

LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE ON BAPTISM:

A REPLY

TO

MR. R. T. HOPKINS'S REVIEW

OF

J. N. D.'s
Letters on Baptism.

Gallarat:

J. ANDERSON & Co., PRINTERS, 7 ARMSTRONG STREET.

1894.

Inasmuch as this is only an endeavour to present in simple language what J. N. D. held as he held it, yet so put as to meet the misconceptions with which Mr. R. T. H.'s "Review of Letters on Baptism" abounds, and as it is virtually J. N. D.'s in substance as he learned it from scripture, the attachment of any other name to this Reply would be out of place; consequently it is sent forth in the spirit inculcated by the apostle,—“ Prove all things: hold fast that which is good ”—with the desire that it may be instrumental in removing hindrances to the reception of more important truth than Baptism.

INTRODUCTION.

CERTAIN articles professing to criticise the Letters of the late Mr. J. N. DARBY, on Baptism, which appeared in the organ of the party with which Mr. R. T. H. has become identified, entitled "Needed Truth," have, we observe, been issued separately in the form of a Pamphlet, and this gives occasion in the interests of justice and truth to enquire into the misleading statements therein put forth. The following Extracts will more than suffice to indicate the general tone, spirit, and character of the Review as a whole. We let them speak for themselves:—

"Seeing it was so wearying to J. N. D., what a pity he should have written eighteen letters (very likely others, but that number appears in these volumes) on such a form." "Wearisome work indeed to wade through them, to find nothing but false reasoning." "What a jumble of ideas." "Though one grieves over such folly, one is prepared to leave that to such as follow J. N. D. and his co-adjutors in this matter—the clergy of Romanism and Protestantism." "And all this cold, formal dishing up of old views of Baptism, is considered the outcome of an original mind, of deep spirituality, to be swallowed greedily, and believed implicitly." "The mere assertions of one who had to own that he was once exercised, but unhappily for him, passed out of that exercise into a firmer holding of his old corrupt notions, held by him when in the Establishment." "Thus J. N. D. wrote on exactly the same lines as Presbyterians long ago." "Already in the adversary's toils, and are with rude hands touching and marring the things of God." "Passing strange if J. N. D. were correct." "Most mischievous." "Outward portion . . . including murderers, thieves, rogues,

&c.!!!” “If particularly strong and bold statements were enough, then the views advanced in the above extract would be well supported!” “So reasoned J. N. D. correctly enough, if his premisses were correct; but, alas for him, they were false.” “One is at a loss to conceive how, with such simple scriptures before him, J. N. D. could have written so absurdly.” “Utterly at a loss.” “The way in which he plays upon the words ‘without’ and ‘within’ is sad indeed.” “Thoughts that flow in the channel of Infant Baptism are contrary to God’s thoughts, and when first heard by us are counted strange. God forbid that our ears should ever become accustomed to them.” “How miserable the expressions in the letters already quoted.” “It remained for a corrupt church, with its already formed system of nuns, to institute that which until then was unheard of.”

They might be multiplied, but we forbear.

Such are specimens of what is levelled at J. N. D. We prefer not to reproduce that which is launched at the others; but these ought to be sufficient to enable every rightly constituted mind to estimate the entire criticism at its proper value; though it is purposed in the sequel to subject each Paper to a more detailed scrutiny.

The intention is by no means to enter upon any special advocacy of either what is known as “Believers’ Baptism” or “Household Baptism,” because among the brethren R. T. H. attacks, those holding the one are just as welcome as those holding the other. The Table of the Lord in order to be the Table of the Lord is the expression of the fellowship of the body of Christ,—not only His literal body, but His mystical body (see 1 Cor. x. 16, 17)—and if those, who were seeking in any real way to answer to that in *principle*, were to make particular views on Baptism—whether Believers’ or Household, so called—the criterion for determining who was or was not to be there, it would be a practical denial of the whole thing, and, according as the one

side or the other was pressed, would constitute them a baptist or a pædo-baptist sect. Had it not afforded an opportunity for stating the truth on matters of greater moment than Baptism, no examination of this review would have been thought of; but considering the over-confident assertiveness regarding it, which meets the reader at every turn, one is inclined to ask whether it has ever occurred to R. T. H. to suspect himself? Is he perfectly sure he scripturally understands Baptism? No doubt, like many another before him, he supposes if there is anything he has thoroughly mastered, and knows with absolute certainty in all its bearings, it is Baptism; but he may live to find that, strangely enough, he has scarcely one scriptural idea on the subject. It may be an unpardonable offence to say so, but the fact is, to any one whose mind is not made up according to the laws of the Medes and Persians, or whose judgment has not been warped by any foregone conclusion, it would not be difficult to demonstrate this from this very Pamphlet.



The Wrongness of Pressing Either Side.

PAPER I.*

THE very first sentence is obviously penned for the purpose of creating a prejudice by making it appear as if the real reason why J. N. D. did not write on Baptism was because he felt he had not scripture at his back. Others are at liberty to differ from him, but if such is the insinuation, nothing could be farther from the truth, as the "Letters" bear witness. J. N. D. says:—

"But while desiring and wishing before God and man this liberty for baptists, and feeling that God can allow in the midst of abuses that this point should be brought on the conscience and before the church as a means of proving its state, the examination of the point which this has occasioned, has more than ever convinced me that the whole *baptist* principle is a mistake, and nothing more than conscientious want of light."

It was from no lack of persuasion, therefore, about his having scripture and God's mind "on the subject of Baptism" that led him to refrain from publishing thereon "during his lifetime." Of course, Baptism bulking so largely in R. T. H.'s eyes, he cannot appreciate J. N. D.'s judicious refusal to exalt a subject of *second-rate* importance into one of *first-rate*; but he had a reason, and could render it too, though R. T. H. takes good care not to cite it. Let us have it in his own words. J. N. D. says:—

"Some, who were carried away in the torrent, complained of them for not speaking to them and teaching them on it. I am very glad they did not, and occupied them rather with Christ; for half the evil (though not all) is being occupied with ordinances, whatever side may be taken."

*"Needed Truth," Vol. V. pp. 105-111. Pamphlet, pp 1-9.

And W. K., at the very time referred to by R. T. H., says something very similar, as follows:—

“ I have for many years said little on the matter, save where clearly called for. Every one who loves the Lord Jesus, and serves the church, has probably more or less observed the keen feelings and strong language the discussion of Baptism is apt to excite, in utter disproportion to its relative place, and, as usual, most heatedly among such as least understand its nature and consequences.”

What can be R. T. H.'s object in making the statement:

“ Thus it is significant that for the first twenty-four years this subject had not been written upon ” ?

Anyone who takes the trouble to examine will find that he is sixteen years out of his calculation, showing how superficially he must have read the “ Letters ” on which he undertakes to comment. As far back as 1840 J. N. D. writes:—

“ I had written to G. on the subject of Baptism. It is a common phase of modern research. One has but to leave everyone to act entirely according to his conscience. V. has strong feelings about it, without much ground it seems to me, still very natural. The same thing among brethren in England had its day, and, everyone being left free, it produced no effect that I know of. If people dispute, it is bad ; that tends also to contract the hearts and the understanding ; but in allowing full liberty, this disappears.”

Accordingly the question had been up, and had its day in England before 1840, and writing or not writing upon it proves nothing. This shows also that the notion of any recent discovery as to J. N. D.'s views is purely imaginary, and it is unfair to represent it as if his attitude towards Baptism was not perfectly well known from the start. What J. N. D. held was no secret, nor was agreement upon Baptism ever a question of *fellowship* among brethren—inclusive or exclusive. It was reserved for R. T. H. and his party to push Baptism to that sectarian extent. No

brother, close or open, competent to speak on the subject ever displayed so sad a lack of intelligence as to think of such a thing till Mr. Hopkins and the "Needed Truth" party arose. Baptists, of course, have done so, but brethren, never—no—not even the brethren who are the greatest sticklers for Believers' Baptism so termed. One has only to read this first paper to know that according to R. T. H.'s own showing there were those associated with J. N. D. holding to "Believers' Baptism" as tenaciously as need be, such as C. H. M. and Andrew Miller, and to see that they could express themselves decidedly enough on the subject too, as given at length in the "extracts"; but did that hinder their happy fellowship one with the other? Indeed, generally speaking, those holding "Believers' Baptism" have as a rule always been in the majority, but did they make it a reason for separating from J. N. D. because he held differently? No. They had learned the relative place of Baptism better than to do it, not to speak of its being a sin against the body of Christ. C. H. M. spoke according to his convictions, and was at perfect liberty to do so without let or hindrance; but he was not so wanting in scriptural intelligence as to make them a cause of separation, and R. T. H. could not have furnished a better example of the untenableness of his own position; for even if C. H. M. did not find Infant Baptism after thirty years' study of scripture, neither after all those years of study could he find any scripture warrant for separating from those who held it because he could not find it. Besides, his not finding "direct scripture authority" does not preclude the finding of *indirect* scripture authority, and God can teach by the one as well as by the other, according as it pleases Him. Not all the dust sought and to be raised will prevent His readers from observing that among those assailed there is at least no bar to

the holders of "Believers' Baptism" being allowed ample scope, only they have by grace learned the evil of making it a ground of severing themselves from those who, while not denying the Baptism of Believers, conscientiously believe in the Baptism of Households as well.

J. N. D. in turn was too well acquainted with scripture and Scriptural Baptism ever to make it a question of fellowship, and he deprecated an anti-baptist equally with a baptist position. Not that he had not decided convictions on the subject for himself, just as C. H. M. has, but he never allowed these to move him a single inch from the only scriptural principle of meeting—viz., that of the body of Christ formed by a totally different Baptism to that of water. He says:—

"I hold fast to not giving to our position an anti-baptist character. While deeply convinced of it, and believing that I have the light of God thereon, I would as much avoid being an anti-baptist as a baptist. I *really* desire the union of all Christians in the unity of the body of Christ. If anyone has the conviction that he has not been baptized I think he does very well in getting himself baptized. My desire is that we should be one as we are one in Christ."

It is a mistake likewise to suppose that J. N. D. held "*Infant Baptism*" as *such* any more than he held "*Believers' Baptism*" as *such*. He was neither a baptist nor a pædo-baptist as *such*. He baptized *believers* as occasion required just as he baptized *children*, as may be seen in the "Letters." He says, "I baptized, myself, a number recently converted at —." The Baptism of Households in reality includes both, and, like Paul in 1 Cor. i., he practised both as circumstances called for it. He did not find "*Believers' Baptism*" in scripture, because that would make it *characteristic*, and would confine it to a particular *view*; but he did find the Baptism of *Believers*, and he baptized them accordingly. He also found

the Baptism of Households, and acted on that, though not "Household Baptism" as such any more than "Believers' Baptism" *as such*. These have become technical names for what is respectively known as pædo-baptist and baptist *views*. When keeping everything in its place, his own path was clear and decided. Yet he always respected the consciences of others who differed from him.

It might have been seen, too, notwithstanding all the foolish talking about the sprinkling of infants, that J. N. D. did not *sprinkle*, but immerse the children. As quoted by R. T. H., he says:—

"I should not re-baptize a person sprinkled in infancy, though I do not like the form, because the intended signification in the form is lost."

R. T. H., however, seems to have been in too great a hurry to find fault for him to understand even what he was reading; for he has strangely enough fallen into a most curious blunder, and, without detecting it, has perpetuated it all through the series of articles, never wearying of bringing it in, and wholly unconscious of the misapprehension under which he is labouring. For what was the "form" J. N. D. says he did not like? It was the *sprinkling*, and in the statement "because the intended signification in the form is lost," the term "form" meant *immersion*—the *right* form. In other words, he did not like the *form* in which it *had* been done,—that is, the *sprinkling*—because such did not convey the signification intended by the scriptural form or figure which, according to Rom. vi., was that of *burial*. Instead of this, here is what is palmed off as the thoughts of J. N. D. by R. T. H.:—

"I have given these rather long extracts to show how J. N. D. seemed always to regard the matter. A 'form'; 'little edification in it'; 'much wearying of the mind'; 'does not present itself with attraction'. Again: 'But to return to extracts from

J. N. D. Surely it is remarkable that he could continue to look upon Infant Baptism as being according to scripture, and yet write of finding in it 'little edification,' 'much wearying of the mind,' and a 'form.' Good that he felt it was wearying it that led him to give up his 'form'; but a gross mistake when he called it a 'form of Christianity.' A form of Christendom it certainly has become, and most wearisome, seeing it is but a 'form,' without one tittle of scripture to support it."

If R. T. H. is not ashamed of all this, he ought to be. He simply manifests that he has not the remotest idea of what J. N. D. was speaking about. There is not a word about Infant Baptism in the copious extracts referred to, except to *disapprove* of *sprinkling*, while the "much wearying of the mind," and all the rest of it, applies to having to meet this excessive occupation with Baptism on the part of men like R. T. H., who magnify and exalt it out of its place, and certainly had he been spared to see this Pamphlet, he would have been obliged to repeat "little edification," and every one of the other expressions with emphasis. Still, on R. T. H. goes, heedless of his inexcusable density, repeating himself *ad nauseam* as to this "form," and pretending to find nothing but "false reasoning," and not a "tittle of scripture"; though he must know, if he has read the "Letters," that J. N. D.'s complaint is:

"Nor did I ever find a Baptist who could stand on Scripture."

Mr. R. T. H. may not agree, but he must not represent the "wearying" as if it were due to J. N. D. not having "scripture." It was because of those who were being occupied with Baptism as obedience to ordinances in the teeth of scripture, and he never had such a low conception of communion with God as to confound it with anything like these "Needed Truth" special pleadings on Baptism. Loving Christ is one thing, loving Baptism is another, and we must beware of holding up His institution in such a way as to hide Himself from view.

R. T. H. ought to make sure that he understands the "ideas" before using the term "jumble," because it is rather awkward for himself when it turns out that he is the "jumbler." J. N. D. was showing that the scriptural order was that all ought to be baptized before they break bread; still if a person happened to be inside without having been baptized at all, then let it be done "peaceably"—that is, without any great fuss, since in every case where it is done after the individual has been at the Table, it is to "repair a fault of negligence," as J. N. D. correctly designates it; but all this seems unintelligible to Mr. H. Nor is the handle he makes of "conscience" any better. There is no thought of referring people to conscience as a "guide," or as a warrant in place of *scripture*. Let there be no mistake on that point. It is because he has scripture and feels perfectly sure of his ground, that he allows and claims liberty of conscience for those having what are known as baptist views. If he pressed them or they pressed him on such a subject, that would be sectarian, and the only thing that is scriptural under the circumstances is to leave consciences free, as he invariably shows, while in the last sentence in the third quotation given on p. 108 Vol. V. "Needed Truth," or p. 7 of the Pamphlet, J. N. D. effectually replies to all R. T. H. has to say, if he would only perceive its force, in these words: "But if one makes it a sect, it is a very great evil."

When next you talk of what you view,
Think others see as well as you;
Nor wonder if you find that none
Prefers your eyesight to his own.

Unintentional Exposure.

