

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

J. J. JAMES, Editor.

Devoted to Religion, Morality, Literature, Agriculture and General Intelligence.

G. HERBERT & Co., Proprietors

VOLUME XX. NO. 17.

RALEIGH, N. C., THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1855.

WHOLE NO. 1057

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER,

A Religious and Literary Paper.

Published weekly at Raleigh, N. C., at \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance.

All letters on business should be directed to G. MERRITT & Co., Raleigh, N. C.

All letters containing communications, or in any way relating to the editorial department, should be addressed to Rev. J. J. JAMES, or "Editor of the Biblical Recorder."

All communications, to insure attention, must be directed to Raleigh, N. C.—*post-paid*.

For further particulars see last page.

THE LAW OF NEWSPAPERS.

1. Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary are considered wishing to continue their subscription.

2. If the subscribers order the discontinuance of their papers, the publishers may continue to send them till all cash charges are paid.

3. If subscribers neglect or refuse to take their papers from the office to which they are directed, they are held responsible until they have settled their bill, and order their paper discontinued.

4. If subscribers remove to other places without informing the publisher, and the paper is sent to the former direction, they are held responsible.

5. The courts have decided that refusing to take a paper or periodical from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected for, is "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

For the Recorder.

Notes Upon the Mode of Baptism.

NUMBER THREE.

(Continued.)

We shall now proceed to show that, had our Saviour used the English word *dip*, Pedobaptists would have used identically, the same arguments that are now used to prove that *Baptizo* means any application of water, to sprinkle, &c.

They often say to us, "show them dip or immerse in the New Testament, and they will be with us." Neither sprinkle, pour, or immerse, is to be found in the New Testament where the ordinance of baptism is to be found. In its proper place, we shall show why this is the case.

Our position is this, had our Saviour spoken the English language, and used the English word *dip*, Pedobaptists would have used the very same arguments that they now do in reference to *Baptizo*, yet every body knows that *dip* no more signifies to sprinkle than it does to fly.

Baptizo is defined in the Lexicons to mean to dip, immerse, to plunge, to wash, to purify, &c., and one out of twelve as quoted by Rev. J. L. Chapman, a Methodist, on Baptism, gives us as a meaning of *Baptizo*.

It is argued that as *baptizo* is said to mean to purify, to wet, &c., that it may therefore mean to sprinkle, as an article may be wet by sprinkling. Now let us apply this mode of reasoning to *dip*, and see what the result will be.

Webster, the highest English authority, gives the following definition to the word *dip*, to plunge or immerse, to put into a fluid and withdraw. To engage, to take concern, to mortgage, to moisten, to wet. From which it will be seen that Pedobaptists would have said, *Dip* cannot always mean to put under water, for Webster says it means also to moisten or wet.

Therefore it means to sprinkle or pour as an article can be moistened or wet by sprinkling or pouring. Again it is said *Baptizo* in its ecclesiastical sense, means to purify, which may be done by sprinkling, therefore it means to sprinkle.

Had *dip* been the word used by the Saviour, it would have been said, *dip* in its ecclesiastical sense means to purify, and therefore may mean to sprinkle. Again, it is said *baptizo* is applied to a partial dipping or immersion, and therefore does not always mean a total immersion.

Had *dip* been the word used, it would be said, *dip* does not always mean a total immersion, for it is applied to a partial dipping, as "dip the finger," "dip the pen in ink," &c. It may therefore mean to sprinkle. Here it is evident the reasoning would be the same, had our Saviour used the English word *dip*.

Again we would be told, *dip* does not always mean a total immersion, for we saw of a mineral vein, it dips, of studious or learned men they dip in books, in science, &c.; of the compass, the needle dips. All this and much more would be said to prove that *dip* does not always mean a total immersion, and therefore means to sprinkle!

Again, it is said *Baptizo* is from *Bapto* to dip and to dye, as dyeing can be effected by pouring the coloring fluid upon an article, it may mean to pour, &c.

Now let us subject *dip* to the same reasoning.

Women, who follow dyeing, frequently call dyeing dipping. They frequently say to each other, "have you dipped (that is dyed) your cloth yet?"

Had *dip* been the word used by our Saviour, Pedobaptists would say, *Dip* means to dye, and as dyeing may be done by pouring the fluid on, therefore *dip* means, or may mean to sprinkle. We find in "Pendleton's Three Reasons," the following appropriate remarks upon this subject. "All English dictionaries give immerse, or its equivalent as the ordinary meaning of *dip*. It would, therefore, be very unreasonable to deny that *dip* ordinarily means to immerse. Greek lexicons give immerse as the ordinary meaning of *baptizo*. Is it not, then just as reasonable to deny that *baptizo* ordinarily means immerse, as it would be to deny that *dip* has this signification? Indeed, there is no argument employed by Pedobaptists to divest *baptizo* of its usual meaning, which may not be plausibly employed to divest *dip* of its ordinary import. The truth is, though *dip* is a definite and specific term, *baptizo* is more so. We speak of "the dip of the magnetic needle," and "the dip of a stratum in geology." Pope speaks of "dipping into a volume of history." And in some places there is a practice which the ladies call "dipping snuff." If Pedobaptists could find *baptizo* used in such connections there would be rejoicing from Dan to Beersheba." p. 89.

