



# ❖ ❖ *Forget Not The Past* ❖ ❖

## *THE PERSECUTION OF OBADIAH HOLMES IN AMERICA*

By J. M. Cramp

Taken from the book entitled, "Baptist History."

There was a pressure on the Baptists in Massachusetts. They were few and fearful. Can we wonder at it? It was no small trial to be driven beyond the bounds of civilization in those days. We hear but little of them for seven years, and then it is whipping again! William Witter, an aged Baptist, lived at Lynn. The distance, coupled with his infirmities, prevented him from enjoying Christian fellowship with his brethren of the church at Newport to which he belonged. There were other brethren in the same neighborhood. A pastoral visit was resolved on. Dr. John Clark, pastor of the church, accompanied by Obadiah Holmes, a ministering brother, and Crandal, repaired to Lynn for that purpose, and proposed to hold a meeting with the brethren on the Lord's Day. They were assembled, and Dr. Clark had commenced his discourse, when the constables made their appearance, charged to apprehend the intruders, and keep them safely till the next day. They obeyed their orders, and the meeting was broken up. Next day the Puritan magistrates committed them to prison, and, about a fortnight after, the Court of Assistants adjudged Dr. Clark to pay a fine of twenty pounds, Mr. Holmes a fine of thirty pounds, and Mr. Crandal five pounds. Some friends paid Dr. Clark's fine. Mr. Crandal was released on promise to appear the next court day. There was some talk about a disputation on baptism between Dr. Clark and the clergy of Boston, who had intimated a willingness to meet him, but it came to nothing.

Mr. Holmes' fine was the heaviest, most probably on account of the circumstances mentioned in the sentence presently to be quoted. He would not allow the fine to be paid for him, nor would he pay it himself. But he must either pay or be "well whipt." So ran the sentence. It is a curiosity, and should be preserved

"The sentence of Obadiah Holmes, of Seaconk, the 31st of the fifth month, 1651.

"Forasmuch as you, Obadiah Holmes, being come into this jurisdiction about the 21st of the fifth month, did meet at one William Witter's house, at Lynn, and did here privately (and at other times), being an excommunicated person, did take upon you to preach and baptize upon the Lord's Day, or other days, and being taken then by the constable, and

coming afterward to the assembly at Lynn, did, in disrespect to the ordinance of God and his worship, keep on your hat, the pastor being in prayer, inasmuch as you would not give reverence in vailing your hat, till it was forced off your head, to the disturbance of the congregation, and professing against the institution of the church, as not being according to the gospel of Jesus Christ; and that you, the said Obadiah Holmes, did, upon the day following, meet again at the said William Witter's, in contempt to authority, you being then in the custody of the law, and did there receive the sacrament, being excommunicate, and that you did baptize such as were baptized before, and thereby did necessarily deny the baptism before administered to be baptism, the churches no churches, and also other ordinances and ministers, as if all was a nullity; and did also deny the lawfulness of baptizing of infants; and all this tends to the dishonor of God, the despising the ordinances of God among us, the peace of the churches, and seducing the subjects of this commonwealth from the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and perverting the straight ways of the Lord; the court doth fine you thirty pounds, to be paid, or sufficient sureties that the said sum shall be paid by the first day of the next Court of Assistants, or else to be well whipt; and that you shall remain in prison till it be paid, or security given in for it:

"By the Court,

"INCREASE NORVEL."

The sentence was passed in July. Mr. Holmes was kept in prison till September, when he was publicly whipped, and so barbarously "that in many days, if not some weeks, he could take no rest but as he lay upon his knees and elbows, not being able to suffer any part of his body to touch the bed whereon he lay." His own account of the affair, in a letter addressed to Messrs. Spilsbury, Kiffin and other Baptists in London, is deeply affecting, but too long for transcription here. He tells the brethren how he declined the proffered kindness of his friends, who "came to visit him, desiring him to take the refreshment of wine and other comforts," having resolved "not to drink wine nor strong drink that day, until his punishment was over," lest the world should say "that the strength and comfort of the creature had carried him through;" how he withdrew to his chamber to seek strength from the Lord, and "prayed ear-

(Forget Not The Past continued on page 9)

11:4, 13-15, that all who preach any other gospel than this are not only accursed of God, but are also (in God's sight) false apostles, deceitful workers and ministers of Satan. Modernist, does this mean you?

