

These would never have been thought of but for the idea that the convert's soul was imperiled if nothing by way of baptism was administered.

In ancient and earlier mediæval art the candidate for baptism is represented as standing waist deep in water to be immersed. That immersion was the ordinary baptism of the earlier middle ages is shown by the existence of the magnificent baptisteries of St. John Lateran, Florence, Pisa, and other cathedrals of Southern Europe, great structures containing pools, where large numbers could be immersed at one time.

Cyprian argued for the use of affusion only in cases of necessity. No one in his day proposed that immersion should be entirely set aside in its favor; no one dreamed that such a thing would ever come to pass. Though affusion was claimed to be allowable in case of severe emergency, it was not considered an orderly baptism. Those who had received it were spoken of as Clinics, as those who had received merely a sick-room baptism, and at first they were considered incompetent to hold the higher offices in the Church.

A synod in 816 decrees as follows: "And let the presbyters know that when they administer holy baptism they may not pour water on the heads of the infants, but the infants must always be immersed."

When the Lutheran and Reformed Churches were established it was recognized that the practice of the Church of Rome was a departure from apostolic usage. Says Luther: "Baptism is a Greek word. In Latin it can be translated *mergo*, as when we immerse any thing into water that it may be completely covered; and although that custom has been given up by most persons, for they do not wholly submerge the children, but only pour on them a little water, yet they ought to be completely immersed." Says Calvin, in his Commentary on Acts viii. 38: "They went down into the water. Here we perceive what was the rite of baptizing among the ancients for they immersed the whole body; now the custom has been established that the minister only sprinkles the body or the head."

It would have been the natural thing for the great Protestant leaders to discard the Roman innovation and restore the primitive baptism. But the practice of pouring and sprinkling, which had prevailed now for two centuries in the Church of Rome, from which the Protestants had come out, had become too firmly established to be set aside, and therefore the usage was continued in the Protestant Churches also. Had it been the Greek communion from which the Lutheran and Reformed Churches seceded, they would to-day be practicing immersion. The Protestant Churches use pouring and sprinkling because it is from the Church of Rome that they derive their descent.

The Church of England has a peculiar history in this matter. Though in the Roman Catholic Churches on the Continent the practice of immersion was discontinued by the beginning of the fourteenth century, it remained the standard usage in England for two hundred and fifty years longer. The chroniclers describe the immersion of Prince Arthur, oldest son of Henry VII. Erasmus notes that the Anglican usage in his day is immersion. Tyndale describes the dipping of infants in the English parish churches of his time. Cranmer's catechism speaks of the "dipping in water." And the reader of Froide has very likely noticed that it was the expectation of Elizabeth that Mary's infant, afterwards James I, would be immersed. Immersion was the ordinary baptism of the Church of England down to the days of the Reformation.

By the way, our High Anglican friends who condemn the Reformation for the changes it wrought in their Church might make a capital point against it by citing the alarming weakness of English infants which has followed in its train! Their baptismal rubric has always enjoined and still commands the use of immersion, pouring being allowed only when the child is "weak." Now, down to the time of the Reformation it was rarely necessary to resort to the pouring. "Blind King Hal," when an infant, went all over into the font. So did his tough baby

daughter, who was yet to swear at bishops and box the ears of courtiers as England's greatest queen. So did the babes of the English merchants and the English plowmen of that time. But when the Protestant leaders came back from Geneva, bringing not merely the Geneva theology, but also the Geneva baptismal usage, all at once the children of English mothers became too weak to receive the ancient immersion, and ever since, (with rare exceptions), instead of being dipped in the font as in the brave days of old, they have been able merely to have the water poured upon them. Poor, degenerate little John Bull!

The Baptists also have a peculiar history in this matter. When, in the Reformation, it was declared that salvation came not through baptism, but through faith, great numbers immediately asked the question, Why, then, should baptism be given to babes who can not exercise belief? And there arose many Anti-pedobaptist Churches, churches which held that baptism should be given to believers alone. The members of these were called Anabaptists or Re-baptizers, because, regarding infant baptism as a nullity, they baptized again, on profession of faith, those who had already been baptized in infancy. But the peculiarity of their doctrine seems to have pertained especially to the question of the subjects of baptism. As regards the act, they generally practiced pouring, as did their Roman Catholic and Protestant opponents. Their rebaptizing was simply a re-pouring. These Churches are represented by the Mennonites of to-day, who reject the baptism of infants, but use pouring for baptism.

