleanses us from sin. We are told:—

If we walk in the light, as He is in the light, . . . the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin.—1 John 1: 7.

When we obey all the commands of Jesus we are walking in the light, and His blood will cleanse us from all sin. If we are not walking in the light,—if we do not believe in Him, repent of our sins and be baptized, as well as observe His other commands,—we can lay no claim to the precious blood which can cleanse us from all sin.

We submit the following from a historical standpoint as proof that baptism is for the remission of sins.

ORIGEN, of the third century, says:—

The baptism of the church is given for the forgiveness of sins.

DR. MOSHEIM:—

The remission of sins was thought to be its [baptism's] immediate and happy fruit.—Cent. 3, part 2, chap. 4, verse 4.

JOHN WESLEY SAYS:—

Baptism administered to real penitents is both a means and a seal of pardon. Nor did God in the primitive church ordinarily bestow this [pardon] on any, unless through this means.—Com. on New Test., p. 35.

MATTHEW HENRY:—

For they must be baptized in His name for the remission of sins upon the score of His righteousness.—Vol. 3, p. 732.

Again:—

A great privilege which by baptism we have sealed to us is the remission of sins.—Vol. 3, p. 884.

We might produce much more testimony from history, but for the sake of brevity, we refrain.

The gift of the Holy Ghost:—

Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ . . . and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.—Acts 2: 38.

The gift of the Holy Ghost, or the baptism of the Spirit, is here promised on condition that they would repent and be baptized. This baptism, or gift, was generally imparted after the laying on of hands and prayer by the ministry. (See Acts 8: 15-19; 9: 17; 19: 6). It was indispensable to the believer then, and it is just as necessary now. Jesus said at one time:—

If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.—John 7: 17.

How was this knowledge to come?

No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.—1 Cor. 12: 3.

In order to obtain that knowledge, he must receive the Holy Ghost. He will then have something against which even the gates of hell cannot prevail. But while it is conceded by some that the first disciples received the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands and prayer after baptism, they contend that this baptism of the Holy Spirit is not given to people now. What! Has the attribute of impartiality possessed by God in such a wonderful degree in other ages of the world changed to partiality now? Is our perfect God—

like poor, frail, mortal man—subject to change ? We cannot believe it of Him. He has assured us, “I am the Lord, I change not.” He has also said that He is no respecter of persons, and that,

Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.—James 1: 17.

Jesus also possesses this same grand attribute ; for we read, “Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.” (Heb. 13 : 8.) We have seen what Jesus was in the yesterday of long ago. Is He the same to-day ? If not, why not ?

To show that God and Christ have not nullified that promise of the Holy Ghost, made by Peter on the day of Pentecost, but that this as well as every other promise made by Them “is yea and amen to all those who will obey Them,” we will briefly analyze the scripture in which the promise was made. Peter’s words were :—

Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins [and now follows a promise], and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise [of the Holy Ghost] is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.—Acts 2: 38, 39.

This promise was to them, their children, and those that are afar off ; in fact to “even as many as the Lord our God shall call.” God is calling men and women to repentance to-day, and as His voice is the same, we claim this promise. Thousands have already had the joy of receiving this baptism of the Holy Spirit in the nineteenth century, and the promise is still good to all those who will obey the voice of inspiration. When teaching this baptism of the Spirit, we are often asked if we are not teaching two baptisms, whereas Paul says that there is only “one baptism.” If we remember rightly, there is also “one God” and Father of all mentioned in the same chapter ; and yet there are three Gods taught by the Christian world. There is God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost ; and they conjure these three Gods up into “one God,” and they call this “three in one,” “one in three,” God, “the Trinity.” We read in 1 John 5 : 7, that there are three that bear witness in heaven ; the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost ; and these three are one. These three are joined together—inseparably connected—for the purpose of bearing witness in heaven. There are three also that bear record on earth, the Spirit, the water, and the blood (verse 8). These three are joined together also, for the purpose of bearing witness on the earth. If we have the united witness of the earthly witnesses—the Spirit, the water, and the blood—that our sins are remitted, and that we are born of God, the same facts will also be witnessed by the three in heaven. If we do not walk in the light as He is in the light, we will not be born of water and the Spirit, and the precious blood of Jesus will not join with the water and the Spirit in bearing witness to our souls that we are children of God. If it is proper to call the three heavenly witnesses “one godhead,” is it not proper to call the three earthly witnesses “one baptism ?” Again, in Genesis 2: 24, we read :—

Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they [two] shall be one flesh.

