

Reckon Him A Christian Indeed Who Is Not Ashamed Of The Gospel, Nor A Shame To It.

PREMILLENNIAL...BAPTISTIC...CALVINISTIC...BIBLICAL

The Baptist Examiner

The Paper With A National Circulation

"Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel."

"To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. 8:20).

VOL. 12, NO. 21

RUSSELL, KENTUCKY, SATURDAY, JUNE 26, 1943

WHOLE NO. 280

The Christ Of Calvary

Christ does not save men by His Life.
Though that was holy, sinless, pure,
Nor even by His tender love,
Though that forever shall endure;
He does not save them by His words,
Though they shall never pass away;
Nor by His vast creative power
That holds the elements in sway;
He does not save them by His works,
Though He was ever doing good;—
The awful need was greater still,
It took His death, His cross, His blood.
Men preach today a crossless Christ,
A strengthless Saviour, vague and dim.
They will not see their sinful state,
They will not own their need of Him.
They will not know the Lamb of God,
Despised, rejected, crucified, —
That were to humble into dust
Their boasted intellect and pride.
Yet no man cometh unto God
Save by the Son alone, He saith.
The deathless life for which we long
Can only — ever — come through death.
Not Bethlehem or Nazareth
Stern Justice's lifted hand could stay;
To Calvary the soul must go
And follow Jesus all the way.

- Annie Johnson Flint

The Preacher's Wife

There is one person in your church
Who knows your preacher's life;
She's wept and smiled and prayed
with him,
And that's your preacher's wife!
She knows your prophet's weakest
point,
And knows his greatest power;
She's heard him speak in trumpet
tone,
In his great triumph hour;
She's heard him groaning in his
soul,
When bitter raged the strife,
As, hand in his, she knelt with
him—
For she's the preacher's wife!
The crowd has seen him in his
strength,
When glistened his drawn sword
As underneath God's banner folds
He faced the devil's horde.
But she knows deep within her
heart
That scarce an hour before
She helped him pray the glory
down
(Continued on page three)

Frozen To Death

After forty hours in a skiff in
ice-choked Lake Michigan, while
his two companions froze to death
by degrees, Clayton Brown, 22
crawled on his hands and knees
over eight miles of ice, and reach-
ed shore more dead than alive.
Indians who found him on the
shore applied primitive first aid,
which doctors credited with hav-
ing kept him alive. His privations
were said to be almost beyond be-
lief.
Brown and his father-in-law had
set out fishing on the lake on Sat-
urday morning. The ice beneath
them broke away from the shore
pack and they were carried out
into the lake. Coast guardsman
Cunningham volunteered to go
after them and fought his way on
through the ice field in a skiff.
When he reached them darkness
had already fallen, the snow storm
had turned into a blizzard, and
return was impossible.
Brown, in relating some of his
experiences, said, "We were not
afraid at first. We thought sure
we would reach shore all right.
Then the wind grew stronger and

we could make no headway, but
we kept on rowing to keep warm.
As night wore on, Cunningham
and my father-in-law got sleepy
and I had to shake them to keep
them awake. I kept telling them
that if they went to sleep they
would freeze to death. I'd heard
that was the first sign when you
are freezing to death, you get
sleepy. They didn't seem to care.
I began slapping them with my
hands. We got through the night
some way, but we were all worn
out. They brightened up some
when daylight came. We moved
around as much as possible and
we stayed close together so that
the heat of our bodies would keep
us all warm.
"The day dragged by. Darkness
came again. Cunningham and my
father-in-law just sat in the skiff
and they seemed to give up hope.
It was dark. I couldn't see them.
I talked to them, but they didn't
answer. I found a stick in the
boat and I began beating them
with it. I'd beat one, then the
other. At first they said not to
(Continued on page four)

"The Easter Racket"

BY RAY MASON, TAMPA, FLORIDA

But now, after that ye have
known God, or rather are known
to God, how turn ye again to the
weak and beggarly elements,
whereunto ye desire again to be
in bondage?

Ye observe days, and months,
and times, and years.

I am afraid of you, lest I have
bestowed upon you labour in vain.
— Gal. 4:9-11.

Every year for a long time now,
I have made it a practice to preach
an anti-Easter sermon, and I ex-
pect to keep up this practice so
long as there is need of doing so,
which will probably be for some
time to come. I do this because
one of the most disgraceful frauds
ever perpetrated in the name of
Christianity is the so-called "holy
week" culminating in Easter. It
is hard to believe that even the
devil with all of his cunning should
have been able to slip over such
a thinly disguised fraud so easily.
He has been able to do this be-
cause of the fact that many peo-

ple accept whatever is being done
and never do any real hard-down
thinking. Now some people get
mad at me for preaching and
writing against Easter. None of
them — not a single person in all
these years — has ever been able
to show that my attitude is not
correct. They don't attempt to
challenge the truth of my utter-
ances, but here is what they say:

"Bro. Mason is going against
everybody else." No, I am not go-
ing against everybody else, for
there are lots of people who don't
believe in nor observe Easter. I
have had a regular avalanche of
letters from radio listeners expres-
sing approval of my anti-Easter
sermons published in Faith and
Life. And suppose that I stood prac-
tically alone — that wouldn't make
any difference, for I would still
have the truth and Word of God
with me, and let us not forget
that one with God is still a major-
ity.

Another person says, "Bro. Mas-
on is upsetting a cherished tradi-

tion." So did Jesus upset some
cherished traditions, and He said
in so doing, "ye by your traditions
set at naught the law of God."

Another person says, "My mo-
ther, or my grandmother taught
me to observe Easter." Suppose
they did — that isn't any argu-
ment for the correctness of it. Mo-
thers in India have taught their
daughters to cast their babies to
the crocodiles as an act of relig-
ious devotion too, but did that
make it right?

I remember that we used to have
a woman who on Easter would
run off to an Episcopal church to
witness the Easter display. She
didn't challenge the truth of my
preaching against Easter, although
she didn't like it. Her argument
was, "That Easter display is so
pretty." I am always afraid of peo-
ple who put sentiment ahead of
the truth. I'm like Paul who said
to the Galatians, "Ye observe
days — I'm afraid of you, lest I
have bestowed upon you labor in
(Continued on page three)

A Compassion For The Lost

By John L. Bray

There is a phrase used concern-
ing the ministry of Christ that
was very characteristic of His at-
titude toward others. It is found
several times in the gospels. "But
when he saw the multitudes, he
was moved with compassion."
(Matt. 9:36). "And Jesus went forth,
and saw a great multitude,
and was moved with compassion."
(Matt. 14:14). "And Jesus, moved
with compassion . . ." (Mark 1:41).
Jesus was a man of compassion!
Oh, what a concern He had for
others!

