Curious Relics
File in Safe

John M Berry the author of this book was the father of William F. Berry who was Abraham Lincoln's partner in the firm of Berry & Lincoln at New Salem, Illinois.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
The Institute of Museum and Library Services through an Indiana State Library LSTA Grant

http://www.archive.org/details/lecturesoncovena01berr

LECTURES

ON

THE COVENANTS,

AND THE

RIGHT TO CHURCH MEMBERSHIP,

WITH OTHER SUBJECTS:

TO WHICH IS ADDED

AN APPENDIX.

BY JOHN M. BERRY:

A MEMBER OF THE IOWA PRESBYTERY OF THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

LOUISVILLE:

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR.

1849.

District of Illinois, }
s. s. }

Be it remembered, That on the twenty-second day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-eight, John M. Berry hath deposited in this office the title of a book, as follows, viz.: "*A Series of Lectures on the Covenants, and the Right of Church Membership, with other Subjects: to which is added an Appendix. By John M. Berry, a member of the Iowa Presbytery of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.*" The right whereof he claims, as author and proprietor, in conformity to the Act of Congress, entitled an Act to amend the several Acts of Congress respecting copy rights.

I, William Pope, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Illinois, do certify, that the foregoing is a true and correct copy from the copy right record of said Court.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto affixed the seal of said Court, and subscribed my name, this 22nd day of December, A. D. 1848, and of our Independence the seventy-third year.

WM. POPE, *Clerk.*

N. H. White, printer, Market St.

TO THE READER.

The Author, having long examined with care and interest to himself and others, the mode and subjecs of Baptism, both from books and men, without arriving at a satisfactory view of the mode, although the subject was clear, and having believed that immersion was valid in the sight of Heaven, was, in June, 1834, called on to administer baptism to an adult. On arriving at the stream for administering, the stream was found too shallow, consequently eight or ten men were employed, for some time, in stopping the water, that the ceremony might be performed. While they were laboring, the Author was led in his mind to enquire: Is this the plan of an all wise God to initiate subjects into the church? His mind turned to the Bible, and he thought, surely if God's book is a complete revelation, it will teach the mode, as well as the subject. This thought caused him to commence another search for the whole truth, and for some months he labored, with great anxiety of mind, on that subject. He began by searching for the origin of the church, the time when, and by whom it was first instituted, and what constituted a legal, as well as a spiritual member of the true church of God. On this subject his mind was much perplexed, and finding that there were different covenants, of a public nature, he was led to investigate each separately. And ascertaining that they were made at different times, and under different circumstances, the nature and design of those covenants being also different, he was led to seek information from authors. But all the writers on the subject he has had access to, (and that a goodly number,) having presented them in a complex form, no distinct explanation of one, apart from another, could be arrived at with cer-

tainty. This being the cause of so much controversy and confusion in the world, about church membership, connected with the course pursued by the writers and speakers on both sides of the subject, in going to the Ancient Fathers to establish the mode and design of the ordinance, and from the definition of the word "baptize," as found in Lexicons, instead of comparing and defining the word with the nature and design of the ordinance, as laid down in the Scriptures, which is the proper standard of truth for moral action. Therefore, the Author designs the churches amongst whom he has labored, to know that he has changed his views of immersion, and also the reasons why he has changed, as will be given in the following work.

PREFACE.

In presenting our views to the public on the subject of the covenants, the only apology for it is, a sincere desire to add to the light already reflected thereon; if, under God, we can afford any additional light, so as to give comfort to the minds of parents who are in doubt, and to the public, in behalf of children of believing parents; whether they are, or are not, entitled to the sealing ordinance of the house of God in baptism, which is the seal of the covenant of grace. Seeing the extremes that men have gone to on either hand, some having made the baptism of infants, not only a sealing, but a saving ordinance,* while others reject them, because they are not capable of believing, we propose an investigation of this subject, not from Lexicons, on the definition of the word "baptize," nor from Church History, but from the Word of God alone. We wish for no history but the Bible, and we want no Lexicon but the Bible. Our reason for assuming this position is, that thousands of readers have not the means of informing themselves from any other source than the Scriptures, for on them alone, they have to rely for light, grace, and salvation. Therefore, we are inclined, with these facts before us, to present our views in the most simple, and scriptural manner possible for us to do. And if the less learned can understand the views given, the more advanced in knowledge can; then all will be the better prepared to judge of the work, whether it presents truth or not.

We expect, in this treatise, to pursue a little different

* See Episcopalian Prayer Book—pp. 125—128.

course, from what has been generally done by men, who have given their views to the public on this subject. Some, however, are afraid of new things, while others are delighted with them, but the great object will be, to present Bible truth; therefore, we solicit all, into whose hands this little work may chance to fall, that they will read it with an unbiased mind, in search of truth, for the truth's sake. And if the reader finds himself profited in view of truth, God will be honored, infants benefited, and the good cause advanced. Then our highest expectation and most ardent desire will be met, if but one ray of light can be added to that which already shines, on the right of infants of believing parents to the covenant.

We propose, then, to examine the different covenants, that are of a public nature, with whom made, and for what purpose, and what was intended to be effected by them: also to notice, whether any of them are done away, for it is often said that all the old covenants are done away, and if so, the Bible will shew it, and if not that sacred Book will teach us. And if, on examination, we can find they still remain, it will be our bu siness to investigate and see, whether they are of any advantage to men in the present day, and what that profit is. This fact can be arrived at with safety; if the apostles regarded them in their day, we surely may in this our day. But special care should be taken, that when an apostle uses or speaks of one covenant, we do not apply it to another, and thereby miss the meaning of the text, for a misapplication of Scripture will always produce error in faith, or practice, either of which is injurious to the cause of truth.

One other object of this work is, to present the reciprocal obligations, that exist between parents and children. This obligation by many is not seen, or if seen, neglected or disregarded; the effect of which has been, great injury to the church and to the world. Truth requires us to say, that the professed friends of infant baptism, from the course pursued by them, have done more iujury to the cause, and are a greater barrier in the way, than all the open and avowed enemies ever it has had. It is a well known fact, that sponsors, who have stood for children, and made solemn vows in their behalf, have treated both vows and children

with perfect indifference. Others, as well as members of the church of England, have neglected duty on this subject; many have their children dedicated to God in the ordinance of baptism, but never instruct them in the nature or design of that ordinance. Seeing this is the case with so many parents, is it marvellous, that the world rejects, and that children, who have been neglected, and consequently left ignorant of their duty and privileges in their covenant relation to God, when they arrive at years of discretion, make light of it? We therefore hope, the reader will not be so hasty in his conclusions, as to reject the evidence on this subject, until he has examined the work carefully, and compared it with the Word of God; and if it be found true, according to that holy book, let him put it into practice; if it be not true, reject it. Do not make mere notions the test, but let the Word of Inspiration be the standard, by which the whole shall be tried.

When our views were first given to the public, (which was on the second Sabbath in June, 1840,) they produced great excitement, inasmuch as the premises, on which the arguments rested, were somewhat different from commonly received opinion, and consequently led to different conclusions, which gave rise to some heavy charges of want of charity, and christian union, toward other denominations, that are considered orthodox in their sentiments. But having lectured on this subject, at different times, and in different places, and our views being made generally known, they were not thought to be so unscriptural; for the more they were examined the more consistent did they appear with the Scriptures. Consequently, a number of persons having solicited their publication, that if true the world might know and practice them, (if not true, let the error sink to oblivion,) and honestly believing, and hoping, that some benefit may be derived from them, we have consented to give our views to the world, and let the honest reader and the public judge of their merits. In a land of equal rights, it is the privilege of every one to think freely for himself, and investigate matters of truth fairly on principle, and explain them in simple candor. For truth is comparable to pure gold, the more it is used the brighter it will shine; though it may not be dressed in a fine garment, yet

it will stand on its own merits, however new it may appear, and will bear investigation without suffering loss.

We are not insensible of our inadequacy to perform so arduous a task, as presenting such a work to the public; but let honesty serve for an apology, for we do not expect the work to be free from imperfection, in point of language and arrangement. But, if any should gain a more correct knowledge of the Word of God, and their duty, so that souls may be profited by the work, and the cause of truth advanced, we will have gained, through the providence of the Great King and Head of Zion, our highest expectations; and our prayer is, that the world may be benefited by this addition to the number of volumes already written on this subject. Though it be a subject of an exciting nature, and often arouses the passions even to irritation, we do hope the reader, be his sentiments what they may, will not suffer his prepossessions to hang as a vail over his mind, until he shall have examined the work with candor. Then, on such examination, if the sentiments taught in the work be not founded on the Word of God, let them with promptness be rejected; but if, on the other hand, they are found to accord with the standard of moral truth, let them not be disregarded.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

Page.

On the Covenant of Preservation, - 17

LECTURE II.

On the first Covenant made with Abram, in Chaldea, or Covenant of Promise, 21

LECTURE III.

On the Covenant of Property, - 27

LECTURE IV.

On the Covenant of Grace, - - 32

LECTURE V.

On the Origin, Government, and Perpetuation of the Church, - - 50

LECTURE VI.

On John Baptist's Ministry in the Church, - - - - - 66

LECTURE VII.

On the Priesthood and Ministry of Christ, - - - - - 83

LECTURE VIII.

On the Old and New Covenants, 109

LECTURE IX.

On the Church passing from the Old to the New Dispensation, - 115

LECTURE X.

On the Commencement of the New Dispensation, - - - - 119

LECTURE XI.

On a Change of the Ordinances in the Church, - - - - 124

LECTURE XII.

On the Seal of the Covenant under the Gospel, - - - - - 132

LECTURE XIII.

On the Mode of Sealing the Covenant under the Gospel, - - - 141

LECTURE XIV.

The same Subject Continued, - - 152

LECTURE XV.

On the Sealing of the Covenant by the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, 161

LECTURE XVI.

On the Seal of the Covenant to Paul and Cornelius' Household, - - 173

LECTURE XVII.

On Lydia and her Household, and the Jailer and his Household, - - 178

LECTURE XVIII.

On the further Examination of the Apostolical Mode of Sealing the Covenant, - - - - - 184

LECTURE XIX.

On the right of Persons to Choose the Mode of Initiation into the Church, 195

LECTURE XX.

On the Benefit of the Covenant, when the Seal is Received, - - - 207

LECTURE XXI.

On the Origin and Perpetuity of the Church under the Seal of the Covenant, - - - - - - 214

LECTURE XXII.

On the Right to Communion at the Lord's Supper, - - - - 223

LECTURE XXIII.

On Government in the Church of God, 234

LECTURE XXIV.

On the Observance of the Sabbath, 248

LECTURE XXV.

On a call to the Ministry of the Gospel, 257

APPENDIX.

PART I.

On the Covenant of Works, &c. 275

PART II.

Standing, &c., of Immersed Persons, 296
Bible teaches the same truth to all men, 297
Support of the Gospel. - - - 298
Preparing the Bread to be used in the Administration of the Supper, 302
A thought deserving the attention of Parents, - - - - - 303

LECTURE I.

On the Covenant of Preservation.

In presenting a general view of the public covenants, as taught in the Scriptures, in the first place, we remark, that, all the covenants made with man were predicated on the atonement; for if no provision had been made for man's redemption, mercy could not have been extended to him; but at an early date after the fall, mercy was brought to view in the promised seed. This is by many thought to be the first intimation of the covenant of grace.

We think differently. We would not be understood to mean, that there was no grace in the promise, by no means, for it was favor to the undeserving, which is the true import of the word grace, (*favor to the undeserving.*) It was not a covenant, but a promise given on the principles of sovereignty; for man sought not after the way of mercy, and there was no agreement entered into between the parties, nor was there any external sign given, on which man could act, but he trusted in that promise, which was given only on the principles of sovereignty, without an agreement. For upwards of sixteen hundred years,

grace was afforded to man on the same principle that it was to Adam after the fall. Although it is believed by many, that there was a covenant of works made with Adam,* in examining the Bible history of man from the fall down to Noah, it fully appears from the word of God, that the first covenant was made with Noah, of which the bow in the cloud was a token or sign. It was made on sovereign principles, and there was a manifestation of grace in that covenant, yet that was not the covenant of grace. When we examine the circumstances, it is at once seen that Noah had witnessed the fearful disaster, that befell the world, with the exception of himself and family; and if he looked forward he had as yet no direct evidence that the same or a similar judgment might not fall on the world again, which would indeed be calculated to depress his mind; and as Noah had witnessed the curse that had fallen on the guilty world, God intended that he should not be left in dread and fear, but that he should have an evidence, that the world should not again be destroyed by water. Then, for his comfort, and those who might live after him, was this covenant made with Noah and his seed, and with every living creature that was with him on the earth. Hence, we arrive at the conclusion, that it was a covenant of preservation, and not of grace, mainly from Gen:

---

* See Appendix—on the Covenant of Works.

9: 8—16 inclusive. "And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying, and I, behold, I establish my covenant with you; and with your seed after you, and with every living creature that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth with you; from all that go out of the Ark to every beast of the earth: and I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth. And God said: this is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you, every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations: I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth: and it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud: and I will remember my covenant which is between me and you, and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to detroy all flesh. And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth." That this covenant is not done away, see Ezek. 1: 28. "As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain" &c. and 2 Pet. 3: 6. 7. "Whereby the world that then was be-

ing overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word, are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men:" also Rev. 4: 3. "And he that sat was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone: and there was a rainbow round about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald:" and Rev. 10: 1. "And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven, clothed with a cloud; and a rainbow was upon his head," &c. And if this covenant still exists, which is not directly connected with salvation, why should those be considered as done away, that are so directly connected with it? So much then for the assertion, that all the old covenants, are done away. This evidence of the bow in the cloud is encouraging to us, to hope in the truth of God.

It may be thought that time is spent uselessly, in thus presenting our views at length on this covenant, but our object is to distinguish it from others. And that we may be understood, when reference is made to this or other covenants, with their several designs, and the benefits derived from them, we will distinguish them by different names, which will be given them in their proper places. And from the cheering evidence which God gave to Noah, that he would no more destroy the world by water, this may properly be called a covenant of preservation, and is not done away.

LECTURE II.

On the First Covenant made with Adam in Chaldea, or Covenant of Promise.

In the former lecture we have shown, that the curse was to be withheld; but no special or direct evidence was given, of a blessing to attend the world in any particular form whatever, for the space of four hundred years or upwards. But as the Great Jehovah intended the happiness of men, and as there was yet no particular object or person brought directly to view; therefore, that this great end might be accomplished, he proposed this covenant of promise to Abram, when in Haran, the conditions of which were, that he should leave his native land, and his father's house. See Gen. 12: 1—5 inclusive. "Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. So Abram departed, as the Lord had spoken unto him; and Lot went

with him: and Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran. And Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the souls that they had gotten in Haran: and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and unto the land of Canaan they came." Here, then, in this covenant a blessing is promised, and a family selected, from whom this blessing is to come. God also told Abram that he would give him a land, that he had not yet shown him, but as yet no supernatural evidence had been given; and there was no natural evidence, for the Canaanite was there. See Gen. 12: 6. "And Abram passed through the land unto the place of Sichem, unto the plain of Moreh. And the Canaanite was then in the land:" and it is clear that the land referred to, was not in the covenant, for it was a seed instead of a land or country that was promised. Hence the necessity of Abram's family being distinguished from all other families, until the seed should come, that the world might have evidence that the blessing did come according to the covenant promise; and the blessing promised was the Messiah. It is clear that this covenant is not done away, for it is yet a blessing that the Messiah is on the throne of mercy. See Ps. 72: 17. "His name shall endure forever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun; and men shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him

blessed." Eph. 1:3. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ"—and Gal. 3: 14—18. "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, That the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise." This is not the covenant of which circumcision was the seal or sign. Nor was there as yet any earthly inheritance possessed by Abram; for he went out to a strange land, and became a tenant at will, though he had much stock, servants, and gold. Abram had no right to any soil, although it was promised that he should have it. See Gen. 12:7. "And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, unto thy seed will I give this land;" but as yet he did not know how he was to obtain it. Nor was it on this covenant that the

church was instituted, for there were no personal marks or distinctions whatever, aside from the whole tribe or race, of which the blessing was to come. Nor was the church instituted for some twenty-four years after the giving of this covenant.

