

The Central Presbyterian.

WHOLE NO. 854.

RICHMOND, VA., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1881.

VOL. 17---NO. 20.

Central Presbyterian.

OFFICE:
No. 1015 Main street, opposite the Post Office.

TERMS:
Three Dollars a year; six months, \$1.50; three months, 75 cents; payable in advance.—Ministers of the gospel, \$2.50.

Payments may be made to local agents wherever practicable; all ministers of our Church are authorized to act as such. Or by checks, Post-office money orders, or letters Registered by Postmaster. Otherwise it must be at the risk of the party sending it.

Obituaries charged at five cents a line. The party sending can make the estimate by counting eight words to a line. Payment in advance. Advertising rates furnished on application to the office.

Communications and letters on business should be addressed to CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN, Box 37, Richmond, Va.

Richardson & Southall,
Editors and Proprietors.

[Entered at the Post-Office at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

Letter from Italy.

MILAN, Nov. 17th, 1881.

Messrs. Editors.—How many lovely cities there are in Italy! Each one contains a marvel, and each marvel has its particular character. Each of them has produced a genius which unfolds, in exchange for the present of existence—and the aspiration of immortality. The divinest monument of this, the city of Italy, and of its especial kind of architecture, is

The Cathedral of Milan.

Of all the arts, the most impressive is that of architecture. Stones shaped by design, and expressive of beauty and harmony, give pure and intellectual pleasure. The great lines, the broad spaces, the ambitious arches, the aerial cupolas, the columns with their adornments, the galleries with their perspectives, the court-yards and their cloisters, force upon the mind profound meditations, and always express the genius of the age with its symbolical character. Without a doubt the best architecture to resist the tooth of time, as well as the more destructive rage of man, is the Grecian, with its imperturbable strength and stability. But the Grecian architecture, though complete in its subjection to the laws of harmony and proportion, is distinguished by small power of expression. It is too severe and rigid to appeal powerfully to the imagination. In fine, we come to architecture, as to everything else, looking through the dominant element of our nature—as through a glass. To those in whom reason and conscience preponderate, the simplicity of the Grecian style, with its truth to nature, will always be preferable. The imaginative, however, demand something more bold and striking. Art is a magician, and impresses her kiss of fire on very different foreheads—the high and narrow, as well as the broad and square. In obedience to her behest the artists of the ages conceived the Gothic method. Not a line of Roman severity is to be seen in the Cathedral of Milan. Truly it is imagination run wild—the florid Gothic expanded in such profuse open work as to constitute forever the richest flower of the renaissance. Begun in 1386 by Duke John Galeas Visconti, it is not yet entirely completed, though 500 years and 550 millions of francs have been expended upon its erection. This tale of years and expense would sound improbable but for a vision of the cathedral itself. No gallery in Europe contains nearly so much sculpture. The building is four hundred and fifty-four feet in length, two hundred and seventy in breadth, and the arched roof is two hundred and thirty-two in height. From highest turret to foundation stone the material is of fine white marble—from the quarries of Gandoglio. Externally the whole superficies is loaded with ornament. The friezes of the monuments, the cusps of the turrets, the roofs themselves are crowned with chisellings.—White marble statues appear in every niche, in every angle, on every steep, round every spire. There total number has been estimated at more than 4,000, but many of them have been carved for immortality alone, and they are so concealed as to be only visible to the birds of the air which perch on them. Within the Cathedral, fifty-two marble pillars, each eighty-four feet in height, twenty-four feet in circumference, and adorned with many statues as well as pediments enriched with a prodigious quantity of arabesques, support the vast edifice. The marble floor, the red polished columns, the singularly painted ceiling of the vault—a perfect imitation of sculpture, the rich colored glass windows, the various altars, the oaken confessionals, the sepulchral urns, the different chapels, the paintings, the basso-relievos, the forest of statues sculptured by men of rank, would require a vast time for careful examination. We can but ascend for a final view to the roof of the temple. Whoever has a feeling for the beautiful cannot help admiring the view from the

platform of the great cupola. Immediately about you are an endless number of statues carved by the most celebrated sculptors, and surmounting hundreds of ornamented pyramids. From every angle of the temple beauty leaps forth to greet the observer, here the numberless gutters, there the surprising, creeping arches; on this side magnificent galleries, and by that, astonishing ogees on the storied parapets. The whole set in order with such a symmetry that amid all this seeming madness of architectural display one cannot escape the consciousness of a consonant method withal. Turning the bewildered eye from the immense roof, a most imposing view of the whole city and plain is presented, surrounded by the chains of snow-capped mountains which form a girdle on the horizon. To attempt to describe the sublimity of the Cathedral of Milan is useless. Better to see, feel, admire—and be silent. It is unequalled in the world!

Leaving the Cathedral, we visit hastily the ancient Convent of the Dominicans, celebrated for

The Famous Painting of the Last Supper, by Leonard da Vinci.

It is not a fresco, but an oil painting on the wall of the refectory, and occupying a whole side of the low hall, in other words, about thirty feet in length by fifteen in height. But it has been so much disfigured by time and vandalism, that it is difficult to trace. Sorrowful is it that the two greatest paintings in the world, that of the Last Supper by Da Vinci, and the Last Judgment in the vault of the Sistine chapel, are so injured as to be almost indiscernible. This in the Dominican Convent has had an outrageous history. It could hardly be credited that the Milanese authorities, at the beginning of the century, changed the convent into a prison where French soldiers guarded their prisoners of war. French soldiers used as a target the painting which had been the greatest ornament of Milan for three hundred years. An old woman who lived near the refectory has related that a soldier of the French husars told her he himself had fired at the picture when guarding prisoners in the hall, not knowing what it was, and that the confined prisoners, alike ignorant, threw stones and brick-bats against it by way of amusement. Bonaparte, who had a genius for art in the midst of his mighty schemes, on coming to Milan, visited the picture, and finding the hall used as a place of confinement, "he shrugged his shoulders and stamped with his foot," according to the relation of the aged woman, and ordering the prisoners away, had a door walled up and a balustrade extended across the room in front of it. Milan has always held a high, distinguished rank in the arts of a useful character. The trade of the city is perhaps the greatest of Italy, and its manufactures are numerous and flourishing. For evidence of this fact, we visited before its close

The National Exposition.

which owed its existence to the initiative of Milan, and bore special witness to the commercial energy of the Milanese.—From May until the first part of November, more than a million persons passed through the turnstiles. Was the Exposition worth seeing? Well not worth coming from America expressly to see, but by no means an uninteresting lounge when one is actually at Milan. Of the Exhibition itself, the Italians are very proud, and well they may be, as it betokens for the first time that Italy is awaking from the apathetic industrial slough that has pervaded the peninsula everywhere. The ox and the ass are to be relegated to the rear, and the cycle of steam is to emerge. The Exposition does not prove that Italian industry is full grown, but that it is a child fairly born, and is an armful of immense probabilities. Their machinery is not better than ours, but it is prettier externally. One difficulty, however, is that if an engine is wanted, or any other species of machinery, the element of time is not taken into consideration, and it requires months to complete the order. Their carriages are light, but yet strong, and in finish surpass the world, although considerably cheaper than our own. In silks they are running the Lyons manufacturers closely. The silks for dresses are of excellent quality, and there is considerable exportation of them for England and America. The French manufacturers could scarcely maintain their ground but for the advantage of Paris being the centre of fashion, and they are thus able to secure a market for inferior goods by manufacturing precisely the thing that is the want of the season. The silk worm is reared with great success in Lombardy, and one of the most attractive features in the Exhibition was the processes of the whole production. Always great crowds were thronged about the machines. From the glass cases with their worms feeding on the mulberry leaves, through the stage of the cocoons steeped in hot water, and the delicate silken threads, machinery, clear to the loom, with its finished product of brilliant and complicate pattern, the silk passed successively under the eye of the

spectator. The cocoons and the machines were manipulated by Milanese girls, who preserve the ancient customs, and with their hair folded in tresses and bound together with a number of silver bodkins, making a sort of shield at the back of the head, presented a very peculiar and unique appearance. Cotton could also be traced from the raw material to the manufactured article. This is an element which was wanting in the International Exposition at Philadelphia, but we are sure the example of the Milanese could have been anticipated on a large scale by the authorities of that exhibition, and with even greater tokens of popular interest than it did receive.

In the centre of the building at Milan, there was a dome filled with the celebrated *Majolica Ware*. For centuries this has been an Italian product, but of late years a good deal of additional skill and intelligence has been devoted to its perfection. The competition of the rival factories is said to be so fierce that the higher priced products are sold without a profit. The forms of the vases are in many instances exquisite in beauty. In some cases they are new, but for the most part models of the antique.

After the Exposition, the dismal weather dampened our enthusiasm in further exploration of this grandly built city. Mean looking houses are as rare as palaces in other towns. But with rain falling thick and fast, and the tempest moaning sadly through the vacant streets—we traversed the great squares leading to our hotel, oblivious to all save their gloom, and tempted to substitute for *Milan magnificent—Milan muddy*.

L. M. C.

Letter from Atlanta, Ga.

The International Cotton Exposition.
ATLANTA, Dec. 8, 1881.

Messrs. Editors.—The International Cotton Exposition, inaugurated October 5th, is now in the midst of a successful career. Of late the attendance has largely increased. The weather has continued mild for the season, and highly favorable. Crowds come and go full of admiration and delight at the wonderful spectacle. I desire to quote the expressed opinions of others with reference to this great Southern Exposition.

The editor of the *Cincinnati Gazette*, on returning from a second visit to Atlanta, published an article on the Exposition. He said:

"In point of general interest the Atlanta Exposition ranks next to the Centennial at Philadelphia. No one can study the Exposition without discerning the amazing resources of the South. It is capable of producing almost everything within its own borders. The mineral resources of the South have been barely scratched. The underlying riches have been merely sampled, so to speak, yet the exhibit of these, as remarked, is amazing."

Editor A. K. McClure, of the *Philadelphia Times*, thus writes to his journal the results of his recent extended visit to Atlanta:

"The Atlanta Exposition is to this city and State what the Centennial Exposition was to Philadelphia and Pennsylvania. By the Centennial Exposition Philadelphia was made the centre of Northern progress for years to come, and Pennsylvania was quickened to the stride of more than a decade in a single year. By the Cotton Exposition Atlanta is made for more than a generation to come the centre, the fountain of the new departure in the South. It is one of the most beautiful inland cities on the continent, and its beauty has all the glow of ruddy health and long endurance."