May I say this, Christian friend?
You cannot follow Jesus and do
the soul-winning work that He
did unless you have a broken
heart for sinners. Unless there is
a passion and a zeal in your heart
to get people saved, then you will
never accomplish much for the
Lord. Let that be plain. People
are saying, "We need more pre-
achers; we need more people to
preach the gospel." Beloved, that
is not the main thing we need;
what we need is for the preachers
we already have to be filled with
a passion for the lost! God took
(Continued on page four)

How The World Got Wrong On Baptism

BY EVANGELIST JOHN R. RICE
There is a strange text of Scrip-
ture in Revelation 17:5:

"And upon her forehead was a
name written, MYSTERY, BABY-
LON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER
OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINA-
TIONS OF THE EARTH."

By reading the rest of the chap-
ter, we find that evil woman is
certainly used to represent Ro-
man Catholicism. Rome with its
worldwide spiritual adultery or

false religion; Rome with its per-
secution of the martyrs; Rome
with its riches and cathedrals, art
treasures, gold, silver and pearls;
Rome, a state church, riding on
the beast of the Roman empire
(which will be rebuilt again under
the Anti-christ); Roman Catholi-
cism, centered in the city of the
seven hills, is the great harlot,
mother of harlots and abomina-
tions, Ecclesiastical Rome is this
modern Babylon. Read the verse
again and you will see that God

has plainly foretold for us that
all the false doctrines, heresies,
and religious abominations which
come to Christianity in this age
are a product of Roman Catholi-
cism. Many individual Catholics
are not to blame for this, and I
mean no unkindness when I call
attention to the plain and unmis-
takable meaning of this passage
in God's Word. I do so to call at-
tention to the fact that Roman
Catholics officially changed from
(Continued on page two)

HOW AN INDIAN GOT REVENGE

Years ago, before the Great
West became the home of thous-
ands of our race, the Indians rang-
ed over these wide stretching
plains and dense forests as their
hunting grounds.

It may be that some of our
readers who read this paper have
heard something of the peculiar
ways and habits of those Indians.
(Continued on page four)

Could Christians Attend Theatres?

Wilbur Chapman tells of
a incident in the life of President
Lincoln that suggests a weakness
in a life and an efficient
element in the life of a few. He
tells of President Lincoln's
wife, Mrs. Pomeroy, who was
counted a
of President Lincoln's
hold. One day when he had
been weary with the affairs of
the war, he asked her to accom-
pany him to the theater and occupy
President's box at the Ford
theater that night. Mrs. Pomeroy
declined.

He gave her a subsequent in-
vitation and it was not accepted.
Finally, with some degree of ir-
ritation, he said, "Mrs. Pomeroy,
I counted an honor to sit in the
President's box. I should like to
know why you have refused."
At a moment, as if she
were about to hurt the feelings of the
President, she said: "Mr. President,
I am a Christian, and when I be-
lieve such I promised my Lord
I would go no place where I
could not take Him with me, or
lose His blessings. I could hardly
sit at the theater, and for
that reason I do not go." It is said
(Continued on page four)

WHICH COUNTRY BUYS THE MOST BIBLES?

The city of Chicago alone
sells more copies of the Scrip-
ture in 1940 than the total sales
made with the Wind," one of
the world's best sellers, during
its entire selling experience; and
this fact, writes the editor
of People's Friend, you
suppose that America buys
more Bibles than any other coun-
try in the world. And then, again,
(Continued on page four)

THE BAPTIST EXAMINER

JOHN R. GILPIN—EDITOR

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

Editorial Department, RUSSELL KENTUCKY, where communications should be sent for publication.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE
Per Year in Advance \$5.00
(Domestic and Foreign)
Send Remittances to Russell, Ky.
Entered as second-class matter May 31, 1941, in the post office at Russell, Kentucky, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Paid circulation in about forty states and four foreign countries.

Subscriptions are stopped at expiration unless renewed or special arrangements are made for their continuance.

HOW THE WORLD GOT WRONG ON BAPTISM

(Continued from page one)
baptizing to sprinkling. One fatal doctrine of our Catholic friends is that they claim the church, or council, or pope, has the authority to promulgate a doctrine, which they believe, is as infallibly correct as if taught in the Word of God. In other words, the Bible is not the authority and guide of Roman Catholics. They do not claim that it is, and they deliberately and purposely depart from some teaching of the Bible. For instance, the Bible plainly says that a Bishop or pastor should be the "husband of one wife." (I Tim. 3: 2; Titus 1: 6). Peter himself whom the Catholics claim as their first pope, was married. (Matt. 8: 14). Roman Catholics knew this Bible teaching, yet they deliberately changed it, requiring priests and nuns not to marry. They insist that they had a right to change it, since they say the pope and the church have the authority of Christ on earth. When Jesus gave the Lord's supper (Matt. 26: 26-28), He gave the disciples both the bread and the grapejuice, or wine. For many centuries Catholics did likewise, and THEN CHANGED IT. Now the Catholic priests drink all the wine (and it is really intoxicating wine) and the common people are given only the bread of the Lord's supper. Catholics admit they changed it, and say they had a right to. On exactly the same basis, Catholics changed from baptism to sprinkling, as their own authorities frankly admit.

CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA ADMITS THEY CHANGED BAPTISM

I have before me the official Catholic Encyclopedia, sponsored by the Knights of Columbus with the imprimatur of Cardinal Farley and given to the public library by the local council of the Knights of Columbus. One page 259, Vol. II, under the heading "BAPTISM, II, Etymology" is this statement:

"The word baptism is derived from the Greek word baptizo, to wash or to immerse."
On page 261, Vol. II, second column, (b), begins the following passage which we quote word for word.

"The proximate matter of baptism is the ablution performed with water. The very word 'baptizo' as we have seen, means a washing. Three forms of ablution have prevailed among Christians, and the church holds them all to be valid because they fulfill the requisite signification of the baptismal laving. These forms are immersion, infusion and aspersion. The most ancient form usually employed was unquestionably immersion. This is not only evident from the writings of the Fathers and the early rituals of both the Latin and Oriental churches, but it can also be gathered from the Epistles of St. Paul, who speaks

of baptism as a bath. (Eph. V. 26; Rom. VI. 4; Titus III. 5). In the Latin Church, immersion seems to have prevailed until the twelfth century. After that time it is found in some places even as late as the sixteenth century. Infusion and aspersion, however, were growing common in the thirteenth century and gradually prevailed in the Western Church. The Oriental Churches have retained immersion, though not always in the sense of plunging the candidate's entire body below the water."

Notice that Catholic authorities admit that "IMMERSION SEEMS TO HAVE PREVAILED UNTIL THE TWELFTH CENTURY," IN THE LATIN OR ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND IN SOME PLACES AS LATE AS THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Notice the words "THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES" meaning the Greek Catholics and some others. "HAVE RETAINED IMMERSION." Roman Catholics changed from baptizing by immersion to sprinkling. Greek Catholics keep the original form, immersion.