The inquiry might here be made: Were there any good people previous to that day, seeing there was no legally instituted church? Truly there were many who loved and feared God from day to day; they were spiritual members, but not legal members. And as we design treating more particularly on this subject in a subsequent lecture, we will leave it, with a request to read carefully the first six chapters of Genesis in view of the church, from which any reasonable mind may become satisfied on that subject, that there was no church organization prior to the flood, nor for four hundred years after.

It would be profitable for persons, when reading the Scriptures, where a covenant is spoken of, to notice with care the one referred to by the writer; and thereby obtain a more correct knowledge, and be preserved from such a complex view of Bible truth, as many have on the covenants.

Some may doubt, whether this is properly to be considered a covenant, inasmuch as it is not so called in the connection. But a covenant is a direct agreement between parties, with stipulated conditions: the conditions in this covenant were, Abram was to leave

his father's house, and his native land, on his part; and the Lord promised on these conditions, he would make Abram's family a blessing to the world. That a covenant is an agreement between parties, see Josh. 24: 24, 25. "And the people said unto Joshua, the Lord our God will we serve, and his voice will we obey. So Joshua made a covenant with the people that day, and set them a statute and an ordinance in Shechem." 1 Sam. 18: 3. "Then Jonathan and David made a covenant, because he loved him as his own soul." 1 Sam. 20: 16, 17. "So Jonathan made a covenant with the house of David, saying, Let the Lord even require it at the hand of David's enemies. And Jonathan caused David to swear again, because he loved him; for he loved him as he loved his own soul;" also Matt. 26: 15; "and said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver." And that this is a covenant, see Acts 3: 25. "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." Gal. 3: 16, 17. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four

hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect," and Eph. 2: 12, "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." This, then, is properly to be considered a covenant of promise, for it was a promise, that in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed.

LECTURE III.

On the Covenant of Property, made with Abram in Canaan.

This covenant was made with Abram, after he had dwelt some years in Canaan. See Gen. 16: 3. "And Sarai, Abram's wife, took Hagar her maid, the Egyptian, after Abram had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan, and gave her to her husband Abram to be his wife." Gen. 15: 18. "In that same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, unto thy seed have I given this land," &c. Gen. 17: 25, "And Ishmael his son was thirteen years old when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin." Now compare the quotations as given, and it will fully appear, that Abram had been ten years in that country when this covenant was made. This covenant was designed to insure Abram, that his seed should have an earthly inheritance. He at that time did not understand how that great object was to be accomplished, for insuperable difficulties were presented to his mind; first, because he had no seed, and second, the Canaanites were in possession of the land. But the Great Jehovah, to instruct Abram on this important subject, led "him

forth abroad." See Gen. 15: 5—18. "And said, Look now towards heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them; and he said unto him, so shall thy seed be; and he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness; and he said unto him, I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it. And he said, Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it. And he said unto him, Take me an heifer of three years old, and a she-goat of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtle dove, and a young pigeon. And he took unto him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each piece one against another; but the birds divided he not. And when the fowls came down upon the carcases, Abram drove them away. And when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and, lo, a horror of great darkness fell upon him. And he said unto Abram, know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years: and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterward shall they come out with great substance. And thou shall go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full. And it came to pass, that when

the sun went down, and it was dark, behold, a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp that passed between those pieces. In that same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates." Here is a covenant made and entered into betwixt God and Abram, the object of which was an earthly inheritance, and sealed by the blood of beasts and birds; but none of that blood was taken from, nor applied to Abram's family, therefore, it could not have been intended for a personal blessing, else there would have been reference to individual rights and privileges. Nor was it of a spiritual nature, for had it been so, there certainly would have been spiritual things brought to view, in the contract or covenant. It therefore appears from this reasoning, that the design of this covenant was, that Abram's family should possess this land, so as to remain a distinct people, until the promised seed should come. Again, this covenant, when referred to in the Scriptures, always brings to view an earthly inheritance. See Gen. 17: 8. "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God;" and Gen. 48: 4. "And said unto me, Behold, I will make thee fruitful and multiply thee, and I will make of thee a multitude of people; and will give this land

to thy seed after thee, for an everlasting possession:" also Ex. 6: 7, 8: "And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God: and ye shall know that I am the Lord your God which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians: and I will bring you in unto the land, concerning the which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; and I will give it to you for an heritage: I am the Lord." And this covenant is not done away, though of an earthly nature; and on the truth of God in this covenant the Jews yet rely, that they will again possess that land, for it was given for an everlasting possession; and they are looking for the time to arrive, when they shall return. See Isa. 11: 12. "And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth:" and Jer. 31: 16, 17. "Thus saith the Lord, Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears, for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy. And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come again to their own border." And as this covenant was made ten years after the covenant of promise, we are led safely to the conclusion, that they were made for different purposes, and were designed to accomplish different ends. One was intended to bring to view a blessing for

the world, which was Christ; the other landed property, or an earthly inheritance. We see there is still no church instituted, for as yet there is no personal mark, nor any particular ordinances given, by which we could draw any distinction.

It is often said by Immersionists, that circumcision was intended to secure a title to, and insure the possession of, the promised land. Such an idea is preposterous in the extreme, when we see that circumcision did not take place for thirteen years afterwards. On such hypothesis, the contract was made thirteen years before it was ratified, which would evidently show indifference in the Divine Being both in reference to man's happiness, and his own truth.

As we expect to treat more at length on these particulars in a subsequent lecture, we shall close for the present, and leave the reader to judge of the matter for himself.

LECTURE IV.

On the Covenant of Grace, made with Abraham when he was ninety and nine years old.

This covenant may properly be called the covenant of grace, in contradiction from every other covenant.

1. Because it has nothing of a temporal nature connected with it, but spiritual and personal blessings; and it bears a feature or mark very distinct from all other covenants, mentioned in the Scriptures, to wit: it was sealed with human blood. It is the only one thus sealed, and it was required to be sealed by the person's own blood, for the blood of the father could not seal it for the son, nor the blood of the son for the father. Hence, the evidence is clear, that it is a personal covenant, designed for individual benefit.

2. It is a covenant designed, in the Divine arrangement, to profit the soul exclusively; and is intended to aid the circumcised person to meet moral obligation, instead of increasing it. Therefore the Divine being condescended to enter into this covenant with Abraham, in which God pledges his truth, that he will be Abraham's God, and his seed's

God; the sign and seal of which was circumcision, and that act of shedding blood confirmed the contract. Hence it is evident, that where this seal is found on the person, that truth and mercy are both engaged for him, when without it there is but mercy alone. For the origin of this covenant and its seal, see Gen. 17: 7, 10, 11. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." "This is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee. Every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you." And persons from ninety nine years to eight days old, might be initiated into the church of God by circumcision. Gen. 7: 12, 24. "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations; he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed." "And Abraham was ninety years old and nine, when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin."

Here, in the sealing of this covenant, we have the origin of the church of God. Then, and not till then, do we find any personal rights, or spiritual and personal blessings promised. Here is a sealing ordinance ap-

pointed, and personal rights enjoyed and privileges granted. This, then, is the commencement of the church of God instituted among men, and the same church yet continues down to the present day, though there are not the same persons in it, on earth now, that were then. A change of persons does not necessarily make a change of churches; by no means. On this subject we will treat more particularly in another place.

It may be necessary for us, here, to give some farther illustration of those different covenants, before we attempt to give our views, in particular, of the covenant of grace, in its most prominent bearings.

It is often said, and by many believed, that this covenant was intended, to secure a title to the land of Canaan; but let us examine the evidence, and it will be found, that such a conclusion is not well founded; for the following reasons.

1. The covenant of promise was given to Abraham for the world, and had he not been favored with temporal blessings, he could not have enjoyed the promise; hence the covenant of property was not intended to take the place of the other, but to encourage him to look for the fulfillment of that promise.

2. Men must have temporal blessings in order to enjoy spiritual ones. Therefore the giving of the covenant of grace was not intended either to destroy the covenant of property, nor to take its place, but all were pre-

sented together, for the comfort and encouragement of the church of God, in Abraham's family, and the church in her militant state throughout the world. It requires but little care to discriminate between these covenants, even when they are presented in one connection. For this distinction, see Gen. 17: 1, 2. God speaks prospectively. "I will make my covenant with thee, &c." In the 3rd verse see the effect produced. "Abram fell on his face," &c. The 4th verse: "As for me behold my covenant *is with thee*," &c. Compare with Gen. 13: 15. "For all the land which thou seest, to thee *will* I give it, and to thy seed forever." Also Gen. 12: 7. "And the Lord appeared unto Abram and said, unto thy seed *will* I give this land," &c. Here is distinct reference to the covenant of property; in the 5th and 6th verses of the 17th chapter is a change of name from Abram to Abraham, with a direct allusion to the covenant of promise; and in the 7th verse there is reference to the covenant of grace as not yet made; in the 8th verse reference is again had to property; in the 9th verse—"thou shalt keep my covenant," &c.—the covenant of grace is again referred to; the 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th verses point out who are to be circumcised, and the 14th verse shows what will befall those who are not circumcised. In the closing verses of the 17th chapter, the contract or covenant, the administrator and the subject are brought

to view. It has been said that the covenant was made long before the seal was fixed; but it will be observed, that that was done the same day the covenant was made. See Gen. 17: 23 and 26. "And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham's house, and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin in the self same day as God had said unto him." "In the self same day was Abraham circumcised and Ishmael his son."

Here, as named above, is the origin of the church, in the seal of the covenant of grace. The act of circumcising was a legalizing as well as a sealing ordinance. The word "legalizing "means making lawful; therefore, by this sign and seal, the persons that received it were made legal or lawful members of the church of God, that such members should have a distinguishing mark, according to God's own plan and appointment, by which they might be known.

In farther noticing the church, which was exclusively confined to Abraham's family at that time, we find some of them were legal and spiritual members, while others were legal, but not spiritual, and the inquiry naturally arises: Why this difference in the family of God? The reason is, that some of them were believers, while others were unbelievers. Here, then, we have believers' circum-

cision, and unbelievers' circumcision; for there were three hundred and eighteen men of war that were born in Abraham's house. See Gen. 14: 14. "And when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued them unto Dan"—besides others that were bought with money, and Ishmael his son, who were circumcised." See Gen. 17: 27. "And all the men of his house, born in the house, and bought with money of the stranger, were circumcised with him." It is evident that all these persons were circumcised on Abraham's faith. But first of all Abraham circumcised himself, (It has never been known that any man, since that time, has legalized himself a member of the church of God.) There was no difference, in a legal point of view, between Abraham's standing in the church and the standing of those men; but in a spiritual point of view, there was a great difference. Abraham had faith in God and peace of mind in viewing the glorious character typified by the blood, in the seal of the covenant; while the men of his house, though, in the seal, their blood pointed to the blood of the Antitype, yet their hearts did not trust the promise, therefore they had no joys of a spiritual nature. They had a right to the promise, but they did not trust the grace, therefore they had no joy of heart in the promise. The difference, then, in the most

simple form, is, that the circumcised unbeliever is a legal member of the church, and the circumcised believer is a legal and spiritual member of the church of God. The former has rights and privileges, but no living comfort; while the latter has rights, privileges and comforts. We shall treat more particularly on this subject when we come to infant baptism.

Again: this covenant, with others, is said to be done away, for the reason that circumcision is done away, consequently the covenant must be. If this were true, it would be strange logic to a consistent mind. We suppose, for example, God intended man for an active being, so then he must travel or move about. Walking was the first and ordinary way of traveling. Now to say that a man, because he does not walk, does not travel from one place to another, would be weakness in the extreme, as well as false. Then, is not a man active, though he now travels on horseback, in a steam car, or a canal boat, instead of walking? The only difference is, that he acts in a different way, and the Divine design is as fully carried out by riding as by walking. Then it is not a sufficient reason to say, (for bare assertion is no proof,) that, because circumcision is done away, that the covenant is done away with it.

Once more: justice is the great principle on which law is founded, and justice says,

that a man shall not have something for nothing. Suppose a debtor to say that he does not owe his creditor, and because the creditor has no instrument of writing, to shew the contract, he is therefore not indebted, and consequently denies the debt, but the creditor brings testimony to prove the contract, that the debtor has had value received, what then will justice and law say in such a case? They will both say the debt ought to be paid. Now, let us apply the figure and see what the result will be. Justice is that perfection of the Divine Being that guards the rights of the Divine throne; and truth must not fail, for truth is also a perfection of the Divine nature. And we find that this covenant is founded on the truth of God. See Gen. 17: 7. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." Therefore, we conclude that if the covenant fails, that truth must fail first, which will never, no never, fail throughout boundless eternity. Will that period ever arrive, when God will cease to be the God of Abraham. If it does, his truth will be tarnished. No it never will, nor will he cease to be the God of any who receive the seal and embrace the grand object, or person in whom the covenant centers, which is Christ. But reason and assertion are not sufficient to substantiate the truth of God,

without revelation. Let us, therefore, take the evidence of the Bible, to prove the perpetuity of this covenant of grace.

It is worthy of remark, that when the covenant of grace was brought up, before the minds of the ancient fathers, to wit—Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that all the other duties enjoined, promises made, and covenants entered into, were presented together for their encouragement and comfort. Hence the importance of our discriminating between those laws and covenants so as not to put a wrong construction on them, when we refer to them, after the five covenants were given. (The fifth one we have not yet treated on, but will in another place.)

When the people of Israel were led into the wilderness, there were things communicated to them, as a people, of which they had no previous knowledge. In the first place, they received the moral law which in itself is a rule of right. This brought to their view the principle on which they should act. In the next place, the ceremonial law, or law of rites and offerings, which was intended to teach practical duty. In the third place, the Livitical Law, which furnished officers, that they should have a complete system of government by Divine appointment.

For us to lengthen out in an explanation of these laws would be spending more time than might be thought profitable. A few thoughts, however, on the point before we

leave it. That the reader may fully understand our true meaning on this subject, is all we wish in this place. The great moral principle shows us that we ought to obey God. The Mosaic law shows us how they were to render that obedience. The Livitical law points out who is to receive the offerings at the hands of the people and what is to be effected by them. In view of these things, we are presented with a complete system of government. In the Moral principle, they were taught their dependence and accountability. In the rite of circumcision, they were pointed to Christ, and possessed rights and privileges. In the Mosaic law, they were pointed to Christ in personal duty. And in the Livitical law, they were pointed to Christ in the priesthood, and furnished with authority to officiate in the church of God. Thus we see the propriety of all these things being presented in connection, that the reader may at one glance see the whole system.

Let us now further examine the Word of God on the covenant of grace. See Deut. 7: 8, 9. "But because the Lord loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt. Know therefore that the Lord thy God, he is God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and

keep his commandments to a thousand generations." In this, reference is had to the covenant of property as well as the covenant of grace. There are also a thousand generations brought to view, connected with a covenant. To what covenant then will this apply? It cannot apply to the covenant of promise, for half that time is not yet elapsed, and many thousand souls have realized the blessings in that covenant; and the blessings of pardoning mercy will never end, but the thousand generations here mentioned will have an end. Nor can it mean the covenant of property, for long since the Jews have been dispossessed of that land; but have the promise of God that they shall return again. We are led to conclude, that it is properly applicable to the covenant of grace alone. This view accords with another passage of Scripture more explicit than the one last quoted. See 1 Chron. 16: 13, 17. "O ye seed of Israel his servant, ye children of Jacob his chosen ones. He is the Lord our God; his judgments are in all the earth. Be ye mindful always of his covenant, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations; even of the covenant which he made with Abraham, and of his oath unto Isaac; and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant." In the 18th verse, same chapter: "Saying, unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance," the cove-

nant of property is evidently referred to; but the 15th, 16th and 17th verses have evidently reference to the covenant of grace, established for a thousand generations. But another proof to the same point—Psalm 105: 6—10. "O ye seed of Abraham his servant, ye children of Jacob his chosen, he is the Lord our God; his judgments are in all the earth. He hath remembered his covenant forever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations: which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac; and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant." Then, in the 11th verse, reference is made to the covenant of property: "Saying, unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance." But in the first verses quoted from the Psalm, the covenant of grace is clearly understood to be established for a thousand generations. It might be proper here to examine what a generation is, according to the Scriptural account. When the covenant of property was made, a generation was one hundred years. See Gen. 15: 13, 16. "And he said unto Abram, know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflct them four hundred years. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again," &c. In the Psalmist David's day, a generation was seventy years. See Psa. 90: 10. "The days of

our years are three score and ten," &c. But we will come to the lowest number of years in the Scriptural account of a generation. See Matt. 1: 17. "So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations." Here are forty-two generations from Abraham to Christ, and, according to dates given, (and infidels will admit dates to be correct, and if they do, surely professing Christians ought also,) it is 1913 years, which, divided by 42, makes, in round numbers, forty-five years the length of a generation; and the covenant of grace being established for a thousand generations, it appears that it was to exist at least forty-five thousand years. And we feel assured, that we are not misconstruing, nor misapplying Scripture, in this connection, on the covenant of grace. But let an impartial public judge of this.