What! *two* persons, of opposite sex, be *one*? Yes; for God will join them together, that they may consummate His Almighty purpose. God has united the two elements, "water and the Spirit," that they might be instrumental in bringing about the new birth. Since those who are concerned in the natural birth are by God called "one flesh," we deem it consistent to believe that the factors ordained by Him to bring about the "new birth" are "one baptism." "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (Matt. 19: 6.)

Paul evidently held this view of the matter, for although he said, in Ephesians 4, that there is "One Lord, one faith, and one baptism," we find him not only baptizing in water, but also laying on hands and praying that they might be baptized of the Spirit. He was very particular that persons baptized in water should also receive Spirit baptism, for we find in Acts 19 that he met some people who believed themselves children of God, and who wished to claim him as a brother in Christ. Paul had a test by which he could tell whether people were disciples of Christ or not. He knew that both John and Christ had promised Spirit baptism to the believer. John had told them that Jesus would baptize with the Holy Ghost. Jesus had promised that His disciples should know of His doctrine by receiving the Holy Ghost. Here was the test. If they had received either the baptism of John or of Jesus and His apostles, they would have received the Holy Ghost. He applied the test by saying, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?"

They replied, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost."

Paul said unto them, "Unto what were ye baptized?" and they said, "Unto John's baptism."

Paul evidently reasoned that there had been some mistake, and that they had not been baptized by John, for in astonishment he replied: "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on Him that should come after him that is Jesus Christ."

If they had been baptized by John, they would have heard him teaching that Jesus would baptize with fire and the Holy Ghost. They evidently were not, for they confessed that they knew not whether there was any Holy Ghost. Paul then baptized them over again, and then having laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied. There was no room for doubt then. There would be some difficulty in persuading those men after that that they were not children of God. They would then have the combined testimony of the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and against that testimony even the gates of hell cannot prevail.

The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.—Ps. 19: 7.

We conclude this part of our subject by inviting the reader to test the matter for himself, and see whether these things are true or not. Do not be led off the track by such statements as "Salvation is not of works." Paul's reference to works was to those of the Mosaic law. No man could work out his own salvation by doing that kind of works, for "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight."—Rom. 3: 20. (Also Heb. 7: 19; 10: 1.) And the "righteousness which is of God" is quite a different thing to our own self-righteousness.

All *our* righteousness is as filthy rags.—Isa. 64: 6.

By the righteous works which are commanded of God in the gospel law we can be saved, but not by the law of Moses or our own righteousness. Paul tells us:—

I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.—Rom. 1: 16.

Will anyone say that we can be saved without doing the righteous works enjoined therein? The "works" enjoined therein are indeed the "righteousness which is of God," for in verse 17 we read, "therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." By faith we must do the works prescribed in the gospel, in hope of eternal life as our reward. Paul tells us that those works are: "Faith in God, repentance from dead works, baptisms, and the laying on of hands" (Heb. 6: 1, 2). If our faith moves us to do these righteous works (Jesus himself was baptized to fulfil all righteousness) in hope of life everlasting, and we continue to walk in newness of life, we will have a part in the first resurrection, and will have no need to fear the judgment seat of God. (See Rom. 8: 1, 2.)