When, however, these opposers of infant baptism demanded where the baptism of infants was sanctioned in the New Testament, they were met by the question, Where in the New Testament was found any sanction of the use of pouring for baptism? It was urged that, if the baptism of infants was post-apostolic in its origin, and rested merely on ecclesiastical authority, the same was true of the use of affusion, and that he who discards the baptism of infants must logically discard also the use of affusion for baptism. These considerations had their effect, and some of the Anti-pedobaptists on the continent, with all in England, discarded the use of pouring and sprinkling, retaining the practice of immersion alone. The immersionist Anti-pedobaptists of the continent were comparatively few in number, and their original Churches are now extinct. Those of England have become the Baptist denomination of England and America, and scores of mission fields. The reason why the Anti-pedobaptists of England became immersionists while those of the continent generally did not, may, perhaps, be found in the fact that immersion had been discontinued on the continent for more than two centuries, while it had been the standard practice in England down to a very recent time, and could therefore be more easily restored.

The Greek Church, through all the centuries, has stoutly adhered to the ancient immersion. This is administered not only in the mild Levant, but on the frozen shores of the Arctic seas. Newly converted heathen tribes are immersed through spaces out in the ice in the northern rivers. The Russian Church, indeed, allows the resort to affusion in cases of sickness, but this has been done only in recent times—only in recent times has it accepted as valid baptism the affusions of the Western Church, and many Russians deny the propriety of even this partial recognition of the validity of pouring and sprinkling. In the Patriarchate of Constantinople and other older portions of the Eastern Church the validity of affusion is utterly denied, and the member of the Latin or Anglican Church who applies for admission to the Oriental communion must, notwithstanding his previous affusion, be immersed.

Regarding the usage of the Byzantine Church Dean Stanley says, in a private letter written not long before his death, and probably his last contribution to the literature of this subject: "My authority for the persistence of the Constantinopolitan Church was the Rev. W. Palmer, who, as you are aware, was better acquainted with the Greek Church in all its branches, than any one else in England. He sought admission to the Russian Church, and almost succeeded, the authorities wanting to baptize him again, but conditionally. This did not satisfy him, as long as the Byzantine Church refused. He referred his case to them, and the Patriarch of Constantinople, in an apostolical synod of bishops (as related, I think, in his work entitled 'Disquisition on the Orthodox Communion'), returned a positive refusal, saying, 'We know of baptism by immersion, and we know none other.'

Regarding the usage of the Byzantine Church Dean Stanley says, in a private letter written not long before his death, and probably his last contribution to the literature of this subject: "My authority for the persistence of the Constantinopolitan Church was the Rev. W. Palmer, who, as you are aware, was better acquainted with the Greek Church in all its branches, than any one else in England. He sought admission to the Russian Church, and almost succeeded, the authorities wanting to baptize him again, but conditionally. This did not satisfy him, as long as the Byzantine Church refused. He referred his case to them, and the Patriarch of Constantinople, in an apostolical synod of bishops (as related, I think, in his work entitled 'Disquisition on the Orthodox Communion'), returned a positive refusal, saying, 'We know of baptism by immersion, and we know none other.'

By the way, our High Anglican friends who condemn the Reformation for the changes it wrought in their Church might make a capital point against it by citing the alarming weakness of English infants which has followed in its train! Their baptismal rubric has always enjoined and still commands the use of immersion, pouring being allowed only when the child is "weak." Now, down to the time of the Reformation it was rarely necessary to resort to the pouring. "Blind King Hal," when an infant, went all over into the font. So did his tough baby

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger. **Ellicott's Commentary for English Readers.**

BY REV. D. A. STEELE.