In the next place, we propose to examine whether the writers of the New Testament had any respect to this covenant in their day. And if we find they had, we will feel perfectly safe in settling on the conclusion, that it yet exists; and if it does, it must be for our benefit, and the benefit of all who will receive and rest on it. In Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, he clearly refers to this covenant. See Acts 2: 39. "For the prom-

ise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Now compare this quotation with Gen. 17: 7. "And I will establish my covenant between thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." Also, 9th, 10th and 11th verses. Now, if the apostle had not reference to the passages last quoted, we must admit we have no knowledge of what reference is, or what it is intended for; but we feel assured that we are correct in this. Here, then, is direct reference to the covenant under consideration, which secures such rights and privileges to the children of believing parents, that they should be encouraged to hope in the mercy of God.

It is said by the Baptists, that this passage, (Acts 2: 39,) above quoted, was intended to comfort the convicted Jews. They also say that circumcision was intended to secure a title to the land of Canaan. Where, we ask, were these Jews when so convicted? In the city of Jerusalem, in Palestine. Then they were in possession of what was embraced by the promise, according to Baptist views. Now, let us make an application of the promise agreeably to such views. The land had been promised; they were then in possession of it, but they were convicted of sin. Peter points them to what they had in possession (which was the land,) for comfort. Strange

reasoning indeed for a man of God, to point souls, burdened with sin, to an earthly inheritance for comfort to their minds. Common sense would reject such an idea. We will here present the reader with what was the apostle's true meaning of the promise he quotes. The Jews had rejected and slain the person brought to view in the covenant of promise; they were in possession of what was couched in the covenant of property; Peter preached Christ to them as the only Saviour, and they were convicted. Then, for their consolation, he directs their minds to the covenant of grace. They had the seal by which they were legally entitled to claim the promise; the blood in the seal pointed to the blood of Christ, and the apostle designed to encourage them to rely on the truth of God for pardon of sin. In this application of the promise, we see every thing calculated to comfort the laboring mind—Christ's merits, and God's truth, in the promise in the covenant of grace. Another reference to this covenant is found in Rom. 3: 1, 2. "What advantage then hath the Jew? Or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way; chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." The apostle evidently had an allusion to the covenant, of which we are treating. He enquires for the advantage of circumcision, and gives the answer himself. "Much every way." One of the ways was, that their own blood point-

ed them to the blood of Christ, which was calculated to encourage them to look to, and hope in him. But another way was, that God's own truth was engaged for them: consequently he gave his oracles to them, from which they might learn their need of salvation, and the plan by which they might obtain it. For to them his truth was pledged, that they might accomplish the great end of the covenant, which was their salvation; and that covenant will lead to salvation if embraced. Hence we see, that the apostles thought it of important use thirty years after the resurrection. If it was of use then, it is yet. But in farther evidence of the perpetuity of the covenant, see Rom. 9: 4. "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises?" In this quotation the apostle evidently understands the covenants, as belonging to the Jews in his day : and from the passage above cited, it is clear, that they were acknowleded and practised in the gospel church. We would refer also to Gal. 8:16. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds as of many, but as of one; and to thy seed, which is Christ." Here are promises made. Mark, they are spoken of in the plural, as being more covenants than one; one of which refers to the covenant of promise, the other to the covenant of grace, for it cannot apply to

the covenant of property in either case. It is thought, by many, that the 29th verse of the last named chapter has reference to the covenant of grace; but from the connection it is clear, that it has an allusion to the covenant of promise, for the promised seed is spoken of in it; and it is evident, when applied to the covenant of grace, that it is a wrong construction of the text.

We deem it unnecessary to adduce farther testimony, in the present lecture, on the existence of the covenant of grace in the gospel dispensation. But if that promise, which God made to Abraham, to be his God, and his seed's God, has ceased or is withdrawn, where, we ask, would the Christian rest his hope for heaven? He could have no hope; for if the promise fails, hope will also. But God has promised that he will never leave nor forsake those who serve him. See Gen. 28: 15. "And behold I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whether thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land: for I will not leave thee until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of;" and, Heb. 13: 5—"Let your conversation be without covetousness, and be content with such things as ye have; for he hath said, I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." God's truth is immutable and cannot fail, therefore the promise in the covenant yet remains firm and sure; consequently, they that believe in God to the saving of the soul, may, with the same con-

fidence as Abraham had, trust the truth of God. God is no respecter of persons; therefore he will bless those that trust him, in this our day, as Abraham was blessed in his.

LECTURE V.

On the Origin, Government, and Perpetuation of the Church of God in the World.

As we noticed in a previous lecture, the institution of the church was in Abraham's family, which was composed of three hundred and twenty at least; the probability is, there were four hundred or upwards, and but one believer among them, as far as the Scriptures inform us in that connection.

What would these people have done, that are such great sticklers for believers' baptism, had they been there, seeing that there was believers' circumcision and unbelievers' circumcision? According to their views, they would certainly have fallen out with the plan on which the church was instituted. They do not however claim themselves to be of quite such ancient date as the first church of God on earth. We see there was a church, and to suppose that there were no signs, ordinances, or government in that church, would be insulting Jehovah to his face. But the Apostle says, Abraham had a sign and a seal. See Rom. 4:11. "And he received the sign of circumcision: a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised; that he might be

the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also." Now circumcision was that sign. What, then, was it a sign of? 1. It was a sign of his interest in, and union with the family of God, (or church,) on the Divine plan. 2. It signified or pointed to the blood of Christ, as the only source of pardon for sin. It was not only a sign, but a seal. And what did it seal? It sealed the contract in which were two distinct things embraced. 1. The truth of God, that he would be Abraham's God, and his seed's God. 2. It sealed or witnessed Abraham's promise that he would serve God, and that his seed should serve him; hence Abraham gave his seed to God in that contract. But the seed's blood had to fix the seal for themselves, for these reasons: the Antitype was to be a son; and to be a true type, it must be a son's blood. According to modern views, blood from any part of the body would have done. If blood, simply shedding blood, had been the prime object, blood from a finger would have answered as well as from the foreskin. For the reasons given above, however, no plan but the one God laid down would do.

It has been often said with a sneer, how could a female be circumcised? Such language always betrays ignorance, and especially so with regard to government in the church. Government is essential to the ex-

istence of the church, nor could she, as a church, live without it. And the first government established in the church, was a representative government; hence the female did not need to shed blood; for when the blood of the male was shed, the female was represented, for she was taken out of him, and therefore ought to be represented by him. Such was the patriarchal government in the church, until the Levitical priesthood was introduced. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, officiated in their families until their death, then the twelve patriarchs. So it is clear that the father, or head of the family, was the representative or officiating priest of that family, until the Aaronic priesthood was appointed. Another evidence of this position is, in the case of Moses' wife circumcising her son. She was a heathen, and had not been represented in the church heretofore, and was opposed to that bloody rite. But the Divine Being, in his providence, afflicts the child, no doubt to reprove Moses for his past negligence. And to correct the error of Zipporah his wife, Moses, who was the proper person, requires her to circumcise the child. She was, no doubt, opposed to the bloody deed; but as she was connected with God's family by marriage, it was of importance that she should learn what regard God had for the ordinance of his house, and that it was a forfeiture of life to neglect it. See Exod. 4: 24, 25, 26. "And it came to pass by the

way in the inn, that the Lord met him and sought to kill him. Then Zipporah took a sharp stone, and cut off the foreskin of her son, and cast it at his feet and said, Surely a bloody husband art thou to me. So he let him go: then she said, a bloody husband thou art, because of the circumcision." See also Gen. 17:14. "And the uncircumcised man child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant." From these passages it may be clearly seen, what regard God has to his own appointments in the church. And when that child was circumcised by the mother it was as valid as if Moses had done it himself, for he was the head of the family and on him the duty devolved. So we see the females were represented in the church by the males. Another evidence of this position, which we will give before we close this part of the argument, is in the institution of the passover. See Exod. 12:4, 48. "And if the household be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbors next unto his house take it according to the number of *the souls*," &c.: "for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof." All the souls that were in the family were to eat of the paschal lamb, and the uncircumcised were not to eat thereof, therefore representation alone gave the females a title to partake. Then, from the reasons assigned, and the Scriptures referred to, it may be clearly seen,

that the government in the church was representative.

It is said again, that it was a national church. True, it was; but while it was a national church, there were true spiritual members in it. And there was no other church on earth but that, therefore it was the true church of God. But in these modern times, Immersionists will not allow of representation in the church; especially so, with regard to children. Now, if children were not subjects of moral government, it would be wrong to represent them. But seeing they are subjects not only of civil, but of moral government, they ought therefore to be represented. And in our national legislature, females and infants are represented; and though they have no voice, and are not entitled to the right of suffrage, yet they are protected by the law; for the very reason, that they are an important part of the nation.

I will close my remarks on this subject by simply saying, that government must be exercised; and if the proper authority in the several departments do not rule, those that have no authority will. If the parents do not govern, the children will. So we see the government established in the church by the Divine Being, was just as it should have been. The children were instructed, the females protected, the rulers comforted, the church advanced, and God honored by the plan.

Then we again repeat, that government is that on which the church is dependent for her existence as a church. We would not wish to be understood as meaning that it is the simple ruling, or governing the church, that makes her happy, but it keeps her in regularity and order, that grace may comfort her. We presume the world has never witnessed a happy family, community or nation, where there was not good government exercised.

Hence we arrive at the settled conclusion, that the covenant of grace is the point where government in the church centres; and let that covenant be done away, and the church will sink with it. Circumcision was the seal of that covenant under the law; it was also the initiating rite, and it was the legalizing act, which gave the persons a lawful right as members of God's family, to claim trust in, and enjoy the benefits of the church. But while we say so much in favor of circumcision, yet in itself it was not a saving ordinance, but it pointed the subjects to that blood, that could save. And though it be legalized, it did not cleanse, but directed the subject to that fountain which could cleanse the soul from sin, and thereby fit it for heaven.

But we proceed to notice the passover, the second ordinance in the church, from which we may learn more of the economy of God. In the institution of that ordinance, there were several grand designs; hence there were par-

ticular instructions given, that the people might know how they could gain the approbation of their Great Lawgiver. They felt the Egyptian bondage, under which they were laboring, but human efforts could not effect for them their freedom; therefore the paschal lamb was appointed, it was slain, its blood was sprinkled on the door posts, and its flesh was eaten. Now the instructions must be obeyed, in order to a deliverance. The lamb accordingly was slain, and the blood sprinkled; the lamb was a type of Christ; the blood being sprinkled on the door posts was an evidence of their faith in the truth of God, and a yearly feast provided for them. This feast was to be kept up yearly, that the hand which delivered them, and the extraordinary deliverance obtained, should not be forgotten. And not a bone of this lamb was to be broken, neither was there a bone of Christ broken in his death. We imagine there never was a Hebrew known to break a bone of the paschal lamb, until this day; but according to modern notions, it would not make any difference, whether they were broken or not. In these latter days of liberty and charity, there are many who seem to pay no more respect to the government of the church, as taught in the Bible, than if it were not therein contained.

Here, then, is a typical feast provided for the church of God, to be kept up till the

Antitype should come, who was so fully represented by the paschal lamb, and the unleavened bread. Who then had a right to this yearly feast? We answer, the whole Hebrew family. See Exo. 12: 3, 4. "Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying: In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house; and if the household be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbor next unto his house take it according to the number of the souls: every man according to his eating, shall make your count for the lamb." And what gave that right? It was circumcision alone that gave that right; for if a stranger would keep the feast, or eat the passover, he and all his males were to be circumcised, and then they might keep the feast. See Exo. 12: 44, 45, 48. "But every man's servant, that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof. A foreigner and a hired servant shall not eat thereof. And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it, and he shall be as one that is born in the land; for no uncircumcised person *shall* eat thereof." Objectors have often asked the question: If circumcision was of so much importance, why was it so long delayed in the wilderness? For the reason that it was a painful rite. See

Gen. 34: 25. And it came to pass on the third day, when they were sore, that two of the sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brethren, took each man his sword and came upon the city boldly and slew all the males." It is not to our purpose to dwell here, but we will give some other reasons why it was delayed. One was, they were measurably secluded from other nations while in the wilderness; another probable reason was, that they had the Great Lawgiver with them in their journey, in a pillar of cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night; so it is evident it was suspended by Divine approbation.

The church is continued on from age to age, and notwithstanding they often provoked God's justice, and felt his judgments, yet there were some who loved, feared and obeyed the Divine commands. But in after ages, for their wickedness, God threatens to take their kingdom from them, and give it to another people bringing forth the fruits thereof. But

The prophet Isaiah, by prophetic vision, having such a clear view of Christ, and of the extent of his reign and authority, that he was the great king and head of Zion, we conclude that Jesus was as much the king and head of the Zion of God under the law, as he is under the gospel: "for they all drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ." 1 Cor. 10: 4. And Isaiah seeing this, cries out in exulting strains:

"Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this." Isa. 9: 7. It might be asked: what was David's throne and kingdom? Was it not his authority in the church in his day? His throne was his authority, and his kingdom was the church, most assuredly. Then, according to the view of the prophet, Christ was not to alter or *change* the *church*, but to order, govern, and establish it; not to CHANGE but ESTABLISH the church in his day. If the prophet was not mistaken in his views, (and we presume no one would say he was,) the church was to be composed of the same kind of members, in Christ's day, and in after ages, that it was in David's day. The only difference that can be made is, that in David's day they were all Hebrews, but in the gospel day they were Jews and Gentiles; for the same prophet says, that "the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." Isa. 60: 3, also 5. "And the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee."

Again: if the Jewish church had to cease, the door must have been shut for a time, whether that time was long or short, so as to effect a change, in whole or in part, of the members of the church. But the prophet says—see Isa. 60: 11.—"Therefore thy gates

shall be open continually, they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought." From this view of the prophet, there was no time when one church receded and another succeeded; no not a moment of time. Mark the word in the quotation "*continually.*" If there were no other Scriptures to prove the perpetuity of the church, the passages above cited would be sufficient to prove, that it is the same church now, that it was under the law. But there are other Scriptures to the same point, some of which we shall notice. See Isa. 49: 22. "Thus saith the Lord God: Behold I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring thy sons in their arms and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders." In this reference is a clear prophetic view of the return of the Jews, in the latter times, to the church which is composed of the Gentiles. The Jews once composed the church; the Gentiles now mainly compose it; but when the Jews are brought in, it will be composed of Jews and Gentiles in one. Again, see Matt. 8: 11, 12: "And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." Some may think

that this passage has reference to the heaven of rest above, where they are to sit down with the Patriarchs; if so, the children that are there, shall be cast out. Now it is clear, that the kingdom of heaven here spoken of, in this passage, is the church of which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were members, and they that come, Jews or Gentiles, are to sit down in the same church, and the Jews who had abused their privileges in the church, were to be cast into hell for their abuse of mercies.