Reader, you are journeying to the judgment bar, there to be judged by your works. The words of Jesus will be there to confront you. You will be judged out of the things that are written in the books. Then be wise and square your life by the words of Jesus, by His bright and holy example, and by the things that are written in the books. Pay no attention to those who tell you Jesus did it all. Jesus did His work. He did it well; but you and I have something to do as well. We have often heard sinners told to get rid of their sins: to get down on their knees and pray, pray, pray. But if prayer would suffice to save a person, it should have saved Cornelius. (Acts 10 and 11 chapters) "He prayed to God always," and yet God actually sent an angel to tell him to send for a servant of the Lord, who would tell him words whereby he might be saved. Peter, after preaching the same as John (Acts 10; 37, 38), commanded him to be baptized (v. 48). Again, the three days and nights spent in prayer by Saul, of Tarsus, should have had some effect with God, if that had been His plan to forgive sin. Paul had been struck blind, his proud Pharisaic heart had been broken; and thoroughly humiliated, he prayed for three days and nights. God did not by this alone take his sins away, for Ananias said to him, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." (Acts 22: 16).

Reader, do you think that God will take your sins away in answer to prayer alone, when He would not forgive Paul that way? Remember, "There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." (Prov. 16: 25). Men have invented many ways of serving the Lord. They seem good and right unto man, but they are not God's way. "My ways are not your ways," saith the Lord. The ways of men, however good they may appear in their own eyes, always lead to death and destruction. Jesus commanded:—

Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.—Matt. 7: 13, 14.

Do you desire to be among those few that find it? If so, obey the gospel, for the way of life is the gospel of Jesus Christ. Paul and others are called "The servants of the most high God, who show unto us the way of salvation" (Acts 16: 17). They preached the gospel, and in this way pointed out the way of salvation. Obey the principles of that gospel, walk in the narrow way, and eternal life will be your happy reward. On the other hand,—

How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by our Lord.—Hebrews 2: 3.



## CHAPTER IV.

### BE BAPTIZED? BY WHOM?

The prevailing idea among orthodox Christians is that baptism can be legally performed by anyone. Hence, when most people make up their mind to be baptized, they seek out what seems to be the most popular of the churches teaching believers baptism, and by that rite are initiated into that church. It seldom seems to occur to them that the Church of Jesus Christ is "the kingdom of God on earth," and that those who initiate others into that kingdom should be divinely appointed. The kingdom of Great Britain, presided over by His Majesty King Edward VII., extends to people of all nationalities an invitation to become subjects of that kingdom. The conditions are that they become naturalized, and are willing to abide by the governmental laws of the country. Officers are appointed to see to the naturalization of all aliens who apply to become subjects. Persons not appointed as officers of the crown would be severely punished if they attempted to attend to the naturalization of anybody. They might take the person's money, and fill out bogus naturalization papers, but the act would be illegal, and the person would still be an alien to the British government.

The Scriptures inform us that we are all "*aliens and strangers* from the commonwealth of Israel"—the kingdom of God on earth. The whole race of man is invited to become subjects of that kingdom. God is King now, and Jesus is its anointed Prince. Here is His invitation:—

Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.—Matt. 11: 28.

Before we enter the kingdom we must make up our minds to abide by its laws, and to recognize the authority of the King. The King has appointed laws of adoption (or naturalization) into the kingdom:—

Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he *cannot* enter into the kingdom of God.—John 3: 5.

Now the question for us to consider is this: Has the King appointed officers to attend to the initiation of aliens into the kingdom, or is any person at liberty to initiate another into it?

How was it in New Testament times? The New Testament informs us that when Jesus began to establish His Father's kingdom nineteen hundred years ago,—

He went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God.—Luke 6: 12.

Why this night of prayer to God? Evidently to seek His direction in the work before him on the morrow, for verse 13 says:—

And when it was day, He called unto Him his disciples: and of *them* He chose twelve, whom also He named apostles.

He afterwards sent these twelve men out to preach the gospel, to publish to the apostate Jews the invitation into His kingdom—to explain the laws of the kingdom, and to initiate into it by baptism all whom they converted. We are told that later on He sent other “laborers” evangelists to assist the twelve—called “seventy.” (Luke 10: 1, 2.)

Would He have chosen these “twelve,” and these “seventy,” from among His few disciples had He intended to invest all disciples with authority to preach and baptize? If there ever was a time when He would authorize *all* to preach and baptize, surely it was when the laborers were so few, at the beginning of His work. And yet He actually *chose* eighty-two men from among His few disciples, and sent them forth to do this work. Does this look as though any one could baptize or preach in those days?

