

their preachers; some were for Paul, some for Apollos, some for Cephas, and some for Christ. Hence he asked, "Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were ye baptized into the name of Paul?" He was glad that under these circumstances that he had baptized no more of *that church* lest they might claim that they had been baptized into his name and should therefore be called Paulites. He showed that in order to be Paulites they must be baptized into the name of Paul; to be Apollosites they must be baptized into the name of Apollos; and in order to be Christians they must be baptized into the name of Christ.

Hence, as they had all been baptized into Christ alone and could not get into him without baptism, they should, instead of being divided as they were, be simply *Christians*. The passage asserts nothing of his baptizing elsewhere, for it is evident that Paul and Silas baptized Lydia and her household, and the jailer and his household; and the fact that it was done immediately shows that they did not regard it as a "non essential."

It seems to us if the idea that Paul was not sent to baptize at all is correct, that it more strongly favors baptism for the remission of sins than it mitigates against it; for in that case we can assign no reason why the apostle would violate his charge in baptizing any one unless he felt that baptism was so very important that it was perilous to leave them unbaptized, and hence concluded to attend to it any way. It is our opinion that a cause which is driven to such objections as this, is a lost one indeed.

#### AN UNNECESSARY ACT.

One afternoon recently we had occasion to immerse a young lady in the canal in the city of Albany, during the administration of which a certain Professor of the Presbyterian order who does not live in Arizona nor in Philadelphia happened to be present. As reported to us, this Prof. allowed himself to indulge in the remark, in the presence of a company, some of which were not church members, that he regarded that as a "very cruel and unnecessary act." This is the opinion of one man, and we grant to every man, however humble, the right to hold and freely express his opinion on this as well as on all other questions of interest to the people; but at the

same time we have an idea that a due regard for the *time and place* of expressing *some* opinions is a matter of some consequence which should not be too lightly passed over. It would occur to most well-bred people that a fair degree of Christian courtesy and a due respect for the *belief of others* regarding sacred things would lead a man of standing to refrain from remarks like the above on such solemn occasions—especially in the presence of others, some of whom have feelings to respect and others who are likely to be influenced by it. To say the very least of it, it is not an infallible evidence of that high degree of mental and spiritual culture which are so highly prized by the truly educated and professional class of men. It is a reckless disregard of the propriety of things which we feel it our duty, in self defense, to rebuke. Yet we pen our protest with no sense of ill feeling towards any one; they have the same opportunity to be heard.

But is immersion a "cruel and unnecessary act?" Such a statement contradicts the experience of eighteen hundred years, is contrary to all enlightened reason and an insult to the scholarship of the world. Did our Savior submit to and command an act of cruelty! and did the apostles and primitive Christians practice that which was cruel and unnecessary! If Christ or his apostles ever commanded anything for baptism except immersion, will some one tell us where to find it? Will our Prof. sacrifice his scholarship on translating the Greek word *baptizo* sprinkle or pour? Or will he tell us of a respectable Greek scholar in the world who would risk his reputation on such a translation? Or has he examined this question at

all? Imagine this Prof., or any one else in the State of Oregon or elsewhere, going to the blackboard before an intelligent class of young gentlemen in the Greek language with an original copy of Aristotle, Plutarch, Polybius, Strabo, Diodorus, Parphyry, Themistius, or any other work of note, in his hand and deliberately writing down sprinkle or pour as a translation of *baptizo*! Let him commence with the earliest age of Greek literature and trace it down to its close, a period of about two thousand years, and he can not find an example in which the word is used in the sense of sprinkle or pour. We have before us a book

entitled "Baptizein," by T. J. Conant, D.D., one of the finest scholars in America, in which he has collected examples of the use of this word from every period of Greek literature in which it occurs, and these, he says, with the examples added from his own reading, exhausts the use of the word in Greek literature. Then in summing the whole matter, he says: "From the preceding examples it appears, that the ground idea expressed by this word is, *to put into or under water* (or other penetrable substance), so as entirely to *immerse or submerge*; that this act is always expressed in the literal application of the word, and is the basis of its metaphorical uses.

This ground idea is expressed in English, in the various connections where the word occurs, by the terms (synonymous in this ground element) *to immerse, immerge, submerge, to dip, to plunge, to imbath, to whelm*. These examples are drawn from writers in almost every department of literature and science; from poets, rhetoricians, philosophers, critics, historians, geographers; from writers on husbandry, on medicine, on natural history, on grammar, on theology; from almost every form and style of composition, romances, epistles, orations; fables, odes, epigrams, sermons, narratives; from writers of various nations and religions, Pagan, Jew and Christian, belonging to many different countries, and through a long succession of ages." With these facts before him, and not an intimation of sprinkling and pouring in the New Testament, how any one can conscientiously say immersion is a "cruel and unnecessary act," is more than we can comprehend.

John Calvin says: "The word *baptize* signifies to immerse, and the rite of immersion was practiced by the ancient church." Prof. Moses Stuart, a celebrated Presbyterian critic, says: "*Bapto* and *baptizo* mean to dip, plunge, or immerse into any thing liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this." Mr. Braner, a noted Roman Catholic writer, after investigating the original authorities, and in summing up the whole matter, says: "Thirteen hundred years was baptism generally and regularly on immersion of the person under the water, and only in extraordinary cases a sprinkling or pouring with water; the latter was, moreover, disputed

as a mode of baptism, nay even forbidden." There is not a case of sprinkling or pouring on record before that of Novatian, a Roman Catholic, in the year 251 after Christ, and that was not regarded as a valid baptism by his own Church. So we conclude with the words of Alexander Campbell, written more than thirty years ago, which have never been answered to this day, and we believe never can be, namely: "Sprinkling or pouring mere water on any person or thing for any moral, ceremonial, or religious use, was never done by the authority of God since the world began."

Though the subject has scarcely been introduced, here we are willing for the matter to rest for the present.

#### Missionary Column.

##### MISSIONARY BOARD.

##### Church of Christ in Oregon.

W. H. Adams, Portland..... President.  
Leo. Willis, Salem..... Vice-President.  
Mrs. Belle P. Walker, Forest Grove, Rec. Sec.  
I. G. Davidson, Portland..... Treasurer.  
J. W. Spriggs, Salem..... Cor. Secretary.

All communications relating to the employment of evangelists, protracted meetings, cooperation in securing pastoral work, etc. all pledges of assistance with requests for the same, and all business properly coming before the Board will be addressed to the Cor. Secretary. All collections, payments of pledges, etc., will be addressed to the Treasurer.

SALEM, OR., Feb. 16, 1884.

##### Editor Herald:

Please say to the churches that are contributing to the State Missionary fund, that it is very desirable that we have prompt payment on pledges so that we may be able to meet all obligations.

After the State Evangelist fulfills his six month's engagement, which will be about the first of April, it is the intention of the Board after providing for all obligations, to employ our own home preachers to work where it is needed, to the extent that our income will justify.

It is thought best to leave the engagement of a State Evangelist until the State Meeting in June. We can then get the direct sentiment of the brethren. Let it be remembered however that Bro. Cheetham stops work at the end of his engagement by his own request.

J. W. SPRIGGS, Cor. Sec.

A man should never be ashamed to own he has been in the wrong, which is but saying, in other words, that he is wiser to-day than he was yesterday.—Pope.