Again, Matt. 21: 43: "Therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." This passage can mean nothing more or less than that the church of God should be taken out of the hands of the Jews, and given to the Gentiles, which accords with the views of the Apostle Paul in Rom. 11: 12—21. "Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness? For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office, if by any means I may provoke to emulation them that are my flesh, and might save some of them. For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead? For if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches. And if

some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive-tree, wert graffed in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree, boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, the branches were broken off that I might be graffed in. Well, because of unbelief they were broken off; and thou standest by faith. Be not high minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee." It is evident that there were a number of Jews in the church at that time, and the Gentiles were graffed in among them, and enjoyed the same promises, blessings and privileges that the Jews did; or there must have been a difference, and if the Gentiles' children were not admitted, there was a difference, and on this conclusion the apostle's language was not correct: "And with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree." It is clear, from this passage, that the Gentiles did not form a new church, but were received into the old one. It might seem useless to multiply proofs on this subject; one or two more, however, might not be amiss for the satisfaction of the reader. See Eph. 2: 12. Before the Gentiles were converted they were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise," &c. Ver. 14. "For he is our peace who hath made both one," &c. Again Ver. 15. "For

to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace." We would ask the plain common sense reader, what does this twain mean? Does it not, in the full and clearest sense, mean the Jews and Gentiles both in the same original church. Some might say, that this new man had reference to conversion; if so, there were none of the Jews converted until the apostles' day, which would be a plain contradiction of the Scriptures, for there were many good men, as the apostle says, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." So we see that the passage cannot apply to conversion, but to a union of Jew and Gentile in the church of God.

Again, verse 16. "And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." One body, or one church, both converted on the same plan, and united in one body. See verse 19. "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God;" that is, equal sharers of the blessings and privileges in the family of God. Also verse 22. "In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God, through the Spirit." Once more, see Eph. 3:6. "That the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise, in Christ, by the gospel." Here is language too plain to be misunderstood by common sense. Again.

see verse 15. "Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." From this passage we learn, that God has but one family or church, and that family but one body, part of them on earth, all centering in Christ. But it is contended by the Baptists, that because children are not named as being received into the gospel church, they therefore ought not to be. Strange conclusion indeed, when the covenant made, sealed, and acknowledged by the church, under the law, embraced children. And the same covenant was acknowledged by the apostle by the grafting into the olive tree, which was the sealing of the covenant of grace, though called by another name; and the church the same, as we have seen above, and not one word about rejecting children. Yet the Baptists say they are rejected, without giving one particle of proof on the subject. They can show that adults, converted after the resurrection, were to be baptized; this, however, is not the point of controversy: the Pedobaptists fully admit this view. But to say that adults having to believe and be baptized, is a proof that infants ought not to be baptized, because they cannot believe, inevitably leads to one of two conclusions. That they must either be excluded from heaven, or admitted there while unfit for the church. And can it be that the church is purer than heaven? Surely not.

Now let the Baptist show where and when

the Jewish church became extinct, and where and when the new church commenced. Let this proof be furnished from the Bible, and then they may get Bible readers to believe them, that do not believe them now. They may show what they call the beginning of the Christian church; but the first thing to be shown from the word of God, is the close of the old church, and then the new; for if the new began before the old one ceased, then there were two distinct bodies. This cannot be done from the word of God, for the church is the body of Christ. But as we expect to touch these points again, we will close the present lecture, and proceed to notice John's ministry in the church.

LECTURE VI.

John Baptist's Ministry in the Church.

It has long been a matter of controversy, in the Christian world, whether John was a gospel minister or a prophet. If the Scriptures do not furnish sufficient testimony to settle this question, the church must still remain in doubt, while there remains a church on earth. A gospel minister is one who proclaims good news through a risen Saviour. This John never did, for he always pointed to Christ as coming after him. See John 1: 15, 27. "John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, this is he of whom I spake. He that cometh after me is preferred before me: for he was before me. He it is who, coming after me, is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose." John was to decrease, i. e. his work was to end; but he, i. e. Christ's ministry, is to increase and spread far and wide over the whole world. See John 3: 29, 30. "This my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease." Now, if John's ministry was the beginning of the gospel church, how was it he was to decrease? In the 29th verse, he says: "this my joy therefore is ful-

filled." John, then, seems to rejoice in decreasing. He did not come to institute a church, but to prepare the way for Christ; and the design of his ministry was, to manifest Christ to Israel: hence he baptized with water. John 1: 31. "And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water." The high priests, in their officiating, used blood, or blood and water. But we have no account that John used any blood whatever in his ministry. And this gave his baptism a different feature from what the Jews had been accustomed to; from which arose the enquiry: why baptizest thou? They did not marvel at baptism, but at his doing it; for baptizing, washing, or sprinkling was frequent among the Jews; but it was a personal cleansing, instead of an initiating rite. See Num. chap. 9—(Will the reader examine this chapter?) But John's baptism was not a personal cleansing, nor was it an initiatory rite, but a preparatory rite. John did not go out of the church to baptize any, nor did he induct any into the church by his baptism. But he baptized them and them only that were in the church. It was the design of his work to prepare the people to receive Christ, by requiring them to believe on him, when he would appear in his official authority, and to induct Christ into the priestly office; for Christ was the last person John ever baptized. See Luke 3: 21. "Now when all the

people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heavens were opened."

It is doubted, we know, by some, whether there was a true church of God before John's day. To the law and to the testimony for this truth. See Deut. 5: 31, 32. "But as for thee, stand thou here by me, and I will speak unto thee all the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments which thou shalt teach them, that they may do them in the land which I give them to possess it. Ye shall observe to do, therefore, as the Lord your God hath commanded you; ye shall not turn aside to the right hand or to the left." Here is a body of people, presented in this passage, that were to receive commandments from God, through Moses, for them to obey; hence we conclude they were a church, for a church is a body of people united for the service of God. Again, Deut. 6: 5, 6: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart." This is another passage of the same import. See also Isa. 63: 8, 9. "For he said, surely they are my people, children that will not lie: so he was their Saviour. In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them: and he bare them, and carried them all the days of

old." In this reference, God claims them as his people. If God's people do not compose the church, we know not who they are that do. Another passage, see in 1 Cor. 10: 2, 3, 4. "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." Here is a people spoken of, that ate spiritual meat, and drank spiritual drink. It cannot be doubted but that this people were the then true church of God. But once more on this subject. See Acts 7: 37, 38. "This is that Moses which said unto the children of Israel, a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear. This is he that was in the church in the wilderness, with the angel which spake unto him in the Mount Sinai, and with your fathers, who received the lively oracles to give unto us." In this passage is mentioned a church in the wilderness. It would be useless for us to multiply Scriptures on this subject, for the existence of a church is too plainly shown, from the passages above cited, for any honest Bible reader to deny. So we see, that John baptized those only who were in the church; consequently his baptism was not the Christian baptism, but was a preparatory rite. The Christian baptism is an initiating rite. John's was not. A Christian, in the

most common sense of the term, is a follower of Christ—(this, we presume, none will deny.) John went before him, consequently he was a saint of God, instead of a follower of Christ. Christian baptism is administered in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. John did not use either of those sacred names. We see, then, from evidence in the passages above quoted, and the reasons given, that the ministry of John was under the law. If it had not been, the Jews, who were such strict observers of the law, would have brought a railing accusation against him; but instead of this they counted him as a prophet. No man amongst the Jews would have been looked upon as innocent that would violate the law of Moses, but no such charge was brought against him. John did not violate the law, yet he was designed of God to point the people to a different method, for pardon, from what they had been accustomed to. It was the custom to offer sacrifice for sin; but John points the people to Christ, as amongst them, that they might look to him personally for salvation, without the blood of beasts. See Luke 1: 77, 78. "To give knowledge of salvation unto his people, by the remission of their sins, through the tender mercy of our God." In this language, the people are pointed directly to Christ, without the blood of beasts. He was more than a prophet, that is, he did more than any of the former proph-

ets, for they pointed to Christ through blood, but he (John) without blood. Hence he uses no blood in his washing, but requires of the people repentance towards God instead of an atonement for sin. See Luke 3: 7, 8. "Then said he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him, O generation of vipers! who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance; and begin not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." This presents another different feature in John's work from former prophets, or from gospel ministers. The prophets required blood, and the gospel repentance and faith; but John repentance without faith, i. e. without faith in order to his baptism. What, then, did John require of the subjects he baptized? He required of them a solemn pledge, that they would believe on him who was to come after him. See Acts 19: 4. "Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." This quotation is Paul's language, and we presume Paul understood the plan, and the object of John's mission, as well as John did himself. John required repentance, and an acknowledgment from the people that they would believe on Christ. Now, whatever

John's baptism was, it sealed or witnessed the pledge that the people made to John to believe in, or receive Christ when they saw him.

It is true, John was a prophet, but he was more; he was a priest as well as a prophet, and was so counted by the people. See Matt. 21: 25, 26. "The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying: If we shall say, from heaven, he will say unto us, why did ye not then believe him? But if we shall say, of men, we fear the people, for all hold John as a prophet."

Here it might be asked—Did John violate the Mosaic law in what he did? I presume no one would say so. What kind of washing, then, was it? And what did that washing effect? These are simple questions, but it will be of importance for the reader to obtain a Scriptural knowledge of these facts. Then see Num. 19: 13, 18. "Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel: because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him, he shall be unclean, his uncleanness is yet upon him." "And a clean person shall take hyssop and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, and upon him that touched a corpse, or one slain, or one

dead, or a grave." In the passages above cited, persons, for their own cleansing, washed their clothes, and were sprinkled and bathed, but in all this, there was no officiating officer of the church. But when the priests use blood, it is invariably by sprinkling or pouring. See Lev. 9: 9, 12. "And the sons of Aaron brought the blood unto him; and he dipped his finger in the blood and put it upon the horns of the altar, and poured out the blood at the bottom of the altar." "And he slew the burnt offering; and Aaron's sons presented unto him the blood, which he sprinkled round about upon the altar." Then, what John did as a prophet, must have been in accordance with the law of Moses, or he would have been charged as being a transgressor of that law; and if so, they would not have counted him a good man, but all men counted John as a prophet.

It is said again, that John received a new order of things directly from God. Admit the position, that it was a new order of things. What evidence had the people then, that these new things were of Divine appointment, when they could find no account of those things that John did in the Scriptures? We presume if John had done things that the people could have had no knowledge of from the Scriptures, they would not have acknowledged the work of Divine appointment, nor the man sent from God. But they acknowledged both work and man, of Divine ap-

pointment, for the reason that the prophets pointed to the man, and the Mosaic law to the work, which was a washing; for the people did not marvel at the baptizing, but at the man for doing it. Hence the impropriety of such a conclusion, that John did something new altogether. Here it is worthy of remark, that what he required was new. Now, was not repentance the very thing that was required? For saith he: "Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance," and directs their minds to the coming Saviour for pardon. The repentance was new in that form of expression, for the law did not require it, but the washing was not new.

It is still argued that John immersed, because he addressed, or preached to adults only, and therefore infants were excluded. Well, if John had been forming a church, this argument might have some weight with the less thinking, but to the careful Bible reader it would have no force or reason with it. As we have observed before, we repeat again, John baptized none but members of the Jewish church, and therefore their children were with them, but the infants were not capable of improving it during John's ministry, (which was short, as we shall see hereafter;) therefore, say the Baptists, they ought to be rejected, because they do not, nor cannot believe. For the same reason, they must be damned. O! my soul, who would embrace such a system as this, that

would exclude infants! For if they are to be excluded from the church, for want of faith, they must be from heaven for the same cause. The Baptist, as well as the Pedobaptist, ought to blush at such an idea as the eternal overthrow of infant salvation for want of faith. Such arguments are worse than none at all, for they are false in view of moral government.

Again: it is offered as a proof that John did immerse, that "there was much water there." It should be recollected, that John's habitation was in the wilderness; to this Matthew, Mark, and Luke agree. And when his mission commenced, the people came to him from every quarter. Pedobaptists are as willing to admit that there was much water, as the Anti-Pedobaptists are; and when this is admitted, we ask, what is proven by it? Nothing at all on either side of the question, but that it was a matter of convenience to the multitude that attended his ministry. But it is urged, that John did immerse the people. Then, for our better understanding of the manner in which John did baptize, there are two or three things we would do well to examine before we decide in this matter. 1. How long did John's ministry continue? 2. How many inhabitants were there in Canaan in John's day? 3. Did he violate the Mosaic law in what he did, or did he obey that law? These are circumstances that should not be left out of view,

when we form our opinions on the subject of John's ministry.

We proceed, then, to examine these items. 1. The length of John's ministry. We are taught in the Scriptures, that John was six months older than Christ, according to birth. See Luke 1: 13, 26. "But the angel said unto him, fear not Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard: and thy wife Elizabeth shall bare thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John." "And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth." Then, according to the Levitical law, he commenced preaching six months before Christ; and in the first year of Christ's ministry, John was shut up in prison by Herod. See Matt. 11: 2, 3. "Now when John had heard, in the prison, the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, and said unto him, art thou he that should come, or look we for another?" And Luke 7: 18, 19. "And the disciples of John shewed him of all these things. And John calling unto him two of his disciples, sent them to Jesus, saying, art thou he that should come, or look we for another?" Again, we see that Christ was the last person John baptized, as far as the Scriptures inform us on this subject, and that Jesus was about thirty years of age when he was baptized. See Luke 3: 21, 23. "Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also being baptized," &c. "And Jesus

himself began to be about thirty years of age," &c. From the passages above cited, it appears that John's ministry could not have been more than eighteen months at farthest. How many inhabitants or people, then, had John to baptize in that length of time? According to accounts given, there must have been nearly two millions of inhabitants in Palestine in the days of Christ. Because the Scriptures say, "in Jordan," the conclusion is with many, that John baptized by immersion. Now let us examine if it was possible for him to have immersed such a vast number in so short a time. He baptized all, or nearly all the inhabitants of Palestine. See Matt. 5: 5, 6. "Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan," &c. except some of the Pharisees and lawyers. See Luke 7: 30. "But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him." Making, at a low estimate, at least one million and a half of people to be immersed; which, at the rate of one every minute, would take upwards of five years to perform. But John's ministry, as has been shown above, could not have exceeded eighteen months; so it is impossible he could have baptized the people by immersion, and whether in Jordan, or out of Jordan, it matters not; it must have been done in some other way. Then, in view of the facts above

stated, immersion is preposterous in the extreme.

But again: it could not be admitted as reasonable, that John went contrary to, or violated the law of Moses, which the Jews so highly esteemed, without a charge or accusation being brought against him for such violation. Such a conclusion would be a reproach to common sense as well as to the Jews. John did not officiate in his office regardless of law; for if he had, he certainly would have been considered a transgressor, with which he was not charged at any time. Hence we conclude that John baptized according to, or in the way that Moses sprinkled, with the exception of blood; and it was a cause of excitement, no doubt, to see a prophet of God sprinkle, and use no blood; for, as remarked before, he was the first prophet that pointed the people directly to Christ without the use of blood. Then, for the plan of Moses, which we have no doubt John followed, with the exception of blood, see Heb. 9: 19. "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people." See also Exo. 24: 8. "And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people," &c. From these passages, we can readily learn how John's baptism was administered, which will make it easy to

reconcile the idea, how John could baptize so many in so short a time.