After Jesus had been crucified and had risen from the dead, and just before He ascended up to heaven. He called His twelve apostles to Him, and extended the mission that He had previously assigned them. Their mission had previously been to *the Jews only*; now He said to them:—

All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach *all* nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.—Matt. 28: 18-20.

“Ah!” exclaims the orthodox preacher of to-day, “That is where Jesus gives the broad commission to all to preach and to baptize.”

Whenever a person feels a desire to preach any particular doctrine, he takes up this great commission and makes it do duty as his *call* to preach. It has been made to do duty as a *call* for one set of men to preach the doctrine that pouring, sprinkling, and immersion are indifferent; for another class to preach that immersion only is legal; for one class to preach infant sprinkling; for another to denounce it; for one body of men to preach that only a predestined *few* of earth’s children will be saved; for another class to preach that *all will be saved*; and for still another class to teach that all *may* be saved by obeying God’s laws; and so on *ad infinitum*, each man preaching something which contradicts the doctrine taught by another, until unbelievers have actually charged our blessed Lord and Saviour with being the author of confusion. Truly, if Jesus did intend that commission as an indiscriminate call to all, He is the author of a strange and very confused medley of doctrine, etc. Is there no remedy for this? Was there no provision made to prevent schism, and contention of this kind among the apostles? Evidently Jesus was alert to the possibility of such an emergency as this, for He told His apostles:—



Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.—Luke 24 : 49.

Why this tarrying? Why this seeming waste of time? Jesus realized the human errantry of the men who were before Him. There was a possibility that if the eleven apostles were left to themselves they would preach just eleven differet kinds of doctrine. They needed the Spirit of God—the power from on high—to bring them to the “unity of the faith.” Hence they were to tarry until endued with the power that should make them one, and stamp their ministry as God-sent.

They tarried, and so well did the Spirit do its work, that their ministry from that time is a grand testimony of their unity with their own great Head, Jesus Christ. Oh, that men would “tarry until endued with power from on high” in these days! What an amount of contention and strife would cease. It is wrong for a person in this age of the world who has not received a direct call from God to do evangelical work, to presume to “go into all the world to preach the gospel” on the assumption that the Saviour’s special words to eleven men are a call to him. Those words never were a *call* to anybody. They were not a *call* to the apostles themselves. We have already shown that the apostles were called, or chosen, by Jesus a long time previous to the time when the commission was given. Why this commission then? As previously shown, this commission was a broadening of their mission. Their mission had previously been only to the Jews, now they were told to move out into “all the world.” Does the commission apply to anyone in this age of the world? Yes, it applies to those who have been properly called of God to do the same kind of work as that done by the apostles—evangelical work. In the Jerusalem church of nineteen hundred years ago, there were two classes of officers: evangelical, such as apostles and seventies or evangelists; and pastoral, such for instance as elders, teachers, deacons, bishops, etc. Although the latter class were duly called of God, we have no evidence that any of them travelled, but the record points to the fact that they were standing ministers to the several churches.

And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed.—Acts 14 : 23.

For what were these elders ordained? To the elders at Ephesus Paul said:—

Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the *Holy Ghost* hath made you *overseers*, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood.—Acts 20 : 28.

Their duties then were to be “*overseers*.” They were to “feed the flock.”

The duties of the deacons are defined in Acts 6, wherein it is recorded that they were ordained that they might minister to the church in “serving tables,” etc. The bishop was the treasurer. The best history supports this. The name *teacher* would imply that the teaching was done *in the church*, else why the name? The evangelical

officers were teachers to the world, primarily. How were these officers called? Paul told the elders of Ephesus that the "Holy Ghost" had made them overseers. In fact, this seems to have been the way in which all officers were called. In the case of Saul and Barnabas (apostles),—

The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.—Acts 13: 2.

In Ephesians 4: 8-11 we read:—

Wherefore He saith, When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men . . . And He gave some, [to be] apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers.

When were these given? When He ascended up on high. How did they know He gave them? He communicated His will to them by a system of "wireless telegraphy" known as revelation. The Holy Ghost was the medium used to *reveal* the fact that these appointments had been made. (See Acts 13: 1, 2, and 20: 28.)

