

clude these, why is it essential to suppose that it necessarily excludes baptism? We demur to that method of reasoning which leaves the Word of God in hopeless confusion. But we are told that remission of sins is promised to faith as the only condition, and Acts x. 43 is quoted in proof. Now it is not stated here that faith is the only condition. Undoubtedly remission cannot depend on less than this, but it may depend on more. It is not even said that whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins, without adding "*Through His name.*" This important phrase is often overlooked, as if it were not in the text. The believer receives remission of sins **THROUGH HIS NAME.** Let us now put this statement by the side of Acts ii. 38:—"Repent and be baptized every one of you in the **NAME** of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," &c., and we readily see how the believing penitent receives remission of sins *through His NAME.* Evidently baptism brings him to that **NAME** whereby we are said to be saved. (Acts iv. 12.) It is furthermore evident that there is no antagonism between these two passages. Acts ii. 38 is in perfect harmony with Acts x. 43. One is really the explanation of the other, because a fuller statement of practically the same thing. Hence we should not allow some foolishly extreme sacramental notions of baptism to crowd this Divine ordinance out of its proper place. What is generally understood by Baptismal Regeneration is a dangerous heresy, and should be earnestly repudiated by all Christians, but repentance and baptism *in the name of Jesus Christ* is in order to the remission of sins. At least that is what the Apostle Peter taught at Pentecost, and we have already seen that he taught practically the same thing at the house of Cornelius. Not only did he tell these Gentiles that "*through His name*, whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins," but he concludes by "*commanding them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.*" Surely nothing could be clearer than the teaching of Peter on this subject. Is his teaching authoritative now? If not, why not? But if it is, what becomes of many modern methods of evangelising? We hope our readers will prayerfully reconsider this whole matter, and act as becometh those who must render an account to God for the light which they have.—*Christian Commonwealth.*

Correspondence.

Letter from Japan.

YOKOHAMA, JAPAN,
Feb. 1, 1884.

Dear Brother:

Your Japan missionaries are all well. Since our last report we have been studying the language steadily. There is no doubt about its difficulties. To read the books and papers in this country one must know a great deal of Chinese and it is not very easy!! The Japanese are rather a practical people in their dealings with foreigners. This characteristic of theirs has been illustrated by the story of the boy sucking the juice from and throwing the rest away. They use the foreigners and then drop them. A few years ago the Japanese thought to take the good of Christianity and reject the bad received with it, accordingly they petitioned the missionaries for one church in Japan. The missionaries were not possessed of the article, and though they met, and being exceedingly kind, tried to grant their request, they were not able to do so. A few days since an old missionary said ten years after the missionaries leave, Japan will have one Protestant church. The history of baptize has been rather curious here. It was much desired that one translation of the Bible be circulated in this country. *Baptize* was the only word to make any one think there might be two. Some wanted to follow King Jesus' orders and preach the gospel to every creature believing that the preaching included having the word understood, thus authorizing the use of the hearer's vernacular; others wanted practically to follow King James' orders and leave one word of the gospel in Greek. One Baptist was of the Translation Committee at first, but he withdrew. An offer was made to use the word *senrei* (washing ordinance) which did not satisfy Dr. N. Brown, the Baptist. Brother Gable, who spent nearly thirty years in Japan, says *senrei* means *laundry ordinance*! The committee's version has baptize as a noun always, and administers it. Dr. Brown translates the word into Japanese. When the question of union was brought up an offer was made to let the Episcopalians lay their hands on the preachers' heads, the offer was respectfully declined. The reports from the missionaries here give an increase of about forty per cent. in the last

year. Some churches report the children sprinkled. A Korean in Tokio is translating the Scriptures from Japanese into his tongue. About six weeks ago we met a reclaimed Englishman; he was raised as a Catholic. On the 16th of January he was immersed in the waters of the Bay. To-day has been appointed for the immersion of his wife, a Chinese Christian who has been sprinkled with water.

We pray that grace, mercy and peace may be with the brethren at home.

CHAS. E. GARST.

Letter from F. D. Holman.

NEAR McMINNVILLE, OR.,

Feb. 25, 1884.

Dear Herald:

After an absence of many years I am sitting in full view of the verdurous hills whose beauty enchanted the vision of my childhood, and gave inspiration to youthful hope.

I left Seattle, W. T., Friday morning of the 15th inst., having attended a soul-stirring meeting in our little church the night previous, at which meeting we had the pleasure of receiving into membership one brother and three sisters. It is always painful to part from those we love, but truly the parting from the brethren at Seattle was an occasion of unusual trial. Although my stay there was brief I had learned to love the church there very much. While their membership is yet small (I think just forty), and while financially they are weak, they are strong in faith, and abound in good works; and in the language of Bro. Durham I take this method of extending to them and to Bro. Durham our

I had the pleasure of speaking yesterday to the brethren and friends of the olden times at McMinnville, among whom I recognized the familiar face of Bro. Wm. Dawson, a comrade of mine in crossing the plains in 1845, as also many others dear to me. I have learned but little of the spiritual status of the congregation at this place, but from the profound attention on yesterday, and their seeming interest in Bro. Cheatham's arrival, I infer the fire is not extinct, and only needs a little judicious fanning in order to secure a lively flame. I have large faith in the brotherhood of grand old Yamhill. No place such as McMinnville can afford to remain long without

regular preaching. I was present also at their Sunday-school yesterday afternoon, which, under the efficient management of Bro. Collin Wallace, is a model Sunday-school. Notwithstanding the unsettled state of the weather, and the sickness of many, consequent upon the same, there were present 101 persons. The teacher of the Bible class was absent, but was lead by our venerable Bro. Jonathan Todd. I expect to attend the protracted meeting here, beginning next Saturday afternoon, and will take pleasure in advising you from time to time of its progress, &c.

Fraternally yours,

F. D. HOLMAN.

Letter from Bro. E. A. Shirley.

PLEASANT FLAT, W. T.,

Feb. 14, 1884.

Editor Herald:

Allow me through the columns of the HERALD to state to its many readers that about eighteen months ago I became afflicted with a cancer on my neck, just back of my right ear. For the first six months I doubted its being a cancer; but having it examined by different physicians, they all pronounced it rose cancer, and in Dec., 1882, I was persuaded to have it cut out, but the operation only caused the disease to spread and grow more rapidly until it became so painful that for hours, both day and night, I could do nothing but walk the floor in almost unendurable agony. I was told by friends that the China doctor at Dayton, W. T., was a successful cancer doctor, I at once went to Dayton and remained under his treatment for about two months, only to return home no better.

All hopes had almost failed, when Dr. Jacob Fees was recommended as a sure cure for cancer. By the earnest request of my wife we went to see him, and after being under his treatment one week I was quite confident he would effect a cure. It has now been about four months since I went to Dr. Fees, and I have been well over two months. The cancer is entirely gone, nothing but a slight scar remains, where so short a time ago the cancer with its aches and pains was constantly gnawing and tearing my life away.

I would recommend any and all persons suffering with cancer where it is not of too long standing to go to Dr. Fees without delay. I assure you he knows his business