PAPER II.*

IF the "extracts such as have been given sufficiently show" anything, it is the remarkable faculty which Mr. H. has for seeing in them what is *not* there, and for not seeing in them what there *is*. Moreover, if the purpose for which they were quoted was to demonstrate

"What it was that originated Infant Baptism,"

as the first sentence in this seems to infer, the attempt has been a signal failure. Does R. T. H. mean to say that J. N. D.'s "Letters" originated Infant Baptism, for these are what he professes to review? Or if he alludes to the citations (which had to be left severely alone because so far-fetched) from the Church of England, Augustine, Whitfield and Wesley, at the close of Paper I., what, may we ask, have these to do with J. N. D.? No one ever exposed the figment of "Baptismal regeneration" more effectually than he has done. Is the reader intended to gather that J. N. D.'s views are on a par with these? If he does, then it betrays an animus which would render the entire review unworthy of serious attention, and if such is not his intention, why does he bring them into such *juxta-position*? Besides, the whole argument is inconclusive. Mr. H. might as well say that because the stoutest of all advocates for Believers' Baptism attribute a saving virtue to it, therefore salvation by

*"Needed Truth," Vol. V, pp. 129-137. Pamphlet, pp. 10-18.

Baptism originated Believers' Baptism. The argument cuts both ways, and is as fallacious in the case of Infant Baptism as Believers' Baptism; but note where it lands him, even after trying to fortify his position by German authority. His conclusion is this: Because certain people have attached *too much* importance to Baptism, the right and scriptural thing is to attach *no* importance to it at all. He declares:—

“Let Christians lay it well to heart. Infant Baptism falls as soon as men are persuaded nothing can result from it to anyone; that it leaves the person baptized—whether adult or infant—not only where but as it found him.”

All Baptism would fall in that case—Believers' Baptism quite as much as Infant. If “whether *adult* or *infant*” (mark his words) “it leaves the person baptized where and as it found him,” and if “nothing can result from it to *anyone*,” why was Baptism instituted at all, and why does he practise it? On that theory the only consistent place for R. T. H. to take is to be like the Quakers, and ignore the institution altogether; yet, strange to say, his main object is to persuade his readers that Baptism is so important that Christians should make it a ground of keeping apart from other Christians. In fact, difference of judgment on Baptism is an avowed reason for his own separate existence as a distinct company. This paper, however, being almost exclusively taken up with S. M. A. and F. W. G., does not come within the scope of our purpose, which is confined to the “Letters” of J. N. D., who cannot surely be held responsible for what these, or, for that matter, anyone else, may choose to advance. Both these writers can be left to fight their own battles. As for F. W. G., he is in Toronto, and is perfectly capable of answering for himself. Certain it is that the author of such a book as “The Facts and Theories of a Future State,” if he thought it worth while to take up his pen, might

with the greatest ease just grind the criticism of R. T. H. to powder. Besides, it refutes itself, and looks like smiting the fellow-servants in the parable. The impression conveyed is, that he does not seem to know what he would be at, save that somebody must be fallen foul of and hit very hard, no matter how, S. M. A. happening to be the readiest victim. All we propose to do in connection with this article is to point out how thoroughly R. T. H. exposes himself. He avows

“ If it does not do any good, there is no use for it ”

(—“ whether adult or infant ”—too, we must remember), which means that Baptism itself is valueless. Now it ought not to be difficult to apprehend that anything appointed by Christ could not be devoid of value. When Baptism was first instituted, adults are no more specified than infants, and the value is in the fact that it is *Christ's* appointment, and is neither in the *baptizer* nor in the *baptized*. It was the Lord's pleasure to command His apostles to use the application of water in the name of the Trinity, in a manner which would be a figure of death, as the initiatory institution of the Christian system on earth, and Baptism derives its *value* from its having been appointed by *Him*.

Here R. T. H. is labouring to show that Baptism cannot be valid unless the *baptizer* is a true believer; in other words, that its validity depends on the one who baptizes. In a future paper he states the reverse, and the best way will be to make him answer himself by his own statement from p. 169 Vol. V. of “Needed Truth,” or p. 29 of the Pamphlet, where he says:—

“ Baptism gains nothing from the one who baptizes.”

It is thus impossible to make him out, for he turns his back upon himself whenever it seems to suit his purpose. Did the Baptism referred to in the opening

verses of John iv. not "hold good" because Judas performed the act? Judas baptized as well as the others, and it was just as valid as that of the other apostles.

Again. R. T. H. must surely be aware of the difference between fellow-*servant* and fellow-*believer*. It is painful to read his sad mutilation of 2 Cor. vi. 14 in connection with this: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers." One cannot but believe that he knows better what these words mean than he pretends to do. Just think of Peter and John denying that Judas was a fellow-*servant* because he was not a fellow-*believer*, in the true sense. There is not a workshop in the city in which there are not those working together as fellow-servants who are not fellow-believers. Yet the deplorable exhibition contained in pp. 132, 133 Vol. V. of "Needed Truth," or pp. 13, 14 of Pamphlet, is the fruit of the refusal to make that simple distinction.

But the long sentence which winds up the argument, and is supposed to culminate in the annihilation of his opponent, on p. 134 Vol. V. "Needed Truth," or pp. 15, 16 of the Pamphlet, is the greatest disappointment of all; so great, that there was an unwillingness to accept the possibility of what is before one's very eyes. He says:—

"The infant, not having been united by faith to Him who died and rose again, its Baptism is not Baptism unto Christ Jesus, but another Baptism; which is not Baptism, but is the invention of man to the concealing of God's own and only teaching concerning Baptism, but is the very masterpiece of Satan to the delusion of millions, leading them to think that they are in a different position from the poor heathen or Jew."

Now, apart altogether from the question of whether both adults and infants, or adults only are baptized (for J. N. D. claimed liberty for both), this is confusion about almost everything. Astray as to the meaning of union, as to the meaning of Baptism unto

Christ, as to the meaning of God's teaching concerning Baptism, as to the meaning of Christendom, and as to the meaning of the doom of Christendom. Is anyone *united* to Christ by *faith*? Does Baptism (with water) unto Christ symbolise *union*? Are there more baptisms than one? Is God's own teaching concerning Christian Baptism that there are two? Have the heathen the same privileges as professing Christendom? Will Christendom be judged either as Jews or heathens? We are *united* by the *Holy Ghost*, not by faith. Baptism unto Christ is profession, not union, even in symbol. There is no other Baptism (with water) in this dispensation but Baptism unto Christ. God's own teaching concerning Baptism is that there is "one Baptism." Christendom is in a different position of light and privilege from either heathen or Jew, and Christendom will be judged neither as Jews nor as heathens, but as professing Christians. It was understood that R. T. H. had at least one scriptural thought on Baptism—viz., "Baptism unto Christ"—as to the *spiritual* meaning of the figure at any rate; but since he connects that with *union*, what is one to think? As to making Baptism a question of constitution, as to making Baptism a matter of obedience, as to making Baptism a sign of what the individual has got, as to what Baptism is, and as to what Baptism does, with all R. T. H.'s pretension to superior knowledge, his Pamphlet shows, as we shall see, the absence of scripture or scriptural apprehensions regarding any or all of them. This is a real grief to one's spirit, because our brother has no conception of what he is losing on more momentous matters than Baptism by refusing his mind to open to them. Still, God is sufficient even for that, and we commend him to God and the word of His grace.

What Baptism does.

PAPER III.*

THIS is just a tissue of misconceptions from first to last, exceedingly difficult to deal with, because Mr. H. is only fighting shadows; for it is evident he has never reached the standpoint which would enable him to perceive what J. N. D. is driving at or the other writers assailed. They speak a foreign language as far as he is concerned. J. N. D. is supposed to be bad, though not so bad as F. W. G., while S. M. A. is declared to be "not a whit behind him"; and then the article closes with deploring that "all this evil arises from the utterly false idea that Baptism is into a kingdom, a house, instead of being unto Christ a symbol of death and resurrection." This is merely a confirmation of what has already been pointed out—that the only notion R. T. H. has of Baptism is its meaning as a symbol, and even that he erroneously associates with union. He assays, with the utmost assurance, to put everybody else right on the subject, but the fact remains, nevertheless, that as long as he fails to distinguish between the *eternal* forgiveness, which clears us once and for ever *before God* in *heaven* through the perfect work of Christ, and the *temporal* administered forgiveness, which has to do with God's dealings in *government on the earth*, Scriptural Baptism is impossible for him to apprehend. Hence the damaging admission:

"One would be almost curious to know what [so and so] means by governmental forgiveness in connection with the palsied man."

*"Needed Truth," Vol. V. pp. 145-153. Pamphlet, pp. 19-27.

This accounts for a good deal, and shows the un-wisdom, to say the least of it, of volunteering scathing criticisms upon what he admits he has yet to learn the meaning of. If one remembers that the curse of disease, as far as Israel was concerned, was to come upon them because of sin, the point referred to is not so very hard to be understood. It was something sent by God, in His dealings with them in *government*, because of *disobedience* (Deut. xxviii. 58-61), hence *forgiving* the sin or sins *governmentally* that gave occasion to the bodily disorder is connected with the *healing*. Christ, as well as the man and his friends, regarded the sickness of the sick of the palsy in this light. Bodily infirmity might be sent in at least three different ways:—(1) as a *blessing* in disguise, as in the case of *Paul*; (2) for the display of *God's glory*, like the *blind* man in John ix. 3; or (3), actually for *sin*, as in the case of the *impotent* man (John v. 14), to whom the Lord said, "Behold, thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee." Now, in the case of the palsied man, Christ knew it was of this last kind, and that the palsy had been sent on account of the man's *own sins*; accordingly, before He heals him, He pronounces, as He had power to do, *forgiveness on earth* of the sins in consequence of which he was suffering this bodily ailment under the governmental dealing of God—a different thing entirely from eternal forgiveness before the throne in heaven. Not but the Lord could have forgiven in the other sense, or that it may not be used, to illustrate the spiritual; yet He here expressly states, "the Son of Man hath power *on earth* to forgive sins." In other words, it was *forgiveness on earth* before men, not eternal forgiveness before God, and one has no hesitation in affirming that any man who is unable to distinguish between the forgiveness of the sick of the palsy in this governmental sense, and the non-imputa-

tion of sin to a believer on the Lord Jesus Christ because of His perfect work, viewed as *eternal redemption*, has everything to learn to enable him to write or teach on Baptism with safety to himself, or edification for anybody else. This is apparent in the way he objects to the thought "that Baptism brought out and brought in." Why should this not be made "clear"? It is just what Baptism *does*. It *is* something and it *does* something, besides what it *teaches* spiritually. Baptism *is* Christ's institution, representing dying and rising in *figure*, but chosen as the appointed *way* for a Jew or a Gentile to get *out* of that sphere known as Judaism or heathenism, and to enter *into* the sphere of professed Christianity, as a divine system set up on the earth. With R. T. H.'s present prepossessions, such a verse as Acts xxii. 16 could not be understood. What can he make of "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins," seeing his only idea of Baptism is the spiritual *truth* contained in the *figure*? Teaching, as Paul does in Rom. vi., those already baptized about the truth which is spiritually *figured* in it as a sign, is a wholly distinct thing from either what Baptism *is*, or what Baptism *does*. Its full spiritual significance is rarely, if ever, known by anyone before being baptized. Like the rest of us, R. T. H. himself has much to learn about it. Observe: Baptism did something for Paul before he knew much of its spiritual meaning. Paul's sins were all forgiven before God eternally, never to be altered, when the Lord met him on the road to Damascus three days previous to his baptism, but it was in the act of being baptized they were washed away before men on earth, and he would not have been recognized by those on earth as a *Christian* (as distinct from Jew or Gentile) unless he had been baptized, but only as a *pious Jew*. This is what Baptism does for an adult. Mr. H. may declaim

against it, but it was a fact, nevertheless, beyond all contradiction, that Paul was there and then, for the first time, brought into a certain *place* and *position* on the earth, where he never had been before, wholly irrespective of what was spiritually taught in the figure. Not as to his eternal acceptance in the presence of God, which had already been unalterably settled, but as to his entrance into that new something—call it kingdom, house, or any better name you have to give it—set up down here consequent upon Christ's rejection and ascension, which was neither Judaism nor heathenism. That divine system, in its dispensational character, as viewed externally in the world, which He was about to establish, is portrayed by the Lord Himself in Matt. xiii., under the well-known designation "the kingdom of heaven," and in particular is very graphically depicted in the parable of the tares and the wheat. You see, Christ called it a "kingdom"; it is ours to accept His teaching. I do not profess to answer for F. W. G.; he can speak for himself; but I desire to see justice done to the Lord's utterances. R. T. H. tells us (as if anybody denied it):

"The tares are, according to the interpretation of the Lord Himself, the children of the wicked one; the wheat, the children of the kingdom."

Surely this is indisputable. But why emphasise that there are "two classes, and only two," as if "wheat" did not include the "little ones," after the pains Christ subsequently takes to insist on their being there? Where was the necessity for suggesting that *more* than two were required, or supposing that there must be a third class? Evidently for the purpose of "thrusting" the little ones *out*. He complains of their being "thrust *in*," and contends that

"When thrust in, the difficulty arises as to how to speak of them."

Had Christ any difficulty about how to speak of them when He said, "of such is the kingdom of heaven"—the very kingdom of heaven of which that parable was the likeness? Nor was there any need of "thrusting" them "in," when everyone knows that the expression "children of the kingdom," so far from excluding the "little ones," more properly includes them than even adults. Hence R. T. H. is far too exclusive; nor is there the slightest difficulty in saying "what they are," as he pretends, if the example of the Master be followed. "All things that offend and them that do iniquity" refers to *judgment* and the kingdom of the *Son of Man*, whereas the parable applies to the "kingdom of heaven." Judgment is always according to *works*, but *grace* is just the reverse. The "wheat" has reference to the "children of the kingdom," in whose case it is all a matter of grace, and even more applicable to infants than to grown-up persons. Hence the shining forth of the "righteous," as the sun in the kingdom of their Father is *as true* of the *infants*, who have died, or who will be caught up when the Lord comes,—whose angels behold the face of the Father now—as of those of riper years. What they are "later on in life" begs the question. They are not infants then.