IV.) But not only does the Bible declare that all persons who refuse to believe all the teachings of Christ are: (1) "Intellectual Fools," (2) Blinded by Satan, and (3) Accursed of God, but it also tells us that all such are lost souls.

2 Cor. 4:3 makes this statement: "But if our gospel be hid it is hid to them that are lost: (4) In whom the god of this world (Satan) hath blinded the minds (noēmata-thoughts) of them which believe not." Here we have the only rational explanation of the duplicity and rank deceit employed by Modernists in order to destroy the faith of an orthodox believer. Listen to Gerald B. Smith's words on this subject: "If now a theologian does actually depart from the authorized content of doctrine, he has to meet the traditional feeling that he is a traitor to the cause. So strong is this feeling that a religious man today is almost inevitably compelled to adopt an apologetic method of setting forth new doctrines. He is led to use the familiar terms and phrases, so far as possible, and to make what he holds to be true seem as much like orthodox doctrine as possible...New meanings are thus smuggled in under familiar labels with a resulting lack of clearness in thinking." (A Guide To the Study of the Christian Religion, p. 489.) Is advocating lying and deception to undermine faith in God's Word a guide to the study of Christ's religion? No! It is "A Guide To the Study of Satan's Religion," for Christ says (John 8:44): "Ye are of your father the devil, and the desires of your father ye will do...there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." If Gerald B. Smith truly represents Modernism then Paul included all Modernists when He said (2 Cor. 4:4) "In whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not." No true follower of Christ will deliberately lie and deceive for any reason.

John makes this same statement, that all Modernists are lost souls, in 2 John 9: "Pas o proagon, kai menon en to didachd tou Christou, theon ouk echei." Literally translated this reads, "Everyone, the one advancing beyond, and not abiding in the teaching of Christ, has not God." If these words are true, then no

denier of Christ's teachings is saved.

HOW WOULD THE BIBLE HAVE US TREAT ALL MODERNISTS WHO DENY CHRIST'S TEACHINGS?

(1) Beware of them.

In Col. 2:8 Paul says: "Beware lest any man spoil you (make a prey of you) through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world (Modernism), and not after Christ, (9) For in Him (Christ) dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, (10) And ye are complete in Him." Now since "all the fulness of the Godhead" dwelt in Christ's human body, and since "in Him were all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (Col. 2: 3)," why should we not put Him above all human teachers?

(2) The Bible not only warns us to beware of all Modernists, but urges us to have no fellowship with them.

(a) Paul says (2 Thess. 3:6): "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly (ataktōs-regardless of church discipline), and not after the tradition (teachings handed down) which he received of us." Here is a straight command from God, through His inspired apostle, that we have no fellowship with any person who does not believe and teach all that Paul believed and taught. All such are enemies of Christ and agents of the Evil One.

Paul emphasizes the same truth in Romans 16:17, "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine (teaching) which ye have learned (from Paul himself) and avoid (ekklinate-turn away from) them. (18) For they that are such serve not the Lord Jesus Christ; but their own belly."

Here is a clear statement that we are to avoid, or turn away from, all who teach anything contrary to Paul's teachings, because no such persons are serving the Lord Jesus Christ (see verse 18 again), but are only actuated by selfish motives.

Now Paul most clearly taught: (1) That man was created directly by God out of the dust of the earth and was not evolved from any lower form of life. I Cor. 15:47, "The first man (O protos anthropos-the very first man) was made of dust (cokoikos) out of the earth (ek ges)." (2) That Christ was very



(How the Bible Estimates Modernists continued from page 7)  
the servant of the community."

These men, being Evolutionists, have evolved such an inordinate intellectual and moral conceit that they conscientiously believe the Lord Jesus Christ was very little wiser or better than they, and most assuredly ought not to be worshipped as God any longer.

(e) President A. C. McGiffert, of the Union Theological Seminary, brings himself under Paul's condemnation when he says: "Democracy demands a God with whom men may cooperate, not to whom they must submit." (Religious Education, June, 1919, p. 161.)

Remember, Paul's statement in 1 Tim. 6: 3, 4 is, that every person, who refuses to accept any clear teaching of Christ's, is "an intellectual fool." Reader, does that mean you?

II). Again the Bible declares that all Modernists, who refuse to believe the gospel of Christ, are blinded by Satan.

2 Cor. 4: 3, "But if our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: (4) In whom the god of this world (Satan) hath blinded the minds (noēmata-thoughts) of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them."