Why were these gifts (offices) given to the church? Some were given "for the perfecting of the saints," others, "for the work of the ministry," and "the edifying of the body of Christ." (Verse 12.)

Did those to whom the gifts (offices) were first given accomplish "the perfecting of the saints?" No, judging from the great apostasy that occurred, and the present disjointed, weak state of Christendom. Did they accomplish all the "work of the ministry" that is to be done? No, there is as much need for real gospel preaching as ever.

Then seeing that these gifts or offices were conferred for the "perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, and for the edifying of the body of Christ," and that the work was not and could not all be accomplished at the death of the persons who received the appointments, is it not reasonable to believe that these gifts will be conferred on others, while God has a true church on earth? In fact we are expressly told in the next (13th) verse that these gifts or offices will remain in the church "till we all come in the unity of the faith." If this particular order of things can bring about a unity of the faith, there never was an age of the world's history when they were needed as much as now. Why is there so much strife, contention and disunion? It is because men have not been content with the kind of officers which God gave to the church, and have instituted other offices as a means to the desired end of unity in the church. Is it strange that since they have cast God's order aside, the officers whom men have presumed to appoint have signally failed to bring about the desired unity.

We have seen, therefore, that the *King* did appoint officers to administer His laws, and to baptize subjects into His kingdom, just as the kings of the earth appoint officers to initiate foreigners into their kingdoms. That persons not so authorized could not admit others into the kingdom is plainly evident from a reading of Acts 19, wherein Paul is said to have met some men who had without doubt been baptized by some one not having the proper authority—possibly by Apollos, "who knew only the baptism of John." The people told

Paul that they had received the baptism of John. But Paul saw instantly that there had been a mistake. John always told the people to believe on the Lord Jesus, who would baptize with fire and the Holy Ghost. These people knew nothing about the Holy Ghost. Hence it is reasonable to believe that they did not receive the baptism of John at all, but that they were baptized by the man Apollos, who also had to be taught "more perfectly." (See preceding chapter.) Paul did not recognize the man's authority (whoever he was) to baptize, and so he baptized the people over again.

From this it is plain that only those who were duly appointed by God had authority to baptize in New Testament times, and only such could teach the whole gospel. Those who were officers in those days either received their appointment direct from God through Jesus, when He was on the earth, or by direct revelation by means of the Holy Ghost after He had ascended on high. Since then, there has been a falling away--a dark night of apostasy. History reveals the fact that men have changed many of the laws of the kingdom; that they themselves have appointed other officers, and have cast out the officers set in the church by God. (1 Cor. 12.) In fact, so radical were the changes made, that not many centuries had passed before it was impossible to recognize the distinguishing marks of the Church of Christ in that which laid claim to the title. Well could Jesus, looking through the unerring telescope of prophecy, say:—

The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.—

Matt. 11: 12.

Not many centuries after this prophecy, the kingdom of God was indeed taken by force, at the hands of wicked men, who transformed the glorious "kingdom of God's dear Son" into one of the kingdoms of this world. From that time the voice of God was not heard for centuries directing His people; men no longer had the offices mentioned in Ephesians 4, and 1 Corinthians 12, conferred upon them. No more was the power of the Holy Ghost manifested in the miraculous ways mentioned in Mark 16: 16; 1 Corinthians 12; Acts 2, etc. What was the reason? Had the time of perfection spoken of in 1 Corinthians 13: 10 come, when these gifts should be done away? Hardly! For if the apostles saw only through a "glass darkly" when they had the glorious gifts of prophecy, tongues, miracles, etc., these later people *saw not at all!* They were farther away than ever from that perfect time, when the righteous shall see face to face, and know as they are known. They must still "walk by faith and not by sight;" but the privilege of seeing into the future through the "darkened glass" of prophecy had been denied them. They had removed their confidence from God to the arm of flesh, and God took away the glorious gifts (through which apostles and prophets looked into the future as through a "glass darkly") and left them to grope their way through the darkness by themselves.