It is no object of ours in writing this to plead for either, but to claim freedom for both; yet we cannot help observing how ill-informed R. T. H. apparently is regarding the mass of scriptural evidence which his brethren, who believe in baptizing children, are prepared to furnish; and in particular, how unaware he seems to be of the remarkable testimony which they see our Lord's own teaching with respect to the "Little Ones" affords. Let us try if we cannot put their position as it appears to them. They follow Christ's instruction step by step from Matt. xiii. onward, and they see that "the kingdom of

heaven" does not mean heaven, nor the kingdom of *God* (for except a man be born again he can neither see nor enter that), nor the kingdom of the *Father*, nor the kingdom of the *Son of Man*, nor the kingdom of the *Son of His love*; but (as parabolically unfolded in Matt. xiii.) is a dispensational term used to designate that divine something set up on the *earth* after Christ went to *heaven*, and lasting in its present mysterious form during His absence *in heaven*, within the precincts of which *Christian*, in contrast with *Jewish*, blessings were to be found as *externally administered* down here. They see in chap. xvi. that Christ for this administrative purpose gave to Peter the keys of this very kingdom of heaven, and when doing so most carefully distinguishes it from what He calls "My Church." Both tares and wheat were in the "kingdom of heaven" of Matt. xiii., but they see there can be no tares in the "Church" of Matt. xvi., which Christ builds, and against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, and that, though He gave Peter the keys of the *kingdom of heaven*, He did not give him the keys of the *Church*. There are no keys spoken of in connection with it. Christ builds it Himself. No hand touches it but His own. No failure enters into it. Nor are keys for building, but for opening doors. They proceed further, to chap. xviii., and they see Christ giving still further instruction respecting this kingdom of heaven, and telling who were to be received or brought into it when it was established. They see the Lord getting a little child, and first presenting, in verse 4, that little child as the *pattern* of the *spirit* which ought to characterise the *grown-up ones* who are receivable, so that whosoever humbled himself *as* that little child would be greatest in the kingdom of heaven. They see, however, that He does not stop there, but continues, in verse 5, "And whoso shall *receive* one such *little one*

in My name receiveth Me." *Not* this time a person as *humble as* a child of that He had just spoken; but the *child itself*—the *actual infant* there, to whom the statement applied, or to any other such infant. Otherwise they perceive there would be no sense in saying, "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you, in heaven, their angels always behold the face of My Father who is in heaven, for the Son of Man is come to save that which was lost" (verse 10); or, again, "It is not the will of your Father who is in heaven that one of *these little ones* should perish" (verse 14). If "little ones" do not mean literally "little ones" here, they see there would be no scripture for the *salvation* of the "little ones," and that would be a more serious thing than even their reception into the kingdom of heaven; still, if they mean it in the one, they must mean it in the other. It does not say "*seek* and save" here, as in Luke, because in this passage it refers to the "little ones." Consequently they regard this as setting the reception of the little ones as *undoubted*, and that no stronger sanction could be given than "Whoso receiveth one such little one in My name receiveth Me." They are quite aware there is not a word about Baptism at this stage, so often put forward as an unanswerable argument, and what is more, think it unintelligent to expect it. One thing at a time, just as the Lord is doing. He is not speaking in this passage of the *manner* of admission into the kingdom; that will come later on. He is telling *who are admissible*, and He leaves not a shadow of a doubt as to the "little ones"; the teaching as to their reception in reference to the "kingdom of heaven" is as explicit in the part of the chapter which treats of that, as is the teaching about the "church" in the portion dealing with it. If Christ's word, "where two or three are gathered together unto My name, there

am I in the midst of them," is valid for the one, it is equally valid for the other. This is what they hold, and surely it is the simple teaching of the passage. They go on to chap. xix., and they find, not only that the "little ones" ought to be received, but that Christ positively *commanded* them to be received, and that they were *not* to be *forbidden* on any account: "But Jesus said, Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven;" the very kingdom of heaven whose keys He had entrusted to Peter in chap. xvi. They see, further, how Peter used the keys when the time came to employ them. They go to Acts ii., and observe how, on the inauguration day of the kingdom of heaven, Peter actually opens the door and admits; and they find the manner of admission is by *Baptism*, so that it was presented as the visible door *out* of Judaism and into the kingdom of heaven, then for the first time set up. Nor does Peter forget the "children." It appears to them more convincing still when, in addition to entrance into the kingdom, they remember the positive earthly benefit it conferred on those first received. Baptism meant for the Jews a way of escape from the temporal judgment which was coming on the nation and the City of Jerusalem, because of their rejection of Christ. Peter pressed the exaltation by God of the One they had crucified, bringing into prominence the terrible contrast between God's estimate and their's, and such was the overpowering sense of their astonishing guilt. (for they felt they had killed their own Messiah) that with pricked hearts they exclaimed, "What shall we do?" Even when Pilate had washed his hands, declaring he was innocent of His blood, they gave vent to those dreadful words, "His blood be on us and on our children" (Matt. xxvii. 25). But that Blessed One had prayed even for His murderers, and in answer to that petition on

the cross—"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do"—when they cried "What shall we do?" Peter was *authorised* to say, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is to *you* and to *your children*"—the exact and blessed counterpart of the terrible cry, "His blood be on us and on our children." Thus, by dying out of the nation in figure in the *act of Baptism*, they and their children would be delivered from the wrath that was coming because of their own wicked and deliberate taking of His blood upon them—a thing quite distinct from spiritual and eternal blessing, which no one wishes to weaken. Indeed, the true purport of Peter's reply to their question, or the meaning of "*save yourselves*" (which they could not do as to their souls,—not from hell or eternal judgment—but) "from this untoward generation," cannot be apprehended unless this is seen (see I Peter iii. 21: "Baptism doth also save *you*"). Now, here is the point. Would any parent with children at that time have come out from under the awful temporal destruction impending on the nation for themselves by Baptism, and left their children behind, after Peter saying "to you and to your children"? They see there is no getting over this by any mind subject to scripture; consequently R. T. H. must not run away with the idea that the strong convictions of a man like J. N. D. were founded on nothing, and try to persuade his readers to suppose the same. Moreover, it is well known that parents could not have retained possession of even their own children unless they had been baptized; the heads of the Jewish nation would have claimed them as *Jews*, as may be ascertained by what is done now when a Jew becomes a Christian. It is the same, too, in heathen-countries—such as India, to-day. If the head of a family becomes a Christian,

and leaves, say, the Hindoo religion, his children would be taken from him unless they were baptized.

Accordingly, starting from Matt. xiii., connecting that with chap. xvi., coupling both with chap. xviii., then multiplying the three with chap. xix., and reaching the climax of the whole in Acts ii., where the actual reception takes place, they, observing how Peter, on the day of Pentecost, for the first time opened the door into the kingdom of heaven, consider the entire argument—taken as a whole, in one unbroken chain—simply irresistible, and look upon the position in their estimation as incontrovertible. Nevertheless, they do not seek to impose the judgment thus arrived at, however decided for themselves, upon others, nor do they “agree to differ,” but inculcate, and give diligence to manifest, mutual forbearance on a subject that has done more havoc in the church of God than perhaps any other, and also in view of the fact that Baptism constituted no part of Paul’s gospel, nor of his heavenly mission, nor of the mystery—the church—which is His body, the very character of truth so graciously recovered in recent years, and to which they are endeavouring to give a true, if feeble, expression in these last days. This, then, is the dreadful evil alleged to be held on Baptism from which Mr. H.’s followers are taught to shrink with horror, and which, alas! according to their own words, keeps many of them where they are.

It may be remarked that though households go to confirm Acts ii., indeed arise out of “to you and to your children,” as a matter of course, so that the frequent occurrence of the baptism of households afterwards in the history is just what might be expected, yet J. N. D. founded what he held on something broader and more distinct even than households, while recognizing these as affording additional and confirmatory evidence, which ought to have its legiti-

mate weight. The case is even stronger still from Paul's *house* point of view, of which notice will be taken later on, and with which J. N. D. *preferred* to connect Baptism, so that R. T. H. must not make *preference* to mean "variance"; for in one of the extracts given by Mr. H. himself, J. N. D. says, "As a *general* thing the house and the kingdom have *now* the same limits." It just depends on whether the thought of *rule* or the thought of *dwelling* is uppermost in the mind how you connect Baptism with the one or the other, but it is true of *both*. In the gospel of Matthew it is connected with the *kingdom*, while in 1 Corinthians it is associated with the *house*. If one thinks of the sphere where the *rule* of the absent *Lord* is *owned*, it is the *kingdom*; but if one has before his mind the place where the Holy Ghost *dwells*, it is the *house* or habitation. Paul associates it more with the latter, and Peter with the former; but there is no antagonism. Indeed, that Baptism with water brings into the *kingdom* in one aspect, or the *house* in another, in contradistinction with the *body*, into which the Baptism of the Spirit alone incorporates, the astonishing thing is that a brother professing intelligence in scripture and divine things should dispute it at all. If it be asked, Is reception into the kingdom of heaven by Baptism? they reply, Is it ever by anything else in scripture? They see the first time Peter used the keys and opened the door it was by Baptism, and cannot find any other method of admission, according to the administration committed to Peter, into the kingdom of heaven except by Baptism. They behold the man with the keys opening the door, and he says, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is to you and to your children." They go carefully through the Acts of the Apostles, and, look where

they will, Baptism is the door out of one thing into something else. They do not find an instance in scripture of anyone being baptized as R. T. H. contends for and practises. The three thousand on the day of Pentecost died in figure out of Judaism, and were brought into the kingdom of heaven by Baptism. Philip preached the things concerning the kingdom to the Samaritans, and they were brought out of connection with their "mountain" and into the kingdom by Baptism of water before their incorporation into the body by the Holy Ghost. The Ethiopian eunuch, also, who was a Jewish proselyte, was reading, "For His life was taken from the earth." Philip, from this same scripture, preached to him Jesus, and as soon as he comes to water, he says, I am going out of the scene, too; "what doth hinder me to be baptized?" when he passes out of proselytism into the new Christian system that had been set up at Pentecost. They see, too, that Saul of Tarsus is told to "arise and be baptized and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord," and he gets out of Judaism by Baptism into the sphere of Christ's Lordship on the earth. Then Cornelius and his house, Lydia and her household, the jailer and his house, Crispus with his house, and the Corinthians, all passed out of where they had been previously, into a new position on the earth by being baptized; while even those who had already been baptized according to John's Baptism had to come in by the appointed door of *Christian* Baptism into this distinct place of privilege. Hence when R. T. H. says, "And so in every letter (of J. N. D.) it is taken for granted that Baptism is into a position," and he asks, "But where does scripture convey this?" It is, they maintain, as we have seen, the uniform testimony of scripture, and the wonder is where Mr. H.'s eyes can have been not to observe it. He need not puzzle himself and others over the

“Friends,” by looking at the confusion which is all around us now; all he has to do is to bring them into the Acts of the Apostles, and he will get undeceived. Would the apostles have recognized any as Christians (I mean, of course, Christianity as contrasted with Judaism and Gentilism) *then* who refused to submit to the Lord’s institution of Baptism? How we are to regard Quakers in the present confusion is another matter, but in apostolic times they would be merely considered as pious Gentiles, not as Christians, if they objected to Baptism. Mr. H. seems also to think that he can baptize into something other than that into which Peter opened the door. No doubt the enemy has sown tares there, and the *crop* has been spoiled, though not a grain of true wheat will be lost, but it is the kingdom of heaven still; and the tares are as much there as the wheat. They grow together in the *kingdom*, not in the *Church*; yet all who belong to the Church, which is His body, are there as well, having got into the kingdom by the baptism of water just as they got into the body by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Christ has not authorised R. T. H. nor anyone else to set up another kingdom, and if the Baptism he practises does not bring into *that*, then, as J. N. D. says, it can only be the “badge of a sect.” Mr. H. may be wroth with him for saying so, but if Believers’ Baptism is pushed to the length he does, it is just a sect. It may be a more select sect, but is simply one of the sects of Christendom after all, and no amount of denying it will alter the fact. The “blind boy” brought in is almost beneath notice. Did J. N. D. ever teach anything so gross as that Baptism could give spiritual or any other sight? The only effect of aught so puerile is to reveal R. T. H.’s own blindness, and manifest a darkness on Scriptural Baptism that might be felt at the very time he is pretending to anoint all our eyes with his

baptismal eye salve. He quotes from another letter of J. N. D. as to the house, the kingdom, and the Quakers; but, as usual, he does not understand him, and, after knocking down to his own satisfaction imaginary foes of his own creation, without apparently any idea of what is meant, he dolefully laments "How, by J. N. D., Baptism is shorn of its teaching and place!" Whereas, if the truth were told, no uninspired man has ever unfolded the spiritual teaching connected with Baptism as he has done, or has shown more distinctly its true scriptural place. But until he learns to recognize that there is a place of blessing on earth set up by God (see Rom. xi. 13-24, &c.), besides the fact of individual conversion, not only the subject of Baptism, but a great deal of vastly more important truth, cannot find accommodation within the horizon which bounds Mr. H.'s vision, to his soul's serious loss. But no man can give his brother eyes, and we must look for him to Him who can.

Paul's Mission not to Baptize.

PAPER IV.*

"PAUL NOT SENT TO BAPTIZE."

No man can handle God's Word, especially such a topic as Paul's distinctive mission, without his own spiritual whereabouts being detected. Paul says, "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1 Cor. i. 17). Mr. H. alleges:—

"The assertion made by Paul was, that he was not sent to baptize, to carry out the act *himself*; and no reference whatever is made to Baptism as such."

Now, Paul just says precisely the opposite. The "reference" is unquestionably to "Baptism as such," in relation to his special mission, and has nothing whatever to do with the "act" of baptizing. If Paul had been "sent not to baptize" in the sense of carrying out the *act*, that would have precluded him from baptizing anybody! He tells us, on the contrary, he did perform the act. The point, however, was that, when he did so, it was not as part of his own mission, but one which had reference only to the earth, while his was specially heavenly. The statement, "Christ sent me not to baptize," simply means what it says—that is, the *character* of Paul's *mission*, like "the Father sent the Son," which means the *mission* of the Son. The act of baptizing is not in question, but the grand *fact* that Paul's mission was *not* a mission to *baptize*, being

*"Needed Truth," Vol. V, pp. 168-174. Pamphlet, pp. 28-34.

as far above a mission to baptize as heaven is above earth. Consequently, the Extracts from J. N. D. are perfectly correct, and Mr. H.'s comments thereon wholly wrong, serving only to manifest that he has yet to learn what Paul's mission really was. For, what does he make it out to be? Just this, that the statement, "Christ sent me not to baptize," is merely another way of saying Christ did send me *to* baptize; only not to do it myself, but to get others to do it for me. Could you have a more complete inversion of the truth? Again, he says:—

"A lesson needed to be learned, and, what is more, practised still. Let the evangelist take it to heart. Has he baptized the first fruits? Then let others baptize, and thus no one in particular will figure in connection with it."

Thus all Mr. H. sees is that Paul affords a fine example for an evangelist only to baptize the first fruits, and leave the baptizing of all the rest of the converts to others. And this is supposed to be the alpha and omega of the special dispensation committed to Paul. A more melancholy example of the blinding effect of Baptism, when misplaced and misapplied, could scarcely be conceived. It seems to shut out from view all proper apprehension of the blessedness and peculiarity of Paul's mission, which, as J. N. D. rightly said, "sets Baptism in the background," and adds, "we lose our intelligent place when we propagate it,"—that is, when we set it in the foreground, like R. T. H., who is a living illustration of the truth of J. N. D.'s words at the very time he is trying to controvert them. Looking at everything through the coloured spectacles of his extravagant views on Baptism, he seems to imagine that what is right is wrong, and what is wrong is right, saying, "Well might one ask, Why all this assertion?" The reply is: Because it is the legitimate conclusion from Paul's *special mission*. After quoting

the words "God intended to leave Baptism in the shade" from J. N. D., he exclaims, "Intended!" and then asks, "Has He done so?"—pretending that to ask the question was to answer it. We reply, Yes, He has done so most emphatically, by the subsequent revelation of the mystery overshadowing the former. Mr. H. continues, "What a curious idea to have concerning anything God-given!" We would ask, Why "curious?" Is everything "God-given" of the same relative importance? Do we not read of "the *weightier* matters of the law—judgment, mercy, faith"; of the "least commandments"; and so on? No truth is non-essential, but some, like Baptism, are of comparatively minor importance. He proceeds "in the shade" yet "not abrogated," citing from J. N. D. as if something extraordinary. The answer is, That is precisely what a mission *not to baptize* given from *heaven*, after one *to baptize* previously given on earth and for earth, necessarily does; the brighter light of the former puts the latter in the *shade*. That from *heaven eclipses* the one from *earth*. He next objects to J. N. D. saying "Paul accepted it as an institution," and asks, with the air of one who thought it unanswerable, "Whose institution?" The reply is, Christ's, but instituted *on*, and *for*, the *earth*. Paul's mission was from Christ in *glory* and to connect with *heaven*. His next question is:—

"If thus forced to admit that Baptism was instituted and not abrogated, why this dwelling upon Paul's mission?"