But before we dismiss this subject, we will offer some farther views in relation to baptizing in Jordan. We wish the reader to compare the references, and then draw his own conclusions in simple honesty, and decide accordingly, for himself, on the import of the language used by the writers of the Scriptures. It is acknowledged by all theologians, that the Scriptures are their own best expositors, and to expound Scripture by Scripture is a safe plan to arrive at truth. For this purpose, then, compare Matt. 3: 6. "And were baptized of him *in* Jordan confessing their sins," with Matt. 5: 1. "And seeing the multitude he went up *into* a mountain," &c. Again, Matt. 8: 1. "When he was come down *from* the mountain," &c. See Josh. 3: 8. "And thou shalt command the priests, that bear the ark of the covenant, saying: When ye are come to the brink of the water of Jordan, ye shall stand still *in* Jordan." The priests, in this passage, are said to be *in* Jordan, when their feet touch the *brink* of the water. Again, Mark 1: 5, 8. "And were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan," &c. "I indeed have baptized you with water; but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Here note, in the fifth verse, it is said *in* Jordan, but in the eighth it is said *with* water. Now if immersion was the mode, why not use the word

in instead of *with.* Now if John did immerse, the word *in*, as used in the fifth verse, would have been the most appropriate in the eighth verse. But we presume he used the word that was expressive of the mode by which he administered, or used the water, which we presume was within the limits of the stream, with wool and hyssop by sprinkling or affusion. But in the 9th and 10th verses, in the baptism of Christ, it is said *into* and coming *out of* the water. This baptism is for another purpose than for a pledge of repentance; therefore we will notice it in another place.

Note again, in Mark 4: 1. "And there was gathered unto him a great multitude, so that he entered into a ship, and sat *in the sea.*" Why not have said, sat *in the ship*, instead of saying in the sea? So it is not a matter of certainty, that because they were in the Jordan, that they were immersed; or that Christ, having sat in the sea, was evidence of his being immersed. By no means. See again, Matt. 3: 11. "I indeed baptize you *with* water." See again, same verse. "He shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost and *with* fire." Now let us read the passage, according to the interpretation of Immersionists, and it would read thus:—"He shall immerse you *in* the Holy Ghost and *in* fire." This would be a strange exposition indeed. Now if it means *in* water, when it says *with* water, it must mean, *in*

the Holy Ghost, where it says, *with* the Holy Ghost. On this subject again, see Luke 3: 16. In this passage also it is said, "baptize you *with* water," "*with* the Holy Ghost and *with* fire." See also John 1: 26. "John answered them saying, I baptize with water." Now it is passing strange, that all four of the Evangelists, in presenting the ministry of John, use the same word, *with water;* and particularly John, where it is said, John 1: 33, "he that sent me to baptize *with* water." If immersion was the mode by which John did baptize, it would be strange indeed, if they meant *in* water, or immerse, that not one of them used the proper word to express the mode that Baptists contend for so strenuously. Indeed, such reasoning is nothing short of charging the Evangelists of giving an incorrect history of John's ministry. Hence the best testimony that the Baptists have on the subject, is inference; and we say they have nothing better to establish their mode by, than inference, from "*much water in Jordan*," and the like. But it is nowhere said *in* water, but always *with* water.

In conclusion on this subject, we would say to persons in search of truth, to examine the evidence in this lecture on the subject of sprinkling, and decide the matter with an unbiassed mind.

As was remarked above, John was a priest, as well as a prophet, for he had different baptisms, and consequently they were

intended for different purposes, and for the accomplishment of different ends. We would enquire why the same name, or phrase, is used, when the end accomplished is so different, to the persons on whom he officiated. John surely did not baptize our Saviour unto repentance, for he had no sin. Then it must have been for some other purpose, which we will examine in the next lecture.

LECTURE VII.

On the Priesthood and Ministry of Christ.

That Christ was a priest, is a matter too clearly taught in the Scriptures to be controverted. But how he became a priest, is a matter of controversy. Some say he was always a priest, and was made so by the oath of God; while others say he never was a priest until he was washed, or baptized, by John. It cannot be said in this case as in many others, that the truth is found between the two extremes, for it is certain that both are right in part and both wrong in part. It is evident from Scripture, that he was a priest in a two-fold sense; he possessed a mediatorial priesthood, and he also received and possessed a priesthood according to the Levitical law. It might be thought his possessing them both would conflict, because of their two-fold nature; but in the first place, he was made a mediatorial priest by the oath of God. See Ps. 110:4. "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent. Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec." Also Heb. 5:5, 6. "So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, thou art my son; to-

day have I begotten thee." As he saith, also, in another place, "Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec." A mediator is one that stands betwixt two parties; so Christ stands betwixt an offended God and guilty man as a mediator, or daysman, to maintain the rights of the Divine throne, and plead the cause of sinful man. In this sense we understand the mediatorial priesthood, and that Christ will continue to be our great high priest, until all the affairs of human redemption are wound up. The difference, then, between the mediatorial and Livitical priesthood is, the former requires a meritorious intercession, and the latter a meritorious sacrifice. So we see they both center in Christ, and that one could not answer in place of the other; then we have just such an high priest as man needed.

If Christ had offered a sacrifice contrary to the law, it could not have been accepted; or if there had been no law, the offering could not have been esteemed as valid; for without law, there could have been no claim for satisfaction. And if it had been offered on the oath of God, it could not have been determined whether the offering was acceptable, for the oath of God did not point out the offering, but the person and office; but the Mosaic law pointed to the offering, and the Livitical law to the authority to make it, for none but a priest had a right to present blood before the altar.

There is a striking analogy between the mediatorial priesthood of Christ, and that of Melchisedec, for Melchisedec had neither predecessor nor successor in office, nor had Christ in his mediatorial office. There is another sense in which there is a similarity betwixt them, which we will notice in its place. The Levitical priesthood of Christ commenced when he was thirty years old, but his mediatorial commenced when he undertook for man's redemption. Hence the similarity between Christ and Melchisedec in this respect, for he was "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God abideth a priest continually." Heb. 7: 3. Some, however, think that this Melchisedec was the Christ himself. If this were true, why was he made like unto the Son of God? This view is taken from the language: "without father, without mother." If this language is to be taken in a literal sense, it would prove what no Bible reader would be willing to admit. That Christ had no father is not true, for God was his father; or to say he had no mother is equally untrue, for he was born of a virgin. This, then, cannot be the true import of the language used. Nor will it apply any better to Melchisedec than it does to Christ; for if he was without father or without mother, he must have been of a different race of beings from that of man. But he was not without father or mother in

the natural sense, but the words imply that there was no genealogy given of his family or race of people. So with regard to the priesthood of Christ, there is nothing said of a priest coming of the family of Judah.

Many have been desirious to know who this Melchisedec was. See Gen. 14: 17, 18. "And the king of Sodom went out to meet him, (after his return from the slaughter of Chedorlaoma, and of the kings that were with him,) at the valley of Shaveh, which is the king's dale. And Melchisedec king of Salem brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most high God." Here he is called the priest of the most high God. Now, according to the ancient custom, the oldest son of a family was the heir of the estate, or promise. It is at least probable, that this priest of God that met Abram, was the oldest son of some family. (It is said by some that he was Shem, Noah's oldest son.*) According then to ancient custom he was born heir to the office of the priesthood and was priest to his death. And this man was not only a priest, but he was king of Sodom, which was the city where he reigned, but his reign was a peacable one; hence he is called king of Salem, which signifies peace.

According to the Scriptures, it is clear, we think, from the office that Christ holds as

---

*See Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.

Mediator, and the office Melchisedec sustained as king and priest, that there was great propriety and consistency in the apostle's language in view of the type and the antitype. So then, from the facts before us, it is reasonable and Scriptural to say, that Christ was a priest by the oath of God. But while this is admitted, it does not supersede the necessity of his being a Levitical priest, or a priest according to the requisition of the Levitical law, for no man had a right to present an offering for sin, but the priests, and that according to their own order, and none but the high priest had a right to enter within the veil, before the golden altar, to make an offering for sin. See Num. 16: 38—40. "The censers of these sinners against their own souls, let them make them broad plates for a covering of the altar, for they offered them before the Lord, therefore are they hallowed; and they shall be a sign unto the children of Israel. And Eleazer the priest took the brazen censers wherewith they that were burnt had offered; and they were made broad plates for the covering of the altar; to be a memorial unto the children of Israel that no stranger which is not of the seed of Aaron come near to offer incense before the Lord: that he be not as Korah and as his company," &c.

Again, 2 Chron. 26: 17—20. "And Azariah the priest went in after him, and with him fourscore priests of the Lord, that were

valiant men : and they withstood Uzziah the king, and said unto him, it pertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but to the priests, the sons of Aaron, that are consecrated to burn incense: go out of the sanctuary for thou hast trespassed: neither shall it be for thine honour from the Lord God. Then Uzziah was wroth and had a censer in his hand to burn incense; and while he was wroth with the priests, the leprosy even rose up in his forehead before the priests in the house of the Lord, from beside the incense-altar. And Azariah the chief priest, and all the priests looked upon him, and, behold, he was leprous in his forehead, and they thrust him out from thence; yea, himself hasted also to go out, because the Lord had smitten him." From this passage we learn that King Uzziah was cursed for attempting to do the priest's work; and if Christ had not been a priest according to the law, we could have no evidence whatever, that his offering would have been accepted. See Heb. 5: 1. "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins." Again, see Heb. 8: 3. "For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer." Again, Heb. 9: 7. "But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood which he

offered for himself, and for the errors of the people." And Heb. 7: 27, 28. "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins and then for the people's; for this he did once, when he offered up himself. For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the son, who is consecrated for evermore." We deem it unnecessary to bring farther proof on this subject, for it is abundantly taught in the Scriptures that Christ was a legal as well as a mediatorial priest.

In the next place, how did he thus become a priest, according to the Levitical law, and he of the tribe or family of Judah? 1. We may say that, according to prophecy, he was intended of God to fill that sacred office. See Gen. 49: 10. "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." Again, Isa. 11: 1, 2. "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots: and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding," &c. The authority to officiate was in the tribe of Levi, but the Shiloh in Judah's family. When the war betwixt Rehoboam and Jereboam took place, the ten tribes went with Jereboam; and Jereboam, in his wickedness, put the priests out of office, and they, still having the priestly au-

thority, returned to Judah and Benjamin and there remained; consequently, the Levitical authority was in Judah in Christ's day. For a proof of this, see 2 Chron. 11, 14. "For the Levites left their suburbs and their possession, and came to Judah and Jerusalem: for Jereboam and his sons had cast them off from executing the priest's office unto the Lord." Also 13: 9, 10. "Have ye not cast out the priests of the Lord, the sons of Aaron, and the Levites, and have made you priests after the manner of the nations of other lands," &c. "But as for us the Lord is our God and we have not forsaken him; and the priests which minister unto the Lord, are the sons of Aaron, and the Levites wait upon their business." 2. Christ was made a priest by John baptizing or washing him, which was according to the law. See Matt. 3: 15. "And Jesus answering, said unto him, suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," &c. Now, we ask, what is to be understood by this fulfilling? Was it a law that was fulfilled? The Baptists say, it was setting an example for us to follow. As we said in the outset we wanted no dictionary but the Bible, let us see how the Bible will define the word fulfill? See John 3: 29. "This my joy therefore is fulfilled." Now, we ask, did John introduce joy? or was his joy complete? Let common sense give the answer. Again, the word "fulfill," as used by Christ, see Luke 24: 44. "And he said

unto them, these are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me." Here, we would ask the candid reader, what did Christ intend to convey by the word "fulfill" in this passage? Did he intend to teach the persons, with whom he was conversing, new things? or did he not intend to direct their minds to things which were complete and finished? We presume no one would say he intended to teach new things by this language. Again, see Luke 21: 22. "For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled." Does this passage point to new or old events? To new ones, most assuredly. See again, Acts 3: 18. "But these things, which God before had shewn by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled." Once more, see Acts 13: 27 and 23. "The voices of the prophets, which are read every Sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him." "God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children," &c. All these passages go clearly to show that the word "fulfill" is generally used either in a retrospective or present sense, and never prospectively, beyond the fulfillment of the circumstance expressed. We ask, why will men of intelligence and reason use it in such a way as to destroy the meaning of the word?

Here we refer to Mr. Peugilly's "Scripture Guide to Baptism," published by the American Baptist Publication and S. S. Society, on page 16. "What, my pious reader, shall we say of the person baptized, in this case! What an honor is hereby attached to the ordinance, and consequently to all that duly follow the example of the Redeemer in it." Now, take Peugilly's exposition of the passage or sentence, which he says we must follow. Then place the language of Christ to John by the side of Peugilly's, and what will we, what can we make of it? From the language Christ uses, in its most simple sense, we must believe something was finished, while from the language of Peugilly we have something introduced. Whether, then, shall we believe Peugilly or Christ? Let reason and common sense give the answer. We must here say, before we leave this part of the subject, that we cannot but feel astonished, that honest men, of ordinary minds, would attach such meaning to words, so contrary to common usage; we leave the reader to judge for himself on the use of the language. Again, Peugilly says: "Let the man who slights and contemns this sacred institution, calling it an useless, unmeaning ceremony, incapable of washing away sin or of effecting any good, let him read these verses and view the immaculate Son of God, who had no sin to wash away, proceed-

ing from Galilee down to Jordan to be baptized. Let him see the Wisdom of God, entering the streams and bowing beneath them." He says, "incapable of washing away sin;" from the language, the only inference that can be drawn is, that it will wash away sin; and if this important work can be effected by water, then the blood of Christ is not necessary. But the apostle says, 1 John 1: 7, "the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth from all sin." Mr. Peugilly says, on page 25, "and who will dare to speak where He is silent." From his own language, how could he venture to say, or infer, that baptism will wash away sin, when Christ and his apostles have not said so. Again he says, "entering the streams, and bowing beneath them," when it is not so said in God's sacred book. Mr. Peugilly says, on page 1, of his introduction: "As to what was done for me in infancy, I was assured it profited me nothing." He exclaims against the Episcopalians for holding that water has any efficacy in cleansing from sin, yet from his own language, as given above, we can infer nothing else, but that he believes himself what he condemns in others.

Mr. Peugilly, with all the Baptists, seems to think that because persons were said to be in Jordan, that they must have gone under the water. Let us take common language and common custom amongst men, and let such evidence pass for what it is worth with

the candid mind. For example: a family resides on a river bank, (as is often the case;) some member of the family is frequently on the stream, in a craft of some kind; inquiry is made for an absent member of that family; the answer is given, yonder he is in the river; when not the least idea is meant to be conveyed, that the person is bathing in the stream; or if he was bathing, the common custom in language is such, that another word or sentence would be used, to express the manner, or mode of their being in the water, such as bathing, washing, swimming, or the like. But farther: it is commonly said, that such an one "runs the river," when it is distinctly understood the person referred to is in a craft, on the stream, but not under its waves. We deem it unnecessary to spend more time on this part of the argument, but will return to the question above stated: What was fulfilled by Christ and John, when Christ was baptized?