After a time the grey dawn of the Reformation began to break, and a determined warfare was waged against the "idolatry" which posed as the religion of Jesus Christ. All honor to the brave and

good men who fought so nobly, and gained for us the amount of religious liberty which all may now enjoy. But did any of them restore the ancient order of things? True, many reforms may be attributed to them; but under none of them was direct communication restored with Him who sits as the Head of the church, in heaven. While the church was pure and true, He directed it by revelation. Then why did He not direct in the work of the Reformation in the same way? Was it not because the reformers were not seeking to *restore* the pure church of Jesus back to the earth, with all its heaven-appointed officers, gifts, and graces, but to *reform* the corrupt church which had taken its place? No doubt they acted up to all the light they had received, and will be rewarded for the good work done, but their mission was not *to restore*. No doubt these reformers were utilized as indirect agencies by the Lord, to prepare the way for a ministry which he had destined to restore the ancient order of things.

The Lord had, through the mouth of His holy prophet, Malachi, said in the third chapter:—

Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, He shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of His coming? and who shall stand when He appeareth? for He is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap: and He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and He shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years.—Mal. 3: 1-4.

All the expressions used in this scripture show that the second coming of the Lord is referred to. It could not have been His first coming, because He did not come suddenly to His temple then. Neither was it at all difficult to stand when He appeared. A messenger was to precede His coming. But, says one, that was John the Baptist. Granted! But this citation does not refer only to the time when He came as the forerunner of the Lord when He was cradled in a manger. The Lord says, "Behold, I will *send* My messenger," and he was to come before our Lord's second appearing, in glory. John came in the flesh to be the forerunner of Christ, nineteen hundred years ago. He then fulfilled the prophecy:—

The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord; make His paths straight.—Luke 3: 4.

He was beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and so if he comes as the forerunner of Jesus again, he must come in the form of an angel. In Revelation, John writes and says:—

And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people.—Rev. 14: 6.

A messenger is to come before the second coming of the Lord. John the Baptist, who came in the spirit and power of Elias nineteen hundred years ago, is to be that messenger. Having been beheaded, he must come as an angel. The reader may not think it possible for

anyone who has departed this life to return to the earth again in the form of an angel. Not only is such a thing possible, but the Scriptures record one instance at least in which a departed servant of God has returned to the earth in the form of an angel of God. In Revelation 22: 8-9, John testifies thus:—

And I, John, saw these things and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel, which showed me these things. Then saith he unto me, see thou do it not: for I am *thy fellow servant*, and of thy brethren *the prophets*, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God.

John saw an angelic messenger coming to the earth, with the everlasting gospel. Would this angel need to come if the pure gospel of Jesus had always been on the earth? No; it came to *restore* that which had been lost through apostasy.

MR. CHARLES WESLEY, although one of the reformers, and a founder of a great church, looked for a final restoration of the Church of Christ in all its glory, as will be seen by these lines, of which he is the author:—

Once he in the Baptist came,  
 And virtue's paths restored;  
 Pointed sinners to the Lamb;  
 Forerunner of the Lord.  
*Sent again from Paradise,*  
 Elijah shall the tidings bring;  
 Jesus comes; ye saints, arise,  
 And meet your heavenly King  
 Previous to the dreadful day  
 Which shall thy foes consume,  
 Jesus prepare thy way;  
 Let the *last prophet come*.

These lines show plainly that Mr. Wesley was not satisfied with the state of semi-darkness which existed by reason of direct communication with heaven—the source of all spiritual light—having ceased. He looked for a time when the Lord God would again work; when one would be sent again *from paradise* in the spirit and power of Elijah, to bring back to earth the pure gospel of Jesus, so long lost to it, and restore communication with Him who is the Head of the Church, and whose right it is to direct its workings.

What a glorious hope must have inspired him in the midst of all the division and spiritual darkness which reigned supreme at that time, to put into words that they might be handed down to others, the prophetic announcement—taken from God's word—that before Jesus appears in glory, He would send a messenger from paradise, who would restore again “the kingdom of God's dear Son,” and bring back to the earth the authority so long lost to it. He and others were working for the cause of Christ, but they had taken the mission upon themselves. They preached, “Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved;” but in this connection the word of the Lord asks:—

How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and *how shall they preach, except they be sent?*—Rom. 10: 14, 15.