CATHOLICS ORIGINALLY HAD LARGE BAPTISTRIES FOR IMMERSION

Visitors to ancient churches or cathedrals in Europe built before the thirteenth century, would know that this is true. But we would rather prove it by this official encyclopedia prepared by Roman Catholic authorities under the supervision of a Roman Catholic cardinal. On Page 274, Vol. II of this Catholic Encyclopedia, under the heading "Archaeology" are the following passages:

"In the apostolic age, as in Jewish times (John 3: 23) baptism was administered without special fonts at the seaside or in streams or pools of water. (Acts 8: 38) — Indoor baptism, however, was not uncommon (Acts 9: 18, 16: 33) and, for the sake of both privacy and solemnity, came to be the rule; while reverence for the rite itself and for the water, which came in time to receive a special consecration, gave rise to the use of a special font or basin for the baptismal ceremony, and at a later period, for the preservation of the water. With the establishment of distinctly Christian places of worship, this font became one of their important adjuncts. In the East it took the form of a pool or cistern, similar to those of the baths, often larger, and deep enough to permit total immersion."

NOTICE THAT THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BAPTISTRIES WERE ORIGINALLY LARGE ENOUGH AND DEEP ENOUGH TO PERMIT A TOTAL IMMERSION! Catholics changed baptism from immersion to sprinkling.

CATHOLICS ADMIT GROWTH OF "INFANT BAPTISM" AMONG THEM

In the same Volume II, on page 275, first column, the official Catholic history of baptism, in this Catholic Encyclopedia, says:

"The passing of the period of adult conversion to Christianity, and the growing prevalence of infant baptism with the consequent frequency of administration determined a change in the structure of the fonts. Instead of a basin below the floor level, walls of masonry were built up to a height of three or four feet to facilitate the minister's holding a child over its opening; or a font hewn from solid stone rested on the chapel floor. Immersion of children had come to be the rule, and as the practice was adopted, too, in the case of adults, the fonts were sometimes large enough to admit of their being immersed. In the thirteenth century, however, simple infusion came by degrees, to be adopted, and was generally used, the font became smaller and more shallow and was raised from the floor on piers or columns. The older

type of font continued to find favor in Italy, but in the northern countries the winter chill of the waters hastened the general use of infusion, and at this rite required for each person baptized, but a small quantity of water, the font generally took the simple form and small dimensions it has today."

Notice the statement "in the thirteenth century, however, simple infusion (he means sprinkling) came by degrees to be adopted and was generally used." Notice the frank statement that because of cold weather, and the "growing prevalence" of the custom of "baptizing" infants, Catholics felt free to change the Lord's way of baptizing by immersion to sprinkling for their own convenience. This is the origin of sprinkling and pouring for baptism and of so-called "infant baptism." All modern denominations which use these customs got them from Roman Catholics, who began them, as the Scripture so clearly prophesied in Revelation 17: 5.

"And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."

LUTHER, BREAKING LOOSE FROM ROMAN CATHOLICISM KEPT SPRINKLING

Early in the sixteenth century, a Catholic monk named Martin Luther became dissatisfied with the unscriptural teachings and practices of Roman Catholicism and tried to start a reform within the church. He discovered in the Bible that marvelous doctrine that people are saved by faith, not by church membership, nor baptism, nor by confessing to a priest and doing penance. Luther was excommunicated and his movement led to the creation of a new denomination, Lutherans. Luther was a great and good man, but he did not complete his reform and carried over into the new denomination many of the customs and traditions to which he had become accustomed as a Catholic. The Lutherans clung to the idea of a state church, and to certain of the rituals such as confirmation, and continued to use sprinkling for baptism. Luther believed in baptism by immersion and understood that the Bible so taught. Dr. Philip Schaff in the History of the Christian Church, Vol. VI, on pages 218 and 219 quotes Luther as saying the following:

"Baptism, he said, is that dipping into water, since it takes its name from the Greek, to baptize, signifying to dip, and baptism is a dipping. Baptism signifies two things — death and resurrection: that is, full and complete justification. When the minister dips the child into the water this signifies death; when he draws him out again, this signifies life. Thus Paul explains the matter (Romans 6: 4) — I COULD WISH THAT THE BAPTIZED SHOULD BE TOTALLY IMMERSSED, ACCORDING TO THE MEANING OF THE WORD AND THE SIGNIFICATION OF THE MYSTERY; not that I think it necessary to do so, but that it would be well that so complete and perfect a thing as baptism should also be completely and perfectly expressed in the sign." (Type emphasis mine, J. R. R.).

However, instead of following the Bible in practice, Luther followed Roman Catholicism on baptism. Our Lutheran friends sprinkle today because they inherited that custom from Rome.

EPISCOPALIANS, COMING FROM CATHOLICISM, KEPT SPRINKLING INSTEAD OF GOING BACK TO BIBLE BAPTISM

About 1530-33, the fat king of England, Henry VIII became dissatisfied with his wife, Queen Catherine. We can sympathize with

him, for he had been forced, while a mere child, for reasons of state, to take as his bride Catherine of Aragon, the widow of his brother, much older. We can understand how it was never a love match. Besides that, she did not bear him an heir to the throne. And to cap it all, he fell in love with Anne Boleyn. He applied to the pope for a divorce from Catherine, his elderly, barren, and unloved wife. The pope refused, partly because of the strict Catholic teaching against divorce, and partly because that his strongest supporter in the world at that time was the Catholic monarch, Philip, King of Spain, and brother of Catherine, Henry's wife. The pope dared not lose the friendship of the strongest king in Europe. There had been much unrest in England over corrupt practices among the Catholic clergy and dissatisfaction with Catholic rule. So Henry VIII promptly threatened to make the English branch of the Roman Catholic church independent. That was soon done and the "Anglican Church," or the English Episcopal denomination was born. The Episcopalians retained many of the forms of Catholicism. They followed the customs of sprinkling and "infant baptism" which had originated in the Roman Catholic church, and to which they were all accustomed.

THE NEW MEDIEVAL AND MODERN HISTORY by Samuel Bannister Harding, page 345, gives the following account of the origin of the English, or Episcopal Church:

"The actual separation from Rome came from the desire of Henry VIII to have his marriage with Catherine of Aragon, with whom he had lived for 18 years, declared void, in order that he might marry Anne Boleyn, with whom he was infatuated; when the Pope refused to grant the annulment of his marriage, Henry obtained his divorce from a court of the English Church, presided over by Cranmer, his Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1553 he proclaimed Anne queen, in defiance of the Pope."

"In November, 1534, the separation from Rome was made complete by the Act of Supremacy, passed by Parliament."

Episcopalians are sprinkled today because when they came out from Roman Catholicism they retained that form which the Catholics had adopted after doing away with the Bible form of Baptism by immersion. They teach the sprinkling of babies and make it a part of the plan of salvation as their Catholic forefathers did.

EPISCOPAL PRAYER BOOK REQUIRED IMMERSION, EVEN OF BABIES UNLESS WEAK

Earnest men tried to break with Roman Catholic practice and doctrine when the English church became independent, but tradition was too strong. The first Episcopalian or English church Prayer Book, adopted in 1549, provided for baptism by immersion even of babies. That rubric under the heading "Public Baptism of Infants," says:

"Then the priest shall take the child in his hands, and ask the name; and naming the child SHALL DIP IT IN THE WATER THRICE. First dipping the right side; second, the left side; the third time dipping the face toward the font; so it be discreetly and warily done, saying:

"I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen."