Milton would be quoted to prove that *dip* does not always mean an immersion. He says, "A cold shuddering due *dips* me all o'er."

It would be said the idea of immersion is excluded here. Had our Saviour and the Apostles used the English word *dip*, and the Scriptures read as follows: "He that believeth and is dipped shall be saved." "John also

was dipping in Enan, &c." And they went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he dipped him, &c." It would be said, *dip* does not always mean a total immersion, it is used under circumstances that forbid the idea of immersion. We should hear much about the "dip of the needle"—"dipping in history"—"a cold shuddering due dips me all o'er," &c.

Rev. R. Watson, in his tract on Baptism, published by the Conference, would have said, "If the Eunuch was dipped, Philip was also dipped, for nothing is said of one that is not said of the other."

To show how easily Pedobaptists could make *dip*, plunge or immerse mean sprinkle or pour, we will introduce some testimony from their standard writers. We will begin with Dr. Thos. O. Summers. On p. 98, in his book on Baptism, he says, "The derivative *baptizo* may have primarily meant to dip; but as things were frequently dipped to be washed and purified, the term readily acquired this latter meaning."

Such reasoning as this, would make *dip*, plunge, or immerse, mean sprinkle or pour—All who are acquainted with the English language, know that they mean no such thing—If the reasoning of Dr. Summers be correct, these words mean, what every English scholar knows they do not mean!

Again, the Dr. says, "Suppose the word *Bapto* originally meant to dip, how easily would it take the meaning of die, color, stain, imbue, from the fact that articles were usually dyed by dipping, or saturating them in a coloring fluid." p. 97.

Let us apply this reasoning to *dip*. "Suppose *dip* originally meant a total immersion, how easily would it take the meaning of die, color, stain, imbue from the fact that articles were usually dyed by dipping." Had our Saviour used the word *dip*, Pedobaptists would have put it to the rack, until they would get it to mean sprinkle or pour! And that too by the same reasoning that they try to make *Baptizo* mean to sprinkle or pour.

Rev. Leo Rosser, A. M. of the V. C. says, "But admitting (which we do not) that in its original primitive classic use, (*baptizo*) meant to immerse, even then the meaning of the word in its scriptural sense is to be divided from new evidence, the new facts, new circumstances connected with its scriptural use." p. 42.

Had our Saviour used the word *dip*, plunge, or immerse, this mode of reasoning would make a dry sprinkle out of the whole of them!

Again, says Rosser, p. 42, "The laws of association, habits, manners, customs, and new circumstances have (the effect) of modifying the original primitive meaning of a word till the original idea is lost, and a secondary sense substituted." Such reasoning as this would (if true) raise Pharaoh and all his host out of the Red Sea, and place them all on dry land with a little water sprinkled in their faces, and all alive at that! If this reasoning of L. Rosser be true, we may retort upon him and say, if sprinkling was the original meaning of *baptizo*, the laws of association, manners, customs, and new circumstances, &c., may have changed the original idea, and immersion may now be its meaning! All such reasoning shows the weakness of the cause, it is introduced to advocate.

Rev. J. Paris on Baptism, in a book published by the Methodist protestants, on p. 30, says, "Whatever the primary meaning of the word 'Baptizo' may be, it is of but little importance. . . . Hence it became necessary in applying an old term to a new thing, to make the word conform to the thing, and not the thing to the word." p. 48.

Was such nonsense ever uttered upon any other subject? Is there a single article of the Christian faith, that would survive the test of such criticism? Would not a Catholic be able by such reasoning to prove every article of his faith and practice?

This reasoning of Mr. Paris would soon make *dip*, plunge or immerse, mean sprinkle or pour! Yet as before stated every body knows they mean no such thing.

Again, Mr. Paris quotes Dr. Kurtz as follows: "Words . . . frequently depart from their primitive ideas . . . The true question is not, what was the original signification of *Baptizo* . . . but what was, and is the meaning of the term as used in the New Testament. . . . Words change their meaning in all languages." pp. 49, 50. Apply this reasoning to *dip*, and the result would be the same as when applied to *baptizo*. Had our Saviour and the Apostles used the English word *dip*, plunge or immerse, the result of such reasoning would be the same. It would be said, "The true question is not, what was the original signification of *dip*, plunge, or immerse, but what was, and is the meaning of these terms as used in the Testament. Such reasoning as this unsettles the meaning of the entire word of God."