We say that it was the Levitical law that was fulfilled in that act, and that act gave him authority to officiate as a high priest. The Baptists say Christ's baptism was to introduce a new state of things; we say it was to comply with old things, long since established on Divine authority. The first evidence we will offer on this subject, is the manner of the induction of the priests into the sacred office of the priesthood. See the instructions of God to Moses, on this subject,

in Exo. 29: 4. "And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash them *with* water:"—but not *in* water. Then, according to directions given, Moses did wash them *with* water at the door of the tabernacle. See Lev. 8: 6. "And Moses brought Aaron and his sons and washed them *with* water." He washed them at the door of the tabernacle; hence the water was poured or sprinkled on them. Again, the age the Levites had to be, when they were brought into the priesthood. See Num. 4: 3. "From thirty years old and upward, even until fifty years old," &c. Now compare the washing and age of the priests, with the age of Christ at his baptism. See Luke 3: 23. "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age," &c. Now in view of these circumstances, with such proof before us, how can we doubt for a moment the manner and design of his baptism? It is evident he was washed according to the Levitical law. Is it reasonable to suppose that the Jews would have approbated the conduct of John and Christ, if they had gone contrary to the law of Moses, and not have brought a charge against them for it? Surely not. Much more likely they would have stoned them, than that they would count John a good man, and bring no charge of crime against him for this. But another proof that John's baptism was intended to authorize Christ to officiate

in the priest's office was, that he never was looked on as a public character until after his washing, or baptism. And this public stand was directly evinced by his being anointed by the Holy Spirit, which "descended in a bodily shape like a dove," and an audible voice from heaven saying, "this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." In the next place he is led by the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted by the Devil; who, after forty days, commences with him at the same point where he succeeded with the first public head, to wit, Adam. This clearly shows that he was looked upon as a public character by the enemy. Now from these circumstances, we have evidence from heaven, earth, and hell. From heaven, by the Spirit descending, and the voice which many heard; from earth, by John's baptizing him; and from hell, by the Devil trying him, but could not succeed in thwarting the Divine plan. Nor did Christ ever attempt to teach or preach, until he was baptized. Again: in his first sermon, there is a clear development of his being in legal authority. See Matt. 5: 17. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." And 18. "For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." If Christ had attempted to have taught or preached without legal autho-

rity, he certainly would not, nay he could not, have used the language he did, in the seventeenth verse above cited: (that is, "to fulfill" the law.) We think it not unguarded language, when we say we are sure he acted in view of the Levitical law in his baptism, as well as the Mosaic law in all his public acts, until he was crucified. If he did not, why did he require others to comply with the law and he himself disregard it? This would have been inconsistent in the extreme; but he obeyed the law, and required others to obey also. But we will give further testimony on this point. See Matt. 8:4. "And Jesus saith unto him, see thou tell no man; but go thy way, show thyself to the priests, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them." Here is evidence sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind, that he required the observance of both the Mosaic and the Levitical laws. See again, Mark 1:44. "And saith unto him, see thou say nothing to any man; but go thy way, shew thyself to the priests, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them." This is language to the same import as noticed above. See again, Luke 5: 14. "And he charged him to tell no man; but go and show thyself to the priests, and offer for thy cleansing according as Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them." And Luke 17: 14. "And when he saw them, he said unto them,

go show yourselves unto the priests. And it came to pass, that as they went they were cleansed." All these passages go to show that Christ was obedient to the law. Another circumstance, which shows his regard for the laws, is his entering the temple. See Matt. 21: 21, 23—27, also Mark 11: 27, to the end of the chapter. When Christ came into the temple, the priests, scribes, and elders ask him for his authority. He then, to answer their enquiry, propounds to them a question: "The baptism of John, was it from heaven or of men?" Here we will notice Mr. Peugilly's notion of the design of this interview; and we cannot but feel astonished at his views of Christ's design in propounding this question to the priests and scribes; that the design of the question was "to convict them of their guilt in treating John's labors as they had done." When Jesus was teaching in the temple, and manifesting his disapprobation of the unholy traffic that was carried on, by casting out them that bought and sold, and overthrowing the tables of the money changers that were there, see Mark 11: 15, also 11: 27—29; there is not one word about John's baptism in the connection, until they ask for his authority. Then Christ introduces John's baptism, as the source from which he derived his authority to teach in, and cleanse the temple. Therefore, instead of introducing John's baptism to convict the scribes and priests, he intended to draw from them an

acknowledgment of the authority he was exercising in the temple, as being derived from John's baptism. This exercise of authority is recorded by John in chapter 2: 15. "And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen; and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables." Now is it reasonable to suppose that those Jews, scribes, and priests, would have suffered any man to do such things and yet go unmolested, if he had no authority? We are led to conclude that no man acquainted with the history of the Jews, and their zeal for the temple of God, could in honesty believe that they would have suffered such things. But it is worthy of remark, that in all the charges brought against Christ, there is not one for a violation of either the Levitical or Mosaic law; although he is frequently charged with violating the moral law, by disregarding the Sabbath, &c. Hence the evidence is sufficiently clear to satisfy any unprejudiced mind, that John's baptizing Christ was the act that gave him authority, according to the Levitical law, to fill the high priest's office.

But further: it was the business of the high priests to offer gifts and sacrifices, according to law, and if Christ had not been high priest according to the law, his offering could not have been accepted. See Heb. 8: 3. "For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that

this man have somewhat also to offer." We need not comment on the offering Christ had to make for sin, for all agree that he was the offering, and the evidence given proves that he was a priest, according to the Levitical law.

In the next place, Christ having sprung from the tribe of Judah, and being inducted into the priestly office according to the Levitical law, we would say that law was necessary for keeping order and regularity in the priesthood, as being confined to the tribe of Levi until the Antitype should come; and when he came, it was right that the officiating authority should be transferred unto the tribe of Judah, and no longer remain in the family of Levi; for then no change, consistently, could have taken place; but, according to Divine appointment, there was to be a change of the priesthood, and also of the law. See Heb. 7: 12—14. "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident, that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood." The apostle surely did not mean, by this change of law, that the things that were right in themselves in the family of Levi, would be wrong in the family of Judah. But as the priesthood was changed into Judah's family, by the same

authority that first established it in Levi's family, it was necessary that the law should continue with the office, (for this law had no particular tribe in view, but its particular design was the office, "for the law maketh men high priests,") until the great atoning sacrifice should be offered that would atone for all sin, except the sin against the Holy Ghost. Hence we see that the forerunner of Christ was the priest who *transmitted the priestly authority* from Levi's family to that of Judah, by baptizing Christ. The apostle then gives most conclusive testimony of this fact. See Heb. 5: 4. "And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, *as was Aaron.*" Here is honor brought to view in the quotation; and what does this honor mean? It is evidently of a two-fold nature; first, that the person appointed of God to officiate in this office, was honored of God, and esteemed amongst men; in the second place, it was an honor to be the first of a family or tribe, to officiate in the office of the priesthood: again, it was an honor to be the first high priest according to the Levitical law, which we find Aaron to be, and Christ the last. And as far as we can learn from Scripture, they were the only two that were called with an audible voice. Compare Ex. 28: 1, "And take thou unto thee Aaron thy brother and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office, even Aaron,

Nadab, and Abihu, Eleazer and Ithamar, Aaron's sons," with Matt. 3: 17. "And lo, a voice from heaven saying, this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." Here we note, Aaron is directly called in person by Moses, and Christ by a voice from heaven. It is evident from the connection, in which the apostle says, "no man taketh this honor," &c., that he designed to show the Hebrews, from the analogy betwixt Aaron and Christ, that this Jesus whom they had crucified was the atoning high priest, that had made the offering, that was able to take away sin. Here again, we see the analogy betwixt Christ and Melchisedec, for Christ had neither predecessor nor successor to the Levitical priesthood, in the family of which he came, therefore he is properly to be considered the great Antitype, as typified by Melchisedec.

In conclusion on this part of the subject, Christ's offering must have been a proper one, or it would not have been accepted; and that offering must have been offered according to the law, or it could not have been known whether the offering was a proper one, "for by the law is the knowledge of sin," so by the law we know duty. And to suppose, that a satisfaction to law and justice could be made without satisfying their claims, would be heterodox in the extreme. And they who deny that Christ was a priest according to the Levitical law, are most certainly unsound

in their system of theology; for it is striking at one of the important things, by which the scheme of human redemption was accomplished. To suppose that justice would accept of, or be satisfied with, what no law required, would be a reproach to the Divine character. It might be thought the moral law required the offering; but it is the moral law that requires obedience, and justice requires satisfaction, which was the life; and Christ giving his life satisfied justice, but obedience in his life, satisfied the claims of the moral law. Then the Mosaic law pointed out what a proper offering was, and the Levitical law gave the authority to make that offering; hence we see the propriety in the language of Christ, when he came to John to be baptized, "thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," that is, *finish* or *complete* what the Levitical law required, instead of laying an example for us to follow.

Once more on this subject. It is believed by the Baptists, that the baptism of Christ is an emblem of his burial and resurrection. Now admit to be correct, that this is the design of Christ's baptism. We ask, then, what was the design of the supper instituted by Christ? Surely none would be so indifferent, or bigoted, as to say, that the supper did not represent the death of Christ. It is most explicit that it did represent his death and sufferings; and if his baptism represented his burial and resurrection, then we have two

ordinances representing one and the same thing. Here we remark, that the burial was the natural result of the death, as effected by men, and his resurrection effected by Divine power. Now, can it be shown from the word of God, that either natural circumstances, or Divine power ever appointed an ordinance in the church; we presume it cannot be, but that these ordinances were given by Divine command. Hence it would be a manifestation of weakness, more than of wisdom, to appoint two ordinances to represent the same work or act; therefore baptism was not designed to represent the resurrection. For evidence that the supper was intended to represent Christ's death, see 1 Cor. 11: 26. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." But the objector would say, the supper represented his death, and the baptism his burial and resurrection.

Now, we ask, what was accomplished for us by the death of Christ? Was it not to make an atonement for sin? We presume all will admit this truth. Here we ask again, what was effected for us by the burial of Christ? Was it not that the grave should be sanctified for us? We ask again, what was effected for us by the resurrection of Christ? That we might be justified, and the grave opened, that we might rise therefrom, and consequently live again according to the character we sustain in death.

But it is still insisted on, that Christ's baptism was an example for us to follow, as representing the burial and resurrection. We will admit this reasoning until we try the principle, and then we will be the better able to judge of the correctness of the reasoning, whether it is in accordance with Divine truth or not. First, then, according to the Baptist's faith, none but adults are to be immersed. Now, we ask, does not the immersion of the person rest on his agency? (Admit that he has every other prerequisite.) If he refuse to be immersed, then he cannot have any interest in Christ's having lain in the grave; most assuredly he cannot. But will he not have to go to the grave? This we all admit. And will not infants realize as much from the burial and resurrection of Christ, as those who have been immersed? Who, but the downright infidel, would dare to say they will not? Now if the adult reject the representation and gain the substance, what has he lost by that rejection? He has lost nothing, for he is as sure of the grave without immersion, as he is with it. Then we ask, what is gained by immersion? We say, just nothing at all, and as far as reason and solid argument is concerned, immersion is a perfect nullity. But further, if immersion is mainly designed to represent the resurrection, we ask, in view of common sense, if the person immersed will not have an advantage above them that are not? If they have,

surely then immersion might be thought to be of great importance. But we are assured they will not, for all must die, all must go to the grave, and all will have to rise from the dead; so we at once see that those who do not represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, realize as much from the grave and rising from it, as those that represent it. So it is seen that in this respect immersion is a perfect blank.

As we design to treat of christian baptism more at length in another place, we will leave it for the present and make a few remarks on the baptism of suffering. We would think it unnecessary to notice this baptism of suffering, as spoken of by the Saviour in Matt. 20: 23. "Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with," &c. And in Luke 12: 50. "But I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished," but for the purpose of answering some objections. The Baptists think it figurative of immersion; were it not for this we would not say one word about this baptism; for we are assured it has no reference to water baptism of any mode, as an ordinance of the church of God. But if we can afford any satisfaction to the enquiring mind, so as to prevent it from being bewildered on this subject, we shall have gained our object. Here the word baptism is used in the passage, but suffering is distinctly understood, and not

sealing. We ask, where was this suffering? Was it inward or outward suffering? Let common sense answer and that answer would be in accordance with the Scriptures. "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death." Does this look like immersion? Surely no one would say it did. Once more we enquire, what constituted this suffering? It is said by the apostle, 1 Pet. 2: 24. "He bore our sins in his own body on the tree." Then let the Bible answer what produced his suffering. See Isa. 42: 25. "Therefore he hath poured upon him the fury of his anger, and the strength of battle," &c. Here then is pouring, and does this have any appearance of immersion? We answer, it does not, but leaves that mode of the ordinance as a perfect blank. We say, that when persons read the Scriptures, they ought to try to understand them, in the sense in which the writer of the Scripture used them; and if he applies the word to a church ordinance, let it be understood in that sense; for the words baptize, and baptism, are often used in the Scriptures when no reference is made to a church ordinance in any way whatever; a perversion of words or idea will afford no true light to the understanding, therefore it ought to be avoided, as far as possible, that we may be profited by our search after truth.

From the evidence adduced from Scripture, it is clear, that the priesthood of Christ, in a mediatorial point of view, was establish-

ed by the oath of God; and that his ministry was according to the Levitical law, until his death. See Rom. 15: 8. "Now I say, that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision, for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." After which he introduced a new order of things, by bringing in water baptism instead of circumcision, as we shall notice hereafter.

LECTURE VIII.

On the Old and New Covenants.

As the old and new covenants compose a part of the system of sound theology, it will afford the mind much satisfaction to have a Scriptural view of them; and we shall attempt to set forth these covenants in their simple form. But in the first place, we will try to obviate some difficulties in the minds of persons respecting them; and to do this, we will propound some inquiries on these covenants, as occasion may require, by way of explanation, for various are the views of different persons respecting them. Some conclude that the old covenant has reference to the covenant made with Adam. Others think that it has reference to all the old rites and ceremonies. And because they think that the old rites and ceremonies are all done away, such persons look on them as the old covenant having ceased, and consequently are of no more use to us in the present day.

In illustration of the old covenant, it is clear from Scripture, that it is the passover that is referred to, where the first covenant is spoken of. See Heb. 8: 13. "In that he saith, a new covenant, he hath made the first

old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away." It is at once seen from this passage, that the apostle had an allusion to Christ, as the personage that took away that covenant or paschal supper, and no allusion whatever is made to a covenant with Adam; nor could it have been what is termed the old rites and ceremonies, that is to be understood by the old covenant as expressed above. If it were them, the apostle most certainly would have brought to view the Mosaic law in the plural, having so many gifts and sacrifices belonging to it, and not have used the singular number so repeatedly, as he does in the connection, in which he speaks of the old and new covenants. The connection in which the passage stands, is evidently presenting the priesthood of Christ, and thereby clearly shows the object he had in view, which was the paschal supper as the old covenant, and the Lord's supper, or sacrament of the New Testameut, as the new covenant. See Heb. chap. 8. Now it is true that the Old Testament sets forth all the covenants that were made except the supper, which was the last work the Saviour did before his death, and it is evident the apostle has allusion to the supper when he says, Heb. 8: 6: "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also is he the mediator of a better covenant, which was established on better promises." 7: "For if that first covenant had been

faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." That is, if the blood of the paschal lamb could have made an atonement for the sins of the world, the second covenant, or shedding of Christ's blood, would have been unnecessary. Verse 8. "For finding fault with them;" i. e. the shew bread and paschal lamb as not sufficient to satisfy Divine justice, therefore the death of Christ, set forth in the uew covenant, was necessary to accomplish the great end of human redemption. Heb. 8: 8, 9. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt." In the eighth verse a new covenant is spoken of, and in the ninth verse an old one. Compare this passage with Jer. 31: 31, 32. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." See Exod. 12: 17. "And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; for in this self same day have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt: therefore shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance forever." See also verse 51.

Now the covenant that was made when God took Israel by the hand and led them out of Egypt, was the introduction of the paschal lamb; it is clearly taught that it was. This, then, is what the apostle shows to be the old cevenant, and the sacrament of the Lord's supper is the new covenant; for it was the first ordinance established for the new dispensation, though it was introduced at the close of the old one. It is called "a better covenant." It is truly better, for the old was the type, the new the Antitype; the former was the shadow, the latter the substance; the former was the lamb, the animal, the latter the lamb of God, the Saviour of sinners; the former had no merit in itself, the latter was all meritorious; the first was to keep in recollection God's miraculous deliverance to Israel out of Egypt, the second is to keep up a recollection of God's delivering grace for the world until the second coming of the deliverer.

From the apostle's language in reference to these covenants, and the analogy between them, it may be easily seen that the old covenant, when spoken of, is not to be understood as the whole Old Testament, with all the rites, ceremonies, and covenants brought to view in it; for if this were correct, then we would have no more use for the Old Testament, and what would we do with the covenant of preservation? See lecture on that subject. Again: what has become of

the covenant of grace? See, also, lecture on that covenant. Then it cannot be that the apostle meant all the covenants and the Old Testament, where he says, in reference to Christ, he taketh away the first, that he may establish the second; but he evidently intended to show that the paschal lamb, as one of the ordinances of the Old Testament, should be taken away, as being the first, and the Lord's supper should be established, as the second. Another important reason for the view, as given above is, that God the father appointed the first covenant of the paschal lamb, and that pointed to the Son, or Saviour; and when the Son came and closed the old, it was his province to introduce and establish the second. There is this point of difference, however, between them: the first was a memorial of a temporal deliverance from the hand of a literal enemy, or tyrant, the other was a memorial of eternal deliverance from a spiritual foe.