"And if the child be weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it, saying the aforesaid words." (Type emphasis mine, J. R. R.).

In the prayerbook as revised in 1662 the above was changed to provide for dipping babies only once, "If they shall certify him that the child may well endure it." It was this English prayer book that John

Wesley later followed, baptizing the child was weak." At this time the custom was already established to do it the easier and unsupernatural way, and so they do it today, though the Prayer Book still stands concerning "the baptism of babies, that the priest or minister shall dip him in the water or pour water upon him, saying etc."

Methodists will see how "Discipline" was patterned after this, though they, like the Episcopalians, follow the Catholic practice, baptizing in the Bible way only when people insist upon it.

WHY BIBLE DOES NOT REQUIRE WORD IMMERSION

When King James of England encouraged a group of scholars to translate the Bible into the English language, naturally the instructions he gave were colored by the position and teachings of the state church of England, the Episcopal church, which came from Roman Catholicism. The translators were ordered, in case of any word where the translation would cause controversy or cast reflection on the church, to simply Anglicize the Greek word, that is, to spell it with English letters and not to translate the word at all. I mention two interesting examples. Greek word *deacon*, literally meaning servant, was not translated but simply spelled with English letters and made into an English word, because in their form of church government, the order of the ministry had named deacons. Likewise, the word *baptizo*, which has the primary meaning of dip, immerse or bury was not translated at all. It was simply put out baptize and made into an English word. That is why our English Bible says "baptize" instead of saying "immerse."

THE BIRTH OF METHODISM

An Episcopalian clergyman on a trip to America, became acquainted with some earnest people of the Moravian Brethren faith, and learned about that blessed doctrine of the new birth and of being converted. After his return to England, he with his brother, a group of other earnest men, formed what was called the Methodist Society. This Episcopalian preacher became a self-evangelist and started a saving movement which went on throughout the world and blessed millions of people. His name was John Wesley and the people who followed him soon formed a separate denomination called "Methodists," or "Wesleyans." In America, the Methodist Episcopal church was divided by them, later dividing into two branches, North and South. They turned away from the formalism of the Episcopalians and Catholics but retained the Episcopal form of denominational government, the doctrine that staying saved depends on one's works, and they kept sprinkling for baptism and "baptism" as Episcopalians Catholics did before them. However, Wesley plainly taught "the ancient form" of baptism by immersion and he used the same form often, even with babies.

JOHN WESLEY BAPTIZED BY IMMERSION; SAID IT WAS "THE ANCIENT MANNER OF BAPTIZING"

The great John Wesley made an effort to go against the tide of tradition and custom and baptize by immersion. He made the mistake of following Episcopal rules, "baptizing" instead of only believers. The Bible teaches, and also using sprinkling instead of baptism if one is "certified" to be weak! It was plainly admitted that

(Continued on page four)

PREACHERS WIFE

(Continued from page one)

Behind a closet door:
I tell your tales of prophesies
I brave
I walked across the world
I changed the course of history
I burning words they hurled.
I will tell how back of them
Some women lived their lives,
I wept with them, and smiled
I with them—
They were the preacher's wives:
— Selected

THE EASTER RACKET

(Continued from page one)

And if we don't like what
said against Easter observance,
who go about grumbling, and
and apologizing for the
because he attacks this
then I have this to say to
— brother — sister: "Just quit
grumbling and get your
much letter and go somewhere
where you can get your fill
of heathenism." And when I say
I think I have the backing
the church as a whole in say-
ing it.

MOTHER'S DAY IS A STEAL

may say while I am on the
of days, that the New
ment opposes the introduc-
of all sorts of unscriptur-
The First Day of the week
the "LORD'S DAY." It ought
to be regarded as the
Day, and ought never to
be given to anybody — Easter,
father, daddy, children, or any-
else. I am opposed to the ob-
servance of "Mother's Day" or
"Father's Day," for both are de-
grade steals, inasmuch as they
steal the Lord's Day and turn it
to mother or father. I don't
think that mother or father can
be honored in the theft of a
day that belongs to our Saviour.

COMMERCIAL RACKET

Now the title of my sermon—
the Easter Racket" sounds pret-
entious, but the truth is, Easter
is a racket. First of all, it is a
commercial racket. Literally tens
thousand of dollars are made
profit by commercial concerns
during Easter time, and the East-
er sentiment is exploited in every
receivable form at the Easter
season for commercial gain. Whole
thousands are given over to the
production of Easter bunnies, and
digestible Easter candies. If all
the groans that have arisen
from the stomach aches caused by eat-
ing candy eggs, were concentrated
into one big groan, the sound
could reach across Florida. And
the devil goes as far as to put on
night Easter dances. Fancy
people engaging in all night revel-
ry and sensuality in supposed celebra-
tion of the resurrection of Christ.
What blasphemy! But, in the se-
cond place, Easter is a religious
racket. Tens of thousands of little
children will be rustled into the
churches today — taken in with-
out any knowledge of the new
truth from above; taken in to
be unsaved in the churches;
taken in to go on through life
unreformed into thinking they are
saved spiritually. Instead of year-
ning for evangelism, and constant
conversions as people under gospel
teaching find the Saviour, many
churches resort to an Easter decep-
tion of the babies and children.
Coming now to the heart of my
monition, let us ask WHAT IS THE
TRUTH ABOUT EASTER?

In answering this I shall give
you the truth and nothing but the
truth. The truth is, Easter is not
Christian but a heathen day,
celebrated originally in honor of
an old Teutonic goddess of
spring. In northern Europe those
uncivilized tribes of the

past were worshippers of a heathen
goddess by the name of Eostre
or as we would say, Easter. Every
Spring when the sun warmed the
earth into new life, they had a big
celebration in honor of their god-
dess, and this celebration was a
drunken, licentious orgy which is
really unfit to describe to a mixed
audience. How do I know this is
true?

1—By History. No real student
of history will for a moment ques-
tion the truth of my statements.

2—By encyclopedias. Any good
encyclopedia will tell you just
what I am telling you. If you doubt
this, I challenge you to read the
article on "Easter" in any stand-
ard encyclopedia.

3—Robert Ripley, who scours
the world for strange facts, came
out a few years ago with the state-
ment, "Believe it or not, Easter is
not a Christian but a heathen
celebration," and he had a drawing
representing this pagan god-
dess.

4—Frederick Haskins of Wash-
ington runs an information bureau
noted for its truth and accuracy
and in response to a question con-
cerning Easter he frankly stated
the pagan origin of Easter.

PREACHERS KNOW BETTER!