Again, Dr. Kurtz as quoted by Mr. Paris, says, "So Christ and his Apostles when they applied the word *baptizo* to express a religious ordinance gave to the word a new shade of meaning, conformed to the thing which it was now intended to express." J. Paris on Baptism, p. 51.

Apply this reasoning to *dip*, plunge, or immerse, and the result would be the same. Had they been used, Dr. K. and other Pedobaptists would have said, "Christ and his Apostles when they applied the word *dip*, plunge or immerse to express a religious ordinance gave a new shade of meaning, conformed to the thing which it was now intended to express."

It is much easier to assert that the Saviour and the Apostles gave a new shade of meaning to *baptizo*, than to prove it.

Again Dr. K. as quoted by Mr. Paris, says, "It is preposterous, therefore, to determine the precise mode of this ordinance from the primary, or previous meaning of the Greek word used to express it. The meaning of an old word when it is used as the name of a new thing, must conform to the thing, and not the thing to the word." p. 52.

If such reasoning as this be correct, it is impossible to establish the meaning of any passage whatever in the New Testament. It makes the word of God a perfect unintelligible jargon, to be interpreted to suit the fancy, or prejudice of every man. An all-wise God never delivered his will to man in this way.

If old words, when applied as the name of a

new thing, must conform to the thing, and not the thing to the word; it follows, that all old words used by the Saviour and the Apostles, have a "new shade of meaning," and the sense must be determined not by the words, but the thing spoken of, must decide what the new meaning is! The cause which demands such defence cannot be of God.

Words in living languages may change, or take an additional meaning, but dead languages never change. The sense of a word is to be ascertained from its known meaning at the time it is used, and not from any new meaning which it may afterwards acquire.

Rev. J. M. Pendleton, in his admirable work, entitled "Three Reasons why I am a Baptist," which should be read by every sincere enquirer after truth, says, "But some say, though *baptizo* in classic Greek means to immerse, it does not follow that it is to be understood in this sense in the New Testament. They discuss learnedly on the difference between classic and sacred Greek. They insist that *baptizo* has in the scriptures, a theological sense. In short, they feel quite a contempt for Ernesti's "Principles of Interpretation." They forget that "when God has spoken to men, he has spoken in the language of men, for he has spoken by men, and for men."—For the special benefit of these wise critics, I quote from the ablest Methodist work I have seen, (Watson's Theological Institutes, vol. 2, p. 153.) The author is showing, in opposition to the Socinian view, that the Apostles employed terms in reference to the death of Christ which convey the idea of expiation. He (Mr. Watson) says: "The use to be made of this in the argument is, that as the apostles found the very terms they used with reference to the nature and efficacy of the death of Christ, fixed in an expiatory signification among the Greeks, they could not, in honesty, use them in a distinct figurative sense, much less in a contrary one, without due notice of their having invested them with a new import being given to their readers. . . . In like manner, the Jews had their expiatory sacrifices, and the terms and phrases used in them are, in like manner, employed by the apostles to characterize the death of their Lord; and they would have been as guilty of misleading their Jewish as their Gentile readers, had they employed them in a new sense, and without a warning which unquestionably they never gave." pp. 102, 103.

(To be continued.)

Eloquent Extract.

From Defence of the Eclipse of Faith.

The brightness of the brightest names pales and wanes before the radiance which shines from the person of Christ. The scene at the tomb of Lazarus, at the gate of Nain, in the happy family at Bethany, in the "upper room" where he instituted the feast which should forever consecrate his memory, and bequeathed to his disciples the legacy of his love; the scene in the garden of Gethsemane, on the summit of Calvary, and at the sepulchre; the sweet remembrance of the patience with which he bore wrong, the gentleness with which he rebuked it, and the love with which he forgave it; the thousand acts of benign condescension by which he well earned for himself, from self-righteous pride and censorious hypocrisy, the name of the "friend of publicans and sinners"; these, and a hundred things more, which crowd those concise memorials of love and sorrow with such prodigality of beauty and of pathos, will still continue to charm and attract the soul of humanity, and on these the highest genius, as well as the humblest mediocrity, will love to dwell.

These things lisp in infancy loves to hear on its mother's knees, and over them age, with its grey locks, bends in devout reverence.—No, before the infidel can prevent the influence of these compositions, he must get rid of the gospels themselves, or he must supplant them by fictions yet more wonderful. Ah, what bitter irony has involuntarily escaped me! But if the last be impossible, at least the gospels must cease to exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.

Yes, before infidels can prevent men from thinking as they have ever done of Christ, they must blot the gentle words with which, in the presence of austere hypocrisy, the Saviour welcomed that timid guilt that could only exist before infidelity can succeed.