This work is not identical with Bishop Ellicott's commentaries on the original text of the Pauline epistles. Indeed, it is not his work at all, strictly speaking. The labor has been performed by others, but has had the supervision of one so well qualified to be the editor of these columns. He has not interfered with their independence, but has left the various writers wholly free to maintain that line of interpretation which, after the considerations suggested by the editor, they have felt it their duty to take.

Of course, such a work must vary with the ability of the writers. Yet, on the whole, it has a value peculiarly its own. Belonging, for the most part, to the Church of England, the writers are not offensively "churchy." They work like a lot of scholars, aiming to understand the text of Scripture. We are assured by the Bishop that "no attempt will be made merely to rehabilitate what may have the sanction of honored names or ancient authority, still less merely to reproduce some current and conventional explanation." All real or seeming difficulties have been candidly set forth, and the inferences discussed and analyzed. Nothing has been kept back from the reader. The truth, so far as a knowledge of it has been vouchsafed to the interpreters, has been stated fully and unreservedly, and where difficulty yet remains no attempt has been made to hide it by any of the plausibilities of a mere conventional or traditional exegesis.

On the other hand, where the meaning is plain, and the inferences from it presumably certain, these inferences have been drawn, and the results—results often in contrast with the current superficial estimates of a mere popular theology—laid seriously before the reader. Our work is for the thoughtful and earnest, for those who seek truth and love truth, for those who desire to be guided by God's Word, and to realize its message in days of doubt and transition, and to withhold from such what would seem to be the full counsel of God, would be to miss the first great duty of a conscientious interpreter.

The italics in the above quotation are ours. We grasp hands with the dignity of the church, because these sentiments bring him into line with the honest men in all ages, not a few of whom have been Baptists, who having discovered a difficulty, did not try to explain it, and to harmonize it, but left it to fuller knowledge and clearer vision; and who, having seen a truth, straightway blazoned it forth to the world, whether in keeping with the creeds, and catechisms or not.

We think it will be found that the promise of the Bishop is fairly carried out. For ourselves we are speaking advisedly when we recommend the work, since we have used it for two years, or since the first volume was published. But our pastors and others who may need such a Commentary must beware of giving their confidence to every note here made. This is true of every work of this kind, and in the appeal which we all are compelled to make to the assistance of other men, we should be careful to keep up a spirit of independent research.

We shall best indicate what we mean by a reference to some of the comments. In Matthew iii. 13 we have placed before us an idea which recurs again and again, and which seems to be a favorite one with Prof. Plumtree, the author of the notes on the first three Gospels. This is the development of the religious life of Jesus, or to give his own words, "We must believe that His righteousness was essentially human, and therefore capable of increase, even as he increased in wisdom and stature. Holy as He was at every stage of His life in proportion to its capacities, there yet rose before Him height upon height of holiness as yet unattained, and after which we may say with reverence He 'hungered and thirsted.'"

To which we say, How do you know? We rather "must believe" that His righteousness or holiness was perfect from the very first. We discover no hint anywhere in the Gospel or epistles that the Saviour stepped from height to height of holiness.

As it is in connection with Our Lord's baptism that these reflections occur, it may be as well once for all to bring forward the views of Baptism set forth in this work. We will take the passages in order.

A New Testament Commentary for English Readers. By various writers. Edited by Charles John Ellicott, D. D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. 3 vols., quarto. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

Mat. iii. 1: "The baptism was, as the name implied, an immersion, and commonly, though not necessarily, in running water." Acts ii. 41: "The largeness of the number (3,000) has been urged as rendering it probable that the baptism was by affusion not immersion. On the other hand, (1) immersion had clearly been practiced by John, and was involved in the original meaning of the word. (2) The symbolic meaning of the act required immersion, and Romans vi. 4, and 1 Peter iii. 21 seem almost of necessity to imply the more complete mode. The swimming baths of Bethsaida and Siloam, or the so-called Fountain of the Virgin, near the Temple enclosure, or the bathing-places within the Tower of Antony, may well have helped to make the process easy."