You see he has no notion all this time of what Paul's mission is, or what J. N. D. means by it. We reply, "This dwelling upon Paul's mission" is to emphasise that the essence of that mission is something which water-baptism does not and cannot touch, and hence the justness of the remark demurred to by R. T. H., that Baptism "formed no part of Paul's mission." Still showing he has no right thought of what is meant.

Mr. H. says:—

“True, if by *it* he means the act of baptizing; not true, if in any way he uses it as to teaching Baptism.”

The truth is, J. N. D. knew better than to use it either for the one or the other; for neither has anything to do with it; the act of baptizing as little as the teaching of Baptism. How does he make out it would be “true” were the act of baptizing intended? J. N. D. does not mean the act of baptizing, nor would it be true if he did. What would “sent not to baptize” in the sense of the *act* of baptizing mean? That he could not do the act at all. But this is not what Paul means, nor what J. N. D. means. It is a mission *not to* baptize like *Paul’s*, contrasted with a mission *to* baptize like that of the *twelve*; and so far from supposing it interfered with Paul’s teaching of Baptism. J. N. D. held he was teaching about Baptism in this very statement: “Christ sent me not to baptize.” Paul is just the one who does teach about it. The question is, What does he teach?

The relation of Baptism to Paul’s special mission.

Paul taught it formed no part of that mission. Baptism is right and proper in connection with the mission to which it applies; but keep it there. The moment you attempt to bring it into Paul’s mission, you spoil both Baptism and the character of the mission. It is the momentous issues involved in all this for souls which impels one to take the matter up. To Paul alone was it given to teach the right relation of Baptism to the mystery of Christ and the church. God chose this vessel for the purpose. He did not choose Peter or John to communicate that part of His mind, and it is in vain to look for it elsewhere, not to say unintelligent. The dispensation of God in connection with the mystery that had been hid from

ages and from generations was given to Paul for us in order to complete the Word of God, and hence his teaching on Baptism is of capital importance. So far, therefore, from the words, "Christ sent me not to baptize," meaning for J. N. D. that Paul was not to *teach* on Baptism (as Mr. H. strangely misconceives). The truth is, it is just Paul's teaching that lets us know where to put it, and one is grieved to observe how persistently R. T. H. labours to reduce the speciality of Paul's mission to the level of Peter. Imagine him not only thinking, but saying, it was just like Peter commanding those who accompanied him to the house of Cornelius to baptize Gentiles. That there may be no mistake, we give his actual words:—

"The same principle, though not stated in so many words, was acted on by Peter when preaching to the Gentiles for the first time. He preached, but when they had believed, instead of baptizing them himself, we read, And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."

Nothing could be more lamentable than this, and it only requires the putting of a simple question to bring out the real nature of it in all its seriousness. Could Peter have said, "Christ sent me not to baptize?" Could John, or any other of the twelve? This is a thousand times more grave than any question of so-called Believers' Baptism *versus* Household, because, for those who accept it, it means the loss of all sense of what God is about in this age, and robs them of the enjoyment of the unprecedented and unique blessings peculiar to the dispensation. Little wonder we find Mr. H. writing:—

"This being so, how can any one assume from these words that Paul made light of Baptism, or had risen into a higher sphere away from it?"

J. N. D. did not assume Paul made light of it, but that he put it in its place. Of course, compared with

the place R. T. H. gives it, such might be called making light of it; but that is all. There is something of greater moment, however, than this in Mr. H.'s statement. "Had risen into a higher sphere away from it," to which he objects, is just what a mission *not to baptize* given from heaven in contradistinction to a mission *to baptize* given on earth actually means. Has Mr. H. not risen into a higher sphere away from water-baptism? In God's estimation he certainly has, but apparently not in his own. He could not be in the Church, which is His body, unless, for as the heaven is higher than the earth so is the Baptism of the Spirit sphere higher than the Baptism of water sphere, and the body is formed by the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, having nothing to do with the Baptism of the water, which is the true explanation of Paul's mission not to baptize, and is as important as the language is plain. But the whole domain of Mr. H.'s thoughts seems governed by the place he assigns to Baptism. He says, "To such a question as, Have you been baptized since you believed? It is no answer to say, Oh, Paul was not sent to baptize." Now, who would have thought of asking such a question but R. T. H.? Is it ever asked in Scripture? No. A question something like it is asked, which, seeing it refers to the higher sphere away from Baptism, Mr. H. has probably never asked. It runs, *not* Have you been *baptized* since you believed? but, "Have ye *received* the *Holy Ghost* since ye believed?" A much more important question, because it is how one gets into the Body of Christ. That was the kind of question Paul asked in connection with his special mission, though he did not ignore the Baptism of water in its place in connection with these very persons bringing them into the *house* by the one, just as they are made part of the *body* by the other. Paul had a mission to bring

into a sphere into which Baptism with water from its very nature could not intrude—that circle where true union to Christ and to each other lives, moves, and has its being; hence the significance of its being “not to baptize.” Yet Mr. H. sums it all up as if nothing more was meant than “Baptism gains nothing from the one who baptizes,” and has the assurance to tell his readers that the objects of his paper was “to recover this particular passage from a wrong use,” wholly unconscious that the one who uses it wrongly is himself. But Paul has more to teach on Baptism from “this particular passage” to which Mr. H. would do well to take heed. He teaches that

To divide on Baptism is a Sin.

In connection with schisms or divisions as such, he points out their evil, and how in particular they sin against the distinctive truth of the dispensation. “Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no *divisions* among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment” (1 Cor. i. 10). “Now this I say, that every one of you saith I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ” (verse 12). And what was the sin involved in this? It was, in practice, like dividing Christ; it was, not actually, but practically, like dismemberment—like tearing limb from limb. Hence Paul in righteous indignation asks, “Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye *baptized* in the name of Paul? I thank God I *baptized* none of you, lest any should say I had *baptized* in my own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanus; besides I know not whether I *baptized* any other. For Christ sent me *not to baptize*” (verses 13-17). Observe how he deals with the causes of division actually *there*,

and very summarily disposes of them ; but he dwells on *Baptism* as a *likely* cause *more* than all the others put together. Not perhaps that they were making Baptism a cause of division there yet, but if they, or others, at any time did, Paul puts a division on Baptism in the same category, and considers it quite as bad as, "I am of Paul, Apollos, or Cephas," and for the very same reason. It was contrary to the whole principle of their gathering ; for you see the known recognised ground was the *body*. It was like *dividing* Christ to divide on Baptism. It makes a sect of those who do, quite as much as if they divided over Apollos or Cephas. If I divide on Paul, I am a Paulist ; if I divide on Apollos, I am an Apollist ; and if I divide on Baptism, I am a Baptist. Hence to separate or keep apart from other Christians on the ground of Baptism is, in practice, like dividing Christ, and quite as grave a sin as a schism on Paul, Apollos, or Cephas. Yet the very purpose for which Mr. H. seems to have written these articles and issued this Pamphlet is to persuade his readers and make his followers believe that it would be just the other way, and a question of Baptism is insisted on as a sufficient reason for the perpetuation of a distinct and separate existence apart from his fellow Christians. Nothing could be more unscriptural than this, for be it observed, it is baptism as Paul understood it which is referred to in 1 Cor. i. ; and surely if any one knew the truth of Baptism Paul did. Hence the sin is: not to make *unscriptural* Baptism a cause of division—that would be worse still—but the sin, mark it well, is to make *scriptural* Baptism as Paul understood it a reason for separating or for keeping apart from other members of Christ, because it is not Baptism with water but Baptism of the Spirit which makes us members one of another and of Christ. Any Meeting, therefore, that owes its existence as separate from

others to strong views of Baptism, even if it were *scriptural* Baptism, is a sect—is dismemberment, not membership, and a sin against the body of Christ, for the simple reason that it makes *Baptism* part of the *constitution* of the Gathering, instead of the recognition of the fact that it is by one *Spirit* we are baptized into one *body*. If it would have been a sin *then* to make even *scriptural* Baptism a cause of separation, how much greater sin is it *now* to make any man's particular *views* on Baptism a reason for keeping aloof from God's people? This turns the tables, and renders the entire review a mistake from beginning to end, because, according to the Word of God, the sin is with those who make their views on Baptism a reason for having a different kind of Meeting, and keeping up such a division, not with those who refuse to do so. Whoever is responsible for it, God knoweth, but the dreadful ideas, almost bordering on superstition, which seem to have been instilled into the minds of those associated with Mr. H. regarding the brethren he attacks, one cannot but deplore. Souls are led to believe that something terribly bad is held about Baptism, and all kinds of misrepresentation with respect to infant sprinkling, one learns, is indulged in. Those delivered out of the snare are amazed they could have been duped for such a length of time by delusive accounts and exaggerated pictures of mysterious evil which they found to exist nowhere except in somebody's imagination. As was to be expected, the question always to the front was, How did you get over Baptism? The moment they learned from Scripture that the evil was in making *Baptism* a *question*, of course there was nothing to get over. The "false doctrine," as they term it, lay with the questioner in relegating Baptism to the position of a stone of stumbling, not in the one who refused to be stumbled by it.

But Paul has more to teach on Baptism still. He teaches also

The Relation of Baptism to the House.

Indeed, not only so, but he teaches the relation of Baptism to the whole Christian system, for, by revelation, and after having been caught up into the third heavens, he unfolds the full and perfect arrangement of everything connected with the present economy in Eph. iv., and gives us each several item according to its divine setting. The special mission committed to Paul set him upon an elevation whence he was in a position to put all in their relative places, according to their order of importance, in the great plan and purpose of God in its entirety, and unless we see everything—every truth of Scripture—in the light of that, and be able to fit it into its own *niche* of God's great scheme, anything we may hold concerning it is simply a private interpretation, hence the immense value of having God's revealed plan as Paul opens it out, that we may rightly understand where to *locate everything* instead of *dislocating* so many things, as we are very apt to do. Notwithstanding, however, that God has been pleased, through His special vessel chosen for the purpose, to give us these seven "ones," and to arrange them for us into *three* distinct groups, founded on *three* totally different characters of relationship, which, in turn, are contained within *three* as different *domains*, whose size and extent again differ, according to the kind of relationship that is characteristic of each, the astonishing thing is, that instead of recognizing the importance of these divinely revealed distinctions with their divine allocations as laid down by Paul, there is a strange perversity which sets about to obliterate them, everyone, and tries to make them all the same, lest it should interfere with particular views on

Baptism. Moreover, to grant a threefold relationship in connection with these seven "ones," and at the same time deny a threefold sphere (the favourite subterfuge of certain brethren), is absurd, for, whatever the relationship, if it exists at all, it must exist *somewhere*, in other words it must have a *sphere*, and a sphere too which is neither larger nor smaller than the nature of the relationship that constitutes the principle of its existence; in fact, each relationship is the diameter of a circle, in which it is true, and defines the circumference thereof, so that just as all circles differ according to their diameter, so these three spheres differ according to the particular relation which is distinctive of each. Consequently, the outermost circle having the greatest diameter is the largest of all, viz., that of "One God and Father of all." The relation, of course, here is the *family* one, but that in Scripture is *twofold*; in one of its acceptations it is by *creation* in a *general way*, as we speak of the human family, and in another acceptance it is by *new-birth* in a *special way*, as we speak of the children of God, nor must the one be used to deny the other. He is God and Father to a *special family* of born-again-ones in the *peculiar* sense of *Begetter*, and this is amply conserved in the words "*in us* all," which is true only of those *born of God*. But we must not lose sight of the other fact that "One God and Father of all" is the name by which "*every family* in *heaven* and *earth* is named," as Eph. iii. 15 distinctly teaches, embracing, observe, *angels* as well as men; not as *Begetter* like the other, but as *Creator*, still none the less true in its place. Yet I have actually known the stigma of Unitarian heresy sought to be affixed, by those who ought to know better, to their brethren for adhering to the plain teaching of this Scripture, under the pretence that the very thought of Fatherhood by *creation* implied the possibility of children of God

apart from new birth in the begotten sense, though pains has always been taken to distinguish creature from child, created from begotten, and creation-Fatherhood from new-birth Fatherhood. Be this as it may, it is perfectly clear that this sphere is far too large for Baptism with water to have anything to say to it, and, accordingly, it is not even mentioned with respect to it, being the domain where God is—"above all, and through all, and in us all."

Further, if we go to the innermost circle, its dimensions also correspond with its diameter. *Body-union* and *unity* is the relation peculiar to it—"one body, one spirit, one hope." The body is the sphere; the Spirit the power; and the hope the glory. The relation of Christ to that is Head, for body is a term relative to head. A man's body is himself, so to speak, the members being his limbs. Only *united ones* are there. Hence to make all these spheres the same is to lose the distinctive truth of the Church as the Body of Christ altogether. Now, just as the other was too large, so this circle is too narrow, and the closeness of the bond too intimate, for water-baptism to intrude. Where, then, does Paul locate Baptism? Is it in the central circle? No. It belongs to an entirely different sphere. He puts it at the circumference of that circle where the one Lord is owned, and the one Christian faith professed, constituting its door of entry; and this is what the Apostle calls the house or habitation, where the relationship is *profession*, not *union*. Consequently, the divinely assigned place of Baptism is outside of, and secondary to, the special sphere which constituted the distinguishing feature of Paul's ministry from a glorified Christ. But Paul teaches that it has a place, and anything but a mean place, in connection with the *house* of God as clearly as he teaches that it has no place except an outside place in connection with the

body of Christ. We have already seen what Baptism is and does in the history of how Christianity was set up and established in the Acts of the Apostles, and the part Baptism played in every case of the passage out of Judaism, or Gentilism, into the new divine domain within which God put the blessings that were communicable through the medium of Peter's keys. This cannot be realised by looking at the present confusion, but if we dismiss from our minds what we see around us at the present moment, and transport ourselves in thought to the time when there was nothing existing but Judaism and heathenism, and then see a new divine system for the first time appearing on the scene, which was neither, but different from both, with people passing into it from the other, its distinct and separate existence would be impossible to deny. That hitherto non-existent and unheard of entity on the earth was the Kingdom of Heaven if we think of Peter, and the House of God if we think of Paul (the body aspect has already been referred to), though, at first, it had a definite and manifest kingdom-character as administered by Peter before ever Paul appears. It is evident those coming out of Judaism did not pass into nothing. They entered somewhere. It was not a vague kind of thing in the air, nobody knew what. Nor was it simply individuals believing and being baptized, with the Baptism leaving people where and as it found them, as Mr. H.'s avowed position as to it really is. There was an actual order of things on the earth into which they were brought, besides individual salvation, consisting of an *external professing* circle, of which Baptism was the instituted *sign*, as well as an *internal reality* circle of which the Lord's Supper was the appointed *sign*. Of course, being signs, both might and have been abused. While the kingdom aspect was prominent, the mission to baptize was prominent,