In Matt. 16: 21-23 Christ declares that all who accept the teaching of men, and reject His teaching are Satan's agents and stumbling blocks to others. Matt. 16:21, "From that time forth began Jesus to show unto His disciples, how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. (22) Then Peter took Him, and began to rebuke Him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee. (23) But He turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind Me, Satan: thou art an offence (stumbling block) unto Me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God: but those that be of men." Reader, if Peter was an agent of Satan when he opposed the teachings of Christ, preferring the teaching of men, surely we must conclude that all today who are rejecting His teachings are also Satan's agents. See also 2 Tim. 2:24-26: "And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, pa-

tient, (25) In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; (26) And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will." Then all Modernists, all who deny any plain teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ, have their thoughts controlled by Satan, and so are his captives.

III.) Again the Bible declares that all Modernists, all who deny the gospel of Christ as proclaimed by Paul, are cursed of God. Gal. 1:8, "But though we, or an angel from heaven; preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed... (9) As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

Again Paul declares (2 Cor. 11: 4): "For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him... (13) For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. (14) And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. (15) Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works."

Now Paul preached: (1) that man was created by God directly out of the dust of the earth (1 Cor. 15:47). This verse reads literally, "The first man was made of dust (choikos) out of the earth (ek ges)." (2) That Christ was very God (Titus 2:10, 13). (3) That Christ's teaching must be our highest and final authority because he was God's own wisdom personified (1 Cor. 1:24; Col. 2:3). (4) That Christ died for man's sins (Gal. 1: 4; 1 Cor. 15: 3). (5) That He arose with a physical body which did not see corruption (Acts 13:35-37). (6) That we cannot save ourselves by our own good works, only by accepting Christ through faith (Gal. 2:16; Eph. 2: 8). (7) That Christ must come again in vengeance, accompanied by all His saints, to subdue a wicked world to Himself (2 Thess. 1:7-10; 1 Thess. 3:13).

Now Paul declares in Gal. 1:8, 9 and in 2 Cor.

## THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

By Wendell Rone, 1945

According to the Baptists "There is no word in Christian literature whose primary meaning is so fully agreed upon as the term translated Church; and yet there is no word in that literature (not excepting Baptism) whose meaning has been so perverted and made the basis of subversive error."

The term "Church" is used in the English Bible to translate the Greek word *ecclesia*, from the verb *ekkaleo*, "to call together, to convene." Its primary meaning, etymologically, is:

"An organized assembly, whose members have been called out from private homes or businesses to attend to public affairs. The definition necessarily implies prescribed conditions of membership.

"This meaning, substantially; applies alike to the *ecclesia* of a self-governing Greek City-State (Acts 19:39), the Old Testament *ecclesia* or convocation of National Israel (Acts 7:38), and the New Testament *ecclesia*."

*Ecclesia*, denoting the institution founded by our Lord Jesus Christ, and referred to by Him as "My *ecclesia*" in contrast to that of the Jews and the Greeks, is found in the New Testament a total of 109 times, and always it retains its primary and simple meaning, a public assembly or congregation. No elaborate proof of the meaning of the word translated "Church" is necessary as the majority of Biblical scholars are agreed on it.

In 96 out of the 109 times the word *ecclesia* is used in a Christian sense in the Greek New Testament, its reference is unmistakably to a local congregation or assembly of Christ's people, in keeping with the primary and simple meaning of the term. There is sharp division of opinion among Baptist scholars over the meaning of the remaining 13 instances: Matthew 16:18; Ephesians 1:22; 3:10; 3:21; 5:23; 5:24; 5:25; 5:27; 5:29; 5:32; Colossians 1:18; 1:24; and Hebrews 12:23. From these passages many Baptist Bible students deduce that the term "Church" refers to a "universal, invisible Church," "the entire community of the redeemed," "the body of Christ," and other kindred and descriptive terms, all setting forth the concept of all believers of all time, in heaven and on earth, as composing "the Church." The author has always rejected this view, believing that those who hold to it have confused the Kingdom of God and the Church, making them one and the same thing. We do not believe that the New Testament will warrant such a conclusion. In the Author's opinion, the

disputed passages above may be classified as follows:

a. The Church referred to as an institution, i.e., in the abstract or generic sense. Matthew 16:18; Ephesians 1:22; 3:10; 3:21; 5:23; 5:24; 5:25; 5:29; 5:32; Colossians 1:18; 1:24.