Somebody says to me, "Do pre-
achers who lead their people to
observe Easter, know these facts?"
The answer is, many of them do.
A young preacher raised the ques-
tion in the Baptist pastor's con-
ference down here one Monday
morning. I had just circulated an
issue of Faith and Life containing
an anti-Easter sermon, and the
young man said, "Is what Mason
says about Easter true?" A pro-
minent pastor spoke up and said,
"Of course it's true. He has the
facts all right, but" said he, "since
Easter is almost universally ob-
served I think it is best for us to fall
in line and make the most of it."
Those were his words in substance.
That explains why Baptists who
know better observe Lent and East-
er and such — their excuse is
"We had better follow the trend
of the times." Now before you
condemn them in that, just ask
yourself the question, "do I fol-
low the trend of the times? Do I
let the world and the flesh and
the devil, set my standards for
me?" You Christian women, tell
me, "Why have some of you cut
your dresses to your knees? Is it
in obedience to the Word of God
which says, 'that women should
adorn themselves in modest ap-
parel?'" You know it isn't. The
Word of God says, "Be not con-
formed to this world," and yet in
spite of this, I'll challenge anyone
to find any difference between
the way the women of the world
dress, and the way in which some
of the best women of this church
dress. Some of you have your
dresses cut just as high as the
women out here who don't even
breathe the word Christian. Why?
Because you have let this world
set the standard for you, rather
than the teaching of God's Word
concerning modesty — that's why.
Now that truth hurts — but be-
fore any of you get angry, you
talk to the Lord about it when
next you pray. What I am saying
is this: We are too much inclined
to let the trend of the times domi-
nate us, instead of what is right
— and that is back behind this ob-
servance of Easter by Baptists.

WHAT IS THE TRUTH ABOUT EASTER?

Now we know beyond any doubt
or question that Easter IS NOT
RESURRECTION DAY, and that
is has no remote connection with
the resurrection. How do we know
it?
1—We know it because Easter
is not in the Bible. Only one time
does the word occur in the Bible
and that is in the 12th chapter of
the Book of Acts, and in that in-
stance, it occurs only by way of
mistranslation. The word in the
Greek is the word "pascha" which
always means "passover" and can

by no stretch of the imagination

be properly translated "Easter."

That the Episcopal scholars trans-
lated it Easter shows to what
length men will go in order to
justify a thing that is unscriptur-
al.

2—We know that Easter is not
resurrection day because it comes
on a different day each year. East-
er comes on the first Sunday fol-
lowing the Spring equinox, and there
is a difference of time amounting
to close to 30 days between the
different Easter times. So you can
see Easter is determined by the
moon and the equinox and not by
the date of the resurrection of
Christ. I ask you, don't you think
our religious observances ought
to be determined by the Bible ra-
ther than by the moon?

3—We know that Easter is not
resurrection day, because it is ob-
served on different days by the
two great branches of Catholicism.
Roman Catholics observe Easter
at one time, and then the Greek
Catholics, such as these over at
Tarpon Springs, observe Easter at
another time entirely. And I may
say just here that this whole East-
er business as observed by some
Baptists and others is lifted bodily
out of Catholicism. The Catholics
got it from heathenism; Protestants
got it from the Catholics, and
Baptists come bringing up the
rear after having adopted it from
paganism, Catholicism and Pro-
testantism.

I want that we shall now note
what Easter does. Let us see what
practical harm comes from Easter
observance.

1—Easter brings a pagan god-
dess into Christianity. It even
brings her very name. When Jero-
boam of old set up his golden cal-
ves in Israel, he linked up with
his calf worship, the worship of
Jehovah—made a sort of "Duke's
Mixture." Do you suppose that
worship which mixed paganism
and the worship of the true God,
was acceptable to Jehovah? A
thousand times no! But that mix-
ture was not one whit more blas-
phemous or an insult to God, than
the mixed paganism and Christian-
ity that is offered to God in hun-
dreds of churches over the land
today. I tell you, this is no trivial
thing. I feel like the prophet of
old must have felt when he came
back there in Jeroboam's day and
stood by one of those calf altars
and cried out against it. As called
of God to proclaim His word and
to defend his truth, I cannot but
cry out against this Easter wor-
ship that is being practiced today.

2—Easter brings pagan symbols
into Christianity. Just ask any-
body you please the question as
to what place and part rabbits
and eggs have in the worship of
God, and they will begin to stum-
ble around in confusion. Go and
consult any good encyclopedia and
you will find that the rabbits and
eggs were pagan symbols of fer-
tility in reproduction, and of
course they have naught to do
with the resurrection.

SATAN LAUGHS

3—Easter sets aside 51 resur-
rection days a year. Sunday is
resurrection day — not one Sun-
day, or a few Sundays, but every
Sunday. When Easter is made to
be resurrection day, then the de-
vil succeeds in striking out 51 re-
surrection days in favor of just
one day, and that day he fills so
full of clothes and rabbits and
eggs and etc., that the resurrection
is not noticed. Easter plays down
and makes unnecessary the week-
ly resurrection day — Sunday.
And it is a noteworthy fact that
in all lands that are dominated by
Catholicism, there is no strict ob-
servance of Sunday at all. The
Catholic featuring of Easter is
largely at the bottom of this. And
it is further noteworthy that the
more we have the denominations
joining in Easter — the bigger the

Easter "blowouts," the more do
we have the Lord's Day desecrat-
ed. There is a direct connection
between those two things. And
back behind the scenes Satan
laughs, and I can imagine him
saying, "What fools these Christ-
ians be — they let me strike out
all of their resurrection days but
one — and then they let me name
that one after a heathen goddess."

4—Easter observance hooks Bap-
tists onto the Catholic "holy week"
calendar, which is historically in-
correct and theologically rotten.
The whole Lent, Palm Sunday,
Good Friday, Easter mess is a Sat-
an concocted falsehood. Listen
Jesus did not make His Triumphal
Entry into Jerusalem on Palm
Sunday. Why? Because it was on
the Jewish Sabbath — Saturday.
Mark (Mark 1:11) tells us that He
went into the temple, looked a-
round and went out. Why did not
He drive the money-changers
out of the temple? Because it be-
ing the Jewish Sabbath day, there
was no money changing going on
— that's why. Jesus was not cru-
cified on Good Friday as common-
ly taught. WHY? Because if He
were He could not have been in
the tomb three days and three
nights, as He had promised to be.
You don't have to be a mathema-
tician to figure that out. The Good
Friday theory makes our Saviour
to have been a falsifier. For He
said He would be in the grave
three days and three nights —
(Matt. 12:40).

And as to LENT — I consider
Lenten observance a disgrace to
the name of Christianity. WHY?
Because people pretend to deny
themselves during Lent. They cut
out meat and go to eating noodles
and canned salmon (which by the
way is just as much meat as beef-
steak). They quit their dancing
and card playing, and things of
that sort, and then just as soon
as Lent is over they plunge head-
long into all sorts of fleshly indul-
gences. Some of the folk who quit
dancing during Lent, plunged
headlong into a dance that lasted
all last night, and in order to hold
out on the dance floor, they took
a little liquor along with the dan-
ce. If it is wrong to indulge the
fleshly appetites during Lent, it is
wrong at all times.