Many have expressed the deliberate judgment that, leaving out of view the Foreign Exhibits, the Art and Horticultural Departments, this Exposition excels the Centennial at Philadelphia. Indeed, in a short speech delivered last night, ex-Governor Jewell, of Connecticut, testified that for practical purposes, uses and ends, it takes the lead of all other fairs. Here are his words:

"I have been quite a constant attendant at fairs. I saw the first great world's fair at New York; I have attended the Mechanic's institute fairs ever since. I was at both the great fairs in Boston this year; I spent a month at the Vienna exposition in 1873; I was a month at the Paris exposition of 1867; I spent six weeks at the Centennial, and yet, for all the practical purposes of life and which we want most to cultivate and push forward to their true consummation, I have seen no fair, exposition or exhibition which answered all the purposes for which it was intended as well as this one does."

One of the finest displays of minerals and woods is that made by the Richmond & Danville Railway Company, supplemented by a magnificent display of the Georgia Pacific Railway, which is an extension of the former line west to the Mississippi river. In these two collections we see the rich and varied minerals, woods, and other productions of North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. Other railroads and various States have made fine exhibits. The whole is a grand advertisement to the world of the resources and capabilities of the South.

J. H. M.

—CARLYLE ON THE CATECHISM.—
"The older I grow—and I now stand upon the brink of eternity—the more comes back to me the sentence in the Catechism which I learned when a child, and the fuller and deeper its meaning becomes: 'What is the chief end of man? To glorify God, and enjoy Him forever.'"

For the Central Presbyterian.

Relics.

In a learned article on Buddhism occurs this paragraph:

"The most renowned of relics is Buddha's left eye-tooth, the present palladium of Ceylon, whose history is quite romantic and miraculous. It is a piece of bent ivory, about two inches long, kept in a splendid chapel and surrounded by many jewels. Buddha's skull, eye-balls, shoulder-blade, etc., his manuscript of the Dharma, his gowns, alms-pot, etc., his shadow, heaven-ladder, his animal bodies, as bird, elephant, etc., the Bodhi-tree at Gaya, and many other relics are shown in various places."

Romish priestcraft is singularly like that of Buddha in many things; among others in the reverence manifested for counterfeit relics. In this particular it must be acknowledged that Oriental imagination has surpassed western ingenuity. Nowhere has the Church of Rome succeeded in securing the shadow of one of its saints! Has the isle of Patmos been thoroughly explored for that of St. John? Possibly too, St. Jacob's ladder might yet be recovered! S. L. C.

Obtaining Money from the Churches on False Pretences.

Messrs. Editors.—All of our ministers and people ought to be warned against John Cereghini, an Italian, now travelling in the South, professing to be an agent to collect money for a church or churches in Italy—(Protestant or Waldensian). He is an apostate and impostor. This fact has been ascertained by correspondence with gentlemen in Italy who know all about him. He is very plausible, and unfortunately has a number of letters from ministers of the Episcopal, Presbyterian, and other Protestant churches who have been deceived by him.

Yours respectfully,
CHARLES S. VENABLE,
Charlottesville, December 10th.

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES.

Southern Presbyterian.

Rev. J. A. Lefevre, D. D., preached at the Westminster church, Baltimore, on Thursday, November 14th, Thanksgiving day, from Jer. xviii: 7-10. The *Baltimore Presbyterian* says the sermon was one of Dr. Lefevre's happiest efforts and made a profound impression.

Rev. W. W. Downey has been invited by the Second Presbyterian church, Charlotte, N. C., to fill the pulpit of that church until they call a pastor. Mr. Downey, during the summer, supplied the First church, Raleigh, N. C., in the absence of the pastor and gave great satisfaction.

Rev. S. R. Preston, of Blacksburg, Va., was in Wytheville on Sunday, 4th inst., and preached morning and evening in the Presbyterian church.

Mt. Horeb Church, Lexington, Va.—A letter from the pastor, Rev. T. M. Boyd, of December 5th, says: "We had a delightful communion meeting last week. We had nine additions to the church, most of them from the Sabbath School. This makes sixty-nine added since I came here. But the old people are dropping off one by one. Our country is improving rapidly and soon will be the most thickly settled and prosperous part of Augusta county. The Shenandoah Valley enterprise is a grand enterprise."

Rev. E. H. Harding, D. D., since his resignation as pastor of the Second church, Charlotte, N. C., has been supplying the First church, Charleston, S. C. He is now preaching to the First church, Savannah, Ga. Letters addressed to Marshall House, Savannah, Ga., will reach him.

Windy Cove Church, Va.—The fall communion service at Windy Cove on the 1st Sabbath in December, was unusually pleasant. Rev. E. McCorkle assisted the pastor, Rev. A. R. Cooke, Friday and Saturday previous. On Friday three deacons, Messrs. John McDonald, H. McClung, and J. McDonald were ordained and installed. Five were added to the number of full communicants, and 21 children baptized. A pleasing feature on the Sabbath was the administration of the Lord's Supper by Rev. Samuel Brown. All seemed touched by the words of this aged and beloved servant of Christ.

Organization.—I organized, as Presbyterian evangelist, a church at Lake Eustis, Orange county, Fla., on November 26th. Two elders and two deacons were elected, Messrs. R. C. Tremaine and A. Spofford as elders, and A. S. Pendry and B. H. Vogt as deacons. Elder Samuel Reeve, of Leesburg, assisted us in the organizing. Rev. J. A. Kimmons supplies this church once a month. He was unable to be present at the organization.

The Lake Eustis church will erect a house of worship some time during the winter.

W. G. F. W.

Dr. Smoot Declines.—A letter has been received in Augusta from Dr. Smoot, declining the call to the pastorate of the First Presbyterian church. A strong influence was brought to bear on Dr. Smoot by his church and the church press in the southwest, urging his non-acceptance of the flattering call from the church in Augusta, Ga.—*Evening News*.

Installation.—The Rev. A. M. Hassell was installed pastor of the Eatonton church, Augusta Presbytery, November 4th.

Second Church, Augusta, Ga.—Five persons were received on profession of faith at the last communion.

Rev. H. C. DuBose.—A correspondent of the *Southern Presbyterian* writes:

This beloved brother and cherished servant of the Church arrived at Darlington, S. C., on the morning of November 16th, 1881, and was met at the depot by a committee, appointed by the session to welcome him back to his old home. At 3½ P. M., or the day of his arrival, he was with us at our weekly prayer-meeting, and caused our hearts to burn within us while he talked to us of the religious privations of the heathen.

At 7 P. M., on Friday, he addressed a large congregation in the Baptist church; his subject being the "Land of Sinim."

On the Sabbath, our own house of worship being in the hands of the architect, the Presbyterian congregation united with the brethren of the Baptist church. An eloquent discourse on the "Three religions of China" was delivered by Mr. DuBose.

Second Church, Wilmington, N. C.—Rev. R. B. McAlpine, pastor of the church at Goldsboro, N. C., assisted Rev. C. M. Payne in services at, and for seven days preceding, the communion of 4th inst. The preaching was direct and heartsearching. Three persons were received into the church on profession of faith, and one by certificate. This church grows steadily under God's blessing of the ministrations of a faithful pastor and faithful officers.

N. C. Presbyterian.

Greensboro, N. C.—A correspondent of the *N. C. Presbyterian* writes, December 5th: "Our delightful meeting has closed after three weeks of faithful preaching and praying, of assembling morning and evening and taking sweet counsel together, with God's spirit witnessing with ours and with a new song put into many new hearts and mouths. The fruits of this revival meeting now sum up sixteen on profession (eight of whom received baptism) and four on certificate—twenty in all. There are several others who I am sure will come forward at our next communion. 'Surely the Lord is in this place.'"

Columbia, Mo.—Mr. Wilkie writes, last Monday:

"What a sight gladdened our eyes yesterday morning! Twenty-seven new converts, received since last Sabbath, publicly confessed Christ. The ordinance of Baptism was administered to seven of them, all the others being children of the Covenant. There were also three additions by letter; and last night two more were examined and received by the Session. We have had the quietest meeting I ever saw. No excitement, just a plain presentation of the truth which the Holy Spirit has used for the salvation of souls."

Many are still inquiring the way to Zion, and the meeting will go on. The Lord be praised.
St. Louis Presbyterian.

More Good News.—Rev. C. W. Humphreys, of Paris, writes us, December 3rd.

"I returned home to day from aiding Bro. Travis in a meeting at New Hope church. God has met with His people there and poured out a blessing on them. There is joy in many a home as well as in the presence of the angels of God. Nineteen are known to have professed faith in the Saviour, and eighteen have, at this writing, joined the Church. The interest is unabating—increasing, and I expect to return to the work to-morrow, Sabbath. Bro. Travis will report to you the final result."—*Id.*

Rev. R. A. Webb accepts an invitation to the Bethel church, S. Carolina, which has been in charge of Rev. S. L. Watson more than 40 years, who now retires because of the infirmities of age. Mr. Webb's address is Bethel, York Co., S. C.—*Id.*

Moore Memorial Church, Nashville, Tenn.—A series of protracted services began at this church on the 6th of November, and continues yet. The pastor has been indefatigable in labors, especially in visiting. His people, and particularly the Sabbath School, have been active in gathering congregations. The most of the preaching has been done by Rev. Dr. J. W. Hoyte. Rev. Dr. Doak, and Rev. Mr. Cowan have aided.

Lafayette Presbyterian Church, New Orleans.—The first Sabbath in December was the 25th anniversary of the pastoral relation of Dr. Markam to this church. At the beginning of his labors there were only 23 members. Now there is a large and flourishing congregation.

Columbia Seminary.—Receipts for November.

For the Howe Memorial,	\$1,155 32
" " Georgia Professorship,	235 00
" " Fourth Professorship,	891 25
Total,	\$2,281 57
Previously acknowledged,	33,580 82
Grand total,	\$35,812 39
J. B. MACK, Financial Agent.	

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

The "Seven Mile Ford Presbyterian church" of Smythe county, Va., returns thanks for the \$15.50 sent to "help buy an organ," by some young ladies of Huntsville, Ala., "the proceeds of a parlor concert" under the management of Miss Sheffey, Miss White, Miss Carrington, and others.