and there was a display of power, called in Heb. vi. "the powers of the world to come," in connection with the kingdom phase from the start on to the time when the Jews sent the messenger after the Lord, saying "We will not have this man to reign over us," which we do not find afterwards. Heaven is then opened to Stephen, and union to Christ where *He is*, with the presence of the Holy Ghost down here where *Christ is not*, became more marked. Paul is called, and his special mission "not to baptize" from Christ in glory comes out into relief, so that the mission of the "one" takes precedence of the mission of the "twelve." Relatively to each other (the King having been rejected, the kingdom having assumed its mysterious form, and the hidden mystery—the church—having been fully revealed), the new thing necessarily made the previous old. In fact the apostles, even in connection with the kingdom, are not recognized in connection with the church, which is His body, the apostles being all re-given from *heaven*, nay, from "far above all heavens," it being from that height He gave the apostles for the church (Eph. iv.). The revelation of the mystery, the Lord's Supper, and the Lord's coming *for* the saints, are all given from heaven in connection with the dispensation entrusted to Paul. But Baptism was not re-given. It belonged to earth, and was only for the earth. The commission to baptize was only partially carried out and acted on when, Paul having received a fresh commission to the Gentiles (Acts xxvi. 16-18), the twelve, who even remained in Jerusalem when those scattered abroad went preaching everywhere, handed over the mission to the Gentiles to Paul, while they were to go to the Jews (see Gal. ii. 9). As far as Baptism was concerned, however, Paul acted on the old commission, but connected it rather with the *house* that *man builds* than with the kingdom, and, we being Gentiles, and

therefore under Paul, J. N. D. has associated Baptism with the house aspect on that account. Though we are in the kingdom of heaven as much as we are in the house, there was a character of kingdom-power, producing a sensible and visible result at the beginning, which we look in vain for now. It is the Spirit dwelling in the house down here, and the Head in heaven supplying the need of the members, that Paul is chiefly occupied with. He taught the church as the body and bride as well as the building or house. But the house is twofold. There is the house which Christ alone builds, and there is the house which man builds. The former is destined for glory, and appears in the eternal state as "the tabernacle of God"; the latter is for earth, and that only, all the real ones of course go to glory, but the building as a building begins and ends on earth. Distinct from that which Christ builds, and against which the gates of hell will not prevail, Paul tells us in 1 Cor. iii. of a house of which he is the wise master-builder, and after him, other builders. Instead of the gates of hell not prevailing against this, everything in or about it is in question except the foundation, and will be tried by fire. The place that Baptism holds in relation to this house Paul distinctly shows in 1 Cor. x., viz., what the Red Sea was to the house of Israel,—not the Red Sea as typical of spiritual redemption, though that is maintained in all its integrity in its place—but as an actual *earthly* fact. In other words, Baptism brings out of Judaism or heathenism, and puts into as distinct a *professedly* Christian *place on earth* as the wilderness was distinct from Egypt. Just as truly as the passage of the Red Sea brought Israel out of Egypt and into the wilderness as an *earthly* fact, so does Baptism bring the baptized out of Judaism or heathenism and into the house of God as a fact on earth. Israel had external privileges which no other nation possessed

wholly irrespective of true conversion to God. To them "pertained the adoption and the glory, and the covenants and the giving of the law, and the promises." (Rom. ix. 14.) Again, Paul asks, "What advantage has the Jew?" and the reply is, "Much every way." Well, says Paul, in 1 Cor. x., there is a place of outward blessing analagous to that into which Baptism brings those baptized as truly as "All were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," and thereby passed out of Egypt into the wilderness. The apostle then shows what may happen to those in this external relationship just as to those in the wilderness, quite different from the salvation of the soul, and this is a distinct teaching on Baptism from this point of view, as Rom. vi. is as to its *spiritual* meaning. But there is more here, for in the estimation of those who believe in the Baptism of the little ones, this scripture not only shows the fact of such a place of privilege, but also *who* are to be received. They ask, Would the Israelites have gone out of Egypt and left the children behind? They go to the history and find out what was actually done. They find, strangely enough, that very question raised, and that Pharaoh wanted them left; but Moses said, "We will go with our young and with our old, with our sons and with our daughters," &c., and "There shall not a hoof be left behind." (Ex. x., verses 9 and 26.) They follow the history further, and find that the "little ones" were those who got into the land, while the carcasses of the grown-up ones fell in the wilderness (Num. xiv. 28-35). "But your little ones, whom ye said should be a prey, them will I bring in, and they shall know the land which ye have despised; but as for you, your carcasses shall fall in the wilderness." It is utterly impossible to shut the little ones out of this. They passed through the sea, were under the cloud, and got into the land. It

will also be seen why J. N. D. considered 1 Cor. vii. 14 the strongest proof of all, because it demonstrates that little ones, who would even have been shut out of the Jewish place of privilege, were to be received into the Christian one. The reception of the children of Christian parents is taken for granted as unquestionable by the apostle, but even where there was only one Christian parent, though the unbelieving husband was not admissible, yet the little ones assuredly were, and Paul appeals to this well-known recognized fact as the reason why the believing wife was to remain with the unbelieving husband. J. N. D. thought it impossible to have anything more decisive than this, and regarded his position as indisputable according to Scripture, but claimed liberty for those who differed from him, because pushing one side or the other to a division would be as much a sect one way as another. As for R. T. H., all he sees in Paul's mission "not to baptize" is to repeat what he started with :

"Paul is not sent to be so constantly ; but while asserting this, he never states that he was not sent to teach Baptism or any other truth of God."

Nobody thought of such a thing but R. T. H. As we have been seeing, Paul is just the one who does teach on Baptism, and in addition even to what has been shown, we have still to look at how he teaches what Baptism means *spiritually*; but that had better be left till what Baptism is a sign of be considered.

The Commission to Baptize.

PAPER V.*

"THE COMMISSION."

MR. H. is here seen to be as far astray as to the commission to baptize as he was about the mission *not* to baptize. As for "Paul's words (1 Cor. i. 17) being wrongly applied," if anything was manifest in the way of misapplication, it certainly was R. T. H. "Thou art the man." Moreover, instead of "needful," if the intention (as he seems to infer) was, when Paul baptized, "to show that he acted upon the same commission as the twelve," it was altogether superfluous, because there was no other mission to baptize, and J. N. D. never disputed it; on the contrary, insists on it in almost every letter on the subject. Does Mr. H. know himself what he was contending for? He knew J. N. D. held this, for he quoted his words: "Baptism was accepted by Paul as already instituted," and then argued adversely upon them, evidently for arguing's sake, on p. 169 Vol. V. "Needed Truth," or p. 29 of the Pamphlet; since he seems to have forgotten that he did so. But he never does seize the force of what J. N. D. says before he proceeds to condemn him, consequently the articles comprising the Pamphlet are largely taken up with trying to demolish, not what J. N. D. and scripture actually state, but his own misunderstandings of both. This paper, for example, shows Mr. H. to be so dark as to

*"Needed Truth," Vol. V. pp. 189-191. Pamphlet, pp. 35-41.

hold Baptism to be *obedience* to a command on the part of the *baptized*, and is devoted to an elaborate defence of that baseless, not to say unchristian, notion. All intelligent brethren of any weight, who hold Believers' Baptism so-called, have abandoned that ground as untenable long since. Does C. H. M., for instance, entertain anything so contrary to the teaching of the Word of God? It is, therefore, most unfair, though he gains nothing by it, to say:—

“The upholding of Infant Baptism seems to necessitate on the part of these writers the denial that we have a command in connection with Baptism. For if there is one, it certainly is for believers, and them only.

It really is a matter of scriptural intelligence as to Baptism *as such*, apart altogether from infant or adult Baptism; but all he does is to let himself out and manifest that he is wholly wrong where he least suspects it—that is, as to the very point on which he is most confident that he is right. He declares: “For if there is one (a command), it certainly is for believers, and for them only.” Now, the truth is there is not a word about *believing* or *believers* in Matt. xxviii. 19 (he has to *reason* it *in* before he can make it even appear so). Moreover, the *command* is not given to the apostles as *believers* (although they were that), but as *disciples* (verse 16). A man may be a disciple, and yet not a believer. It is not without meaning that the command to administer an external ordinance should be given to the apostles as *disciples*, which term denotes an external relationship. It is by no means denied by any intelligent holders of either what is termed “Household” or “Believers’ Baptism” that there is a “command in connection with Baptism”; what is denied is that there is a command for Believers’ Baptism as such, or to *believers*, in the passage that contains the commission. The only command in connection with Christian Baptism

is this very scripture, and anything about *believers* is conspicuous by its absence, while as to the correct application of the *command* that *is there*, it is plain that command is to the apostles *to baptize*, not to the nations *to be baptized*, Baptism for them being always a *privilege*. Mr. H. has, therefore, been misreading and misinterpreting the terms of the commission all his life. You have only to read the passage to see it: "Go ye therefore and disciple all the nations, baptizing them." It is not all nations, but all *the* nations—that is, the Gentiles. Nothing is said of believers, nothing of adults, nothing of infants, but language employed which includes all ages—young, old, or middle-aged—as 1 Cor. x. 2 unmistakably proves. After another quotation from J. N. D., Mr. H. proceeds:—

"Nothing could be plainer than this! J. N. D. held and taught that Matt. xxviii. was the only command, yet not for Jews, but for Gentiles. But while so positive as to this, he never seeks to explain why Peter, a few weeks after this commission was given, baptized on the day of Pentecost Jews only."

This is another mistake. J. N. D. does explain. He says:—

"The twelve had been sent forth by Christ in connection with the kingdom."

Again,

"But, more particularly, a command there was to baptize, not to be baptized; but this was not even to baptize *believers*, but to disciple the nations, baptizing them—a commission which supposes Jerusalem and the Jews received."

Hence no command was needed to baptize Jews. Christ knew there would be no difficulty about baptizing them, and their Baptism is taken for granted and presupposed in Matthew; but they are commanded to go out to the Gentiles, which they would certainly not have done unless they had been positively *commanded*. See how difficult it was to get Peter

even to go to Cornelius, though he had heard the terms of the commission, and the command it contained, from the Lord's own mouth. He had to get the vision of the sheet over and above to remove his scruples. Unquestionably the example and action of Peter on the day of Pentecost are plainer than any command, that it was the Lord's *pleasure* Jews should be baptized, still that does not alter the fact that the only *command* in connection therewith is to baptize *Gentiles*. R. T. H. breaks forth into one of those characteristic outbursts to which we have become accustomed:—

“Samaritans as well as Jews were baptized—thousands before one Gentile. Passing strange if J. N. D. were correct in saying, No command for Jews, but for Gentiles only.

There is nothing “passing strange” about it. J. N. D. is correct, and let R. T. H. own it is the truth, or find a command to baptize Jews in scripture. If it is there he surely can produce it. You see, with all the noise he makes, you have simply to pin him down to Scripture, and he has not a leg to stand upon. In spite of W. K., a commission to baptize and a warrant to baptize are not the same thing. Mark xvi. is not a commission to *baptize*. It is a commission to *preach* with Baptism as a privilege, but no actual command either to baptizer or to baptized, still the true relation of Baptism to those who are *preached to* is given distinctly enough. It is perfect in its place. Accordingly, *believing* comes in here, because faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by preaching; but this in no way interferes with the scope and extent of the commission in Matt. xxviii. Why then, let us ask, is it

“Most dangerous and unscriptural to state that the Apostles had no commission to baptize Jews?”

Is it unscriptural to state Scripture? Nothing else is scriptural, and nothing else is true. Surely,

if there was a command to baptize Jews it ought to be forthcoming. But all this misconception arises from supposing that you cannot have warrant for anything without a command. That is legality, not Christianity, and mark how it shows itself. R. T. H. says, "Could it be approved unless based on a command given? Assuredly it could. The Lord could signify His mind to Peter about baptizing Jews in another form than that of a command, which would be quite as effectual. He could have done so by instruction or by revelation. A father's instructions to his children are not commands; but they, as distinctly, express the father's wishes, and are more in keeping with the relationship of parent and child. Again, Why is it

"Most mischievous to say there is a command to the baptizer not to the baptized?"

I suppose, because it upsets all R. T. H.'s preconceived ideas on the subject. Nothing else is the truth. He says, "The baptizer alone had a command; but how did his command run?" There is not much difficulty in ascertaining that if Scripture be attended to; but he makes it run wrongly. Scripture says, "Disciple all the nations baptizing them"; he says, "Make disciples baptizing them." He next treats his readers to a rather remarkable combination of interrogations and exclamations, interspersed with suppositions of his own, such as "J. N. D. would have said" this, and "J. N. D. would have replied" that, endeavouring to his own satisfaction, if to nobody else's, to make Scripture square with his erroneous notion of a *command* to the *baptized*; but it is immovable and inexorable, let him charm ever so wisely. A command to one to be baptized has really no sense, because no one can baptize himself. Accordingly, when a command is given in Scripture it is addressed to the only one who

can carry it out, and that is the baptizer, and the obedience is on his part, not on the part of the baptized. In fact, to make it, as Mr H. labours to do, a matter of obedience on the-part of the baptized is a principle which breaks down Christianity in its foundation, like one who keeps days, and the sooner such a "thought is destroyed in the minds of Christians" the better. He even tries to persuade himself that "what doth *hinder?*" is the same as "I am *commanded.*" He gives a citation from J. N. D. which is explicitness itself, but he misunderstands it as usual, and pretends to "analyze" what he calls "particularly strong and bold statements," after this fashion:—

"So reasoned J. N. D. : Correctly enough, if his premisses were correct; but, alas, for him! they were false. Where did he find them in Scripture?"

This is like the blowing of wind around a mountain, the truth being that J. N. D. was stating scripture, and showing that Christianity never sets before people obedience to commandments in order to get into anything. *Baptism by doing* on the part of the *baptized* is as foreign to scripture as *salvation by doing* on the part of the *saved*. The baptizer effects the doing in the one case quite as much as the Saviour effects the doing in the other. The Ethiopian eunuch was evidently more intelligent than to think of it as a question of obedience or doing. He knew he had to be received by another, and never dreamt of receiving himself, saying, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" not expecting to be *recognized* as a Christian until he was so, for he knew he was just a Jewish proselyte, though a believing one, unless he came in by the door opened by the keys of Peter—that is, as distinguished from *Jew* or *heathen* on the *earth*, and not to be confounded with his spiritual state before God. This was what Baptism meant for him: not

obedience on his own part as to any act of his own, but a privilege conferred and reception by another who was already there. So it always is in scripture. Mr. H. plays on the words "obedient," "obedience," and "obeyed," in a manner that would subvert the gospel; for, viewed in their context, they mean the very opposite of *doing* or obedience in the sense objected to by J. N. D., in relation to Baptism as an act of obedience on the part of the baptized. The next passage he misuses is Rom. i. 5: "the obedience of faith"; as if that were not a very different thing to obedience to ordinances, for that is what making Baptism a matter of obedience for the baptized really amounts to. "The obedience of *faith*" means *believing* what has *been done* as opposed to *doing*, and is just the reverse of being baptized as an act of obedience by the one baptized. Does the obedience of faith put the individual in the attitude of a doer or of a receiver? A receiver undoubtedly. So with Christian Baptism; it is not doing, but receiving. It puts one in the attitude of a receiver, and is the opposite of an act of obedience on the part of the baptized. Nor is "obeyed the gospel," in Rom. x. 16, otherwise. It is receiving good news of what another *has done*, not *doing*. Is this not to pervert scripture, and sacrifice even the gospel itself, rather than give up an erroneous idea? Certain it is that "obedient to the faith," "the obedience of faith," and "obeyed the gospel," all mean the reverse of *doing* or obedience in the sense of the yoke of bondage with which this would entangle souls. To bring up these passages and use them as he does, as if they had aught to do with the matter in hand, appears to me very serious. Is he honest? What J. N. D. says and intends is simple enough. Good works, obedience, or doing, because you *are in*, is Christianity; good works, obedience, or doing, in order *to get in*, is anti-Christian. For who does

not know the Galatian bondage into which many have been brought by the legal way in which Baptism has been pressed upon them. To connect Baptism with obedience in the manner insisted on by Mr. H. is just what Paul means by "falling from grace." Simple souls are beguiled, however well intended the ostensible object. They are told Baptism is Christ's command to them, and asked if they have obeyed it. They are solemnly informed how serious a thing it is to be living in *disobedience*, and are urged, without delay, to fulfil the commandment of the Lord. They are gravely assured that Scripture says "believe and be baptized," when it does nothing of the kind, and they are disturbed. They do not wish to be disobedient. They are perplexed, and become occupied with ordinances instead of Christ. They get the length of what is called seeing Baptism, and their consciences are affected. They must get baptized, as an act of obedience on their part, in order to ease them, and the consequence is, their whole life gets a legal bias which cripples their souls and deteriorates the character of their Christianity, obscuring to their spiritual vision all that is most blessed in connection therewith. Whereas in Scripture, on the contrary, the command is to the baptizer, not to the baptized. Baptism is not an act of obedience on their part, but a privilege conferred, which puts them in the room of the *receiver*, not of the *doer*. Nor is it ever said, "believe and be baptized," but "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," which is a very different matter, and shows their view cannot be put in the plain language of Scripture, but has to be altered to suit. The pity is ears have become so long accustomed to these perversions of God's Word.