But this is called a new way, compared with the old. It is a new way, for the old way was a representation for pardon, by sacrifices and offerings, and the scape-goat which carried away the sins of the people into the wilderness. Lev. 16: 21. But in this new way it was a personal application for pardon, through the merits of Christ. It is also called a living way, for the reason that the old pointed to life, while the new possesses life, because it centers in Christ Jesus.

In conclusion on this lecture, when the old covenant is spoken of in the singular, we understand the language to mean the paschal lamb; and when the new covenant is used in Scripture, we understand it to mean the Lord's supper. Then let such as wish fully to understand those covenants, be careful to examine the evidence as given in the Scriptures on this subject, before they take the liberty to say that all the old things are done away, (though some of them are, yet others are not,) for when they do, they strike at the Old Testament, the Mosaic law, and all the covenants; which, if taken away, would leave us without a knowledge of good or evil, "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." One of the misfortunes of many persons in their search after truth on this subject, as well as many others, is this: before they investigate they become traditionized, and then search for the purpose of establishing their notions, however far they may stray notwithstanding. And let a man once embrace an error, and he can never bring truth out of it; he must first renounce the error, for truth and error cannot dwell together in harmony.

LECTURE IX.

On the Church Passing from the Old to the New Dispensation.

There has always been a church on earth, since it was first instituted in the family of Abraham. But at no period of time was there a more general declension, or a greater want of spirituality, than at the time when John the Baptist made his appearance as a public teacher; "for darkness covered the land, and gross darkness the people." Notwithstanding the Jews were looking for some change to take place, yet of the kind of change, or the personage that was to effect it, they seem to have been ignorant, for they looked for a temporal deliverance from the Roman yoke. But when John came, there was much excitement amongst the people, for they looked on him at that time as the great deliverer of Israel. In this they were mistaken; for John did not come to change customs or ordinances, but to prepare the minds of the people for the reception of Christ, who was to deliver them, not from the Roman yoke but from the curse of the law, and to change the form of the ordinances in the house of God, but not the subjects of the church. The

former he did do, the latter he could not do and be in union with his Father, as we shall show hereafter. The ordinances were typical, and the subjects were to be benefitted by these types when received. When the Saviour entered on his public ministry, there were but few, very few indeed, that served God in spirit and in truth; but they were careful to observe the ordinances of the house of God, for they were in legal union in the Jewish church. And as soon as Jesus had given evidence of his power and authority, he commences his important work of teaching, and preaching repentance to sinners, "for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." See Matt. 4:17; and in verse 18, we have an account of the first persons he called to be his followers. They were members of the Jewish church, and had a right to all the privileges of that church, but they gave no evidence of true piety until after the Saviour called them to be his followers. And those followers, which he selected out of the Jewish church, passed into the new dispensation from the old; and all that he called to follow him were of the Jews, for there were none of the Gentiles called to be with him under the law; and all the males were circumcised, and not one baptized in the name of the Trinity; but the particular number that became followers of Christ before his crucifixion, is not taught in the Scriptures. It is evident from the then existing circumstances, that amongst the number of disciples

that followed the Saviour, there were some parents, and we may reasonably conclude, some children; for if children were rejected by Christ under the law, then he must have transgressed, for the law admitted infants as members in the church. But he says, "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill," and he was not charged as a transgressor in this respect.

It is often said, and by almost all the Baptists believed, that the Jewish, or old church, was done away; but it is said and believed without the least shade of Scriptural testimony, for there is none that can, from the Bible, show either time or place, when or where the old church became extinct, or in other words, died; for if it can be shown when the old church died, or ceased to be, it might be found and known when and where the new one commenced, with a new class of members, differing from the old; that is, with no children amongst them. But the truth is, that the old church did not cease, or die, as a body, but passed from the old to the new dispensation. Now it is evident, as above stated, that the Saviour did collect all his followers, during his ministry until he was crucified, from the Jewish church, and that under the old dispensation, for he was obedient to the law himself, and required others to comply with it also, as shown in Lecture VII. It is evident that he was obedient to the law, therefore there could not be a new

church and the old order of things, unless the law had first been changed or abrogated. And these same persons were not only legal but spiritual members of Christ's mystical body, and were his followers until he was crucified; but then they did not disown nor turn away from him. Though they were left to mourn and weep, yet their hearts cleaved to him, as the great deliverer from the bondage of sin and eternal death; and they, having received instructions from the Saviour, after he rose from the dead, to tarry at Jerusalem until pentecost, when they should be indued from on high, were acknowledged in the new dispensation without baptism, as we shall notice in our next lecture more particularly.

LECTURE X.

On the Commencement of the New Dispensation.

It is a truth admitted by all, that the old dispensation did close or cease, but the time when it closed, is a matter of question amongst professed Christians in the religious world. Some think it ceased at the commencement of John's ministry; there are others that are of opinion that the birth of Christ closed the old, and commenced the new dispensation; there are others again who think that the death of Christ closed the old, and that the resurrection of Christ was the commencement of the new dispensation. The latter opinion is strictly true. A few suggestions by way of investigation may aid our minds, in arriving at a correct knowledge of truth on this subject.

1. The ministry of John. If his ministry commenced the new dispensation, why did not the types and shadows cease? Because the great Antitype had not yet come; and until they were met by him, they could not cease, without producing confusion in the church; for as all Bible readers know, both the gifts and sacrifices which were to be of-

fered according to the law, were required in John's day. Now, let such as contend for John's ministry commencing a new church, show from the Bible how the old one ceased, and what became of the rites and ceremonies, or when they came to an end, for it is true, they did not cease at the commencement of John's ministry. But further on this point, did John induct any into the church by his baptism? We answer, not one. Again, did John baptize any but what were members of the old or Jewish church? He did not. His baptism was not intended as an initiating rite, but, as we remarked in a former lecture, a preparatory rite. His baptism was not what excited the people, but it was the man for doing it; hence the word "baptism" was only a new name for an old rite. Therefore John's ministry could not have been the commencement of the new dispensation.

2. Nor was the birth of Christ the commencement of the new dispensation, for the following reasons. 1. The minds of the people were not prepared to receive the child Jesus as their deliverer, nor would the Jews have admitted any change in their rites and ceremonies, without having first sufficient evidence of the authority to effect that change, which was not given at the birth of Christ. Though the birth of Christ formed a new epoch or period of time, yet it did not meet the types and shadows which pointed to his death and blood, but not to his birth. 2. An

offering made to atone for sin, was required to be offered by one thirty years old or upwards. See Nun. 4: 3. "From thirty years old and upwards," &c. And had Christ offered an atoning sacrifice before he was thirty years of age, he would have been a transgressor of the Levitical law, which would have thwarted the whole scheme of human redemption. But "he came not to destroy the law but to fulfill," so you see it would not do to require obedience to the Mosaic law, and reject the offering required by it.

Hence we arrive at the conclusion that the new dispensation did not commence with John's ministry, or Christ's birth, but at the resurrection of Christ. See 1 Cor. 15: 3, 4. "For I deliver unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." See also 14th verse. "And if Christ be not risen then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." Therefore the resurrection is the point on which hangs the whole gospel system of salvation.

And it is true, that the disciples that followed him before he was crucified, and that were acknowledged as members of the Jewish church, and that too by the rite of circumcision, were the same persons that returned from the mount called Olivet to Jerusalem, and there continued till the day of Pentecost.

See Acts. 1: 12, 14. At this important period in the history of the church, we find "the number of the names together were about an hundred and twenty," but not one of them baptized in the name of the Trinity, no not so much as one of the eleven apostles, for previous to that day baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, had never been performed by any one on earth. And when the day of Pentecost was fully come and the Holy Ghost had descended on the apostles, and Peter standing up with the eleven, had preached unto them, the wicked Jews were pricked in their hearts, and exclaimed, "what must we do?" Then Peter instructed them what they must do, in order to obtain salvation, many of them did comply, and there were added unto them three thousand souls. See Acts. 2: 37, 41. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." We ask to whom were they added? To the one hundred and twenty, most decidedly, and yet we have no account of the one hundred and twenty being baptized with the christian baptism, and and if we have no account in the Scriptures of their being baptized, we have no right to believe they were; (for there is enough written for us to believe, without believing what is not written;) but it is evident they were not. Then on what were they recognized as members of the church? Most evidently

on the rite of circumcision! Here then are the one hundred and twenty, that were followers of Christ before his death, and were legal members on the ground of their circumcision, acknowledged by the apostles as members of the christian church, and that without baptism. Here we see instead of the old or Jewish church receding and becoming extinct, and another formed out of new materials or subjects, we have the same persons acknowledged by the highest authority, as members of the church in the gospel dispensation.

Hence the Scriptures show us the existence of the church in an unbroken chain, from the family of Abraham until the new dispensation is ushered in, the evidence of which is so clear that no honest and intelligent Bible reader dare reject it, without offending against the blessed Book of God

LECTURE XI.

On a Change of the Ordinances in the Church.

Seeing that the old dispensation has passed away, it is reasonable as well as Scriptural, that there should be a new order of things, but not a different class of members in the church, (i. e. adults but no infants.) Notwithstanding it is strenuously contended by the Baptists, that infants cannot be admitted as members of the church, in the gospel dispensation, for the reason that faith is the condition of salvation under the Gospel, and they not being capable of exercising faith, ought therefore to be rejected. Now we ask, what was the condition of salvation under the law? Was it not faith? For the agency of adults is addressed, but that of infants is not. We answer, it was; for if it was not, then God must have saved those adults who were saved without it, on some other plan or condition; and such a plan would prove the Divine Being partial in his dealings with the fallen family, to save some through faith and some without it. But if infants are to be rejected from the church because they cannot exercise faith, and faith being the condition of salvation, this argument, if true, at once

would prove the eternal overthrow of all infants. Such reasoning as the foregoing proves too much, and thereby destroys itself. As faith was the condition of salvation under the law, so it is under the Gospel. Further, faith is not the condition but a preparatory to admission into the church; for if it were, then all that believed would be in the church, and who would admit such an idea to be true? The Baptists themselves do not believe it. The means employed for the accomplishment of salvation under the law and under the Gospel, were different in their form, though not in their design; for under the law both gifts and sacrifices were offered, by which the people proved their faith in the coming Messiah; but under the Gospel, turning from sin, confession of sin, and repentance towards God, are the means and duties the Gospel requires; yet they are not the conditions upon which salvation is obtained, for on faith alone is pardon granted to the sinner. So the means and duties under the law, had the same effect as those under the Gospel, their form so different notwithstanding.

Hence we see the propriety of a change in the ordinances of the house of God, inasmuch as Christ met all the types and prophesies that pointed to him and spoke of him. But these changes that are effected by the Man of Calvary in the ordinances of the church of God, are clear evidence of his Messiaship; for of all

the accusations brought against the Saviour, not one was raised on account of such change. After the introduction of the Lord's supper, the paschal supper went into disuse, but no complaint was made by Jew or Gentile for it; so in the case of circumcision and baptism, no charge whatever is brought against Christ for appointing, nor his apostles in consequence of such alteration in the form of administration. And we might reasonably expect that, as the whole church at that time were composed of Jews, and not one Gentile among them, if their children had been denied the right of church membership, they most certainly would have complained of it. Now we ask the honest enquirer after truth, to reason fairly on this subject, and decide accordingly.

In further treating on this subject, we would address those particularly that acknowledge the unity in the Trinity, or the equality of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Now it is admitted by all, that the Father appointed the covenant of grace, of which circumcision was the sign and seal; and that the blood in that ordinance pointed to the blood of Christ, and that children were admitted into the church by that rite. See Gen. 17: 12. "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generation," &c. And Luke 1: 59. "And it came to pass that on the eighth day

they came to circumcise the child," &c., for there was evidently a church under the law. Acts 7: 38. "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him in the Mount Sinia, and with our fathers," &c. So we see that God the Father appointed the covenant, the subject, and the seal. Now we ask, could the Son reject a part of the subjects that the Father appointed in the covenant, and be in perfect union with the Father? If infants had no souls it might have been reasonable, as far as they were concerned, to have rejected them; for then they could not have been personally interested. But who believes such an idea as this? No one but an Atheist would. But they were, and are interested yet, and therefore could not have been rejected then, without violating the Father's will and his own language. See Ps. 40: 7, 8, and Heb. 10: 7. "I delight to do thy will, O! my God." We ask, was it the Father's will that infants should be in the church? Let the reader examine the references above in Gen., Luke, Ps. and Heb., and then let him say they were not! It is more than he can do in honesty. Again: let the objector say the Son rejected infants, and still remained in unison with the Father in all things. We are persuaded the candid mind cannot say so. Then we see from both reason and Scripture, that to reject infants from the church,

would sap the foundation of the church of God. The Son could not, (consistent with his nature,) he did not, nor will he reject them when offered in the covenant by believing parents. Therefore we arrive at the conclusion, with safety, that all the children of believing parents ought to be dedicated to God, in the covenant of grace by baptism. And no children, where neither of the parents is a believer, have a right to the seal of the covenant.

But once more on this subject. He did not do away the covenant of grace, (see Lecture IV.) but changed the form of sealing, or initiating members into the church, which was his right, and his alone to do. In the first form of sealing the covenant, blood was shed by the appointment of the Father, and that blood pointed to the Son, and the covenant centered in him. See Isa. 42: 6. "And will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles." It then became right and fit, in the nature of things, that he should change the manner and form, after he had met the first form of sealing, by shedding his own blood. And as the blood in circumcision sealed and typified, so the water as appointed by Christ, sealed the covenant, and represented the blood of the Son of God. And as far as the seal is concerned, the former effected as much as the latter, and the latter as much as the former, and no more; for one

constituted legal membership, and so does the other.

But infant baptism is objected to by the Baptists, for the reason that though infants were to eat of the passover, they were not permitted to partake of the supper. This is true; but does that prove that children should not be baptized, because they were not to partake of the supper? Surely not; for the paschal supper was a literal ordinance, and one design of it was to keep up in the minds of the Hebrews, a temporal deliverance; another design of it was, to point to that spiritual deliverer, the efficacy of whose blood they so much needed: for all were morally contaminated, both old and young; and as it was a literal ordinance and a national church, therefore all the nation should partake of it. But while we call it a national church, yet as it was the only church that was on earth, therefore it is properly to be considered as national and spiritual, for the true church of God was in Israel, yet all the Israelites were not spiritual members.

Though it was right that all the children should eat the passover, for faith was not required as a preparation to it, yet it is not right for children to partake of the Lord's supper, for faith is required in every subject who partakes of that ordinance, nor should they, until they profess faith in Christ. See 1 Cor. 11: 29. "For he that eateth and

drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." And the reason is so obvious, that no reasonable mind could raise an objection against infant baptism on that account. The Lord's supper is a spiritual ordinance, and therefore persons should be capable of spiritual enjoyment before they partake of that ordinance. But all this does not afford one particle of proof, that children should not be dedicated in the ordinance of baptism. But as we expect to enlarge upon this subject in a subsequent lecture, we leave it for the present, by saying the world needed a change, Divine wisdom saw that a change was necessary, and the blest Emmanuel, God with us, did change the ordinances; the one from blood and flesh to wine and bread, and the other from blood to water, which was his right to do. But a change of subjects he did not make, nor could he have done so, speaking with due deference to his Divine character. The world has been benefited by the change he has made, and not one of Adam's race injured, (as we shall see hereafter.) Now we ask, can any man point to time or place, when or where, children were rejected by Christ or his apostles, though a change has taken place? There is no man can, from the word of God; for children have a moral character of some kind, and therefore are subjects of moral government, and could not

be rejected without violating the principle in that government which would tarnish the Divine throne; and no change would be made by Divine authority that would violate a moral principle, for the Judge of all the earth will do right.

LECTURE XII.

On the Seal of the Covenant under the Gospel.

That circumcision ceased as an ordinance of the church at the death of Christ, no Bible reader we presume will for a moment doubt; and it was right that it should cease, for these reasons: 1. Because it was a painful rite. 2. The Antitype had met the type. And 3. Because it was no longer necessary to have a representation by the male for the female, in pointing them to Christ. For under the law the females were represented by the males, both in a civil and religious point of view, but under the Gospel they are represented in a civil, but not in a moral point of view, for all that are capable of reasoning can have access to God, through Christ, for themselves. And this is one of the advantages of a change in the ordinances of the house of God. Hence the propriety of the personal application of water in baptism to the proper subjects, of which we will treat hereafter, viz: of the subjects.