Men who are not sent can preach, but *how shall* (or do) they preach? Why, they go out, and contradict each other, and if they do happen to agree upon anything, it is to contradict what Jesus and His *heaven-sent* and divinely inspired apostles have taught. All ministers of Christ should preach the one gospel; and we are confident that it is not the system of Christ by which men preaching so many different gospels, go forth. If anything is ever done by which unity in gospel preaching is brought about, it will be a very different system to that which now obtains. Under the present “orthodox” system, anybody and everybody may go and preach just as he desires. There are no restrictions. Was it so in Bible times? We have seen that all the ministers of Christ, mentioned in the New Testament, were called of God—*Heaven-sent*. Were there any exceptions to this rule? Not one; for in Hebrews 5: 1-4, Paul, in speaking of the ministers of Jesus Christ, or the “high priest taken from among men” “ordained for men in things pertaining to God,” says: “No man taketh *this* honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.” It is this honor: *To act “for men in things pertaining to God,” that could not be usurped.* All ministers of Christ must be called of God “as was Aaron.” How was he called? In just the same way as were the ministers of Christ in the first century—*by revelation.* (See Ex. 28: 1.)

Here, then, is the key to the whole trouble. Men were not called in that way among the reformers, nor are they by the popular churches that exist now; hence the present confusion. But if they were to wait until called of God, as was Aaron and the ministers of our Lord nineteen hundred years ago, and then “tarry until endued with power from on high,” this confusion would all cease, and unity and love would prevail. This was evidently what JOHN and CHARLES WESLEY were looking for when they wrote:—

What could God have done, which He hath not done, to convince you that the day is coming, that the time is at hand, when He shall fulfil His glorious promise, *and will arise to maintain His own cause,* and set up His kingdom.—John Wesley in sermon seventy-one.

Almighty God of love,  
Set up the attracting sign,  
And *summon* whom Thou do'st approve  
For messengers divine.  
From favored Abram's seed  
The *new apostles* choose,  
In isles and continents to spread  
The soul reviving news.

—Charles Wesley, in Wesleyan Hymns.

Dear reader, God has arisen to maintain His own cause, and set up His kingdom. The angel has flown with the everlasting gospel. The Elijah has again come and restored the authority to administer in God's holy ordinances. Once again communication is established

between earth and heaven; and once again God has called men by direct revelation, and sent them forth with the glad message that the "everlasting gospel" has been restored to the earth. The message is to you. Will you examine it, and see if the Lord God is indeed working? That such a claim is made should demand from you a candid and free investigation. Do not pass it carelessly by, for if true, this message is fraught with life and salvation to you. If false, you will be justified in rejecting it; if true, you cannot afford to remain in ignorance of it.

We have seen that the prophecies point to the fact that just before the coming of the Lord a messenger will be sent from the courts of glory. That messenger was to be John the Baptist. He was to come as an angel; in the spirit and power of Elias. Elias belonged to the priesthood, God's ministry then on the earth, and was inspired with the Spirit of God. (See 1 Kings 18: 21-38.) To come in the spirit and power of Elias, John must come with power to confer the holy priesthood and the Spirit of God which was present with Elijah. The Wesleys and others anxiously awaited his coming. When he came he must come to some one.

#### WHO WAS IT TO BE?

On the 23rd day of December, 1805, there was born at the town of Sharon, Windsor county, Vermont, U.S.A., the personage to whom this divine messenger has come. His name was Joseph Smith. Born of parents religious, he was religiously inclined, and at an early age became concerned about his soul's salvation. In his own home the division and contention characteristic of the Christian world was brought plainly before him; some of his family favouring one sect and some another. While wavering in his mind upon which sect to unite with, he chanced one day to read:—

If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.—James 1: 5.

Accordingly he retired to the woods to ask God's direction, as to which church he should unite with. He says:—

My object in going to inquire of the Lord was to know which of all the sects was right, that I might know which to join.

