

REVIEW OF EDITOR'S COMMENTS.

Editor Messenger.—In your comments on my article, published in the 20th No. of your paper, you make the following statement: "to make the concession that immersion is baptism is, in our view of the premises, yielding the entire point in controversy."

Did I believe the sentiments of Alexander Campbell true, I should wish myself glory in immersion as the great medium of salvation. "Agreed, will Mr. H. follow our example, and give us witnesses who can not be impeached on the score of partiality to their own practice?"

But the truth is, you misrepresent, or misunderstand your witnesses, and make them say what they never believed nor ever intended to say, viz. that immersion alone is scriptural baptism.

It was only to show up that man who washed his hands by sprinkling them," so says the editor. Now I will furnish you another man who washed the priests in the same way, that is by sprinkling water upon them.

In a former communication I called upon the editor to produce one historian or commentator who speaks of his present mode of baptism, previous to the reformation, "that is, a single dip, back foremost with clothes on."

We are pleased to see that Mr. Henderson, returns to the investigation with the apparent purpose of redeeming lost times. Pedo-baptists who read the above "Review" will, we predict, regret that Mr. H. did not let the matter drop where it was; for they can not fail to recognize the weakness of the attack, the evident discomforture with which he begins, and the laborious effort with which he toils through to the conclusion.

Then follows the charge against us, that we "glory in immersion as the great medium of salvation." We deny most positively, that we have uttered by tongue or pen, in the state of Oregon, a word or syllable, to justify such a charge.

Does going down into the water, and coming out of it prove that one of the parties went under it and the other did not? If this is the kind of logic used by the President of a College, what may we not expect from a common man? It certainly proves nothing that is in controversy—the editor as usual simply assumes the question in debate, and then argues from his own assumption.

I have seen persons go down into the water, receive baptism, come up out of it and none of the party went under it.

"Whole armies of men, in crossing streams, have gone down into the water and come up out of it again and not one of them went under it."

I consider that my challenge stands unanswered, and unanswerable—and repeat it, with emphasis, at this point. "Produce one historian or commentator who speaks of your present mode of baptism being administered previous to the reformation by Luther; that is, a single dip, back foremost, with clothes on."

I now come to a very serious charge against those who baptize by sprinkling: "And it has nestled as a cancer worm at the very core of the church, not only blighting and withering by its own activity, but showing itself the prolific parent of other hurtful issues, which divide those who otherwise would be joined together."

This charge against Pedo Baptists comes with a poor grace from one who is an active, leading member of a very small sect, born in the nineteenth century, of the strife, contention, divisions and heresies its own parents had originated; and like another young Ishmael, its hand has been against every man from its birth to the present time.

Even Alexander Campbell and Barton W. Stone, the father and mother, so to speak, of the so-called Christian Church were educated, trained and converted (if they ever experienced that happy change) in a Pedo-Baptist church—they were in debt for about all they were, except their heresies, to the Presbyterian Church.

For a small sect, not yet fifty years old, composed of fragments from different churches, notorious for its proselyting spirit, calling itself the Christian Church, to complain of divisions by others is presumptuous in a high degree.

In questioning the different modes of baptizing your types make me use the word "wringing" where it should have been "running."

In last week's issue, we expressed some concern at the unceremonious manner in which, we supposed, our correspondents had left us.

We are pleased to see that Mr. Henderson, returns to the investigation with the apparent purpose of redeeming lost times. Pedo-baptists who read the above "Review" will, we predict, regret that Mr. H. did not let the matter drop where it was; for they can not fail to recognize the weakness of the attack, the evident discomforture with which he begins, and the laborious effort with which he toils through to the conclusion.

We fail to see any thing in his first quotation from which the conclusion is warranted, that in our view, "It is a matter of no consequence whether baptism be administered in accordance with Bible teaching or not, so that it includes immersion." It is our zeal for Bible teaching that makes us insist on baptism, instead of sprinkling and pouring.

Then follows the charge against us, that we "glory in immersion as the great medium of salvation." We deny most positively, that we have uttered by tongue or pen, in the state of Oregon, a word or syllable, to justify such a charge.

We have never represented baptism as a cause—but only a condition of pardon. Nor have we limited the power of God to this condition; we insist, however, that the scriptures do not authorize the church to offer any other conditions of pardon, than faith, repentance, confession and baptism.

We said in a former article that we never made our witnesses say that "immersion alone was scriptural baptism." This would have made of them Baptists and diminished the weight of their testimony in as much as they would have been regarded "as interested witnesses. We neither misrepresents and them, misrepresents them, nor charge them, even by implication, with hypocrisy, or want of piety. No one of them thought or believed that immersion alone was valid baptism.

The unfortunate and false assumption

that the bible teaches modes of baptism, was the will-o'-the-wisp that led them into the practice of sprinkling and pouring as more convenient than immersion, while as candid men, they did not dare to deny that immersion was a valid rendering of baptizo. This assumption, that lies at the very foundation of sprinkling and pouring, has absolutely no warrant in the scriptures. "A mode of baptism" is not once named in the Bible. And even Mr. Henderson has failed to show that it is necessarily implied either in the word itself or in the practice of the apostles or christians of early ages.