Acts viii. 38: "The Greek preposition might mean simply, 'into the water,' but the universality of immersion in the early Church supports the English version. So far, then, the Commentary is sound on the method of baptism. We are quite prepared for Pedobaptist inconsistency to be told on Mat. xix. 15: 'He laid His hands on the little children.' The words and the act have rightly been regarded, as in the baptismal office of the Church of England, as the sure warrant for infant baptism. The blessing and the prayer of Christ cannot be regarded as a mere sympathizing compliance with the fond wishes of the parents, and if infants were capable of spiritual blessings then, why, it may well be asked, should they be thought incapable now?"

Well, that would be "perfectly innocuous" as a friend says, in a Baptist family, and ought not to do harm in any family—especially when taken in connection with the foregoing passages on Baptism.

There is a looking through Episcopalian glasses in the note on the laying on of hands, to which passage we refer our readers, Acts viii. 17, 18, where they can form their own opinions as to whether "this was the starting point of what afterwards developed into the rite known as confirmation." As an instance of erroneous, or, to say the least, defective teaching, we call attention to the remarks on John x. 27: "Yet the sheep itself may wander from the shepherd's care," and all the fulness of these promises depends upon the human will, which is included in the first clause, "My sheep hear my voice," etc. The commentator here sets his *ipse dixit* against the Saviour's, "Verily I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish," etc. If anything is absolute it is that saying of our Lord. To see how slack the interpretation is, we have but to ask, What led these particular ones to hear? Who taught them to follow? What constituted them sheep, their own volition, or the Saviour's gift of eternal life? And let us remember when we are inclined to exalt the human will that Jesus has also declared, "No man can come unto me except the Father who hath sent me draw him."

Still more weak is the interpretation of Mat. xxv. 32: "Now we have the law by which those shall be judged who have lived and died as heathens (sic), not knowing the name of Christ, and knowing God only as revealed in nature or in the law written in their hearts." This is opposed to the fundamental doctrine of regeneration, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Yet these reverend expositors assure us that "Not for Israel only, or those among the brethren who should in this life believe in Christ, had the kingdom been prepared, but for these also," i. e., these unconverted heathen. This is sentimentalism, not Christianity; and wherever our readers find the idea of heathen being saved by virtue of their being sons of God, or because of their good deeds, without repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, they will trace it to its source in the charity of Broad Churchmen, not to the Bible of a God who does not save men apart from their personal participation in the benefits of the atonement of His Son. The case of Cornelius is referred to in proof that the position of our commentators is right: "In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted of Him." Turn to that passage, and see the sum of the Apostle's argument. Cornelius sees a vision. Peter the Apostle, a Jew, with all the prejudices of a Jew, has his prejudices so far shaken as to say, "Of a truth, God is no respecter of persons, in every nation he that feareth Him, is accepted of Him." That is to say, a Gentile may be a recipient of the blessings of salvation, and a Gentile may be admitted to the blessings of the church. The parenthesis is significant: "He is Lord of all," or "of all men." Christ is a Saviour for the Gentiles. It is difficult

to see how the commentators get the idea of heathen salvation out of this passage. But they persist in this all the way through: "It is clear that this question ('Lord, when?') of surprise could not be asked by any who, as believers in Christ, have come under this teaching." Why not? Will not Christians be astonished to find that the Master has noted their insignificant services? Does not our Lord mean to say, "You did good, not recognizing it was to me, but I accepted it as for myself?"

These are blemishes upon what is on the whole a good work. Others will appear upon a close perusal. Yet, generally speaking, there is the appearance of strong men having been at work. It will be an advantage to the pastor not well versed in Greek to possess this book, as also to the keener intellects among our people. The first edition is quarto, with large clear type; but any who wish to have it in handier volumes, may order the duodecimo edition since published by the same house.

Amherst, Oct. 24, 1882.

For the Christian Messenger. [The following paper on the Trilobite was written as an ordinary class exercise by a young lady, member of the Junior Class of Acadia College. The other papers were equally good though rather briefer. It is printed just as it was handed in.]

History of the Trilobite.

