

Sister Brabyn writes:—"Judgment and atonement belong to two separate lines of argument and refer to two distinct principles of divine action. Judgment is not the *aim* of Baptism, but the very reverse. Baptism in itself admits *only* of *one* meaning, namely, atonement. There is nothing in the ceremony from any point of view of a penal character, therefore judgment cannot grow out of it if it is not in it. Judgment of any degree, or in any form, is the result not of baptism but of knowledge of law. Baptism of course will be followed by the judgment seat of Christ—not, however, by VIRTUE of BAPTISM, but because of responsibility arising from light. At the moment of writing, I do not see that *baptism* has anything to do with standing again to *mortal* life. It is wholly concerned with *eternal* life. The blood of the covenant was shed to that end, and consequently the mere coming out of the grave must be explained on an entirely different principle, namely, *knowledge*. Christ did not die to judge men but to save them, and baptism is baptism into his death and salvation. The *act* does not involve judgment or condemnation, but the *knowledge* which makes the act valid brings us to judgment. Therefore if knowledge is the principle on which Christ proceeds, then knowledge may stand independent of baptism—indeed it seems to me it must, as being the principle of judgment—and Christ said *his word* should judge them in the last day, and he also said he came for judgment, by which I understand that what he *taught* would bring condemnation to the disobedient. I do not see that we can place any limits on those warnings of Christ. They certainly do not depend on baptism—they simply prove to me that the law of condemnation is quite apart from the principles of mercy, of which baptism is the embodiment." -1893