But in application the generic and abstract become particular, individual, and concretely evident.

b. The Church referred to as "in glory," i.e., prospective rather than actual. Ephesians 5:27; Hebrews 12:23.

This "general assembly" has not met as yet, but it will meet in God's appointed time. But the term "Church" still retains its meaning, a congregation or assembly, and it will meet in a place, Heaven. The Greek term "*Ecclesia*" is never used in Biblical or classical Greek in an unassembled sense.

The Author makes the contention, furthermore, that the terms "body," "temple of the Lord," "house of God," "flock," etc., are figures of speech, and as such are applicable to particular congregations of the people of the Lord, but these terms are never used to refer to all of the particular congregations as a whole or collectively. It is highly doubtful if the notion of universality (catholicity), either "visible" or "invisible," is allowed to attach itself to the term *ecclesia* in the usage of either the Apostles or the early Christian writers.

"The two ideas, that of a local organism on the one side, and that of a scattered and unaffiliated world-community on the other are too incongruous to dwell harmoniously together under a common designation. To admit the idea of a Church universal, at all, is to make that '*The Church*,' and relatively to derogate from the importance of, and the honor due to, the local Churches. . . . As every idea seeks to embody itself, he who regards himself as a member of the Church universal (either 'visible' or 'invisible' W. H. R.) will naturally seek to adjust himself to the demands of the larger, as more important than the smaller, body to which he belongs. John Henry Newman, smitten with enthusiasm for the Church universal, which must from its very nature be one and historically continuous, went logically to Rome. Others, dreaming of a like Church as essentially ideal in organization, have looked contemptuously on the 'sects'; exhorting men to join a kind of 'choir

(The Nature of the Church continued on page 9)

# HOW THE BIBLE ESTIMATES MODERNISTS AND HOW CHRISTIANS SHOULD TREAT THEM

By T. J. McCrossan, 1929

1.) They are "Intellectual Fools."

In 1 Tim. 6:3, 4 Paul gives us God's estimate of every Modernist who denies any plain teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ.

1 Tim. 6: 3, "If any man teach otherwise (than as Christ teaches) and consents not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . : (4) He is proud (tetuphōtai), knowing nothing." Now this word proud comes from "tuphos" smoke. Every good Greek dictionary will tell you that the Perfect passive here (tetuphōtai) really means "to have the mind beclouded with the smoke of self-conceit" or "to be an intellectual fool." Then Paul's declaration is: "If any man teach otherwise (than as Christ has taught), and consents not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . (4) He is an intellectual fool, knowing nothing." By these strong words the great apostle desired to impress upon all mankind that, in comparison with the Lord Jesus Christ, "The Only Wise God Our Saviour" (Jude 25), the greatest scholar who has ever lived, or ever will live, is "only as a farthing candle held before the blazing sun." Realizing this, let us again resolve with Paul (Rom. 3:4), "To let God (The Lord Jesus Christ) be true and every man (Modernist) a liar."

(a) A splendid illustration of the Intellectual Fools here spoken of by Paul is seen as we read that book conjointly edited by Gladden, Farrar, Horton, Peake, Adeney, Freemantle, Porter, and Lyman Abbott, and called, "The Bible and the Child." In this book, regarding teaching the Bible to children, we read these words: "The first thing to be done is to destroy their illusions. No word should be said about the Bible being infallible. Vaccinate them (the children) with doubt to save them from the small-pox of Skepticism." Men who can conscientiously give such damnable advice to parents are most assuredly going through a process of mental and spiritual devolution, not evolution.

(b) Another good illustration of what Paul means here by "intellectual fools" is seen in Gerald

Birney Smith's writings, as quoted by Horsch (Modern Religious Liberalism, pp. 158, 159). Here Mr. Smith says: "An autocratic (i.e. evangelical) religion cannot prepare citizens for democracy. If submitting to the authority of Scripture, we are training men to think of Christianity as something unchangeably there by divine decree...we are training men in autocracy. We cannot maintain one kind of authority in our political life, and a totally different kind of authority in religious life unless we wish religion and democracy to be mutually distrustful. To insist on blind submission in religion is a preparation for blind submission to autocratic power in the State: it is fundamentally opposed to the ideals of democracy. A Church that holds to orthodox views belongs to the old regime rather than to the age of democracy."