—There are in Philadelphia 545 Sabbath schools. Of these, 144 are connected with Presbyterian and Reformed churches; 125 with Methodist churches, and 110 with Episcopal churches, 78 with Baptist churches and 35 with Lutheran churches. The membership of all the schools is 174,295; 157,847 scholars and 16,438 teachers.

Central Presbyterian.

WEDNESDAY, - - - December 14, 1881.

For the Central Presbyterian.

What is Christian Baptism?

By Rev. R. R. Howison.

The discourse which follows was delivered within the past month, to congregations of the Samuel Davies church, Hanover county, Va. No sectarian or belligerent spirit incited either its preparation or its delivery. Two objects—each, in itself, legitimate—were sought: first, to satisfy and establish the minds of some good people, in my own pastoral charge, who had become disturbed as to the action in Christian baptism; second, to furnish from Holy Scripture, from sound laws and usages of language, and from authentic history, such evidences and arguments as would aid honest inquirers in every denomination to reach safe conclusions on this subject. Good reason exists for believing that both of these objects have been, to an important extent, accomplished. And so many requests have been presented for copies of the discourse it has been considered best to let it appear in a form in which it will be accessible to all who may desire it.

R. R. H.

"I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire."—MATT. iii. 11.

Christian baptism is admitted by all churches, denominations, and people who profess to be followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, to be the visible sign and symbol of initiation into His Church on earth. It is an ordinance given to us by Christ himself in those divine words in which, just before he re-ascended to heaven, he issued his commission to his ministering servants for all future ages of the world. "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." He did not point out any specific action or mode of proceeding, farther than by using the word "baptizing." He did not say "washing," or "dipping," or "immersing," or "pouring," or "sprinkling." He used only the word "baptize"—the meaning of which had been ascertained, and was well understood by the age and the people of His day. Christ—our omniscient Redeemer—was, as to his human nature, of the Jewish race, born of a Jewish mother, his reputed father a Jew, his earthly avocations and education and environment Jewish, his original disciples all Jews, and therefore we are compelled to believe that in using this word "baptize" he used it in the sense in which it was understood among the Jews of His day. What that sense was, we have abundant historical means for ascertaining, and I propose to show you what it was. But before doing so, and in the very opening of this discourse, I wish to say a few words to prevent any possible mistake or misapprehension as to my own views, and what I understand to be the views of the venerable Church of which I am an humble minister. We hold that Christian baptism is the application of water to a proper subject, in the name of God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, by an authorized minister of Christ. We do not hold that any special mode of this application of water is essential to the validity of the ordinance. We verily believe that the application of the element by effusion, or pouring, or sprinkling is the mode suggested and indicated by the Holy Scriptures of God, as the proper mode, the preferable mode, the mode best adapted to all climates, conditions, states of health, ages, and sexes, and as the mode and the action most vividly symbolical of the outpouring and operation of the Holy Spirit in His renewing and sanctifying power. Therefore, this is the mode we adopt and practice. But we do not deny the validity of immersion in water, as Christian baptism, if done in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Hence we recognize as brethren beloved and as entitled to full fellowship and communion with us as Christians, all who have been thus baptized, and who retain their integrity and good standing as believers in Christ. Although we differ from them as to the preferable mode and action involved in the rite, yet we recognize their conscientious preferences, and have no controversy with them as to the validity of immersion. In fact, we know from Church history that, from a period at least as far back as the third century of the Christian era, and down to the present time, some persons, in all parts of the visible Church and in all its divisions and denominations—whether known as the Church of the fathers, the Roman Church, the Greek Church, the Episcopal, Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational, Lutheran, or any other form of Christian Church—have preferred immersion in water as the most suitable mode of baptism. And these persons have embraced many eminent names of learned and devout Christians. But all such persons as we now speak of, while expressing a preference for immersion, have distinctly declared and left on record their conviction that while immersion was the preferable mode, it was not the essential mode—it was not the only mode in which the ordinance could be validly administered—that baptism by effusion, pouring, or sprinkling of water, if done and received from conscientious motives, and in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, was valid Christian baptism. Therefore, with all such persons, in all ages of the world,

and in the present age, as far as they exist, we have no question at issue of sufficient importance to justify a zealous controversy. We bid them God-speed in their own lines of Christian effort and labor.

But I regret to say that, within the past three centuries, a class of professing Christians has arisen who, in their tenets and principles, differ from those just described as far as slavery to forms differs from liberty in Christ—as far as exclusiveness differs from liberality—as far as bigotry differs from charity and love. That this class of persons are in most cases conscientious, we do not deny. Paul was conscientious when he persecuted the Church, and doubtless Spanish Inquisitors were often conscientious when they applied the rack and the fagot. We know too well, from the past history of our world, how sadly that sense of the right and the wrong which we call conscience may be deadened and obscured by ignorance, bigotry, prejudice, and partisanship, ever to admit the validity of the plea of conscientiousness. The only mitigating effect which such a plea ought to have is to induce us to look with deep sorrow and compassion on those who urge it as a defence for serious errors of opinion and practice; and to use every effort which Christian prudence, love, and zeal united will permit for the removal of the efficient causes of those errors. The class of professed Christians of whom I now speak have held, and have attempted to carry out in practice, the following tenets:

1. That the immersion of the whole body in water in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is essential to Christian baptism; so that without such immersion there is no baptism.
2. That persons who have not received such immersion are not members of the visible Church of Christ; and persons calling themselves ministers who have not received such immersion are not authorized ministers of Christ.
3. That, consequently, immersed professors ought not to, and cannot conscientiously, commune even in the Lord's Supper, with non-immersed professors, however lovely, consistent, and Christ-like may be the lives and characters of these non-immersed professors.

Now, every man well acquainted with Church history knows that these tenets, carried out to their logical results, would unchurch—turn out of the Church of Christ—at least nine-tenths of all professing believers from the days of the Apostles to the present time. This fact alone may well cause us to doubt whether these tenets are sound, and whether the small class of professing Christians (for it is a very small class as compared with all other professing Christians) who have held these tenets and attempted to establish them and to force them upon the world, are to be believed as the only and original discoverers and sound exponents of Christian truth on this subject. But I beg you will note, my hearers, that our controversy is with these tenets and not with those who hold them. It is impossible that we shall be at peace with these tenets—these principles; because their operation, if carried out, is to upturn and revolutionize and largely to destroy the visible Church of Christ itself in all ages of its existence. Therefore this discourse is intended to combat these tenets—these principles—but not to make war on those who hold them. For all of them, as far as I know them as Christian men and women, I feel sincere respect and esteem, and for many of them the warmest love; and therefore, if this discourse be heard by any of them, I beg them to be assured that it is not intended herein to hurt their feelings, or to outrage their religious convictions, but, in a calm, impartial and Christian spirit, to search for and point out the truth on this subject.

Turning then to the first of these tenets—the foundation principle on which all else in them stands, viz: that immersion of the whole body in water is the sole and only mode or action of valid Christian baptism, I ask you to note how impossible is the undertaking to maintain it. The word "baptize" is not originally an English word, but is simply a Greek word transferred to the English language. Therefore it was intended, by Christ and by the Holy Spirit who inspired the Scriptures, to mean in English, what it meant in Greek. The Greek verb is *baptizo* and it is formed on the primal verb *bapto*. It is admitted by all competent scholars (including holders of these immersion tenets) that, so far as they express the idea of mode or action, there is no difference between *bapto* and *baptizo*. Hence it devolves on immersionists of this class to prove that these Greek verbs as used in the days of Christ meant "to immerse" and meant nothing else. For, if they meant any mode of action other than immersion and different from immersion, then the foundation stone of their argument is gone. Hence it is that these exclusive immersionists have made the most strenuous efforts, and have exhausted all the resources of human learning for the purpose of proving that *bapto* and *baptizo* mean to immerse and mean nothing else and nothing different. But vain have been all their efforts in this direction. Scholars of equal ability and learning have met them and defeated them on this point. It has been shown that all the witnesses, ancient and modern, on whom we are obliged to rely to prove the meaning of a word from an ancient and dead language like the Greek, such as Lexicons or Dictionaries, the usage of authors, and ancient translations of the Scriptures, unite in proving that

bapto and *baptizo* do not mean only to immerse, but mean also to wash, to cleanse, to dye, to tinge, to effuse, to pour on, to sprinkle. I will, as briefly as I can, give you some of this testimony. It proves that *bapto* and *baptizo* are not words of specific meaning, expressing only one mode or action such as immersion, but generic words—i. e., words of general meaning expressing the thing done—as the application of water to a subject, and not the specified mode of doing it.

Hedericus in his ancient lexicon defines *baptizo*: to dip, to immerse, to cleanse, to wash, to baptize in a sacred sense.

Scapula: To dip or immerse, also to dye, also to cleanse, to wash.

Stephanus: To dip, to submerge, to cover with water, to cleanse, to wash.

Schleusner: To plunge, to immerse, to cleanse, to wash, to purify with water.

Parkhurst: To immerse in, or wash with water in token of purification.

Bretschneider: Often to dip, often to tinge, often to wash; then simply to wash, to cleanse.

Sudas: To sink, to plunge, to immerse, to wet, to wash, to cleanse, to purify.

And the word *bapto* is defined as follows:

Scapula: To immerse, to plunge, also to stain, to dye, to color, to wash.

Ursinus: To dip, to dye, to wash, to sprinkle.

Groves: To dip, plunge, immerse, to wash, to wet, to moisten, to sprinkle, to steep, to imbue, to dye.

Donnegan: To dip, to plunge, to submerge, to wash, to dye, to color.

But the question may well arise in the minds of my intelligent hearers how do these compilers of Lexicons ascertain these meanings of the Greek words *bapto* and *baptizo*. The question is a very proper one, and the answer is, by the usage of authors who wrote in the Greek language. To these, therefore, as witnesses we may also appeal. And I wish you very carefully to observe that these authors who wrote in Greek must be divided into two classes. First, the classic authors, such as Homer, Hesiod, Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato, and Aristotle who lived and wrote entirely apart from the influence of the Hebrew Scriptures and Jewish nation; and secondly, the writers of Greek connected with the Jewish Scriptures and Jewish institutions—such as the translators of the Old Testament and Apocrypha, known as the Septuagint, and the writers of the New Testament. I shall give you the testimony of both of these classes on the meaning of the words *bapto* and *baptizo*.