BAPTIST TRAITORS TO THEIR MARTYRS

It is a sad commentary on the
looseness and worldly attitude of
Baptists that they have come to
mix into this Easter and Lent
business. For hundreds of years
Baptists suffered death by martyr-
dom rather than observe Easter.
They absolutely would not sym-
bolize with Rome or with heath-
enism though it cost them their
lives. In the year 591 Baptists were
put to death in great numbers in
Wales for their refusal to baptize
their babies and observe Easter.

Dr. John Christian who was for-
merly teacher of church history
over here in B. B. I. at New Or-
leans, tells us that about 1200 of
them were killed at one time for
their refusal to keep Lent, Holy
Week, and Easter. And yet, the
very thing that our heroic Bap-
tist ancestors died for is surren-
dered by Baptist churches and pre-
achers today without firing a shot.
I tell you, Baptists dishonor the
memory of these martyrs of the
past, when they fall into the ways,
that they refused to walk in even
under penalty of death.

Now if Easter is not the Bible
memorial of the resurrection, let
us ask WHAT IS — OR WHAT
ARE THE BIBLE MEMORIALS
OF THIS EVENT? The answer is
twofold:

—IMMERSION. Listen to this:
(Rom. 6:3-5). Know ye not, that so
many of us as were baptized into
Jesus Christ were baptized into
his death?

Therefore we are buried with
him by baptism into death; that

like as Christ was raised up from
the dead by the glory of the Fa-
ther, even so we also should walk
in newness of life.
For if we have been planted to-
gether in the likeness of his death
we shall be also in the likeness of
his resurrection."

When a child of God is Scriptur-
ally baptized, they say by that act,
"Christ was raised from the dead,
and just as He was buried and a-
rose, so I am buried to the old
life of sin, and am raised to walk
in newness of life."

"BLUE NOTHING"

2—The second memorial of the
resurrection, as already indicated,
is THE LORD'S DAY — every
first day of the week. The Lord's
Day ought to be the biggest day
in the life of every Christian. What
does Christianity hinge upon? It
hinges upon the resurrection of
Jesus Christ from the dead, for "if
Christ be not risen then is your
faith vain," says Paul, "ye are yet
in your sins — and they who have
died in Christ are perished." And
there isn't anything that consti-
tutes such an eloquent, indisputable
reminder of the fact that Christ is
risen, as the observance of the
Lord's Day as a day of worship
and Christian service. When laws
are passed to safe-guard observan-
ce of this day, they are usually
called "blue laws." And Sundays
that are not given over to dissipa-
tion and worldly pleasures are de-
signated as "blue Sundays." Blue
Sundays — nothing! Is Sunday a
"blue day" because it reminds that
we have a risen Saviour who is
able to give salvation and life and
eternal joy to men and women? Is
Sunday a "blue day" because it re-
minds that the grave does not
swallow us completely up when
we die? Is Sunday a "blue day"
because it reminds us that our lo-
ved ones who have died in Christ
have not perished, but that we
shall see them again? Is Sunday a
"blue day" because it reminds us
that there is such a thing as the
resurrection of the dead? Instead
of Sunday being a "blue day," it
is the brightest day on the calen-
dar, for if there could be blotted
out of existence all that Sunday
or the Lord's Day stands for, then
the human race would be hope-
lessly doomed forever.

HE LIVES — HALLELUJAH

That's the reason why I don't
believe that we should come to
the Lord's house with the corners
of our mouths hanging down.
That's the reason why we should
not sing as if we were at a fune-
ral. That's the reason why we
oughtn't to come "poking in" to
church as if we were about to
begin serving a jail sentence. Christ
is risen. Christ lives! Christ is
coming again! Christ is going to
rule the world in righteousness.
Ah, that's enough to banish pes-
simism; that's enough to lift our
hearts out of the slough of des-
pond; that's enough to make us
shout for joy! God forbid that we
members of this church should
take this day — the Lord's Day,
as a day to visit, as a day to fish,
as a day to loiter at the beach, or
as a day to desecrate in any fash-
ion. It is our business to so ob-
serve the Lord's Day, that the
world out there in sin and dark-
ness and hopelessness, may learn
the truth that a Saviour has risen
from the tomb, who has the power
to give life unto men. I say GIVE
LIFE — for salvation and eternal
life is the free gift of God to all
who will receive it. And that op-
portunity to freely, instantly, re-
ceive eternal life is open to every
sinner here today. Will you make
use of the opportunity?

BROKE HIS NECK

In a small western town one
night, several commercial travel-
ers came in from a late train to
a certain hotel. Among them was
a man who had been there many
times, and who knew the hotel as
well as the bell boys. So he vol-

like as Christ was raised up from
the dead by the glory of the Fa-
ther, even so we also should walk
in newness of life.

For if we have been planted to-
gether in the likeness of his death
we shall be also in the likeness of
his resurrection."

When a child of God is Scriptur-
ally baptized, they say by that act,
"Christ was raised from the dead,
and just as He was buried and a-
rose, so I am buried to the old
life of sin, and am raised to walk
in newness of life."

"BLUE NOTHING"

2—The second memorial of the
resurrection, as already indicated,
is THE LORD'S DAY — every
first day of the week. The Lord's
Day ought to be the biggest day
in the life of every Christian. What
does Christianity hinge upon? It
hinges upon the resurrection of
Jesus Christ from the dead, for "if
Christ be not risen then is your
faith vain," says Paul, "ye are yet
in your sins — and they who have
died in Christ are perished." And
there isn't anything that consti-
tutes such an eloquent, indisputable
reminder of the fact that Christ is
risen, as the observance of the
Lord's Day as a day of worship
and Christian service. When laws
are passed to safe-guard observan-
ce of this day, they are usually
called "blue laws." And Sundays
that are not given over to dissipa-
tion and worldly pleasures are de-
signated as "blue Sundays." Blue
Sundays — nothing! Is Sunday a
"blue day" because it reminds that
we have a risen Saviour who is
able to give salvation and life and
eternal joy to men and women? Is
Sunday a "blue day" because it re-
minds that the grave does not
swallow us completely up when
we die? Is Sunday a "blue day"
because it reminds us that our lo-
ved ones who have died in Christ
have not perished, but that we
shall see them again? Is Sunday a
"blue day" because it reminds us
that there is such a thing as the
resurrection of the dead? Instead
of Sunday being a "blue day," it
is the brightest day on the calen-
dar, for if there could be blotted
out of existence all that Sunday
or the Lord's Day stands for, then
the human race would be hope-
lessly doomed forever.