According to this reasoning Peter and the other apostles were enemies of the human race when they said (Acts 5:29), "We ought to obey God rather than man." Mr. Smith here insinuates, that all persons who recognize the Sovereignty of God, and teach unquestioning obedience to His will as revealed in the Scriptures, are not and cannot be true democrats. This teaching is absolutely ridiculous, for the most democratic people in every nation, those who bury all selfish interest, and live for the benefit of their neighbors, are those who obey most sincerely the Word of God. On the other hand, wherever the people of any nation reject the sovereignty of God as in Russia today, democracy is a wretched failure.

Then when Mr. Smith argues, that to prevent autocracy on earth God must be shorn of His autocratic power by teaching men that the Bible is not His Word, he proves himself only worthy to be classed among Paul's "Intellectual fools"

(e) Another fine example of these "Intellectual Fools" condemned by Paul in 1 Tim. 6:3, 4 is Prof. Foster, of Chicago. He has said: "Man cannot live without science! . . . Gone are the old ideas of religion; gone is the old notion of the divinity of the sacrament, of the efficacy of prayer, of the authority of

(How the Bible Estimates Modernists continued on page 7)

(Forget Not The Past continued from page 2)

nestly that he would be pleased to give him a spirit of courage and boldness, a tongue to speak for him, and strength of body to suffer for his sake, and not to shrink or yield to the strokes, or shed tears, lest the adversaries of the truth should thereupon blaspheme and be hardened, and the weak and feeble-hearted discouraged;" how he attempted at the place of suffering to address the people, but was prevented by the magistrate in attendance; and how graciously he was strengthened to endure the pain. "As the man began to lay the strokes upon my back, I said to the people, 'Though my flesh should fail, and my spirit should fail, yet my God would not fail.' So it pleased the Lord to come in, and to fill my heart and tongue as a vessel full, and with an audible voice I broke forth, praying unto the Lord not to lay this sin to their charge, and telling the people that now I found he did not fail me, and therefore now I should trust him for ever, who failed me not; for in truth, as the strokes fell upon me, I had such a spiritual manifestation of God's presence, as the like thereof I never had nor felt, nor can with fleshly tongue express; and the outward pain was so removed from me that indeed I am not able to declare it to you; it was so easy to me that I could well bear it, yea, and in a manner felt it not, although it was grievous, as the spectators said, the man striking with all his strength (yea, spitting in his hands three times, as many affirmed) with a three-corded whip, giving me therewith thirty strokes. When he had loosed me from the post, having joyfulness in my heart and cheerfulness in my countenance, as the spectators observed, I told the magistrates, 'You have struck me as with roses,' and said moreover, 'Although the Lord hath made it easy to me, yet I pray God it may not be laid to your charge.'" Mr. Holmes then proceeds to state that John Hazel and John Spur, who expressed their sympathy by shaking hands with him after it was over, were sentenced "to pay forty shillings or be whipt;" and that a surgeon who dressed his wounds was inquired after as if he had committed some crime. But "it hath pleased the Father of mercies," he adds, to dispose of the matter that my bonds and imprisonment have been no hindrance to the gospel, for before my return some submitted to the Lord and were baptized, and divers were put upon the way of inquiry. And now, being advised to make my escape by night, because it was reported there were warrants forth for me, I departed; and the next day after, while I was on my journey, the constable came to search at the house where I had lodged; so I escaped their hands, and was, by the good hand of my heavenly Father, brought home again to my near relations, my wife and eight chil-

dren, the brethren of our town and Providence having taken pains to meet me four miles in the woods, where we rejoiced together in the Lord."

"Bonds and imprisonment" awaited all Baptists in New England. They met for worship as they were able, and constantly testified against infant baptism, for which they were harassed by the courts without mercy. □



(The The Nature of the Church continued from page 3)

invisible,' where denominationalism shall no longer hinder the communion of saints. Such sentimentalism is apt to degenerate into a Christianity as 'invisible' as the vaporous constituency to which it fancies itself allied. *He who loves the Church universal, while despising the Church particular, is of no particular use to either.* God 'setteth the solitary in families.' This is as true in the religious as in the social sphere, and 'free love' is as disreputable and baneful in one as in the other."

Baptists, believing that the "local" Church is the only one with which we can be concerned in an active manner in this world, have stated that:

"A visible Church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers, associated by covenant in the faith and fellowship of the Gospel; observing the ordinances of Christ; governed by His laws; and exercising the gifts, rights, and privileges invested in them by His Word."