Textual Criticism, &c.

PART V. (*Continued*).

"THE COMMISSION."

It is rather unfortunate Mr. H. should have ventured into the region of textual criticism; for, as was to be expected, he has gone beyond his depth. There is no doubt by any scholar that "baptizing them" means nations, or, indeed, by any one moderately acquainted with the language in which the Spirit of God wrote. What misleads the ordinary reader is that the verb "disciple" is translated as if it were a verb with a noun,—“make disciples,” when the word “them” might be supposed to apply to disciples instead of nations, whereas there is no word for *disciples* in the original, and nothing else for the baptizing to refer to except nations; the words actually being, “Go and disciple all the nations, baptizing them.” But Mr. R. T. H. gives a critical rendering of his own, which, if correct, would *exclude* all the feminine portion—the women—and include all the *male* children, and that would be more damaging, from his standpoint, than leaving it as it was, because it would let in *half* of the little ones. A plural, neuter, collective noun, followed by a plural, masculine pronoun, is common enough in Greek when there is no question of disciples or discipling. For example, in Paul’s mission in Acts xxvi. 17, it is said: “Delivering thee from (the Jews) the people, and (the Gentiles) the *nations*,

*“Needed Truth,” Vol. V. pp. 218-224. Pamphlet, pp. 42-48.

to whom now I send thee." The word for "nations" here is the same as in Matt. xxviii., and the word for "whom" is masculine, plural, but would anyone think of saying that "whom" did not refer to *nations*? The same in Acts xxviii. 28: "The salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles,—the *nations*—and they will hear it." Here, also, the Greek word for nations is the same as in Matt. xxviii., and the word for "they" the same as the word for "them," the former neuter and the latter masculine, just the same. There is no doubt in the mind of anyone who reads "they will hear it," that "they" refers to the *nations* to whom the salvation was sent. With F. W. G.'s position we have nothing to do. J. N. D. is not to be saddled with that. Practically, however, it makes no difference; so we can grant Mr. H. to be the best Greek scholar going, and allow him his own interpretation. It does not alter things in the long run. He cannot, and does not pretend to, deny that it was the *nations* that were to be *discipled*. He demurred to "baptizing them," meaning nations, because he said "that, if true, would mean that any and all were to be baptized;" hence he must admit that discipling all nations means that any and all are to be discipled. Nations, as everybody is aware, are composed of men, women, and children. It accordingly follows that children are to be discipled, and being discipled are to be baptized like the other classes; so what, after all, does Mr. H. gain by a disquisition which only manifests, to those who know, how little versed he is in such matters? Those who believe in Baptism of children think this affords another proof in their favour. They see the commission to the twelve relates to the kingdom and the *manner* of reception into it, which had not till then been announced by the Lord. They know that He had already instructed His disciples as to *who* were to be

received, and here He is telling them *how* to receive, so that they would have no difficulty in understanding to *whom* the baptizing applied. They see that Christ, in Matt. xviii., had given a little child as the *pattern disciple*, and in chapter xix. said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," not heaven, but this very kingdom in connection with which the apostles got the commission, so that according to the command they could not refuse to baptize the little ones; nay, it appears to them it was incumbent on the apostles to do so, for they were the pattern disciples, the command applying even to them more than to men or women, because they had to *become like* the little ones first, whereas the little ones were *as such* the model disciples. Hence, connecting the Lord's previous instruction as to the kingdom of heaven and who were to be received up to this point step by step, they cannot escape the admission that a command for baptizing the little ones is included in the terms of the commission even more than to any other class, and often as it is denied, they consider this as distinct a warrant as could be had, seeing that in the light of Matt. xviii. it is more directly applicable to the little ones than to any other portion of the nation. This is the argument from the commission as it has appeared to men most deeply taught in the Word of God, and the conclusion arrived at is that the little ones cannot be excluded by any fair dealing with the Scripture. They conscientiously believe this.

Mr. H. next assumes the task of expositor, only to cut as poor a figure at exegesis as he did at criticism, which one might have excused and passed over unnoticed, were it not accompanied with an assumption that is intolerable, particularly in the absence of anything to support it. For example, he says:—

"But to return to what is spoken of as 'the commission.' Is there not a laboured unscriptural way of writing about Matthew

xxviii., even by some who do not (one is thankful for it) go as far as F. W. G., or even J. N. D. ?”

“How miserable the expressions in the letters already quoted, which would lead us to believe that the words when spoken (afterward to be recorded by Matthew) were the only commission given for Baptism.”

Reproof, rather than refutation, is what this merits. Mr H. knows, or ought to know, that neither he nor anyone else can find another commission to baptize. Nor is this all. Not satisfied with the way in which the Spirit of God has been pleased to give a distinct commission suitable to each of the four gospels, he tries his hand at an improved edition of his own as to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, mixing them up together in the strangest fashion so as to adapt them to his peculiar notions of Baptism, and when he does, in measure, make a distinction between Matthew and Mark, that, too, must be made to contribute to the same circle of ideas and gravitate towards the same baptismal centre. He takes care to leave out the commission in John, because that being in Jerusalem, “where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews,” would not fit in with his new “private interpretation” scheme, which he has the temerity to pass off on his readers as Scriptural, though manifestly the invention of his own lively imagination. The very sentence by which he introduces the novelty serves to burst the bubble. He says:—

“Let the reader carefully note that that which is recorded in Matt. xxviii. was the closing scene, and the record of the last words of the Lord Jesus as uttered on the Mount of Olives.”

Clearly his memory must have failed him. One has only to read the 16th verse of this chapter to see that the mountain in Matt. xxviii. was in Galilee. “Then the eleven disciples went away into *Galilee*, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them,” and surely any child at Sunday School could have told him the Mount of Olives was not in Galilee.

Did Mr. H. not know better? Has he intended to deceive? We answer not; still we can scarcely think it was a slip, otherwise no reference would have been made to it. On the contrary, his whole argument depends on it. His over-anxiety to make out a case appears to have misled him and carried him away. To show that we are taking no undue advantage, and that he really makes out the Matthew and Luke commissions were *one*, and given at one and the same time, after placing the words of Matthew and Mark side by side, he fearlessly states:—

“What we now get separately the disciples received at one time.”

So wide is this of the mark, that the very thing Scripture is scrupulous about emphasising is that they did not receive them at one time, but are as separate as Galilee is from Judæa, and as the Galilean mountain from the room in Jerusalem. There can be no doubt, as we have seen, that in Matthew it was given in *Galilee*, but in Luke it is quite different. (See chapter xxiv.) After the Lord's journey with the two to Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem three score furlongs, it is said, “And they rose up the same hour, and returned to *Jerusalem*, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and has appeared to Simon, and they told what things were done in the way, and how He was known of them in breaking of bread; and as they thus spoke, Jesus Himself stood in the midst of them” (verses 33-36). It was there and then He gave the commission recorded in verse 37; and it is this we have also in Mark, not the Matthew one, as Mr. H. supposes. The Galilee close of our Lord's life is given in Mark xvi. up to verse 8, as may be ascertained from these words: “But go your way, tell His disciples and Peter that He goeth before you into

Galilee" (verse 7); but not a word is said of the commission, or the terms of it, as recorded in *Matthew*. Then from verse 9 to the end is appended an account of the Bethany close of Christ's life, similar to that in Luke—a fact which we thought was familiar to all Bible students, for after recapitulating the points narrated in the latter part of Luke xxiv., such as appearing to "two of them as they walked into the country" (verse 12), and "afterwards He appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat" (verse 14); and then (the same as Luke) on that very occasion He gave the commission to *preach* recorded by Mark; so that placing it alongside *Matthew* is all a mistake. There has been rather too much of the self-confident taking-for-granted that he could not be wrong, and that all the Scripture was on his side, but the moment you come to close quarters, his position is only defensible by changing Scripture. He further says:—

"The master of the house is prominent in *Matthew*, the servant in *Mark*; the command in the one, is brought out, the obedience in the other."

This is another accommodation of Scripture, to his ideas, so as to favour his views on Baptism. The truth is, what is prominent in *Matthew* is the king and the kingdom, not the house. The command is that of a king who is invested with "all power in heaven and in earth." *Mark*, on the other hand, gives Christ in His servant's character, undoubtedly, and in accordance therewith the commission in that gospel is, going out in the sweetest service to preach the Gospel to every creature; but obedience is not connected with *Baptism*, as Mr. H. seeks to make out. There is no command in the form of "believe and be baptized," though so often thus misquoted and misapplied, but "he that believeth and is baptized shall be *saved*," so that obedience can no more be associated with *Baptism* here than with salvation. The commis-

sign in the one gospel is quite distinct from the other, and the little ones can no more be put into the *preaching* commission of Mark—where it is, “he that believeth not shall be damned”—than they can be shut out of the *discipling* commission of Matthew, where they are all through given as the pattern and model disciples. Mr. H. continues:—

“How many now-a-days, scarcely knowing what they affirm, are talking learnedly about Matthew xxviii? ‘It is not for us.’ ‘It is not for the Church.’ ‘It is for the Gentiles.’ Going to the length of taking away the verses from the Church altogether.”

Does he not perceive that to say Matthew xxviii. is “not for the Church,” “it is for the Gentiles,” is not the same as saying “it is not for us?” We are Gentiles in the sense mentioned there, and, of course, it is for us. Then as to the commission, since it relates to the *Kingdom*, not the Church, it is perfectly right to say it is not for the Church as *such*, as Christ has it in Matthew xvi.; but that does not mean it is not for those who *belong* to the Church, for all who belong to the Church are in the kingdom of heaven; nor is anything being “taken away” from us. It is only a question of his applying “the Church” to the wrong thing, and then drawing wrong conclusions from his own misapplication. Why does he bring in the prophet Joel, as if J. N. D. did not believe in a future fulfilment of the prophecy quoted by Peter in addition to what took place at Pentecost, and why assume, on such reasoning, that he referred “all nations” to the *future*, in such a way as to take away the application to Christianity *now*? This is misrepresentation; whether ignorant or wilful, I leave to Mr. H.’s own conscience.

What J. N. D. says.

J. N. D. says:—

“The baptizing of the Gentiles was not unto John’s or Messiah’s Baptism, but unto that full revelation by His death

and resurrection—the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. It is the most formal statement of the Christian revelation replacing Judaism—the sphere is enlarged to embrace all the nations, and the observance of what Christ commanded is substituted for the law of Moses. Those who went forth to disciple the Gentiles were messengers of the King, whose presence would be with them till the end of the age, when He Himself should appear in the glory of His Kingdom.”

As to Mark, he says:—

“Being more especially the witness of the ministry of Christ, he gives—not the outreaching principle of the dispensation now opened by His death and resurrection, and founded on the place of power where He was—but the principle—the new principle—of the ministry *itself* and its consequences: ‘Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to the whole creation.’ It is a question here not of the Kingdom, but of *salvation*.”

As to Luke, he says:—

“Suitably to that Gospel, we have, not the dispensation change which went forth to reduce all the Gentiles to a recognition of Christ (Matthew), or the character and universal extent of the Gospel (Mark), but its moral subject and scope, involving withal Jew and Gentile alike as sinners, for he specially looks at *man*. Hence it runs there, ‘Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.’ It is beautiful to see that while the need and ruin of man are fully met, testimony to the Jew first is not forgotten, even if Jerusalem were first in guilt as well as privileges.”

Then, lastly, as to John, he says:—

“As the Sonship of Christ is the great subject (who He—the Son of God—was in person), the authority and power of His person in mission was brought forward. ‘As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.’ And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and said unto them, ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.’ We have here the authority of the Sender from His person, title, and work. This was authority delegated in grace by the rejected but risen Son of God, giving peace to His own, and sending them forth with peace for others in a world which know neither Him nor

it. As to these commissions, while the spirit and principle of all*remains, and so far as we have spiritual power, we can realise them ; yet all, I believe, have been perverted and fallen, like all else in man's hand."

No one, taught of God, can read the foregoing without being convinced which is the "unscriptural way of writing about Matthew xxviii."—R. T. H.'s or J. N. D.'s, or the poverty of the former compared with the latter.

The Baptism of Households.

PAPER VI.

"HOUSEHOLD BAPTISM."

WHILE endeavouring to put the argument from the standpoint of the "Letters" (as one must do in meeting strictures upon them), we repeat, the object is not to advocate one view more than the other, even when from that cause it might appear otherwise. All that is intended is, to show adequate reason for the claim we make that those holding the Baptism of believers only (while perfectly free to maintain this for themselves) must, nevertheless, allow full and unfettered liberty to those who hold the Baptism of households as well, and not quietly assume that they have all the scripture and the others none, as is too often done, without the slightest idea of what can be advanced in favor of the latter. We deprecate the pushing of the one unduly, quite as much as the other, because equally tending to sectarianism.

R. T. H. does not even attempt to grasp the position of his brethren who differ from him with reference to "households." On the contrary, there seems a disposition to paint a picture of horrors, such as "most wicked and appalling statement"—"how horrible the thought"—"turning with shame and disgust from the very thought." The object of language so intemperate one is at a loss to understand, unless it be to horrify his readers by the pre-

conception of something dreadful, and thereby hide from himself and them what the Baptism of households (as recorded in Scripture) really involves. We do not mean to let him evade the issue because those he attacks, seeing in Scripture the Baptism of individual believers, practise that; and, seeing as distinctly in Scripture the Baptism of households as well, feel bound to practise that also. Does R. T. H. practise the Baptism of households? No. Well, they cannot see he can pretend to follow Scripture if he is all the time refusing to be guided by it on the very point in dispute. As they read their Bibles they find quite as much, if not more, said in the Word of God, about the Baptism of households, than even the Baptism of individual believers; and they do not believe that any man has a right to confine Baptism to the latter only, and reject the former, when the same Divine Word that records the one, as emphatically records the other. They see five households in Acts and Corinthians, written, they humbly think, for our instruction and example. The number clearly shows that it was no casual occurrence, but the regular practice of the Apostle's time; and is, in fact, brought into greater prominence than any other aspect of Baptism. The importance of this will be seen when we ask, were anyone to write the acts of R. T. H., would he have the Baptism of a household to record? Had Paul held the views of Baptism entertained by Mr. H., and advocated in these papers which compose this pamphlet, would he have said "I baptized also the household of Stephanas"? Could R. T. H. say that he baptized a household as such? Could anyone say it of him? No. It cannot be denied that there is a serious discrepancy between the practice of Mr. H. and the Apostolic practice, somehow, as far as the Baptism of households is concerned.