The different genera of the Trilobites belong to Paleozoic time which includes three ages in the earth's history,—the Silurian, which is divided into Lower and Upper, the Devonian and Carboniferous. The earliest species are found in the Primordial rocks. They continued developing and increasing until the maximum in number and grade was reached in the Upper Silurian period. After there had been a succession of one thousand seven hundred species, the number so rapidly decreased, that at the close of the Devonian age there were only three species to represent this remarkable tribe in the Carboniferous age. These became extinct before the close of the age, for no fossils have been found in the rocks of the Permian period.

The Trilobite (the animal having three lobes) belongs to the Crustaceans, one of the sub-classes of the Water Articulates. The Crustaceans are grouped in two classes,—the Malacostraca (mollusk shelled) and the Eutomostrea (insect shelled). To the latter class Trilobites probably belong, although they have some similarity to the other class. Thus they occupy a middle position between the two, and probably this position is between the Isopods (Malacostracans) and the Phyllopods and Limuloids (Eutomostreans).

In general appearance they resemble the Limuloids (horse shoe Crabs) which replaced them in the process of evolution. The Limulus now represents the extinct genera of the Trilobite. The upper shell of the Trilobite is convex and the lower, concave. It is of jointed structure, generally smooth and divided into three lobes. This division, however, is merely a depression or suture. They have well formed eyes situated in the lateral lobes of the bucker or head shield. In different species the eyes are of different sizes and in different positions. The under shell of this animal is not well described because very imperfect remains have been found.

It was formerly believed that no species had legs, but that instead of these they had soft, flat, leaf shaped swimmers. But in 1870, Billings found a fossil having eight legs, and in 1878 Walcott found one having jointed legs.

The Buckler (head shield) is divided into three areas, two lateral and a middle one called the glabella. The latter area is usually smooth, but in flower species it is deeply furrowed, the furrows corresponding to the articulations of an animal.

Burmeister thinks that Trilobites swam in shallow water near the surface, fed on smaller animals, and had the power of rolling themselves into a ball to avert danger.

The different species vary in length from one fourth of an inch to twenty-two or four inches.

It is evident that this sub-class of Crustaceans passed through many stages of existence. M. Barrande has traced their development from a point when they were without eyes, joints and body rings, to the complete form with the full number of segments.

The division of this animal tribe into species depends on the form and sculpturing of the head shield, the size of the tail shield, and the number of movable segments. Different species of the Trilobites are found in different periods. The genera belonging to the Primordial period, are the *Paradoxides Bathyrus*, *Sao*, *Ario-*

nellus, *Agnotus* and a few others, all peculiar in the multiplicity of their thoracic segments and the diminution of their caudal shield. The former is confined to this period. Very many species have been found in the Cambrian beds in Wales, similar species have been found in Bohemia, five species near St. John in the Acadia group, and others in different places.

The *Bathyrus*, which was a common species during the epochs of the Canadian period, reached its greatest development at that time. The last species became extinct at the close of the Lower Silurian age.

The *Asaphus* and *Remopleurides* are confined to the Canadian period during which they were fully represented. The *Asaphus gigas*, having a length of twenty inches and a breadth of thirteen, and the *Calymene* were the largest fossils of this period. The latter species is distinguished from others by having a semi-circular caudal shield, an axis prominently marked by seven annulations, and lateral lobes, having five ribs.

The *Calymene* with the *Ampyx*, *Ellanenus Acidaspis* and *Cerurus* continued till the close of the Upper Silurian Period.

The species, *Homalonotus* and *Lichas*, continued from the middle of the Lower Silurian to the middle of the Devonian. One fossil was found in the Niagara formation, eight or ten inches in length. The *Homalonotus* is readily distinguished by the broad not prominent axis, and by the rectangular direction of the annulations and their abrupt bending at the edge.

When these species were found the Trilobites had reached their greatest development. Species of the *Homalonotus* are found in the early periods of the Devonian age, but disappear before its close, being succeeded by the *Phillipsia* and *Griffithides*. These continued nearly through the Carboniferous age and then became extinct, being the last species to represent the most prominent type of Paleozoic time.

A NOTED BUT UNTITLED WOMAN.

(From the Boston Globe.)