Hippocrates, a Greek writer, reckoned among the fathers of the science of medicine, uses the word *bapto* to denote dying by dropping or pouring the liquid dye on the thing dyed. His words are, "When it drops upon the garments, they are dyed." Now, certainly this does not mean immersion. The Greek writer Arrian, in his "expedition of Alexander the Great," has the following sentence: "Nearchus relates that the men of India dye (using the verb *bapto*) their beards;" and Dr. Carson, a very learned immersionist, admits that here *bapto* cannot mean to immerse, for the dye was applied to the beard, and the beard was not dipped in the dye. Homer, in his poem known as the "battle of the frogs and the mice," in speaking of the wounding and death of one of these little animals says: "He, breathless, fell and the lake was tinged (*ebapto*) with his blood." Will it be seriously contended that *bapto* here means "immerse," and that the lake was immersed in the blood of a frog or of a mouse? The witty Greek Aristophanes says: "Magnes, an old comic actor of Athens, shaved his face, and washed it over (using the verb *bapto*) with tawny washes." Here the face was not immersed, but the wash was applied to the face. Plutarch who wrote in Greek, and certainly understood his own language, in speaking of a Roman General who was wounded, says: "Just before he died he set up a trophy, on which having baptized his hand with blood he wrote this inscription," etc. Here it cannot be pretended that the hand was immersed in blood. The blood, running from his wound, was applied to his hand, and thus the inscription was written.

And we have another quotation from the old Greek physician, Hippocrates, which is conclusive against immersion. Giving directions concerning the use of a blister plaster, he says: "If it be too painful let it be *baptized* with milk or Egyptian ointment," (using the verb *baptizo*). Now, no doctor, in his senses, in carrying out the prescription of Hippocrates, would immerse the plaster in milk or ointment, but would simply apply the liquid to moisten it. And it is remarkable that when *bapto* and *baptizo* are used in the Greek classics to signify the act of dipping or plunging or immersing, they mean in most cases that the object immersed was sunk down to the bottom and never brought up again! Thus Josephus uses these verbs concerning ships and their cargoes which were sunk in the sea; and Diodorus Siculus speaking of the overflowing of the Nile says: "When the water overflows, many of the land animals (*baptizomena*) being sunk in the river, perish." But this significance of *bapto* and *baptizo* is too strong even for the strongest immersionists.

These quotations from classic Greek authors completely overthrow the exclusive immersionist theory. For, that theory plants itself upon the assumption that the words *bapto* and *baptizo* always

mean "to immerse" and never mean any other action. This assumption would be overthrown by showing one single instance to the contrary—one instance in which a different meaning from "immerse" was the true meaning. But, when we show from classic Greek authors, not one instance but, many instances in which a different meaning from "immerse" must have been the true meaning we totally defeat the theory of exclusive immersion. Within the past half century, this subject has been thoroughly ventilated, and the usage of both Classic and Jewish Greek has been shown to be so strongly against the pretensions of exclusive immersionists that the men among them who have had some just claims to learning and culture, have been driven to extremes, and have made vain attempts to anchor themselves on what they claim to be the primary meaning of *bapto* and *baptizo* as distinguished from what they are pleased to call their figurative, secondary, or conventional meanings. But all in vain! For it has never been proved that the primary meaning of *bapto* or *baptizo* was "to immerse" any more than it was "to wash," "to dye," "to moisten." And even if that could be proved it would avail nothing in this controversy, for the question is not what *bapto* or *baptizo* primarily meant, but what *bapto* and its derivative *baptizo* meant in the days of our Saviour when He instituted Christian baptism. What words mean, i. e., what ideas they convey, depends on their usage in language in any given age. It is a perfectly ascertained fact that there is hardly a noun or a verb in any language which has not, with the progress of years, changed its primary meaning for its secondary meaning—its literal meaning for its figurative meaning. Thus, our English word "prevent" meant primarily nothing more nor less than "to come before," being derived from two Latin words "prae" before, and "venire" to come. But everybody knows that "to prevent" in English does not now mean, and has not for one hundred and fifty years meant "to come before," but means "to hinder," "to obstruct," "to obviate," "to preclude." The man who would now in common discourse or ordinary composition use this word in its primary sense of "to come before" would be laughed at as either grossly ignorant or pedantic. The question, therefore, as to *bapto* and *baptizo* is, not what was their primary meaning in Greek ages to which we cannot ascend, but what was their meaning—what ideas they conveyed—in the land and in the age when Christ our Saviour appeared and lived and taught in the land of Judea. And on this question we have overwhelming evidence against the claims of the exclusive immersionists. To the Jewish mind the words *bapto* and *baptizo* never did convey the idea of the immersion of the whole body in water or any other liquid. It is a very important fact that in the inspired books of Moses, God never does require in one single instance the immersion of the whole body as a type or emblem of the spiritual renewing and purifying which was just as necessary and just as inexorably required under the Old Testament dispensation as under the New. The reason of this obviously is that the inherent depravity of our nature is too deep to be reached by immersion, however complete, and therefore the smallest quantity of water or of blood availed as fully to furnish the type and emblem of purification, as the largest quantity. Hence we have, in the Old Testament, requirements and instances of sprinkling, washing, and bathing, but no command for complete immersion. And these words *bapto* and *baptizo* as used in the Greek translation of the Old Testament Scriptures, and of the immediate books known as the Apocrypha, were used in the sense of effusing or sprinkling or washing, and not in the sense of immersing. Thus in Leviticus xiv: 6, 7, the priest was directed to kill a bird, and then take a living bird, and cedar-wood, and scarlet, and hyssop, and dip them in the blood of the killed bird. Here *bapto* is used, but it is evident that all of these things could not possibly have been immersed in the blood of a single bird. Hence the meaning of *bapto* there is to wet or to moisten sufficiently to enable the priest to sprinkle the blood. In Exodus xii: 22, *bapto* means simply wetting or moistening. "And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop and dip it in the blood that is in the basin, and strike the lintel and the two side posts with the blood that is in the basin." That is, the blood was to be effused or sprinkled on the lintel and the two side posts of the door. And in Leviticus xiv: 16, 17, "The priest shall dip his finger in some of the blood and sprinkle it seven times before the Lord." "The priest shall dip his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand." In both these cases the expression from the Greek is *bapsei apo*, he shall dip from. Did any one ever hear of immersing from water? In the case of Naaman, the direction of Elisha the prophet was, "Go wash seven times in the Jordan." Here the verb used is not *bapto* or *baptizo*, but *lavo*, to wash, which does not mean to immerse, but to apply the water in washing to the person. And yet we read that when Naaman made up his mind to comply with the direction of the prophet, he baptized (*ebaptizato*) in the Jordan seven times, according to the word of Elisha. This is proof that to wash was to baptize; and furnishes no proof of immersion, but the contrary. And in the book of Daniel, we read in the Greek Septuagint concerning Nebuchadnezzar, that "he was driven from

men, and did eat grass as oxen, and his body was wet (*ebaphae*) with the dew of heaven." Now will any man be so blind and so absurd as to contend that the gentle effusion of the dew, which was the moisture pressed out from the air condensed by cold, and effused upon the body of Nebuchadnezzar, was an immersion? Yes there have been men—even learned men—so blinded by partisanship that they have so contended; but no unprejudiced and fair-minded man can agree with them. In the Septuagint i. e., the Greek translation of the Apocryphal book of Judith xii: 7, we read, "And she went out at night into the valley of Bethulia, and baptized herself (*ebaptizeto*) at a fountain of water." Here the words rendered "at a fountain" are "*epi tes peges*": the preposition *epi* means *at* and not *in*, and the Greek noun *pege*, as every competent scholar knows, means not a river or a lake or a reservoir, but a spring, a trickling rill or fountain, like the thousands trickling from the hill sides of Virginia. And moreover Judith was in the camp of Holofernes, surrounded by armed men. Therefore the idea of her immersing herself at a trickling spring, and under such circumstances, is too heavy a draft on the fancy to be endured. Consequently, the only answer that exclusive immersionists have ever attempted to this case is that it is recorded in the Apocrypha and not in the Old Testament. But this is a very weak answer—or rather it is no answer at all. For the question is not the inspired authority of the statement, but the meaning of the word *baptizo* which is used in it. For this purpose, it is strong evidence against immersion; for this book of Judith brings us nearer to the times of Christ than any of the inspired books of the Old Testament.

And now we come to *bapto* and *baptizo* in the New Testament. We have this passage from Mark vii: 4, "Then came together unto him the Pharisees and certain of the scribes which came from Jerusalem. And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled (that is to say with unwashed) hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash (*baptizo*) they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washings of cups and pots and brazen vessels and tables." Now in order that you may have all the light on this passage that I can give to you, I will read the rendering as given in the Revised Version of 1881. "And there are gathered together unto him the Pharisees and certain of the scribes which had come from Jerusalem, and had seen that some of his disciples ate their bread with defiled, that is, unwashed hands. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently, (marginal note the Greek word here means "with the fist") eat not, holding the tradition of the elders; and when they come from the market place, except they wash themselves, (in the margin, Greek, *baptizo*—some ancient authorities read *sprinkle themselves*) they eat not: And many other things there be which they have received to hold—washings of cups and pots and brazen vessels. Marginal note—many ancient authorities add "and couches." Now as this Revised Version has been highly commended by very learned advocates of Exclusive Immersion, I suppose none of that school will reject its rendering. Yet it is as fatal to their claims as the Old Version. For it proves that in the times of our Saviour the Jews perfectly understood that to baptize was not to immerse, but simply to wash; that is, to apply water to their hands or persons or utensils, by effusion, sprinkling, or pouring. No proof has ever been attempted that when the Jews came from market, their habit was to immerse their bodies in water. All they did was to wash their hands or faces, or in extreme cases their feet. Yet this is expressly declared to have been *baptizing*. And in like manner they had washings (*baptizings*) of cups and pots and brazen vessels. Nothing in the history of the manners and customs of the Jews authorizes the belief that these domestic utensils, some of which were of large size, were washed and cleansed by being immersed in water. They were baptized just as they are washed now by effusion, pouring, and applying water to them. And the same kind of proof against exclusive immersion is furnished by another passage from the 11th chapter of Luke. A certain pharisee asked our Saviour to dine with him, and he went and sat down to meat. And now I give you the Revised Version: "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner."—Here the word rendered washed is in the Greek *ebaptisthe*, baptized. The Pharisee wondered that Christ had not first baptized himself before dinner. Now, has any man, not blinded by prejudice, ever supposed or contended that this Pharisee marvelled that Christ had not immersed his whole body before dinner? Assuredly not. All that this Pharisee expected was that Christ would, according to the usage of the Jews, baptize himself by applying a small quantity of water to his hands or his face. That was all he expected. That was what baptism meant in his day and according to his traditions, and he was a Pharisee of the Pharisees—a Jew of the Jews.