*New Hampshire Confession of Faith, ARTICLE 13*

"The individual Church may be defined as that smaller community of regenerate persons, who, in any given community, unite themselves voluntarily together, in accordance with Christ's laws, for the purpose of securing the complete establishment of His Kingdom in themselves and in the world."

"They (Baptists) hold that a Church is a company of disciples, baptized on a profession of their faith in Christ, united in covenant to maintain the ordinances of the Gospel, and the public worship of God; to live godly lives, and to spread abroad the knowledge of Christ as the Saviour of men."

"A Church is a congregation of Christ's baptized disciples acknowledging Him as their Head, relying on His atoning sacrifice for justification before God, united in the belief of the Gospel, agreeing to maintain its ordinances and obey its precepts, meeting together for worship, and co-operating for the extension of Christ's Kingdom in the world." □



## JUDSON, THE SCRIPTURES MADE HIM A BAPTIST

Taken from the book entitled, "The Story of the Baptist," by Richard Cook, 1887

On the 19th of February, 1812, four American missionaries embarked in the brig "Caravan," from Salem, Mass., for Burmah. They arrived at Calcutta, June 17th. Two of them were Adoniram Judson, and his wife Ann H. Judson. He was born in Maiden, Mass., August 9th, 1788, and was educated at Brown University. He entered the Theological Seminary at Andover, in 1808, and was converted soon afterward, and joined the Congregational church.

While at Andover, he and a few other pious students turned their attention to foreign missions, and, impressed with the wretched condition of the heathen, resolved to devote themselves to the work, and presented themselves to their older brethren in the ministry and the churches, as ready to be sent abroad for that purpose. This led to the formation of the "American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions," in June, 1810. And Judson and wife, with others, were sent to Burmah by the board.

The long voyage to Calcutta was partly occupied by Mr. Judson in examining the subject of Christian baptism.

There were two reasons for this special study. First, he hoped to have conversions among the heathen, and what to do about the baptism of children and servants he did not know. Then he was going to reside for awhile among the Baptist missionaries at Serampore, and expected that they would introduce the subject of baptism, and that he would be called upon to defend his views.

Hear the result in his own words: "I could not find a single intimation in the New Testament that the children and domestics of believers were members of the church, or entitled to any church ordinance in consequence of the profession of the head of their family. Everything discouraged the idea. When baptism was spoken of, it was always in connection with believing. None but believers were commanded to be baptized, and it did not appear to my mind that any others were baptized."

"I knew that I had been sprinkled in infancy, and that this had been deemed baptism. But throughout the whole New Testament I could find nothing that looked like sprinkling in connection with the ordinance of baptism."

He felt that he had never yet received Christian baptism, and that his only consistent course was to join the Baptists. This plunged him into great difficulty and distress, and it cost him a struggle to decide.

"Must I, then," he asked, "forsake my parents, the church with which I am connected, the society under whose patronage I have come out, the companions of my missionary undertaking? Must I forfeit the good opinion of all my friends in my native land, occasioning grief to some, and provoking others to anger, and be regarded, henceforth, by all my former dear acquaintances as a weak, despicable Baptist, who has not sense enough to comprehend the connection between the Abrahamic and the Christian system? All this was mortifying; it was hard to flesh and blood. But I thought, again, it is better to be guided by the opinion of Christ, who is the truth, than by the opinion of men, however good, whom I know to be in an error."

"If I quieted my conscience in regard to my own personal baptism, and concluded that, on account of my peculiar circumstances, it was best to consult my own convenience, rather than the command of Christ, still the question would return, with redoubled force: How am I to treat the children and domestics of converted heathens?" Mrs. Judson, in a letter to a friend, said: "An examination of the subject of baptism commenced on board the Caravan. As Mr. Judson was continuing the translation of the New Testament, which he began in America, he had many doubts respecting the meaning of the word baptize. After arriving at Burmah, he continued the examination of the foundation of the Pedobaptist system. The more he examined, the more his doubts increased; and, unwilling as he was to admit it, he was afraid the Baptists were right and he was wrong. I felt afraid he would become a Baptist, and frequently urged the consequences, if he should. I always took the Pedobaptist side in reasoning with him, even after I was as doubtful of the truth of their system as he. We procured the best authors on both sides; compared them with the Scriptures, examined and re-examined the sentiments of Baptists and Pedobaptists, and were finally compelled, from a conviction of truth, to embrace those of the former."