The above is a good likeness of Mrs. Lydia E. Fishman, of Lynn, Mass., who above all other human beings may be truthfully called the "Dear Friend of Women," as some of her correspondents love to call her. She is a lady who devoted her work, which is the result of a life's study, and is obliged to keep six lady assistants, to help her answer the large correspondence which daily pours in upon her, each bearing its special burden of suffering, or joy at release from it. Her Vegetable Compound has medicine for good and not evil purposes. I have personally investigated it and am satisfied of the truth of this.

On account of its proven merits, it is recommended and prescribed by the best physicians in the country. One says: "It works like a charm and cures much pain. It will cure entirely the worst form of falling of the uterus, Leucorrhœa, irregular and painful Menstruation, all Ovarian Troubles, Inflammation and Ulceration, Floodings, all Displacements and the consequent spinal weakness, and is especially adapted to the Change of Life."

It permeates every portion of the system, and gives new life and vigor. It removes faintness, dizziness, sleepiness, all craving for stimulants, and relieves weakness of the stomach, it cures Headaches, Rheumatic, Nervous Prostration, General Debility, Dyspepsia, Depression and Indigestion. That feeling of longing down, causing pain, weight and backache, is always permanently cured by its use. It will at all times and under all circumstances, act in harmony with the law that governs the female system.

It costs only \$1. per bottle or six for \$5., and is sold by druggists. Any advice required as to special cases, and the names of many who have been restored to perfect health by the use of the Vegetable Compound, can be obtained by addressing Mrs. F., with stamp for reply, at her home in Lynn, Mass.

For Kidney Complaint of either sex this compound is unsurpassed as an abundant testimonial show. "Mrs. Fishman's Live Pills" says one writer: "are the best in the world for the cure of Constipation, Biliousness and Scouring of the Liver. Her Blood Purifier works wonders in its special line and bids fair to equal the Compound in its popularity. All must respect her as an Angel of Mercy whose sole ambition is to do good to others."

Philadelphia, Pa. (C) Mrs. A. M. D. Oct. 4. 1 y.

KIDNEY-WORT
HAS BEEN PROVED THE SUREST CURE FOR KIDNEY DISEASES.
Does a lame back or diseased urtic indicate that you are a victim? FERRY DO NOT HESITATE; use Kidney-Wort as usual, druggists recommend it and it will speedily overcome the disease and restore healthy action.
Ladies. For complaints peculiar to your sex, such as pain and weakness, Kidney-Wort is unsurpassed, as it will act promptly and safely.
FERRY'S. Inconstancy, retention of urine, brick dust or rosy deposits, and dull dragging Gout, all speedily yield to its curative power. IS SOLD BY ALL DRUGGISTS. Price \$1.

Oct. 4. 1 year

CHURCH AND SCHOOL BELLS.

RIERS AND PRICES.
Diam. W't with Cost of Bell. Frame of Bell's No. 1. No. 2. No. 3. No. 4. No. 5. No. 6. No. 7. No. 8. No. 9. No. 10. No. 11. No. 12. No. 13. No. 14. No. 15. No. 16. No. 17. No. 18. No. 19. No. 20. No. 21. No. 22. No. 23. No. 24. No. 25. No. 26. No. 27. No. 28. No. 29. No. 30. No. 31. No. 32. No. 33. No. 34. No. 35. No. 36. No. 37. No. 38. No. 39. No. 40. No. 41. No. 42. No. 43. No. 44. No. 45. No. 46. No. 47. No. 48. No. 49. No. 50. No. 51. No. 52. No. 53. No. 54. No. 55. No. 56. No. 57. No. 58. No. 59. No. 60. No. 61. No. 62. No. 63. No. 64. No. 65. No. 66. No. 67. No. 68. No. 69. No. 70. No. 71. No. 72. No. 73. No. 74. No. 75. No. 76. No. 77. No. 78. No. 79. No. 80. No. 81. No. 82. No. 83. No. 84. No. 85. No. 86. No. 87. No. 88. No. 89. No. 90. No. 91. No. 92. No. 93. No. 94. No. 95. No. 96. No. 97. No. 98. No. 99. No. 100. RUMSBY & CO., Sonoma Falls, N. Y., U. S. A.