We have already drawn attention to the fact that

J. N. D. founded the Baptism of the little ones on something broader, deeper, and wider than "households," but he said enough to show how he regarded the latter. He says:—

"I admit that there is no *command* for infants to be baptized—it would suppose a moral effect but there is none for adults. There is to the apostles to go and baptize the *nations* they had brought into discipleship and *households* are spoken of in Scripture."

Now, when Mr. H. quoted this very passage from J. N. D., on p. 187 of Vol. V. "Needed Truth," or p. 37 of the Pamphlet, why did he leave out the part that spoke of *households*, even when required to complete the sentence? The position of J. N. D. in that quotation is this: Scripture uses two collective nouns or terms in connection with Baptism, each of which includes both young and old—viz., "nation" and "household," and his contention is that the argument that shuts out the young is equally valid for shutting out the old or middle aged. The objection constantly raised is: Why baptize little ones when there is no command for it? J. N. D. replied by admitting no command about infants as a special class; but affirmed, neither was there a command for any class; no command for adults, nor for believers either, for the matter of that, any more than for the other. In the original commission where alone any command is found, that command is to the apostles *to baptize*, not to the people to be baptized, and the word there used is *nations*, which includes the young as much as the grown up. Neither class is specified, but a term employed which embraces both, and you can no more exclude the infant portion of the nations than you can the adult. Then he added:—

"And households are spoken of in Scripture."

That is to say, there was another word used in Scripture in relation to Baptism which also includes both old and

young, and we have no right to shut out one class more than the other. The term "household" comprises children, and men, and women, just as "nations" do, and J. N. D. held these as undoubted warrant for baptizing the young as much as the old, and never found any who could disprove it from the Word of God, nor can Mr. H., with all his ingenuity. Looking at things in the light of the confusion of to-day, instead of realising the actual state of things to which Scripture refers when Christianity began, accounts for an obliquity of vision that is remarkable and distressing. It makes one tremble to think that Mr. H. might as well have applied the fearful language indulged in to the Lord Himself, where it is said: "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John," seeing that we afterwards read of such disciples, "From that time many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him." (John vi. 66.) Would he have dared to say to Jesus,

"In their sins, and the names to be named on them? How horrible the thought!"

Yet, according to his ideas of Baptism, that is what this shocking manner of speaking amounts to. It is perfectly clear Christ meant by "made and baptized disciples" a totally different thing from R. T. H. He cannot deny the fact that there is the Baptism of Households over and over again in Scripture, but instead of reducing this knowledge to practice, he sets himself to explain away every one of the instances he has to acknowledge is there, and would have us believe that the Spirit of God recorded them just that we might act as if they had never existed, or had never been on the inspired page.

Unclean and Holy.

PAPER VII.*

“ELSE WERE YOUR CHILDREN UNCLEAN.”

LET it be still kept in mind that in anything professing to express the communion of the Body of Christ, agreement or disagreement on Baptism with water cannot be made a condition. Hence, seeing eye to eye with J. N. D. or any man is not for a moment to be considered a pre-requisite. Those who differ from him on Baptism are as welcome as those who agree, provided particular views are not so pressed as to amount to sectarianism. Of course no one expects that Mr. H., from his avowed attitude throughout, could regard J. N. D.'s making so much of 1 Cor. vii. 14 as otherwise than “strange;” but it simply goes to show that he does not, from some cause or other, seize hold of the real force of the passage. There is no doubt J. N. D. looked upon this Scripture as the strongest proof of all, and let no one suppose he did so without adequate reason. It will therefore be our endeavour to make plain why he attached so much importance to it, because others may be helped to see the point if R. T. H. will not. There are instances in which the *manner of allusion without direct statement is the most indisputable evidence of all*, and this is one. That Baptism is not directly mentioned so far from weakening, only strengthens the case, especially when there is a word like “holy,”

Pamphlet, pp. 60-6, or “Needed Truth,” Vol. V. pp. 255-251.

which more than covers Baptism. The moment the significance of "unclean" and "holy" in contrast with one another is apprehended nothing could be stronger than the way the Apostle brings it in. It is perfectly true he is not treating of Baptism; it is whether a believing wife is to live with an unbelieving husband, or *vice versa*; but on what ground does he decide it? Mark it well. It is the known and acknowledged right of admission in respect of the children. Moreover, this is so thoroughly taken for granted, and appealed to as past debate, that you cannot possibly have anything more conclusive as J. N. D. was convinced of. Every one who has understood his Bible knows that under the law "holy" meant free access to, and "unclean" meant *exclusion* from that which God then recognised on the earth. For the children to be "holy," then, *both* parents must be Israelites, and the meaning of "holy" was full title to the privileges of Judaism, so that the religious status of the *children* was incontestable proof of the recognised rightness of the marriage. If a Jewish husband married an alien from the commonwealth of Israel he was *profaned*, but not "unclean" so as to be excluded from the Jewish people—that is, as belonging to that community. The wife and children, however, were "unclean," and they must be put away as *profane*; nor could the husband be "holy" till this was done in relation to the congregation of Jehovah. In Christianity, on the other hand, if one parent was a believer, the children were not only not "unclean," and hence not to be put away, but they were "holy," and hence to be received to privilege; while the unbelieving parent was *not* "holy," like the children, so as to be admitted, but "sanctified," the opposite of "profaned," and therefore not to be put away. All are perfectly put in their respective places. Accordingly, just as the religious status of

the children as "holy" proved the rightness of a marriage in Judaism, so the recognised position of the children of all believing parents as "holy" in Christianity (whether one or both) was the proof of the validity of *all* their marriages at Corinth, and, of course, as to the *case in point* as much as to *their own*; consequently the believing wife was not to separate from the unbelieving husband, but to remain, because the marriage was valid, and demonstrated to be such by what was known to them all—that the children were received as "holy." There is no question as to its being "Else were *your* children unclean." Unquestionably it is not *their*, but "your." "Their" would have confined it to the children of a *mixed* marriage; but the point of the argument is that the children of all believing parents (whether both or only one) are in Christianity, not "unclean," but known and owned to be "holy," and the fact that they are so, which is stated as something which could not be gainsaid, is what sets the matter in question completely at rest. Mr. H. seems to think he finds something material to his contention in the "your," but it is all the other way. His exposition inverts the truth of the passage, though presuming to point out the alleged "falsity of several statements made in extracts," which, as usual, he fails to understand, and in which the correct interpretation is given, in spite of what he may assert to the contrary. For what is Mr. H.'s version? He says:—

"If a wife is to be separated from her husband because unclean, then children, all unbelieving children, must be acted towards in the same way." "That which is true of the unbelieving wife is also true of the unbelieving child; the one is no more accounted holy than the other."

Now, let any one read the passage as the inspired Apostle wrote it, and say does it not explicitly state the opposite? R. T. H. puts words into the passage

which are not there, and then builds his argument on his misquotation. There is not a word about believing or unbelieving children. Believing or unbelieving does not apply to them. They are said negatively to be "not unclean," and positively to be "holy," which entitles to admission. Neither the unbelieving wife nor the unbelieving husband is said to be "holy," nor is either said to be "unclean" when married to a believing husband or wife. The term used is "sanctified;" yet neither is said to be "holy," but the *children are*. The term "sanctified" is opposed to *profaned*, yet not *profane* or "unclean." The term "holy" is opposed to "unclean" or *profane*, yet more than "sanctified." The latter did not entitle to *access*; the former did. Hence so far from that being true of the children which is true of the unbelieving wife, the fact is, if the husband is a believer the children are declared to be "holy" in the same sense that the Jewish children were "holy," when both parents were of the stock of Abraham, and every one knows that signified title to admission to the full privileges of Judaism. There is no getting over it, and Mr. H. has to make the verse appear to say the reverse of what it does say to give him any standing ground at all. Then he asks:—

"Where in the chapter is there the slightest thought of a position?"

The reply is: The recognised "holy" *position* of the children settles the point whether the believing wife is to leave or remain with the unbelieving husband. The whole argument depends on it. Again, he asks:—

"Or where the thought of 'coming in,' for J. N. D. said, that is, in scriptural phraseology, 'has right to come in.'"

and then gives the reply himself:—

"The verse says—'now are they holy.' What has that to do with coming in?"

Alas for R. T. H.! Nothing shows where he is like this. If he does not know what the scriptural terms "holy" and "unclean" mean, there is little use dealing with him till he does. Unless he learns that "unclean" is equivalent to what must be *shut out*, and "holy" what ought to *come in*, as far as the language of the Word of God is concerned, it is waste of time to discuss what the passage "Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy" is intended to convey. For J. N. D., who so clearly understood their meaning, the strength of the argument was beyond cavil, and when viewed in connection with 1 Cor. x. (as already shown, and which need not be repeated here), the proof as to the reception of the children was held to be absolute, and he never found anyone who could overthrow it. Still, perfect liberty was allowed to others, and he claimed the like for himself.

As to "Of such is the kingdom of heaven,"—which Mr. H. is evidently anxious to explain away, the unbroken chain of evidence from Matthew xiii., containing the parables of the kingdom of heaven; then chap. xix., commanding the little ones to be received; on to Acts ii., where the actual admission took place, with the "promise to you and to your children;" the same word for children, too, as in 1 Cor. vii. 14, having been amply stated in replying to Paper III.—nothing further need be said here, save to remark that Mr. H. does not seem to have any definite idea of what the "kingdom of heaven," as a distinct entity on the *earth*, is. Much as he has been accustomed to slight them, Matthew xviii. and xix. are both most emphatically claimed to afford *as* distinct warrant from Christ for the reception of the little ones in connection with the "kingdom of heaven" *below* as it does as to the *salvation* of the little ones in con-

nection with heaven itself *above*, where their angels always behold the face of His Father. The same chapter that tells of the latter is equally explicit as to the former; and Mr. H.'s irrelevant disputation seems to us an evasion of his Saviour's plain words. Then to exclaim with reference to J. N. D. :—

“ ‘The Scripture will have infants received.’ Bold statement! But he never referred to the Scripture that will have it.”

is *cunning* in the extreme, because R. T. H. must be aware J. N. D. referred to Matthew xviii. 5 when he said “they that receive them receive Christ;” to Matthew xix., when he said “Of such is the kingdom of heaven;” and to 1 Cor. vii. 14, when he said “the child of a believing parent is holy.” Mr. H.'s reasoning is beside the mark. It is not a question of the *number* of infants, be it *all*, *many*, or *few*, over which he tries to stumble; but the positive fact that *infants as such* cannot be excluded, if Christ's instruction in these chapters is to be followed. Neither is it a question of *Christ receiving* (though that He did there and then, to signify His approval), but of Christ *instructing* His disciples *to receive* them into the kingdom of heaven that was to be set up after He was gone—*living* infants observe, for it never occurred to Him to ask His disciples to receive *dead* ones, and Mr. H.'s strictures here are little better than idle trifling. He next undertakes to show we are all sitting in darkness, declaring

“They all seem to confound ‘Of such is the kingdom of heaven’ (Matthew xix. 14) with ‘Theirs is the kingdom of heaven’ (Matthew v. 3). Two very different thoughts.”

They differ in this: that chap. v. refers to “the poor in spirit, and chap. xix. to the little ones; moreover, that “theirs” means *heirs* of the kingdom, while “of such” means *those* that *actually compose* it, so that the difference tells against R. T. H., not for him. One cannot help observing the irritation Mr. H.

seems to display at the very mention of the little ones. Is this the spirit of his Master? Are they ever so treated in Scripture?

But the construction put on a quotation from J. N. D. by F. G. P., is wholly inexcusable, especially as it was explained for him. It meant that our business is to bring *christians*, who are in the midst of a great baptized house, into the consciousness of their position as members of the body of Christ, as he might have seen in one of the letters from which he gave an extract, where J. N. D. says "What is special to brethren, so called, is the presence of the Holy Ghost, forming the unity of the body down here, and gathering saints into this unity *out* of the great baptized mass." To endeavour to make out, as Mr. H. does, that it was their position *in a great baptized house* (which J. N. D. considered it was his business to bring Christians into the consciousness of) is really too bad, and worse still to endeavour to put his statement on a par with Pusey's declaration, that "the first point is to get people to believe in their Baptism." Charity hopeth all things, but there is something about this way of dealing which one hesitates to pronounce upon, and must leave to the Searcher of hearts. Where does J. N. D. ever dream of having people "remember their place in a great baptized house," as Mr. H.'s perversion puts it?

The Symbolical Meaning of Baptism.

PAPER VIII.*

“WHAT IS BAPTISM THE SIGN OF?”

THIS is the keystone of R. T. H.'s baptismal arch, and when it falls the whole structure falls with it. That of which Baptism is the sign and symbol completely exposes the unscripturalness of his entire position. All unconscious of the utter baselessness of his foundation, he makes Baptism a sign of what the individual has already got on the one hand, and a symbol of being united to Christ on the other; not a trace of either of which is to be found in the Word of God. Never, in Scripture, is Baptism the token of what one has already possessed, but the individual, on the contrary, is invariably baptized in *view* of something. An unprejudiced mind has only to examine the passages that speak of it to be convinced of this. No doubt the bare announcement of such a fact so crosses the thoughts of many that they are staggered to hear it, because they have so long taken the opposite for granted without question; but it is a mistake, nevertheless, which the simple reading of the words will serve to correct.