They requested baptism at the hands of the Baptist missionaries at Serampore, who were "extremely surprised," for nothing had been said upon the subject by either party. They were baptized on the 6th of September, 1812, in the Baptist chapel at Serampore. Luther Rice, who was ordained with Mr. Judson, and who arrived in India a short time afterward, also joined the Baptists. The effect of the baptism of Judson and his, companions, upon the Baptists of America, was truly startling. □

(The Inspiration of the Scriptures continued from page 1)

many other passages, he claimed that his words were the words of the Lord. 9:11, 13:15, etc. Amos professed to speak the very words of God: "Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O house of Israel." 3:1. Micah closes a prophecy with the words: "The mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it." 3:4. "The Lord put a word in Balaam's mouth, and said, Return unto Balak, and thus shalt thou speak?" Num. 18:5. It would be easy to multiply quotations of this kind; but if the above passages do not establish the fact that the writers of the Old Testament claimed plenary inspiration, it is impossible for language to do it. God spoke by the prophets. In a sense their words were their own; but in a higher, truer sense they were the words of God. There was no possibility for them to err in their words, unless God could be mistaken.

When Christ appeared in the world, the writings of Moses and the prophets, called, by way of eminence, the Scriptures, were held in high estimation among the Jews. How did Christ respect them! He was "God manifest in the flesh," and knew perfectly their origin, history, contents and authority. He treated them with the greatest reverence; and never uttered a word to indicate that he deemed them human and fallible, as well as divine and inerrable. He pronounced them the sure preservative from error: "Ye do err," said he to the Jews, "not knowing the Scriptures." Matt. 22:29. Could this be true, if the Scriptures themselves abounded in errors? They might, in that case, have been seduced into error by their knowledge of them. Listen further to the testimony of Jesus: "The Scripture must be fulfilled." Mark 14:49. The Scripture cannot be broken." John 10:35. If the Scriptures "must be fulfilled," it is because their predictions are true and accurate: if they "cannot be broken," it is because there is no defect or weakness in them. Jesus, resting his claims to the Messiahship on the testimony of the Scriptures, commended them to the undoubting confidence and careful study of his hearers: "Search," said he, "the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." John 5:39.

The evangelist John furnishes incidentally the strongest possible proof of his high estimate of the Scriptures. He says: "The disciples believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said." John 2:22. The apostle coupled the Scripture and the word of Jesus as of equal credibility. Could he have done this without dishonoring Jesus, if the Scripture had

partaken of the errors prevalent in the ages of its several authors?

Let us now examine the testimony of the apostles on the inspiration of the Old Testament. Their own inspiration we shall now take for granted, and prove in another place. Peter, proposing to fill the vacancy in the apostleship caused by the apostasy and death of Judas, said: "Men and brethren, this Scripture must, needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas." Acts 1:16. The apostle had reference to Psa. 12:9. The text had not a very clear reference to Judas; but Peter, himself inspired, declared that it was spoken by the Holy Ghost, that the mouth of David was merely the organ for uttering the prophecy, and that its fulfillment was a matter of necessity. No advocate for plenary, verbal inspiration has ever expressed it more clearly or strongly than did Peter on this occasion. To the same effect was the language of all the disciples, when Peter and John, released from imprisonment and the power of their enemies, "reported all that the chief priests and elders had said unto 'them.'" "They lifted up their voice to God with one accord," saying, "Thou art God, ... who by the mouth of thy servant David hath said, why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things?" Acts 4:25. These words were not David's, but God's. David uttered, but God indited them; and filled them with a meaning of which probably the Psalmist had but little conception. 1 Pet. 1:11&12. On this subject the teaching of Paul is explicit and full: all Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine (teaching), for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3:16, 17. The apostle affirms, not only that Scripture, but that "all Scripture" is Divinely inspired. The language clearly means, not merely that every book of Scripture, but that all the contents of every book, historical, geographical, and scientific, as well as doctrinal, is inspired of God; and therefore infallible, and fitted to make the man of God perfect. As Paul teaches the measure, so Peter states the manner, of Divine inspiration. He says: "Prophecy came not in old time (at any time.) by the will of man; but holy men of God spake (and doubtless also wrote) as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." God employed holy men to reveal his truth to the world. They did not speak or write by their own knowledge or will; but as they were enlightened, guided and influenced by the