This we take to be a challenge to perform an impossibility.

How could a pedobaptist make any such concession.

The very statement would prove that he was not a pedo-baptist. Must, we repeat a second, and a third, time that we never intimated that they said immersion alone was baptism. We appeal to them as honest men to say whether immersion is not the primary meaning of the Greek word baptizo. They respond in the affirmative—they dare not do otherwise and hope to preserve their reputation, as men of learning and candor. As they are honest men, they believe there are "modes" of baptism, and that any one of several modes is alike valid.

Will Mr. Henderson please turn to the viii Chapter of Numbers, read it through and say candidly whether there is in it this sentence, "Moses brought Aaron and his sons and washed them with water?" This language does not occur in connection with the quotation from Numbers, and if it did it could not be shown how the washing was performed by the expression, "Sprinkle water of purification upon them." Water of purification was too precious and sacred to be used in washing any thing. Does not Mr. Henderson know that this was a legal purification that was secured by sprinkling pure water, or the water of purification. They were to wash there close will Mr. H. hazard even an opinion, that they washed them in the water of purification, or that they sprinkled this sacred preparation on their clothes to cleanse them from dirt?

The call on us to produce one historian or commentator who speaks of the present mode of baptism, is simply calling on us to produce one man who speaks of that which does not now exist in the Bible nor ever did—a mode of baptism. How then, could any man speak of that which had no existence as a divine ordinance? My reply, in a former number, waited this fallacy in the challenge; because it was easy to produce a number of early historians who described immersion as the action of baptism with greater minuteness and precision than any other action of equal antiquity ever was described; the legal details of the Mosaic law, only excepted.

Mr. Henderson is greatly exercised over the assumptions and false logic of a "President of a College" yet who so ignorant as not to see that all this muddying the water is to conceal a little sophistry which follows immediately. "I have seen persons go down into the water, receive baptism, come up out of it and none of the party went under it." How, baptized, Mr. Henderson? By sprinkling or pouring, do you answer? That is the very question in controversy. Now what of assumptions? Not only the President of a college, but even a Theologian will some times use doubtless logic! That argument about armies crossing streams, we met fully in a former number.

Mr. Henderson speaks of us as a "member of a very small sect." We ask for the proof of this charge, which we regard as of the very gravest character. The rebuke tendered us for speaking of "Partizan Churches," was coupled with friendly suggestions, that we should avoid offensive epithets, &c. Certainly there was nothing in what we said, half so offensive to good taste, as the sneer implied in the "very small sect" in the above quotation.

The ebullition of feeling in the close of the above review, will be construed by many to arise from conscious defeat, or from the smarting caused by the unwilling recognition of the truth of the paragraph complained of.

It is a crime to point out to a friend an error in which he is involved, to show him the unpleasant consequences of that error, and to ask him to walk in the light of Bible truth which makes for peace? We are grieved when that friend yields to passion; grows indignant and suffers his feelings to betray him into

an effort to heap reproach on the church of Christ by calling it a "very small sect," composed of fragments from different churches, notorious for its proselyting spirit, &c.

The gratuitous and unwarranted attack, certainly not provoked by anything we have said in these comments, against Alexander Campbell, and Barton W. Stone, is peculiarly unfortunate, since there is no argument in the unlovely connection in which their names are placed, nor can such allusions to men, venerable and distinguished for learning and moral worth, promote the great cause of Christian union.

We have in no instance, in these comments, or elsewhere, called in question the learning, candor, piety, or moral worth of any pedo-baptist denomination in the land. That they are in error in the matter of baptism is with us beyond a doubt; and that that error is hurtful—even ruinous to the peace and harmony of God's children, we are equally certain. We have said so frankly, and sustained our position with arguments, which Mr. Henderson has failed to meet.

A brief recapitulation, not of arguments, but of points made, will show how we stand: In a report made by Mr. Henderson to the Congregational Association of Oregon, he used the following language, which is worthy to be written in letters of gold:—

Now, could the strength of Zion be concentrated, and harmonious action generally secured, it would tell in happy results upon the great Gospel field. The idea of a general Christian union, upon the creed or confession of faith of any sect or denomination how extant, is not to be expected. There is no one basis upon which we can unite—that is, upon those articles of faith that all orthodox Christians endorse, and under the one name, Christians. Upon this platform, and upon one other, can all who love Jesus unite, with honor and profit to themselves, and advantage to the cause. Where is the Christian that cannot consistently meet us upon this foundation?

We copied and endorsed much of this report, and called attention to the fact that we recognized no name but "CHRISTIANS." That the churches organized by us took no name, but "the Church of Christ," "The Church of God," that we took the Bible alone as our rule of faith and practice; and that we held as conditions of union and fellowship, those principles recognized by all orthodox christians. To these comments, Mr. Henderson replied, taking issue with us on the subject of baptism; denying that all orthodox christians recognized immersion as scriptural baptism. This led to an investigation, in which Mr. Henderson was constrained to make the admission that pedo-baptists "tolerated it as a concession to ignorance." Here we might have stopped the investigation; for this concession placed them in a position from which the desired union could be reached by prompt action on their part.