HE LIVES — HALLELUJAH

That's the reason why I don't
believe that we should come to
the Lord's house with the corners
of our mouths hanging down.
That's the reason why we should
not sing as if we were at a fune-
ral. That's the reason why we
oughtn't to come "poking in" to
church as if we were about to
begin serving a jail sentence. Christ
is risen. Christ lives! Christ is
coming again! Christ is going to
rule the world in righteousness.
Ah, that's enough to banish pes-
simism; that's enough to lift our
hearts out of the slough of des-
pond; that's enough to make us
shout for joy! God forbid that we
members of this church should
take this day — the Lord's Day,
as a day to visit, as a day to fish,
as a day to loiter at the beach, or
as a day to desecrate in any fash-
ion. It is our business to so ob-
serve the Lord's Day, that the
world out there in sin and dark-
ness and hopelessness, may learn
the truth that a Saviour has risen
from the tomb, who has the power
to give life unto men. I say GIVE
LIFE — for salvation and eternal
life is the free gift of God to all
who will receive it. And that op-
portunity to freely, instantly, re-
ceive eternal life is open to every
sinner here today. Will you make
use of the opportunity?

BROKE HIS NECK

In a small western town one
night, several commercial travel-
ers came in from a late train to
a certain hotel. Among them was
a man who had been there many
times, and who knew the hotel as
well as the bell boys. So he vol-

unteered to go to his room alone, and not wait for a boy to show him the way. When he reached the floor his room was on, he found it dark, but feeling sure he knew where the room was located, he didn't light the match the clerk gave him, but kept on walking along the dark hall. Suddenly there was a cry of distress, and it was found that he had walked through the dark hall to the end, and out through a door that a careless servant had left open. He was found on the ground below with a broken neck, and in his hand, tightly clasped, was the unlit match. His intention was good, but he didn't fulfill it. That commercial traveler had the light right in his hand, if he had made use of it, but he failed to do it, and walked on through the darkness to death and doom. Listen: Dear friend, don't try to find your way to God without the Saviour who has been provided for you. God has placed before you a gospel opportunity right this morning. Right within the grasp of your faith is the light that will lead you to God, to heaven, and to home. Will you take Jesus — the Light of Life as your Saviour and Guide and will you do it today? Don't walk on — like the travelling man walked, through the darkness to doom. Take Him, who can light the path of life for you, and who can guide you until you shall stand in the light that streams from the eternal Throne.

SHOULD A CHRISTIAN ATTEND THEATRES?

(Continued from page one)
that Abraham Lincoln never again asked her to accompany him to such a place, but it is known that again and again when they were driving together on some mission of mercy in the various hospitals, he would say to his coachman, "Drive a little slower." And then he would say to Mrs. Pomeroy, "Tell me more of this Christ whom you serve."

Such a life has power, and this is simply being consistent, and not in any sense fanatical. — Exchange.

A COMPASSION FOR THE LOST

(Continued from page one)
a handful of Christians in the early beginning of the church and shook the world with them. Why? They had a passion for the lost; they wanted to get people saved. But the modern-day church sits down and folds its hands and does nothing for the lost. There is no passion; there is no burning; there is no zeal; and if there is anything that I would try to stir up in your own hearts, it is a burden for the lost.

I heard the pastor of one of the largest churches in Florida preach not long ago, and in his message he said something that struck home in my heart. He said, "I wouldn't give the snap of my finger for all the formal, ritualistic, religion there is today. Any man than can see Jesus Christ there dying on the cross for us should certainly have a burden in his heart for lost souls." That is what we need, but do we have it?

I have read the lives of great men of God who really won people to the Lord, and there is one thing that is outstanding about all of them: they had a burdened heart for the lost. And, oh, my friend, you can be concerned about your business and your organizations, and about your churches, and about your work in the churches, or anything else, but unless you have a deep burden down in your hearts for the people who are lost round about you, you are never going to win many

people for the Lord. Now keep that clear because it is true. God help some of us! Some of us have never shed a tear over a lost person, have never wept because we felt down in our hearts that someone was without God and needed to be saved and were bound for Hell itself. There is no concern. And that is why we are not making any impression on the world today; that is why more people are not being saved than are; that is why the church is dead spiritually and not doing anything for God. We are sitting back with a heart filled with our own ease and comfort and pleasure. May God stir us up and make soul-winners out of us!

FROZEN TO DEATH

(Continued from page one)
do it, but I kept right on. Finally Cunningham didn't move. He was frozen and dead. I felt awful bad because he was a man who had risked his life to save mine. He died some time during the night. My father-in-law was just about dead then. He was saying prayers, and I would join in. Finally, he turned to me and said, 'My time has come to meet my Maker. I wish I could see my family before I die.' Then he died. I thought about my wife and two little girls. That was all that kept me going. I was so weak I couldn't walk, so I crawled. I kept right on crawling for what seemed days. Finally I got ashore and the Indians found me."

One can feebly enter into what took place out there on the ice. Clayton Brown, who lay in the Charlevoix hospital alive after having crawled for eight miles on hands and knees, owes his life to the mercy of God.

Let us not forget the greatest of all storms is coming! A storm that will burst in all its fury upon the heads of all who know not the Lord Jesus as their refuge. Dear unsaved one, you are this very moment exposed to the danger of being swept out into the cold, icy grip of death and judgment. Oh, the thought of it — to PERISH! This should make every reader of these lines stop and think and act.

What we need above all else in a time of storm is a place of shelter. David knew this blessed place and in Psalm 61 he cries, "Hear my cry, O God; attend unto my prayer. From the end of the earth will I cry unto Thee, when my heart is overwhelmed; lead me to the Rock that is higher than I. For Thou hast been a shelter for me."

In the incident above we saw how Earl Cunningham was willing to risk his own life to save others. Surely this was remarkable, and an act of bravery that will never be forgotten, especially by Clayton Brown. We only feel sorry that Cunningham failed in the kind act he attempted to perform. This fully illustrates the love and kindness of another — that of the person of our Lord Jesus Christ. He was willing to give His life that we might be saved. He bore the storm of God's wrath upon our sins at the Cross of Calvary. Is it any wonder that we cry as Paul did in Gal. 2:20, "I live by the faith of the Son of God Who loved me and gave Himself for me?" — A. H. H.

WHICH COUNTRY BUYS THE MOST BIBLES?

(Continued from page one)
you would be mistaken, for the greatest buyer of Scriptures of any country on earth is — guess again — heathen China.

Last year China bought 8,705,616 copies of the Bible, or portions thereof. Is it possible that some of us younger people should live to see Chinese missionaries bring-

ing the Bible back to us in America?

— Selected

HOW AN INDIAN GOT REVENGE

(Continued from page one)

In living near them one has to be careful not to offend them, or else he who on peaceful terms was a true friend becomes a bitter enemy.

A story is told of an old time Pioneer having settled in the West near an Indian's wigwam. In the course of time by some unkind act he greatly offended his Indian neighbor. The Indian, in a way common to his race, watched for the occasion when to the best advantage he could satisfy his vengeful spirit. But before such an opportunity presented itself, the wondrous story of the gospel was made known to his soul. He learned that he had sinned against God — had greatly offended Him, and become an enemy to his Creator; but that instead of receiving his just deserts—death, as the wages of sin, he saw that God had laid the penalty upon Jesus, His beloved Son, and by His stripes, he, an Indian deeply wounded by sin, might be healed.

One day, as our Indian friend was coming down the river in his canoe, he saw a little boy in the water struggling for life. Recognizing him as the son of the pioneer, he thought, "I'll get revenge at last." With all speed he raised the boy from the water and took him safely to his father, and said, "You wronged poor Indian. Poor Indian get revenge at last."