(To be continued.)

The best friendship is friendship to the soul.

The Central Presbyterian.

WHOLE NO. 855.

RICHMOND, VA., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1881.

VOL. 17---NO. 21.

Central Presbyterian.

OFFICE:
No. 1015 Main street, opposite the Post Office.

TERMS:

Three Dollars a year; six months, \$1.50; three months, 75 cents; payable in advance.—Ministers of the gospel, \$2.50.

Payments may be made to local agents wherever practicable; all ministers of our Church are authorized to act as such. Or by checks, Post-office money orders, or letters Registered by Postmaster. Otherwise it must be at the risk of the party sending it.

Obituaries charged at five cents a line. The party sending can make the estimate by counting eight words to a line. Payment in advance.

Advertising rates furnished on application to the office.

Communications and letters on business should be addressed to CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN, Box 37, Richmond, Va.

Richardson & Southall,
Editors and Proprietors.

[Entered at the Post-Office at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

Letter from Italy.

VENICE, Nov. 27th, 1881.

Messrs. Editors.—From Milan to Venice is a journey of several hundred miles through the lowlands of Lombardy, a very fertile territory, but abounding in ditches and surface water. Among the principal crops of this region we would be tempted to place the fever and ague. The whole country is a mulberry orchard with grapes festooned from tree to tree, high from the ground. The mulberry furnishes the silk-worms with their food, the interspaces are planted with corn, and the grape comes in at the end never properly nourished and deprived of the sugar producing action of the sun. This is the occasion of the wretched wine of Italy. The ecstasies of Horace over the "mild Falernian" were mainly poetical, we fear. The Greek hostages spoke more probably the prose of the matter when they remarked in derision of the Roman wine "that the grapes that made such wine ought to be lifted up to the skies." At all events the modern traveller agrees with the Greek hostages, for he drinks the thin, sour beverage only at thirstiest need. Very picturesque, however, is this habit of trailing the vines from the trees, and nearly everywhere in Italy just now the landscape is gay with the autumnal garlands of vines festooned along the long and regular lines of mulberry trees, their foliage all golden and russet with dashes of crimson. Their purple burden has gone to the wine-press, and the festivals of the vineyard are over. But to the traveller they still furnish fascination, and difficult for him will it be ever to forget the journey of northern Italy on an autumnal day with the perpetual lines of pollarded mulberries, linked with the many-colored festoons, backed by the lakes of emerald green or forest clad hillsides in the golden splendor of their most brilliant change and the mellow brightness of an Italian sky.

After many hours, the change from the hard and sonorous, to the softer and more sullen rumble of the railway carriage, indicates that we are traversing the famous *Lagunes*, which border the Adriatic gulf and diffuse an unwholesome atmosphere over the scattered habitations that surround them. It is night when we reach the end of our journey and begin at last to behold, as in a half-darkened mirror, the fantastic outlines of the city of Venice, here and there illumined by pale lights, and rising from the water like a floating carivan or mirage of the deep. Truly the night, with its uncertain vision and fitful shadows, is the time above all others to enter this city of enchantment, whose chief glory now consists in its power to excite the imagination. To the stranger ignorant of the 117 islets on which this city, of more than one hundred thousand inhabitants, stands,

Venice Does Indeed Appear a Floating City,

poised upon the surface of the water, and presided over by some sprite of the waves. The train having stopped, we immediately discover that in Venice all the conditions of vulgar life belonging to other cities, are wholly changed. No crowd of omnibuses nor rush of yelling hotel derisives await you. Instead, there is a long row of black gondolas lying at the bottom of the marble steps, and the formalities of securing one of these, and entering together with your luggage, are all conducted with a quietude which seems to indicate that there is no power even in steam to break in with hoarse energy upon the tranquillity of a city whose streets echo with no sounds save those of the wavelets which the blue Adriatic wafts through her gloomy canals.

We find the *Venetian Gondola*, the object of so much curiosity on our part, to be a most melancholy craft. An ellipse of black wood, swan shaped, with many relieves—at one of the extremities a great halberd cut deeply with teeth whose steel shimmers ominously, and at the other end a species of twisted tail—in the centre a place of repose lined in-

side with black cloth and silk embroidery, and shaded with dark curtains—this is the gondola. We confess that on entering the silent, ill-lighted boat, we were led irresistibly to romance, and it was not difficult for us to imagine that we were in a floating hearse, and were being drawn onward through a city of the dead, an illusion which is heightened by the imperceptible movement of the boat, the night-gloom, the desolate palaces, the half ruined windows, the low and shadowy arches, and the murmur of the waters as they plash against the broken marble steps—like tear falling on tear. This craft is a fit companion for adventure and romance. We understand now more vividly than ever before, Shakespeare's Moor and Merchant of Venice, Victor Hugo's Angelo, and the dramas of Byron. They were cradled in the mysterious shadows of these gondolas.

From the station to the hotel seems an extremely long distance, and impatient of the low and ill-lighted saloon, we emerge and stand erect to gain a better view of this strange and unique city. We feel that the boatman standing at the end of the boat and handling his single oar might be Charon and these the waters of the Styx, so sombre and bituminous are they and so prevalent is the sentiment of gloom. The streets of water are unlighted save by the dull lamp of the gondola passing so silently by, and the high walls of the great buildings but deepen the darkness of the night. It is as if the city was without inhabitants. Over the arches of the bridges living beings do indeed occasionally pass, but it is not difficult to imagine them to be unreal as the strange reflections caused by the vapors of the air. The silence is broken only by the ripple of the oar, or the cry of the gondolier, sharp and shrill as the note of a wild sea-bird, by which he warns at every corner his fellow craftsmen in order to prevent a collision.

At length we emerge from the tortuous labyrinth of narrow waterways and enter

The Grand Canal

where, by the light of the stars, we gaze with astonishment upon the shafts of twisted columns, the plinths and pedestals, the gothic roses, and arabesque windows which mount above the water.—Soon, however, the gondola is lost again amid the maze of narrow streets, and all the beautiful decorations disappear from our view, the while we are involved deeply in a mental study as to how the gondolier, balancing himself on the furthest extremity of the long boat and using the oar only on one side, can possibly guide his craft with such precision as to glide safely by the passing boat or avoid by a hairsbreadth the jutting bridges and corners of stone. These Gondoliers form a distinct population, but they are no longer gay sailors singing Venetian airs and reciting the verses of Tasso. The deflection of the stream of human migration towards America and the west, has ruined the prosperity of Venice and turned the life of this worthy and industrious class of Venetians into a hard and bitter struggle. That struggle has been rendered desperate of late by the introduction of steam vessels upon the grand canal. At this time the gondoliers are indulging in a strike against this invasion of their ancient rights, but we fear it will be in vain. Political economy is ruthless. What protest of special class ever availed to stem the general progress, or to undo the incidental fatality? We fear the gondolier will find it an unequal struggle, and must soon, like the wellers of the land, be improved off the face of the water. The gondolier descends from a line of ancestors as long as the dilapidated Patricians, but is a nobler character. His whole fortune is in his boat, which is worth, perhaps, \$200, and requires an additional expenditure of \$50 yearly for repairs. He pays in addition a tax to the municipality according to the *tragitto* or station to which he is allocated, and he is obliged to be there all and every day not only, but also every third night. During the summer months he gains four to five francs *per diem*, in the winter almost nothing. The food of the family, when they have food, consists of polenta and a handful of small fish. On feast days, if the gondolier has been fortunate, they eat a little rice, and this, however, is an exceptional luxury which they can rarely afford. And yet these men, who from year's end to year's end would be supposed, according to the notions of an American laborer, to starve, are able each day to row, without an apparent effort, for many hours, and are well set, strong, and muscular. Physically, intellectually, and morally, they compare advantageously with the descendants of the Doges, and are infinitely superior to the curious creatures who spend most of their time seated on a chair, with their feet on a second one, in the piazza of St. Marc, and imagine that to do absolutely nothing from the first day of the year to the last is perfect bliss. The descendants of Patricians who traded in the days when all commercial pursuits were despised by the aristocracy, they would sooner die forsooth than soil their hands

with labor. Why should a man trouble himself about public life when his means will permit him to vegetate on an easy chair? Why should a man trouble himself about the army and risk a wound or perhaps his life, when for two pence and a half a day he may drink his coffee in safety? Why should a man embark in the uncertainties of speculative commerce, when for a lira he may have all the excitement and none of the exertion, in some national lottery or at the gambling table in the back room of a *cafe*? Yet Venice is full of youths of this sort who regard themselves as the salt of the earth, simply because they are sons of the Patricians. While all other Venetians of any prominence are seeking to bring back prosperity to their town, while the humbler citizens work hard to gain a pittance, and while the very beggars are disappearing from the byways, these noble drones, fit illustration of the advantage of such a class to the State, too proud to work and too contemptible even to be ashamed of their purposeless lives, stagnate in the midst of all the intense movement of the world, and are well satisfied with an existence that one would think would drive a snail to commit suicide. Over against these descendants of the Patricians, are the humbler and more worthy gondoliers who toil day and night for the luxury of living on polenta.—There is, however, one serious and dreadful attendant upon this article of food, viz., madness. On one of the islands near the town, there are six hundred lunatics who owe the loss of their wits to the use of polenta. The disease begins with an outbreak of scabs on the arms and head, then either idiocy or madness occurs. This year there has been a congress of doctors to report on this singular result. Their conclusion is that good, well-cooked polenta is a wholesome food, but that disease arises from eating polenta which is either bad from being grown on exhausted land, or from being mildewed by dampness, or from being badly cooked. Whatever the cause may be, it is remarkable that Venice should supply six hundred lunatics from eating Indian corn.

The City of Silence.