Mr. H. then brought against us the charge of baptismal regeneration. This he utterly failed to sustain, for the simple reason that we never believed, taught or practiced it. Mr. Henderson had very naturally fallen into this error from the different extension given to the word, "baptize" by us, and by those who have opposed us.

With us, immersion must be preceded by faith, repentance and confession, to give it any value as a religious rite.

Nothing less than this is Christian immersion, with us; while others, opposing us, look only to the single act of immersion without reference to the qualification of the subject. That such an act is utterly worthless, we may well concede; and yet claim for baptism all that we ask when coupled with faith unfeigned, repentance unto life, and a confession with the mouth of what is believed in the heart—that Jesus is the Christ of God.

As we have come to the one Lord and the one faith, let us come to the one baptism, and preserve the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

We are reassured in our position and strengthened in the conviction that we occupy the only common ground on which all the children of God can stand together and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. To this end, we labor, for this consummation we pray!

PREMIUMS.

The following note from our popular lawyer of Buena Vista, explains itself, we predict that there will be rustling of leaves in grammar and lexicon, on the part of three young gentlemen and two young ladies, for these premiums and the honor of securing them.

PROF. T. F. CAMPBELL, Dear Sir:—I take a lively interest in the classics, with your permission, I beg to offer the works of Tacitus, (Germania and Agricola,) as a premium, to the advanced Latin class in your institution. The prize to be given for either the best Latin prose composition of about twenty lines, or the rendition of the first ode, first book of Horace, into English verse. The translator to have in view the correct rendering of the text.

Respectfully yours, JOHN J. DALY.

Buena Vista, May 24, 1871.

The five great powers: Love, money, ambition, revenge and a good dinner.

The Rev. Dr. Luther E. Albert asked the following pointed question in the Lullwater Observer: "Would it not be well to give up, at least for a season, our disputes about differences, and lend our entire energy towards the extension of Christ's kingdom throughout the world? The diversions might be more favorable in the end for parity of doctrine, as well as practice, than those discussions which are frequently stepped more in our own spirit than in the spirit of Christ."

Upon the bell in the Episcopal church in Newtown is the inscription:—"I to the church the living call, and to the grave do summon all."

NEW THIS WEEK.

HIMES & BACHELDER, Book & Job Printers, 93-93 Front Street, Portland, Oregon.

R. R. PARRISH, Harness and Saddle Maker, Independence, Oregon.

Mexican Saddles, Brides, Bits, Reins, Spurs, Whips, Lashes, Martingales, Collars, Ladies' Saddles, Horse Brushes, Patent Leather, Curryscombs, Cinchas, Chamis, Fkins, Tacks, Copper Rivets, Cards, Rawhides, Straps, Enamelled Duck, etc.

Frank Cook, BOOKBINDER AND Blank Book Manufacturer, SALEM, OREGON.

Christian Hymnal! H. D. BOON, Bookseller and Stationer, COMMERCIAL STREET, SALEM.

Agents also Wanted for the "Pacific Law Encyclopedia," THE BEST LAW BOOK OUT!

By J. F. COWDERY, Of the San Francisco Bar.

Reduced Rates of Ferriage OF THE SALEM STEAM FERRY.

For each span horse and wagon, additional animal, horse and buggy, five crossing, paid in advance, man and horse, six paid in advance, loose animal, twelve crossing, paid in advance, loose, paid in advance, loss of property of goods.

By J. W. SMITH, Capt. Salem Steam Ferry.

Stoves and Tinware!

S. L. FENNER & CO., Cook, Parlor, And Box Stoves

EVER BROUGHT TO POLK COUNTY, AND AT PRICES AS LOW AS ANY PLACE THIS SIDE OF SAN FRANCISCO

WE ARE ALSO PREPARED TO DO JOB WORK OF ALL KINDS, IN A FIRST-CLASS MANNER.

COUNTRY MERCHANTS FURNISHED AT THE LOWEST WHOLESALE RATES.

THE PUBLIC ARE INVITED TO CALL AND EXAMINE BEFORE GOING ELSEWHERE.

N. B.—ALL REPAIRING AND JOB WORK done with neatness and dispatch as I am a Practical Workman myself.

Independence, March 27, 1871.

THE MOST POPULAR MEDICINE EXTANT

OVER THIRTY YEARS

Perry Davis' PAIN KILLER.

Physicians of the first respectability recommend it as a most effective preparation for the extinction of pain.

It is sold in almost every country in the world and is becoming more and more popular every year.

Its healing properties have been fully tested, all over the world, and it need only be known to be prized.

Sold by all Druggists.

Reduced Rates of Ferriage OF THE SALEM STEAM FERRY.

For each span horse and wagon, additional animal, horse and buggy, five crossing, paid in advance, man and horse, six paid in advance, loose animal, twelve crossing, paid in advance, loose, paid in advance, loss of property of goods.

By J. W. SMITH, Capt. Salem Steam Ferry.