While praying, two personages appeared before him in glory, standing above him in the air. One of them called him by name, and pointing to the other, said: "This is my beloved Son, hear him."

He continues:—

I asked the personages who stood above me in the light, which of all the sects was right (for at this time it had never entered into my heart that all were wrong), and which I should join. I was answered that I must join none of them, for they were all wrong, and the personage who addressed me said that all their creeds were an abomination in His sight; that those professors were all corrupt; "They draw near to Me with their lips, but their hearts are far from Me; they teach for doctrine the commandments of men, having a form of godliness, but they deny the power thereof." He again forbade me to join with any of them.—*Times and Seasons*, vol. 3, p. 748.

At this time he was but a young boy, about fifteen years of age; and for a number of years after that the Lord kept up communication with him, instructing him and fitting him for the great work that was before him. When the Lord had sufficiently instructed him, and the time for the work to begin had arrived, He sent an angel (whom they said was John the Baptist) to confer the priesthood upon him, and a worker named Oliver Cowdery. He says, regarding that occasion:—

While we were thus employed, praying and calling upon the Lord, a messenger from heaven descended in a cloud of light, and having laid his hands upon us, he ordained us, saying unto us, "Upon you, my fellow servants, in the name of Messiah, I confer the *priesthood* of Aaron, which holds the keys of the ministering of angels and of the gospel of repentance, and of baptism by immersion, for the remission of sins; and this shall never be taken again from the earth, until the sons of Levi do offer again an offering unto the Lord in righteousness."—Church History, vol. 1, pp. 34-36.

Oliver Cowdery corroborated this testimony. They also said:—

The messenger who visited us on this occasion, and conferred this priesthood upon us, said that his name was John, the same that is called John the Baptist, in the New Testament . . . It was on the fifteenth day of May, 1829, that we were baptized and ordained under the hands of the messenger.—Church History, vol. 1, p. 36.

When we consider that both these men up to the last, in the face of the bitterest persecution, maintained the truthfulness of this testimony, we think that it should *demand* the consideration of all those who are "honest in heart."

The messenger was to come. Why not to Joseph Smith? The time is ripe and no one else makes the claim. The Messenger must come. In accordance with divine command given to Joseph Smith, "the kingdom of God," "the Church of Christ," was once again set up on the earth, April 6, 1830, with six members

It was afterwards decided to call the church (in accordance with divine command) "The Church of Jesus Christ," the members of which were to be known as "Latter-Day-Saints."

From that time men called of God by revelation, "as was Aaron," have gone forth preaching this good tidings of the restored gospel, and the same joyous story of the cross as was preached by those whom God appointed in days of old. Like those delegated by God of old, they have authority to initiate subjects into the "kingdom of God."

Although the Lord had dealt so kindly by the people of His choice, like in days of old, the net gathered of the good and bad alike. Nineteen hundred years ago Judas and other traitorous fish were found in the net. The "kingdom of God" set up in these last days also had its bad fish. It also had its traitor (Judas) in the person of Brigham Young, who drew away a large company of the church after him, and retaining *the name of the church*, organized another body, re-baptized his membership, and introduced the detestable doctrines of polygamy, "Adam-god" worship, and "blood atonement." This caused a partial disorganization; but the Lord moved again, and brought about a re-organization of those who had remained faithful.



Reader, we present the "Re-organized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day-Saints" for your consideration. It is the "kingdom of God" on earth. Jesus is its Head. He has appointed officers as in days of old. His gospel is the same "good tidings" as when first heralded by holy men of God in and around Jerusalem. The laws of initiation are the same, and the same kind of heaven-appointed officers stand ready to induct you into the kingdom. The gifts of the gospel are enjoyed, as in apostolic days. The signs mentioned in Mark 16: 16, do follow the believer; and as in days of old God's ministers declare: "*If any man will do the will of the Father, he shall know of the doctrine.*"

Reader, try it; put the matter to the test; and all doubt will disappear.



---

NEWCASTLE :

FEDERAL PRINTING AND BOOKBINDING WORKS,  
BOLTON AND KING STREETS.

2/02.

---