Shall we ever forget our first night in the city of Venice—and its almost supernatural quiet. The following morning in the reading room of the hotel, as if by strange coincidence, we found an old number of the *Saturday Review*, and read therein with much edification an article on *Noises*, from which we extract the following sentence: "If we could only popularize the idea that noise is really injurious to health, and that in fact it disintegrates the tissues, we might get this subject attended to, and there would be some chance of the intelligence and co-operation necessary for the taking of measures to diminish noise." Ah! thought we, Venice is the delectable city for which this philosopher of ease and conservator of tissues is sighing. For nervous folk, and all who have grown too superfluous in their notions of civilization to longer endure noise cheerfully, we recommend a residence in this city of silence. No nerve-shattering street-cars every three minutes of the day and night! The cab horses, you imagine, are shod with felt, until you learn that Venice has never been disturbed by the tread of a single quadruped of this description. Sounds of bells there are, but ah! not clangorous! Strangely mellowed and sweet voiced are the bells as they bring to our ears the angelus, and remind us of the emotion of Byron, when one evening he fancied he heard the combination of these same echoes from the borders of the horizon gliding over the waters, as the stars of heaven to the mother of Christ, with the moon at her feet and with the mysterious white dove waving its wings on her forehead in that sublime hour of Catholic respect and devotion! L. M. C.

Professor Robertson Smith.

Messrs. Editors.—Apropos of your article on Professor Robertson Smith, and Dr. Watts' book in answer thereto, I enclose an extract from a letter just received from a prominent Christian gentleman of Edinburgh, a ruling elder of the Free Church:

"We had the celebrated Dr. William Robertson Smith lecturing in Dr. Walter Smith's church on Sunday night, and the subject of the lecture was, 'The Hebrew Prophets and their Times'; and it was a strange thing to have such a lecturer, and such a lecture in a Free church; but it just shows what things are coming to in this part of the world, so far as free handling of the Bible is concerned. The object of the lecture was not to build up, but to pull down, and though it was merely the introductory one of a series, it was sad to see, from hints given in it, that the lecturer did not believe in what are called Messianic Prophecies in the Old Testament, but was disposed to give them the go-by, as texts that had an interpretation put upon them by writers in the New Testament which they were not intended to bear. As to the prophets they will be quietly disposed of, I have no doubt, in a similar way when he comes

to treat of them in his subsequent lecture. He will make them out to be common men who spoke of things to come in a way that was too wide of the mark to entitle their sayings to be called prophecies; in short he will do his best to wipe out the prophetic element altogether from the Old Testament. And such is the doctrine that can now be proclaimed without let or hindrance from the pulpit of one of the principal Free churches in Edinburgh. *O tempora! O mores!*"
Fredericksburg, Va. J. P. S.

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES.

Southern Presbyterian.

Rev. T. J. Allison has been called to Tallahassee, Fla.

Rev. David McMeekin, of Ballymena, Ireland, has declined the call to Eufaula, Ala.

Second Church, Petersburg, Va.—On last Sunday Messrs. Freeman W. Jones and John Batte were installed as elders in this church.

Rev. C. M. Howard has been holding a series of services in the Presbyterian church at Drummondtown, Accomac county, Va., since the beginning of this month.

Rev. R. A. Wailes, late of Lynchburg, Va., was, on the 11th inst., ordained and installed pastor of the church at Tarboro, N. C. Rev. J. H. Smith, D. D., presided and preached the sermon; Rev. S. M. Smith delivered the charge to the pastor, and Rev. T. J. Allison the charge to the people.

Rev. W. G. Woodbridge, pastor elect of the Hot Springs (Ark.) church, has declined to be installed, and has notified his congregation that his services as their minister will cease with the third Sabbath in January. He has not yet determined where he will labor.

Rev. F. W. Lewis has removed from Kentucky to Louisiana, and taken charge of the church at Vermillionville and Opelousas. His Post office address is Vermillionville, La.

Mt. Carmel Church.—Lexington Presbytery will meet in this church next April, and the congregation are having the house of worship thoroughly repaired and painted.

Rev. J. B. Booker, of Staunton, has lately conducted a series of meetings at Olivet chapel, which resulted in the addition of six persons to the church. The meetings closed on Sunday, 11th inst.

Organization.—In obedience to an order of the Abingdon Presbytery which met at Dublin, Pulaski county, Va., on the 25th day of November, 1881, after due notice the Rev. J. M. Kirkpatrick preached a sermon at Martin's Station, Va., and proceeded to organize a Presbyterian church which was done with 14 members; and that being finished the church then went into an election of its officers: R. D. Martin, B. E. Watson, and G. A. Calfee were elected ruling elders; C. L. Teaney and S. M. Williamson, deacons. We commend the little church into the hands of our Lord and Master; and ask the prayers of all Christians for the growth of the church.

Sewell Church, West Va.—A church with this name, of seventeen members, was organized at Sewell Station on the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad on the 10th of December, 1881, by Revs. James Haynes and J. H. Lewis, with elders A. D. Johnson and C. S. Warner, a committee appointed for this purpose at the fall meeting of Greenbrier Presbytery. The members all came from other Presbyterian churches but one, who was received on examination. Several of them were from churches in Scotland. Dr. J. P. Hughton, who had previously served as an elder in Mossy Creek church in Augusta county, Va., was elected and installed into that office; and John Kay was elected, ordained, and installed into the office of deacon. Two others, one of whom had served in that capacity in Fayette church were elected elders, and one other was elected deacon; but have not yet signified their acceptance. There are sixty or more families living at this place and no other church organization as yet; it is hoped therefore that this little church may serve as a nucleus for the formation of a prosperous Christian brotherhood at no distant day. This makes the sixth church organized in this Presbytery within a little more than a year, two of them in the field of our evangelist, Rev. L. A. McLean. He feels very much encouraged by these indications of the divine favor. This little band at Sewell, aided by others at this place, have erected a building for church and school purposes combined, and seems disposed to work. May grace, mercy, and peace be multiplied among them. L.

Rev. E. H. Harding, D. D.—The Savannah Evening News of December 13th, highly commends the sermon preached on the Sabbath preceding, by Dr. Harding, who is now supplying the First Presbyterian church of Savannah, and says that an earnest effort will be made to have him repeat it.

Auxvasse Church, Mo.—Dr. Cowan sends us by postal this good news:

"We have been conducting a meeting in my church for the past ten days. Up to this date, there have been thirty-five added to the church on profession of faith—some of them heads of families and advanced in life."—St. Louis Presbyterian.

Des Peres church, under the care of Rev. J. A. Smith, received four new members on the 11th inst. At the same time, the elders-elect, Messrs. Black and Syder, were ordained and installed.—Ib.

Marshall Church.—Rev. L. P. Bowen is encouraged in his labors. The church continues to grow cheerfully. Congregations constantly increasing, and sixteen additions to the membership within a month.—Ib.

Churches Organized in Missouri.—Prairie View church was organized on the 2d of December. Twenty-three, all of whom, except three or four, are heads of families, united in the organization, and three others were received on profession of their faith in Christ. Three elders were elected, Messrs. James McCord, J. C. Van Boskins, and Edward C. Gamble, and two deacons, Messrs. Samuel L. McCord and Samuel S. Northern. These were ordained and installed into office on Sabbath morning in the presence of a large and interested congregation. A church has also been organized near Fulton, Mo., with fifteen members, all heads of families. Two elders were ordained and installed. The church is named Carmel. Ib.

Hopewell Church and Chapel.—Rev. W. E. McIlwain writes under date of December 6th, from Hopewell, N. C.:

"On last Sabbath we closed a meeting at our new chapel opened last July and received eight more members, making sixteen at that place during the present year. And since I last wrote we have received three others on certificate at the main church building, which added to those received at the chapel makes more than fifty in the last twelve months. On the Sabbath preceding a congregational meeting was held at Hopewell when Rev. F. L. Leeper, of Fort Mill, S. C., was chosen pastor, H. A. Grey, Dr. E. A. Sample, and William Caldwell, elders; John L. Parks, Richard Harry, and William A. Jamison, deacons."—N. C. Presbyterian.

The Presbyterian Sabbath School at Greensboro numbers 188 scholars, and it is in contemplation on the night of the 26th at Benbow Hall to give them an entertainment at which each scholar will receive a gift as a token of the interest the church feels in them.—Ib.

Cedartown, Ga.—From Rev. James E. Jones we have the following good news: "Rev. Nathan Bachman, who visited us two years ago, and held a series of meetings which were owned and blessed of the Lord, has been with us again. The whole Christian community joined us in a meeting that continued through two weeks. The result was that twelve united with our church upon profession of faith, and one by letter seven united with the Methodist church upon profession, and three with the Baptist. Our community is in some respects the best I ever knew. The churches and ministers are, and have been, ever since I have lived here, upon the best of terms. No bickerings, no jealousies, nor strife; but all seemed to be engaged in one common cause, that of the upbuilding of Zion. Rejoice with us, and let God have all the praise."—Christian Observer.

Westminster Church, Nashville, Tenn.—Rev. T. M. McConnell writes: "We ordained and installed (December 4th) two new elders and one new deacon. Mr. W. A. Stewart as deacon and Messrs. G. W. Gifford and J. M. Waldie as elders—the last named is a native Scotchman, and the other two of Scotch descent. I feel more encouraged in my work than I have for some time. I think the people are taking more interest than ever before. We have a meeting in progress now. Will be assisted by Dr. J. C. Mitchell, of Columbia, and Dr. Doak, State Superintendent of Public Instruction." Ib.

The Third Church, Knoxville, Tenn.—(Rev. W. A. Harrison's) participated largely in the benefits, resulting from a visit paid that city by Dr. Munhall, of Indianapolis, Indiana, who was sent out under the auspices of the Young Men's Christian Association of that city. His visit was the occasion of a good deal of religious interest, which extended to most of the churches in Knoxville. The Third church protracted the meeting after the Doctor's departure and received thirteen additions.—Ib.

A Quarter of a Century.—On Sunday, December 11th, Dr. Palmer, after a temporary absence from the city, occupied his pulpit. The subject of his discourse in the morning was the text with which he began his ministry here twenty-five years ago. At that time the congregation worshipped in the Odd Fellows' Hall, since destroyed by fire. That was in the winter of 1856-7. They took possession of the spacious church now occupied by them in the winter of the following year.

The text was 1 Cor. ii. 2: "For I determined to know nothing among you, but Jesus Christ and Him crucified." The attention of the congregation was called especially to the latter part of the verse, enforcing the duty of living to Christ.