To begin with the discipleship of Matt. xxviii., even there Baptism is *unto* something, not because they had something. It is “unto the *name*.” Then

*“Needed Truth,” Vol. V. pp. 272-278. Pamphlet, pp. 67-72.

if we take Mark xvi. 16, where it is not discipleship, but salvation—and this is the stronghold of the theory—what have we there? I know this scripture is constantly and triumphantly appealed to as if it settled the question for ever. Does it not say, “believe and be baptized”? I reply, No. It says no such thing! “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” is a very different thing from “he that believeth and is *saved* shall be baptized,” though that is how it would need to read to bear out the contention of R. T. H. Note well, it says “he that believeth and is baptized *shall be saved*”; accordingly, it is not because one *has* something, but in order to something, notwithstanding the confident way in which we hear it cited for the contrary. Again, if we pass to Acts ii. 38, that tells the same tale: “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive,” &c. It does not say, “Repent, and get the remission of sins, and then be baptized,” but, “Repent, and be baptized *for the* remission of sins,” not because they had it. Further, it is, “Ye *shall* receive,” not because ye *have* received. Go on to Acts viii. Simon Magnus was baptized; but Baptism could not, in his case, have been a sign of what he had already got, for Peter told him he was still in the “gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity.” We pass on to Acts xxii. 16, and Ananias says to Paul, “Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins;” not be baptized because they *have been* washed away. It is the same thing in the teaching of Paul himself, in Romans, Galatians and Colossians. “Know ye not, that as many of you as were baptized *unto* Jesus Christ were baptized *unto* His death.” (Rom. vi. 3.)* “Therefore we are buried by Baptism

*The Apostle is referring to the time when they were baptized, not to anything that took place previously. It was what they did then

unto death." (verse 4.) It was "buried *by* Baptism," not because they *had been* buried, and "unto death," not because they died before. "For as many of you as have been baptized unto Christ have put on Christ." (Gal. iii. 27.) They were not baptized, because they had already done it. The putting on Christ in figure and by profession was in the act of being baptized. "Buried with Him in Baptism." (Col. ii. 12.) Paul is teaching the spiritual significance of what took place when they were baptized, but the burial is *in* the Baptism, not because it had taken place before. The being baptized *professedly* meant burial with Him. Then if we examine the remaining passage in Peter it is the same thing. "The like figure whereunto Baptism *doth* also now *save* us" (or "you.") It is not what has saved. Noah did not pass through the flood because he had been saved from it; hence Baptism is the figure of what *saves*, not what *has saved*, and the "good conscience" is not *by* Baptism, but "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Thus, no matter where you look, the invariable testimony of God's word is, that Baptism is not the sign of what any one has got. According to Paul, by being literally buried in water, in Romans, it is dying, and in Colossians, it is dying and rising again in figure (allowing the

professedly of which he reminds them, and applies that to their conduct at the time he was writing. It is well known that many authorities translate the Greek preposition *eis* as "into" in place of "unto," but that relates to whether it is subjective or objective, and does not alter the fact that, be it "into" or "unto," it is not because of anything *already* received. To make it "into" would mean that the Baptism of water effected a vital connection between the baptized and Christ, which is Romanism or Puseyism; whereas "unto" is that to which one is brought, or with whom one is associated—profession. "Baptized unto Moses" shows the true meaning. Baptized *into* Moses would have no sense; still, whether into or unto, the reference is not in the institution to anything, or because of anything done to or in the individual *before*, but what occurs at his Baptism. Now, though R. T. H. does not believe in anything subjective in the ritualistic sense of saving efficacy in the rite itself, and hence very properly never quotes the Scriptures other than unto, yet, strange to say, he makes it subjective in another sense—that is, what the one baptized had previously been the subject of, which the Word of God nowhere states, but the contrary.

utmost it will bear), not the sign that one *had* died and risen. According to Peter, it is "for the remission of sins," "shall receive," and the figure of what *saves*, while, according to Ananias, it is the sign of *washing* away sins, not that they *had been*; of course, the passage does not mean sins before God, but before men. Thus, wherever the notion that Baptism is a sign of what the baptized had got came from, it certainly never came from Scripture. We search for it there in vain.

What Baptism Symbolises Spiritually

is all that now remains to be noticed. But nowhere is Mr. H. farther astray than here. For him Baptism is a sign or symbol of "United to Him in death, burial, and resurrection." (P. 68 Pamphlet; and last line, p. 273, Vol. V. "Needed Truth.") Now, the fact is, Baptism has no connection with union whatever, not even in symbol. It is the Holy Ghost that unites, and union is by a different Baptism than that of water. Hence there is no such thing in Scripture as united to Christ in death, or in burial, or in resurrection, strictly speaking. It is in *exaltation* we are united, and in that alone. There can be no *union* in the Scriptural sense, except to Christ *in glory*. It was from the *ascended* Christ the Holy Ghost was sent down, and it is "by One Spirit we are all baptized into one body." (1 Cor. xii. 13.) That is how *union proper* is effected; but Baptism with water has nothing whatever to do with that in figure, sign, or symbol. The Baptism of water introduces into the *profession* circle, and the Baptism of the Spirit into the *union* circle, as Eph. iv. and 1 Cor. xii. clearly show; but Mr. H. does not appear to have a correctly defined idea of either, and hence the confusion in his mind. He seems to have no notion at all of what Baptism of water does, and is wholly

wrong even as to what it signifies. The consequence is he judges J. N. D. from his own confused standpoint, and no wonder he is unable to perceive the force of what he says. Baptism is *actual* burial in *water*, but expresses dying and rising in *figure*. The individual dies and rises in *sign* in *view* of a Christ who died and rose. Therefore it is always according to the proper rendering, "unto"—"unto the name," "unto the remission of sins," "unto Christ," "unto death," "unto Moses." That is to say, it is without exception *objective* in relation to what it figures. Scripture never says

"Death and resurrection of the believer *in* Christ,"

as R. T. H. does. It invariably says "dead *with* Christ," or "risen *with* Christ," because Baptism with water goes no farther than "with"—that is, *association* at the most; it is never "in," and still less does it ever go the length of *union*. It is part *with* Christ in death or resurrection, but never reaches as far as part *of* Christ, which can only be of Him exalted. Part of Christ is union, but no one can become part of Christ except by the Holy Ghost to *indwell* him, for "he that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit." Were union assigned to its own distinctive place, and referred to the Baptism of the Spirit by which alone it can be brought to pass, would anyone think of coupling it with the baptism of water?

Mr. H. next objects to the statement

"Romans does not look at believers as risen with Christ at all."

The question of Infant Baptism has nothing to do with this. It is a matter of rightly or wrongly dividing the Word of Truth. Romans looks at the believer as *dead* with Christ, and as having *life* from *Christ* risen, but not as himself *risen with* Him. Colossians again looks at him as both dead *with* Christ

and risen *with* Christ, but *not* as *seated* in the heavenlies; whereas Ephesians looks at him as *co-seated* in the heavenlies *in* Christ Jesus. There is no attempt to rob anyone of resurrection, as Mr. H. strangely imagines, but he proves the very thing he is denying for all that, without apparently being aware of it. He calls out

“Surely Scripture is definite enough.”

Most certainly it is, but where does he go to get it? Could he find “risen with Christ” in Romans? No. He has to go to Colossians for it. “Buried with Him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God,” is not in Romans. Is this honest? He says:—

“Holding the Head we fully learn how incurably evil the flesh is;” but one has been unable to find the faintest inkling of what it is to “hold the Head, from whom all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God,” in all these articles from beginning to end, but plenty of what is virtually the denial of it.

We have gone over the whole of the Papers (the appendix not going beyond F. W. G. we leave alone), and what is the result? However unpalatable, we are obliged to state it. Mr. H. has not one thought on Baptism which will stand the test of Scripture. As to what Baptism *is* as the *initiatory* institution of Christianity, all is a blank. As to what it *does* as entrance into the “kingdom of heaven” and admission into the House, he seems to know nothing. As to making Baptism a question of *obedience* on the part of the baptized instead of the baptizer, he upsets Christianity in its very foundations. As to making it a question of *constitution*—that is, making it a reason for having a separate Meeting apart from other

Christians—it is like dividing Christ. As to what it is a sign of, making it a figure of what one has *got* instead of “*unto*” something, all is confusion; and making it a symbol of *union*, is to destroy all proper conception of the Church, which is His body. Yet he has committed himself to all this on black and white in his Pamphlet, and there is no escaping it.



CONCLUSION.

A TREATISE on Baptism not being our object, there are doubtless scriptures and scriptural principles connected directly and indirectly with the subject which we have left untouched, or merely touched upon. What we have sought is a simple answer to R. T. H. and his misconstructions of J. N. D.'s letters. Yet one desires to recognise whatever is to be seen of Christ in our brother. Our regret is that he should allow a question like Baptism to become as a coat of mail around him, preventing the entrance of other and better things which would bring blessing to his soul beyond what has entered into his heart to conceive. But the Lord knows best how to deal with us all. He never deviates from the purpose of His own heart with respect to us, and in patience we can possess our souls even as to one another.

Of course, in a certain sense, the contents of Mr. H.'s Pamphlet ought not to surprise us when we remember his connection, as one of its prominent leaders, with the "Needed Truth" movement, particularly since its true character is definitely and authentically learned from a tract called "Why I left the Open Brethren," which may be regarded as the virtual creed of this little party. The significance of both publications being issued from the office of "Needed Truth," evidently is that R. T. H.'s embodies what the tenets of that new departure are on Baptism, and T. M.'s what they are on the Church; and I introduce the latter here, because that tract defines

the place they give to Baptism in relation to any company which they can recognise as entitled to the name of "Church of God." It is there avowed:—

"A company which ignores and fights against the truth of God affords no ground for owning it as Church of God. There are companies holding, teaching, and practising unscriptural doctrines, such as the reception of unbaptized believers, &c."

which is, being interpreted, that anything which does not accept and act upon Baptism according to their views of it—as propounded in R. T. H.'s Pamphlet—cannot be considered as "Church of God." To state this is to manifest its unscripturalness. To hold separation from evil, moral, doctrinal, ecclesiastical, or practical, as an indispensable pre-requisite to any divine position, is right; but this is only *negative*. It is the *positive* place actually taken consequent thereon which is the essential point. Hence it becomes a very solemn matter to *set* up anything at all when "God *hath set* the members, every one of them, in *the* body (not in bodies) as it hath pleased Him." Our business is to own and act on what He hath *set*. Just think of the solemnity, in the face of this, of setting up or forming themselves into a company characterised by principles that make "Church of God" to depend on not receiving "unbaptized believers" in their sense of being unbaptized! They assume to have renounced the independency principle of gathering; but they have constituted themselves into a mere aggregation of "churches," which is neither one thing nor another; for if they give up independency, and at the same time refuse to act on the principle of body-unity, where are they? It is a mere congregational unionism of their particular Gatherings. They do not really believe in *the* Church in a city as found in Scripture at all, but in a concert of *Churches*. *The* Church in a city in Apostolic times, being one body in the place, of course, acted *as* one body; for, how could there be

two bodies of Christ representatively in one place? Those who meet on the same *principle* to-day ought certainly to act on that principle in a city; but the "Needed Truth" party repudiate any such principle. The consequence is, all the Meetings belonging to their "fellowship" in a town or city within a certain radius become affiliated, and a central oversight is established which arranges and transacts everything on behalf of all the Gatherings within the bounds of its jurisdiction as contrasted with each meeting being independently on its own responsibility, as formerly. Is there anything in all this expressive of the *intimacy* of relation and mutual *dependency* characteristic of the articulated parts of the One New Man—Christ and the Church? That there may be no mistake, let me give their own definition:—

"The Church of God in any city can only be the totality of believers or companies who are in subjection to the Lord's authority, *even as the same is exercised through the overseers.*"

[The italics are mine.] This is surely clericalism with a vengeance! Besides, how can they profess honestly to have given up independency and yet remain independent of those who had all through refused independent principles during the very time, too, they were supporting and defending them? No true answer can be given to this which will not reveal a sectarian position. Nor can they go so far without going farther to be consistent; because, as they now stand, they are as *neutral* as ever they were. They seem to found a great deal on "continuing steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine;" but how can they continue steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine *about the Church* till they know it? Was it revealed or even known in the second chapter of Acts? It was not. One looks in vain for the shadow of a trace of any Scriptural conception from cover to cover of this tract regarding the Church as taught by Paul. It is

all about the *churches* of God, *their* constitution, reception into *them*, order in *them*, oversight over *them*, discipline in *them*, and fellowship between *them*. Now, there is not a word about churches when we speak of the Church, nor does the Church of God consist of a union of churches. The very idea of *the* Church as revealed by Paul is lost in all this, because it makes saints members of *their* churches and *their* fellowship, and even if they miscall them "churches of God," that does not alter the fact. Whereas there is no such thing in Scripture as members of *the* Church, much less members of *a* Church, but "members of Christ," "members of His body," "members one of another." Hence Paul does not ask, Is the Church divided? but, "Is *Christ* divided?" because the only kind of members he recognised meant limbs—like a hand or foot. The Church of God's Word does not consist of a collection of churches, but of persons united to Christ and to each other, constituting a unity like the human body, and so intimately part of Christ that it is something He nourishes and cherishes as His own flesh. But according to them, no one can get into the Church of God at any place except by becoming a member of one of *their* churches and entering *their* fellowship. According to Scripture, on the other hand, the Church at any place was merely a matter of locality, consisting of that part of the whole who might happen to live there, and whose gathering together was not in order to be the Church of God in that town, but because they already belonged to the Church,—the body, which is "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all," and neither had, nor could have, any Church standing apart from the whole as a whole. The Church of God at Corinth, for example, represented at Corinth that one and only unity of all true Christians, not churches, baptized into one body by one Spirit, which was not

confined to Corinth, but in every place. But these rash and uninstructed men say the Church of God at any place consists not of all who are united to Christ there, but of the aggregate of the "Needed Truth" party Meetings in a given locality. Could anything be more false than this? It denies the very testimony to the state of ruin which God has called us at the present moment to render, and is neither the Table of the Lord nor God's Assembly, because it is not *true* to start with. *The Church of God* at any place to-day includes all the saints of God there, the *ungathered* as well as the gathered (in the technical sense). Consequently for any fraction of them to pretend to be *the Church* in a town would simply be adding another to the too many sects already existing. There was only one kind or *way* of meeting, not only at Corinth, but everywhere, in Paul's day, and that was as "the body of Christ and members in particular." Their being gathered together expressed what they were in common with all the other members, and we must have that in *principle* or nothing; but we could not presume to be the *whole* in any place when we know we are only a small part. Nevertheless, though *not* the whole, yet on the *principle*, of the whole, even two or three can give a *true*, if incomplete, *expression* of the Church of God, embracing in their thoughts all who ought to be, but are not, there as well as themselves. Such, though not *the Church of God* in any place, would be alone those who gather on and express, the *principle* of its unity. But we are told

"The expression 'Church of God' is solely and only applied to a local church."

Has this brother ever read 1 Cor. x. 32: "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to *the Church of God*"? What locality is that? Is not that the Church on earth—the very thing

he is likewise denying? We have here the three classes into which the whole habitable world is divided—the Jews, the Gentiles, and the Church of God. Moreover, this chapter gives us the way in which each of these three classes expresses its *fellowship*. The Gentile, or heathen, by partaking of what was offered to idols; the Jew, by partaking of the altar; and the Church of God, by partaking of the one loaf. Now, What did the one loaf mean? Not only His literal body *given* for us, but His mystical body—“*For* we being many are one bread, one body.” We *remember* Him in death where He *was* as the fellowship of His *literal* body, but we *express* what we *are* as to the fellowship of His *mystical* body. Such was the reason, ground, or principle of the fellowship of what Paul called “the Church of God,” and there is no other way recognised in His Word of expressing true *Church* fellowship except that. “The fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord,” so constantly misapplied in T. M.’s tract, is *sonship-fellowship*, “the fellowship of His *Son*,” is calling not union “*called* into fellowship,” and hence it is *individual*, not corporate, though the called ones and the sons are members of the body as well. It is something into which the *saints* individually are brought by the *call* of God, not by addition to Churches, nor is it even if we are faithful; but the blessed fact that “God is faithful by whom ye were called into the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.” What, then, is one to think of the absurdity of the following?

“We can only recognise as in the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord those who have been added to the Churches of God.”

Remember, for them, “Churches of God” mean “Needed Truth” party Meetings. But worse than

all, the claim is verily set up that a letter addressed to *the* Church of God at their city or town ought to go to *them*; a very serious thing, because it makes any set of Christians who could get themselves, not merely to *think*, but *say*, they are *the* Church of God at any place in the present scattered condition of God's people, a testimony to a lie instead of to the truth. By all means, act on the *principle* of *the* Church of God, and refuse everything but that; but for a mere handful of the Christians in any place to pretend to *be* it, and arrogate to themselves the sole right to the title of *the* Church of God there, is a silly and delusive assumption of such an unconscionable description that it cannot fail to open eyes to its palpable falsity, and in connection therewith, as R. T. H.'s own course sadly proves, our Lord's words are sure to be verified:

“He that gathereth not WITH ME scattereth.”

Auburn,

Melbourne.