Was not that a noble "revenge" dear friends — to return good for evil? The Indian remembered that Arm of love outstretched to save him as he struggled in the river of sin, soon to be swallowed up in death, and instead of cruel revenge, as he would have done in former days, the grace of God taught him to return kindness for insult, and good for evil. The Holy Spirit had taught this Indian Christian, you see, what we read in Titus 2:11, 12, "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation to (or, for) all men, hath appeared, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world."

My dear young reader, have you pushed aside the hand that was stretched forth to save you, or do you know what it means to be safe in the arms of Jesus?

"Safe in the arms of Jesus,
Safe on His gentle breast,
There by His love o'ershadowed
Sweetly my soul shall rest."

HOW THE WORLD GOT WRONG ON BAPTISM

(Continued from page two)

was the Bible way of baptizing, and used immersion ordinarily, though he was greatly criticized for it by his Episcopalian brethren.

Once in fact, Wesley was tried in court because he insisted on immersion. He tells about it, himself, in "John Wesley's Journal," something of a diary which he wrote. In the "Popular Edition, Condensed," of this Journal, published by Charles H. Kelley, London, 1903, I read and copied his account of that incident, which happened in Georgia in 1736. Here it is:

"Wed. May 5th — I was asked to baptize a child of Mr. Parker's, second bailiff of Savannah; but Mrs. Parker told me, 'Neither Mr. Parker nor I will consent to its being dipped.' I answered, 'If you certify that your child is weak it will suffice (the rubric says) to pour water upon it.' She replied,

'Nay the child is not weak, but I am resolved it shall not be dipped.' This argument I could not confute. So I went home; and the child was baptised by another person."

September first of the same year Wesley records in his Journal the "List of grievances presented by the grand jury," delivered to the court at Savannah, Georgia that day. Number 5 of these grievances for which Wesley was tried was, as Wesley copied it in his Journal.

"5 By refusing to baptize Mr. Parker's child, otherwise than by dipping, except the parents would certify it was weak, and not able to bear it."

The jury seems to have disagreed, and Wesley left the colony for England. Another entry in his Journal, quoted by Robert Scutney in LIFE OF WESLEY AND RISE AND PROGRESS OF METHODISM, footnote, page 58 edition of 1871, in Wesley's own words, is as follows:

"Mary Welch, aged eleven days, was baptized according to the custom of the first church and the rule of the church of England, by immersion. The child was ill then but recovered from that hour."

Robert Southey, in the book mentioned above, criticized Wesley severely on this question of baptizing by immersion. On page 498 Southey says:

"Both brothers (referring to John and Charles Wesley — J. R. R.) retained the fancy of baptizing by immersion, after they had outgrown many eccentricities; and Wesley sometimes followed the mode out of condescension to the whims of others where he had ceased to attach any importance to it, and must have perceived inconvenience of the practice. One of the charges which the virulent Toplady brought against him, was that of having immersed a certain Lydia Sheppard in a bathing tub in a cheesemonger's cellar, in Spitalfields."

Wesley frankly believed that the Scripture taught immersion. In his "Explanatory Notes Upon The New Testament," he honestly declared himself, specially when commenting on Colossians 2:12 and Romans 6:4, and when he came to those Scriptures mentioned baptism as a burial. In that commentary as published by Carlton and Porter, New York, page 376, the note on Romans 6:4, John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, says:

"We are buried with him — Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion."

WESLEY FOLLOWED EPISCOPALIANS AND CATHOLICS IN SPRINKLING AND INFANT BAPTISM

Wesley had been taught from childhood from the Episcopal or English church Prayer Book that babies were born again at baptism, as that Prayer Book still teaches, and he never got away from this tradition of men. In his sermon on The New Birth, part IV, point 2, as published by B. Waugh and T. Mason, 1835, Vol. I, page 405 of "The Works of the Reverend John Wesley," Wesley says:

"It is certain our church supposes, that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again; and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants proceeds upon this supposition."

Wesley was there discussing John 3:5, and makes clear that the reason he "baptized" babies was that it saved them! He followed this reasoning of Catholics and of the English church of which he was still a minister and member, and gradually gave way to their custom of sprinkling or pouring instead of Bible baptism. Now, however, Methodist ministers

argue against that which Wesley so stoutly defended and practiced immersion for baptism. How sad that men should follow "Babylon the great, mother of harlots and abominations of the earth," Rome instead of the Word of God!

JOHN CALVIN, FOUNDER OF PRESBYTERIANISM, ADMITS IMMERSION WAS ORIGINAL MODE OF BAPTISM

History tells a similar story concerning John Calvin and our Presbyterian friends. That great man had a part in the reformation that went back to the Bible teaching that salvation is altogether of God's grace, not of our works, and is obtained by simple faith in Christ. However, to avoid making more enemies, he retained the forms of sprinkling and "infant baptism" as they had been established by Roman Catholics, instead of going back to the Bible way of baptizing only saved people, by burial in water.

Great scholar that he was, John Calvin could not entirely break away from his Catholic training and tradition. He knew that the word baptize in the Greek literature means immerse, and said so, admitting that New Testament practice and teaching was immersion. Yet he said it was "of no importance" and continued the Catholic customs of sprinkling and even baptized infants. In that famous work of his, "Institutes of the Christian Religion," in chapter XV on Baptism, at the close of paragraph XIX, Calvin says:

"But whether the person who is baptized be wholly immersed, or whether thrice or once, or whether water be only poured or sprinkled upon him, is of no importance; churches ought to be left at liberty in this respect, to act according to the difference of countries. HOWEVER, WORD BAPTIZE, EVER, SIGNIFIES TO IMMERSE, AND IT IS CERTAIN THAT IMMERSION WAS THE PRACTICE OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH."

Our Presbyterian friends, who say that what Jesus did and commanded about the form of baptism is of no importance, have followed the Catholic example away from the Bible!

STUDY THE PROOF CAREFULLY: THEN AWAY FROM TRADITION, BACK TO THE BIBLE!

Sprinkling used for baptism, so-called "infant baptism" IN EVERY CASE came from following the example and tradition of Catholics who first began them, and they themselves plainly admitted. No group of people ever practiced sprinkling or "infant baptism" because of any Scripture on the subject, since not a single case of either is found in the Bible! I beg you to study the proof of every statement in this book. If you will come with an honest, humble heart, willing to follow the Bible alone, God will clearly reveal His will and teaching to you. The only safe guide is the Word of God! Put away your prejudice, leave the teachings of tradition, childhood, cast out the traditions of men, and you will find Scriptures absolutely unanimous in their teaching on baptism, and as clear as daylight!

Editor's Note: The above is chapter from the book, "Bible Baptism," by John R. Rice. The book is of paper cover and is 128 pages. There are seven other chapters and all are just as interesting as the one quoted.

We will send this book free to everyone who sends a new subscription to the Baptist Examiner.