How forcibly the events of the last quarter of a century conspire to impress that lesson! The storms of battle and the work of time have removed the proudest achievements of human pride and power, but the name of Jesus, is still above every name.—Southwestern Presbyterian.

Northern Presbyterian.

On the 4th of December ninety-eight persons were added to the Third Presbyterian church in Chicago, Ill., (Rev. Dr. Kittredge's.) There is much religious interest in the congregation. The church has now one thousand eight hundred members.

The Presbyterian church in Nyack, N. Y., is prospering under the ministry of the Rev. J. E. Lloyd. At the last communion on December 4th thirteen persons were received to the church.

(Continued on 5th page.)

Central Presbyterian.

WEDNESDAY, - - - December 21, 1881.

For the Central Presbyterian.

What is Christian Baptism?

By Rev. R. R. Howison.

(Continued.)

From all these evidences, independent and yet cumulative, we learn what was the meaning of the verb "to baptize" in the days of Christ's personal residence on earth. It meant—not to immerse, but to wash by effusion, pouring, or sprinkling water on the person or thing baptized in sign or token of purification. This was the well-understood and established meaning of the word baptize when John the Baptist came "baptizing in the wilderness" and preaching: "Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." How then did John baptize? What mode, what action did he use in this rite? It is insisted, by exclusive immersionists, and their notion has been too easily acquiesced in by others, that John baptized by immersion. But there is no proof of it whatever; and to suppose it, is to run counter to all the fair and natural presumptions of the case. For hundreds of years, the action involved in baptism among the Jews had been—not immersion, but simply applying water in washing, pouring, or sprinkling, and yet we are asked to believe that John the Baptist, himself a Jew, and born and raised wholly under Jewish usages, suddenly and without cause, and against all the reasons of facility and convenience, changed this usage and commenced the practice of immersing the whole body in water! This we have no good reason to believe. It is a false notion founded on false premises. One of these premises is the statement based on our faulty English translation that those baptized went down into the Jordan river and came up out of the Jordan. But the true rendering is "went down *eis* to the Jordan and came up *apo* from the Jordan." When Peter ran *eis* to the sepulchre, it appears distinctly by the narrative in Luke that he did not go into it. And the only reason why John resorted to the neighborhood of the river Jordan was that the immense multitudes of people who came to him to be baptized, many of them doubtless attended by beasts of burden, rendered it indispensable that an ample supply of water for cooking, drinking, and cleansing should be at hand. We read in the fourth gospel that John was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there. But this is not an accurate translation. The Greek is *udata polla*, many waters, as the Revised Version states in the margin, and this expression has been explained by the many springs, rills, and fountains found by travellers, near the site of ancient Enon. These springs, though entirely unsuited for immersion, would have been highly important to the multitudinous assemblage of men, women, children, and beasts. The numbers baptized must have amounted to hundreds of thousands, for Judea at that time contained about six millions of inhabitants, and Matthew says: "There went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan." Mark says "there went out unto him all the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem and were all baptized of him." Luke says: "Then said he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him." Now even if John had many assistants (of which we have no evidence whatever) it would have been physically impossible to have separately immersed each individual of these innumerable multitudes. But there would have been no difficulty in separately performing the simple act of effusion. All these facts confirm the belief that John the Baptist did not depart from the established usage of the Jews in baptism, and did not baptize by immersion. It is a favorite argument of exclusive immersionists that Christ our Saviour was baptized by immersion. But there is no proof of it and no reason to believe it. Christ was baptized just as the others were baptized—that is, according to the established Jewish usage by having the water applied to him by effusion, sprinkling, or pouring. He went down *eis* to the water, and came up *apo* from the water. And even if he went into the water that would not prove that he was immersed, for the action of effusion or pouring might have been most conveniently performed by John the Baptist while both were standing in the water. It is worthy of close attention that the evangelist John states that the great multitudes of baptisms took place in Bethabara beyond Jordan, and that the place of the baptism of Christ was in Enon near to Salim where there were many springs and fountains—many waters, as the Greek expresses it. And the very earliest writers of the Christian era after the apostles when they speak of the mode of baptism practised by John, and of the mode in which he baptized Christ our Saviour, speak of it as by effusion or pouring of water, and not by immersion. Aurelius Prudentius, who wrote A. D. 390, speaking of John's baptism, says: "*Perfundit fluvio*," "he poured water on them from the river." A few years later, Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, speaking of John, says: "He washed away the sins of believers '*infusus lymphis*' by waters poured on them." Saint Bernard, speaking of the baptism of Christ our Lord by John, uses these striking words: "*Infundit aquam capiti Creatoris creatura*," that is, the

creature poured water upon the head of the Creator. Lactantius, about the close of the third century, says: "Christ received baptism that He might save the Gentiles by baptism: that is, (*purificatoris perfusione*) by the distilling of the purifying dew." And the earliest pictorial representation that we have of the baptism of Christ is a very ancient medal or tablet, from which Poussin has taken the figures and attitudes of his celebrated painting, representing Christ standing in the water and John the Baptist with his hand pouring or effusing water on the head of our Lord. To this mode of baptism also correspond the rude tracings on the walls of the Catacombs of Rome, those gloomy subterranean retreats which date back to a time before the birth of Christ, and in which many Christians took refuge in the days of persecution under the Roman Emperors. None of these tracings represent immersion. All represent pouring or effusion, although the person baptized is sometimes represented as standing in the water. The very earliest notice of the mode of baptism that we have, after the death of the Apostle John, has been preserved to us by Walker, a very learned and careful English writer on baptism. His account was repeated by Dr. N. L. Rice, in his celebrated debate with Dr. Alexander Campbell, in Lexington, Kentucky, in 1843, and the authenticity of the account was never disputed. It is the case of a man, about seventy years after the time of the apostles, who was on a journey through a desert part of Asia, in company with a number of Christians. He was taken dangerously ill and professed Christianity and desired to be baptized. But there was no water within reach, and therefore he was sprinkled with sand, with the Christian forms. He recovered, and returned with them; and his case being reported to the presiding Presbyter or Bishop, he decided that he was validly baptized "if only water should be poured (*perfundetur*) on him." Justin Martyr, in the second century, the very first of the Christian fathers (after the apostles) who mentions baptism, speaks of it as a washing (*lutron*), and not as an immersion. Origen, who was born in Alexandria only 185 years after Christ, and was one of the most learned men of the Christian Church, and was certainly acquainted with his own language—the Greek—translates the word *bapto* in Revelation xix: 13, by the word "sprinkle," *rantizo*. "And he was clothed in a vesture sprinkled with blood." And in the same way exactly the old *Peshito-Syriac* translation of the New Testament which is one of the most ancient translations existing on earth, rendered that verse, thus proving, by early Greek authority itself, that *bapto* means *sprinkle*. So excruciating torture have these indisputable facts from Origen and the *Peshito-Syriac* version given to exclusive immersionists, that two of them, Dr. Gale and Alexander Campbell, have been actually driven to adopt the wild theory that Origen and the translators of the *Peshito-Syriac* must have had access to a Greek copy of the book of Revelation differing from our received Greek text. This theory is not only wild, but false and dangerous. There is not one particle of evidence for it in all the Greek copies of that book that remain on earth; and to adopt this theory would be to launch us on a stormy sea of uncertainty as to the whole original text of the Bible; without chart, rudder, or compass to guide us. To proceed with the early testimony as to the mode of baptism: Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, who was born about the close of the second century, and was put to death by martyrdom in 258, decided in a council of sixty-six bishops, all of whom agreed with him, that baptism by sprinkling or effusion of water was valid, and quoted from the prophet Ezekiel in vindication of the decision, these words: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean."

Some exclusive immersionists seem to have sought comfort and encouragement from a work entitled "Christian Institutions," by the late Dean Stanley, of the Anglican Church. But if they had studied that work carefully, and compared it with Holy Scripture, and with all the remains of patristic literature and history that are genuine and authentic, they would promptly lay aside the book as one which, both in its letter and its spirit, will overthrow their tenets, rather than aid them. It is true that in the opening chapter, Dean Stanley intimates a strong opinion that John's baptism was by immersion, and that this was the mode practiced in the primitive Church. But, when we come to look for his authority for this opinion, and to winnow the wheat of facts from the very beautiful chaff of fancy and of graceful rhetoric with which he has enveloped the meagre product of truth presented, we find his opinion to be the result of his own broad-church theories stimulated by a lively imagination, and not the sober result of facts. This opening illustration of John's baptism, in which he compares it to modern scenes at and in the Jordan river, where in thousands of pretended pilgrims of various nations plunge, dip, and dive into the water, has no more real application and truth to commend it, than would have a similar description of a group of modern boys leaping, plunging, swimming, and diving in the James, the Rappahannock, or the Potomac. No such scene, however adorned by the graces of Dean Stanley's style, can be any thing but a ludicrous parody of the solemn and simple religious rite of John's baptism. That rite was the Jewish rite, and was

performed by effusion and not by immersion. It is remarkable that Dean Stanley, with all his learning does not bring forward the testimony of a single witness of the first century or the second century or the early part of the third century, after the death of the apostles, to testify to the prevalence of immersion in the primitive Church. All he does is to refer to the now well-known facts of abuse and superstition in the practice of the rite of baptism testified to by Tertullian, and writers either contemporary with him or living after him—not one of whom was born earlier than A. D. 160, and most of them long after that date. The practice proved by these writers was that the person to be baptized, whether male or female, adult or infant, was stripped entirely nude, and was then plunged into the water of the baptistery *three successive times*, accompanied by divers forms and symbols without a trace of scriptural authority, and pregnant with the dark superstitions of the coming middle ages. Surely, such usages do not commend immersion to the favorable regard of any reflecting person. In fact, Dean Stanley, in the very book referred to, has published some of the most caustic censures upon the views of exclusive immersionists that ever appeared in print. His opinions are evidently shaped by his Church-theory, which is so broad and all-embracing that, on the subject of ordinances and institutions, he lays aside, in substance, the authority of Scripture, and holds that the visible Church has power and authority to change, modify, or establish them as, to her, may seem good. It is strange indeed that such a book should be relied on by any who pretend to stand on the authority of inspired Scripture.

Thus I have shown you that there is no sound reason for believing that John the Baptist baptized by immersion, but every reason from the established Jewish usage in his day to believe that he baptized by effusion, sprinkling, or pouring of water, and that Christ our Saviour was so baptized, and that such was the testimony and the belief of early Christians. Let us now look farther into the New Testament history beyond the time of John the Baptist. It is a strong argument against the immersion theory, that we never read in the New Testament that the apostles or evangelists, when people professed faith in Christ, delayed their baptism, or changed their location to go to a river or a pool or a lake or a reservoir in order to immerse them. On the contrary it appears from the narratives that they baptized them immediately, and just where they were and just as they were, in town or country, in sickness or health, in jail or on a journey, by night or by day—facts which we can easily understand if the baptism was by effusion or sprinkling, but which are perfectly inexplicable if it was by immersion. When on the day of Pentecost, three thousand people professed conversion, we read in the inspired narrative: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Not one word is said about immersion, or about going out to the river Jordan, or going to any pool or reservoir. These fictions are added to the Scripture narrative by the fancies of exclusive immersionists. And not one word is said about change of clothing or about the time necessary to immerse so many; both of which points are material to the question. For we know, from the express words of Tertullian, herein previously referred to, that when immersion became common in the third century, the subjects, both male and female, were denuded entirely of their clothing, and were three times plunged under the water and raised up again. Hence it was called Trine baptism. But this assuredly was not the practice sanctioned by the New Testament. Take the case of the Eunuch baptized by Philip the evangelist. It is remarkable that this Eunuch had been reading the prophecy of Isaiah, and just as Philip joined him he had reached what is now known as the fifty-third chapter; but there were no divisions into chapters then, and therefore we have a right to believe that his reading had included those strong words in the close of what is now the fifty-second chapter—words which apply to Christ our Saviour: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." And thus after Philip had instructed him in the gospel of Christ and the Eunuch believed, his mind was already prepared for Christian baptism by the inspired mode indicated by the prophet Isaiah—that is by sprinkling. And then they came unto a certain water. Now we know from the accounts of geographers and travellers, ancient and modern, that there was not then, and has not been since, any stream of water in the desert between Jerusalem and Gaza, where this transaction occurred, sufficiently deep to make the immersion of the Eunuch possible. The inspired Greek says they both went down *eis* to *udor*, to the water and he baptized him; and they came up *ek tou udatos*, from the water. Assuredly we have no reason to believe this was an immersion. There was not sufficient depth of water for the purpose, and the Eunuch went on his way without any change of clothing or other preparation which an immersion would have made indispensable. Take now the case of Paul. Can any fair-minded man believe that he was immersed? He had been stricken down by a supernatural vision and a power from Christ on high. He was blind; he was weak; he was without food or water for three days; he was in a room by him-

self in Damascus; Ananias is sent to him; Paul is praying; spiritual light has come; Ananias speaks: "Brother Saul, the Lord even Jesus who appeared unto thee in the way which thou camest, hath sent me that thou may'st receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And straightway there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight; and he arose and was baptized; and he took food and was strengthened." Paul was baptized standing up, *anastas*, standing up. Was any man ever immersed while standing up? And Paul was baptized straitway—in the room where he had been blind and weak and without food for three days. Where was the river or the reservoir in which to immerse him? They cannot be found without a human addition to the inspired Word of God? Who will dare to make it? And the case of the jailor of Philippi is as strong against immersion as that of Paul. This jailor was converted and believed, in his house in the jail building and at night. And so we read: "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized he and all his immediately." We read of no going out of the jail to seek a river or a pool of water, and of no reservoir in the jail. All these are vagaries and dreams and imaginations, and are not found in the Word of God nor in the facts of the case. Therefore the jailor and his household were not baptized by immersion, but by the effusion of baptismal waters in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

Some lovely Christians, male and female, whom I have known, have quoted Hebrews x: 22, as sustaining the immersion theory. The verse is as follows: "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." But no learned and critical advocate of immersion, acquainted with the Greek original, ever ventures to refer to this verse as favorable to his views. For, in fact, it militates powerfully against them. The verb rendered *washed* is not *bapto* or *bapto*, but *lavo* which means to wash, in its generic sense—that is—to apply water to the person or thing for the purpose of cleansing or purifying. It does not mean to dip, to plunge, or to immerse. Moreover, the preposition "*with*" is the proper rendering—not the preposition "*in*." Now, immersion is performed not "*with*," but always "*in*" water or other liquid. Moreover the word "*soma*" body, and not the word "*somata*" bodies, is used. A perfectly liberal rendering, therefore, would be, "We, being washed, as to the body, in pure water." The Revised Version of 1881, gives the whole verse as follows: "Let us draw near, with a true heart, in fullness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our body washed with pure water." And this verse so far from teaching immersion, finds its appropriate illustration from the very words of Christ our Lord who at the time when He washed the feet of His disciples to teach us the duty of purity, of humility, and of bearing one another's burdens, said, "He that is washed (*o leloumenos*, using this same verb *lavo*) needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit,"—words which though they have no direct allusion to baptism, yet strongly confirm the true theory of baptism, viz: that the immersion of the person in water is not essential, but that the application of water as an emblem of cleansing is sufficient and valid, in the view of Christ himself.

Having thus shown that all evidences, whether of lexicons, or of Greek authors and usage, or of the fathers of the Church; or of Old Testament teaching, or of Jewish customs, or of the teachings of the New Testament are against the claims of exclusive immersionists, I now come to their stronghold—their ultimate argument. That argument is founded on two passages from Scripture—one from the sixth chapter of Paul's epistle to the Romans and the other from the second chapter of his epistle to the Colossians. In each of these passages, believers are said to be buried with Christ through baptism or in baptism. Immersionists insist that this is a distinct inspired teaching as to the mode of baptism, and is designed to show that baptism is a symbolic memorial of the burial and resurrection of Christ, and that as Christ was buried and rose again, so the believer in immersion is buried for a time under the water and then rises again. But a close examination will satisfy us that these Scriptures are not intended to teach, and do not teach, any thing as to the mode or action involved in Christian baptism. The burial of Christ is not an event in any manner essential to our salvation. The life, the righteousness, the sufferings, the death, and the resurrection of Christ are all essential to our salvation, and therefore all are commemorated by visible symbols and ordinances instituted by him. His life and righteousness are commemorated by baptism, which is the symbol of the renewed life, the cleansed soul, and the infused purity, all coming from Him; His sufferings and death are commemorated by the Lord's Supper, and His resurrection is commemorated by the Lord's day, the first day of the week, the day on which he rose from the dead, the Christian Sabbath, which will be observed till he come again. Therefore, there is no ground for the notion that two commemorative symbols were instituted for the resurrection. The Lord's day represents it and commemorates it, Immersion and rising from water does

not; and is wholly supererogatory and useless for that purpose, as the Christian Sabbath day has been instituted for the very end of such commemoration. The burial of Christ has no symbolic or commemorative sign among Christian institutions, because it is not an essential link in the chain of facts necessary to our salvation. If Christ had not been buried at all, if after death, his body had remained suspended on the cross for three days, and if then by His almighty power he had taken again to himself his life, and had come down from the cross, his resurrection from the dead would have been as complete as it was when he arose from the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, and the salvation of believers—soul and body would have been as completely secured. And moreover, it is impossible that the burial of Christ can be the symbol or memorial or representative of immersion, because it bears no analogy and no resemblance to it. Even if Christ had been buried as the dead are buried now among us, it would have been not like immersion, because the earth would have been applied to the body and not the body to the earth. But in fact the burial of Christ was no interment—no enveloping of his body in earth after the manner and mode of immersion in water. His body was laid in a tomb hewn out of a rock—in a sepulchre wide and high and spacious. So that his burial bore no more resemblance or analogy to immersion, than if his body had been taken from the cross into an upper room in the house of Joseph of Arimathea and there kept for three days. Therefore the essential point of the illustration or symbol fails entirely when we come to look at the facts of the case. But, moreover, a careful examination of the passage from Romans (and that from Colossians does not differ in meaning and spirit) will satisfy any candid and intelligent Christian that Paul did not intend to teach or to suggest anything whatever concerning the mode of baptism. His teaching is entirely concerning its spiritual nature and design. He is teaching the great doctrine of justification and salvation through Christ—of the power of his death in working in us and for us death unto sin and life unto righteousness. His style in this passage abounds in these powerful and suggestive figures for which he is so renowned. He introduces into this passage five distinct elements of our salvation, viz: our death to sin, our burial by baptism into death, our resurrection to newness of life, our being planted together in the likeness of his death, and our crucifixion with Christ that the body of sin within us might be destroyed. Now, four of these elements must be held to be figurative because they are not literal; viz: our death to sin, our resurrection to newness of life, our being planted in the likeness of his death, and our crucifixion with Christ. These are all figurative and spiritual truths. Why then shall not the fifth element, viz: our burial by baptism into death, be also held to be figurative and spiritual? It must be both. For, it is declared to be a baptism *into death*, that is, that by the power of the death of Christ, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit working faith in our hearts, we die in Christ unto sin and thus become entitled to baptism, which is the outward sign signifying these inward and spiritual conditions. In this light alone can this passage be understood. It has no reference whatever to the mode of baptism, but teaches in the strongest manner its spiritual nature and symbolism for which we earnestly contend.

And this leads me naturally and properly to the last argument of this discourse. It is that baptism is the outward sign and symbol of the renewing and sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit, and that all through the Holy Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments, the operation and action of the Holy Spirit is described as an effusion, a pouring, a washing, a cleansing, and not as an immersion. This is an argument which exclusive immersionists have never answered and cannot answer, for it comes from God. His words are: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. And a new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you and cause you to walk in my statutes and ye shall keep my judgments and do them." Oh! that all the members of this congregation may have that inward baptism—that baptism into the life and death of Christ—that effusion and outpouring of the Holy Spirit of which the baptism which the hands of man can give, is but the feeble, outward type and symbol. Then shall we all at last meet in heaven to enjoy forever the peace of God which passeth all understanding.

THREE KINDS OF PREACHING.—An English merchant who visited Scotland in 1650, being asked on his return what he had heard and seen, answered, "Rare things. I went to St. Andrews, where I heard a majestic-looking man (Blair), and he showed me the majesty of God. After him I heard a little fair man (Rutherford), and he showed me the loveliness of Christ. I then went to Irvine, where I heard an old man (Dickson), and that man showed me my own heart!"

—If every person would be half as good as he expects his neighbor to be, what a heaven this world would be!—Luther Norris.