It will be evident to the enquiring mind that baptism has taken the place of circumcision, for circumcision was an initiating rite and so is baptism; circumcision was a seal-

ing ordinance, for it was the seal of the covenant of grace. See Rom. 4: 11. "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." So is baptism. See Acts 2: 39. "For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Circumcision was a national and personal rite; baptism is personal, but not national; circumcision was a typical ordinance, baptism is a representative ordinance; one engaged the truth of God, and so does the other. See Gen. 17: 7. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." Rom. 3: 1, 2. "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." Rev. 7: 3. "Saying, hurt not the earth neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in the forehead." Circumcision constituted the subjects of it, legal or lawful members of God's family; for they that were not circumcised, were compared by David to the beasts of the earth. See 1 Sam. 17: 36. "Thy servant slew both the lion and the bear, and this uncircumcised Philistine shall be as one of them," &c., and consequently they had no standing in the

family or church of God. So baptism also constitutes the subjects of it, legal members of the church of God. A question on this subject. Why did Christ administer the supper to Judas, and he such a wicked man, for he knew that he was a devil at heart? See John 6:70. "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" It was evidently on the ground of his legal right to the ordinance, on his circumcision, having professed faith, though he did not possess it. We ask again, why was Paul baptized, and the rest of the apostles not? The answer is simply this: Paul did not embrace Christ until after his ascension, and all such had to evidence their faith by receiving the seal in the new form, which is baptism. But it is not mentioned in Scripture that any of the one hundred and twenty who then constituted the church, were baptized on the day of Pentecost; and no one we presume would doubt for a moment, but that all their males were circumcised previously. Paul was also circumcised, but he had to be baptized, and all the Jewish males that were added to the church on the day of Pentecost had been circumcised, but they had to be baptized; and the reason is obvious: because they did not embrace Christ as a Saviour, until after he went home to heaven; and, as in the case of Paul, they must receive the seal in the new form, as an evidence of their faith. So we see on the day of Pentecost a church com-

posed of members, some circumcised but not baptized, and others circumcised and baptized. This is the condition of the church on that memorable day, and who is the man that is well acquainted with his Bible, that dare gainsay it? We will, in the next place, notice the language of Christ on the appointment of the ordinance of baptism. See Matt. 29: 18, 19. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Here we would refer to Matt. 18: 3. "And said verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children," &c. Compare this with Mark 9: 36. "And he took a child and set him in the midst of them: and when he had taken him in his arms," &c. It is contended by the Baptists that this refers to young christians; but they cannot think so from the language in Mark. "And when he had taken him in his arms," &c. If words mean anything these cannot mean an adult just converted, but it is most certainly to be understood an infant. Now we wish again to call the attention of the inquiring mind to the idea, as noticed in a previous lecture; could Christ be in union with the Father, and reject infants of believing parents, or deny them the right and advantages of the covenant, or union with the church? We presume no Trinitarian would make such an as-

sertion understandingly. And if Christ is in union with the Father, just so certain does he approbate the infants of believing parents to be in covenant relation in the church, and this is no sectarian speculative argument, but it is predicated on the unity in the Trinity.

But again on this subject, see Mark. 16: 16. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he the believeth not shall be damned." It is a well known fact that this communication made by the Saviour, to his disciples was that on which they felt themselves authorised to officiate, in sealing the covenant with water in the triune name. From the passage just quoted, Immersionists conclude that because believing and baptism are expressed in connection, that infants are excluded by the Saviuor from the church. Now let us examine the premises and see what the conclusion will be. 1. Infants are to be rejected from the church, because they are not believers; the only conclusion we can arrive at is, that they must be damned. O, what a painful conclusion! Who would be reconciled to it? We think the baptists themselves would blush at the thought. 2. If Jesus in commissioning his apostles, authorised them to preach, and baptize believing adults only, thereby rejecting children, he at once struck a fatal blow at his own immutability, for he is unchangeable. Heb. 13: 8. "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever." By the word yesterday we

understand past time, by to-day, present time, and by forever, we understand that he will always be the same. Now we ask, was he not with the church in the wilderness? See 1 Cor. 10: 4. "For they all drank of that spiritual rock that followed them; and that rock was Christ." Did he approbate children as members of the church at that time? This none who are acquainted with their Bible would doubt for a moment. Again we ask, could he reject children under the gospel, without changing his mind, when their moral character is the same in the old and new dispensations? Surely not. Hence we arrive at the conclusion, that he could not reject the children of believing parents, and be consistent with himself. Therefore we are not to conclude that infants are rejected, because adults are required to believe and be baptized; but some other interpretation must be given to the passage in order to get the true meaning and spirit of the language. Then, in order to a correct interpretation of the passage, there are two things to be considered. 1. The situation of the world in view of a legalizing ordinance in the church; and 2, the object to be effected by the apostles' baptizing. 1. The situation of the world. At the time the Saviour introduced the language above cited, there was not one in the world that had been baptized with the Christian baptism, and as order and regularity in government were of as much importance, un-

der the gospel, as they were under the law, it was essential that all who did not embrace the Saviour until after his ascension should, after believing, receive the seal in the new form by water baptism. And as the agency of infants could not be addressed, their faith was not required; and as the right of children to union with the church, did not depend on their faith, but on the faith of the parent, or parents, therefore there is great propriety in the language, "he that believeth and is baptized," &c. being applied or addressed to the adult, and the infant not named. The parents' faith interested him in Christ, but does not interest the child; it gives the parent a right to claim the covenant for the child, and therefore the child is entitled on the parents' faith to legal membership. And this is the great principle upon which the church was first established. Abraham was a believer, and Ishmael, and others were circumcised on his faith, so children are to be baptized on their parents' faith. 2. The object to be effected. We imagine the Saviour intended nothing more or less than the admission of members in the family of God in the new form, to legal union with the church, to the promise in the covenant, and to the enjoyment of all the privileges of the sons of God.

By further investigation it will be seen, that there is one of three things must be true. The covenant must be done away, or if not

done away, then baptism must be the seal of that covenant, or else there is no seal at all to it. It is certain that the covenant of grace is not done away, for it is to exist for a thousand generations. (See Lecture IV.) If there is no seal of the covenant under the gospel, there is no badge of distinction between the church and the world, and no one could tell who had a right to church privileges, the professor or non-professor. But it is evident from Divine authority that a distinction was to be kept up in all ages, betwixt the church and the world. And how was this done? Not by a bare profession, nor was it done by eating the passover in the old dispensation, or partaking of the Lord's supper in the gospel day. But the mark of distinction under the law was circumcision, and under the gospel, baptism. The mark of circumcision secured the promise of God to the subject, Gen. 17: 7, "to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." And baptism secures the promise to the subject under the gospel. See Acts 2: 39. "For the promise is to you and to your children," &c. Neither circumcision nor baptism gave spiritual union with Christ, nor did they effect any change in the moral character of the subjects, but changed their standing from alienism, to legal union with the church of God. And the Saviour, by the language in the commission, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," intended to show that salva-

tion is not dependent on the baptism, but on the faith; faith secures the salvation of the soul, and baptism the promise of God, with order and regularity in the family or church; the one gives spiritual union, the other legal union. Under the existing circumstances at the time the Saviour gave the commission, there would be no propriety in his naming children, for all the Jews understood that children were received on the parents' faith, and it would have been redundancy for him to have mentioned them. Therefore the language is just what it ought to be, and infants as fully embraced in view of the government of the church, as if they were named, and it is so understood by the apostles, from their language afterwards. Now, from the evidence drawn from the Scripture, baptism is the seal of the covenant under the gospel, as was circumcision under the law.

LECTURE XIII.

On the mode of Sealing the Covenant under the Gospel.

We enter on this subject, knowing that it is one greatly controverted in the professing world; and it is not to be wondered at, that there is such a diversity of views amongst men on the subject of baptism, when the mode is presented to their minds in such a variety of forms.

One denomination of professing Christians view it as important to represent, in baptism, each person in the Trinity, and consequently they dip or plunge the subject three times with the face down; such is the practice of Dunkards. Another class must have the example of Christ followed in his baptism, and believing that he was immersed, consequently they must be plunged; while others of the same denomination, think baptism is intended to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ; these are the views of the Anabaptists. While another class of Immersionists, differing from the former, not in the mode, but in their view of the effect produced, consider it as the act in which the pardon of sins is obtained; these are the Campbellites, so

called by the world. Another denomination discard water baptism altogether, as unnecessary and unscriptural, but yet they are considered as orthodox; such are the sentiments of the Friend Quakers. But there are others who differ in opinion from all the former, who believe in baptizing infants by sprinkling, and adults by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion, as the subject may wish; they are called Pedobaptists. Now, we ask, is it marvellous that there is confusion in the religious world, when professed biblical men teach so differently? Again, we ask, why are these things so? Is it because the Bible does not teach how this ordinance is to be administered, or if it does, it is so imperfectly taught, (as some think,) that the honest inquiring mind cannot arrive, with certainty, at the proper mode? If this were true, there would seem to us, at least to be a very great defect in that blessed book, which is acknowledged as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. But we would be very unwilling to admit so severe a charge against that holy book to be true, when we find in it such language as the following: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter 1: 21. Again 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in right-

eousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." These passages are so plain, that they need no comment; mark however one word in the passage "instruction;" but according to the theory of some we are left uninstructed with regard to the mode of baptism. It would be strange indeed to suppose, that the infallible book of God does not teach how the sealing ordiance of baptism is to be administered. Moreover, "that the man of God may be perfect." Now we are not to understand, that the man is to be in a sinless state of perfection, but that the teacher or preacher is to have a perfect system to teach, which the Bible is in itself. Therefore we conclude, that one of the great causes, if not the whole cause of the difference of opinion amongst men is, their coming down to the ancient fathers, who wrote after the revelation of God to man was completed, and taking their uninspired views, and definition of the word "baptize," &c., as though the inspired book did not give it clear enough. And these fathers fix on the mode from the definition of the word, instead of fixing on the true meaning of the word from what is effected by it, in the application of the ordinance, which we think the Scriptures abundantly show. We shall examine some of the passages, in reference to that point of the subject, hereafter, that it may be seen whether such a plan of defining the word, will comport with

the Word of God. If it will, it most certainly will be a safe one; if it will not, then it must be erroneous, and therefore ought to be rejected.

From the diversity of views, as noticed above, any one to believe in the validity of the seal of the covenant, without taking one side or the other, would seem to be inconsistent. But we hope we shall not be thought supercilious, when we say, we believe it possible for such a course to be taken, as not to embrace either sentiment as above referred to, and yet be with the Word of God; and if we can do that, it will be enough to maintain truth, and that is all we want.

But in the investigation of this subject, we shall naturally, and necessarily, come in contact with Immersionists, and perhaps others. Our object is not to controvert, but to search for truth, for truth's sake, and for the advantage of those who may live when we are gone from this mode of existence.

In the examination of this subject, we say, that the Bible is consistent with itself, and therefore we conclude that every thing taught in the Bible is consistent with reason. Hence we think it no violation of moral principle, to examine this subject on reason. It is true, that all by nature are strangers and foreigners from the commonwealth of Israel, and when brought nigh, should there not be some distinguishing mark, or sign, placed on them to evidence their union with God's family?

Reason would say there ought to be. So, circumcision fixed the mark under the law, and baptism fixes it under the gospel. Where, then, ought this mark or seal to be affixed? Here we are reminded by Immersionists (if the language is not too strong,) of the gormandizer, swallowing up the whole man in water, and nothing else will do, thereby placing the seal on the whole body. And they arrive at this conclusion from three things mainly. 1. The example of Christ's baptism. 2. His burial and resurrection. And 3, from the definition of the word baptize, which, they say, means to immerse or overwhelm. Now, let us examine these three points. 1. The baptism of Christ, for whatever purpose it was intended, was an act according to the Levitical law. See Lecture 7, "On the Priesthood of Christ." The Baptists themselves say, that all the old rites and ceremonies are done away; now, is it reasonable to suppose that they, under the gospel, should follow an example given under the law; reason would blush at such a conclusion. The Baptists believe this notwithstanding. 2. The burial and resurrection of Christ. Now, if baptism is intended to represent this mournful scene, we ask, what is the Lord's supper intended to represent? If it does not represent the death and sufferings of the Saviour, we know not the meaning of language; for it is said by Christ, "as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death

till he come." On this hypothesis, we have two ordinances pointing to the same thing; and such a view would not make a display of wisdom, but of weakness to any intelligent mind. Therefore his burial was the natural result of his death, but baptism is not a natural result of a death to sin, but an ordinance of Divine appointment. But the Baptists draw their conclusions from a passage in Romans 6: 3, 4. "Know ye not that as 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 Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." And one in Col. 2: 11, 12. "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." These passages have no allusion to a church ordinance, we affirm most confidently; and our evidence is, that the subject that is buried with Christ in paptism, as expressed in this passage, has "risen with him through the faith of the operation of God." So it is easy to see the difference betwixt the baptism here spoen of and water baptism; one is raised by Divine power, the other by human agency;

and we hardly think that any unbiassed mind that will read this connection, can believe that it is water-baptism that is spoken of, or even referred to, but that it is the initiating act of the Spirit uniting the soul to Christ, which is the true and simple meaning of the word "baptize," as expressed by the apostle in the passage above cited. But let us examine the import of the word "baptize," as used in Rom. 6: 3. If the apostle intended to teach water baptism in this place, he certainly used improper language (i. e. "to be buried,") to convey his idea, and such as is nowhere used in connection with water baptism; and if the apostle intended this language to be understood in a literel sense, then a literal application must be made of it, and who would be baptized in such a way as into death? Not one. But it is evident the language is figurative, and therefore the application easy. Let us examine the text, (3rd verse,) "baptized into his death." Here we would ask, by way of illustration, who is the agent that baptizes? It cannot be man, for man has not the power, if he had the will, to baptize into a death to sin. Now, from this reasoning, it is evident the agent that baptizes is the Spirit of God, and the effect produced is a death to sin by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and the element used, (if we may so speak,) is the blood of Christ. So we see, that whatever this baptism is, it saves the soul, and we know that water bap-

tism does not, and no one but a heretic would believe it would save. Therefore we arrive at the fair conclusion, that the baptism, as expressed in the passage, is that which initiates into union with Christ. Now we ask, was this baptism by immersion? or was it by sprinkling? By sprinkling most certainly. See 1 Pet. 1: 2. "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." In conclusion on this point we see that the true import of the word "baptize" is not to immerse, but to initiate and that by sprinkling. In the 3rd place. The defiinition of the word "baptize" or "baptism" as the case may be. As we have said before so say we again, that we want no lexicon but the Bible, nor any history but the Bible known as the King's translation, and received by all orthodox denominations, as the infallible rule of faith and practice. For if the writers of the Scriptures, who were inspired men, did not give the true sense of the language they used, in the connection in which they used it, in vain may we come down to men in our day, who are uninspired, to get their true meaning. If this view be not correct, what is to be the condition of the less learned who know nothing of the original language, many of whom perhaps never saw a dictionary in their lives, even in this day of improvement? Is it not Popery in its nature and tendency, that we

ignorant folks must depend on the learned, for the true meaning or proper interpretation of Scripture language that points out our duty? And of course then, we must depend on what they say and act accordingly. Such views are calculated to sink that blessed book, in the estimation of men, rather than to increase their attachment to it. We cannot, and we do not, and we hope we never will entertain such views of that holy, that practical book, the Bible!! We are aware, that the views we entertain on this subject are not popular, and that they will meet with opposition from different quarters, because they differ from the common usages of many of the churches so called. Be it so. But the great question is, do our views agree with, or are they contrary to God's holy book? Now, if they are according to that book, we have nothing to fear, for we had rather have the world against us than the Bible; for that is to be the standard, in a coming day, by which our character is to be tested. For, as it was said by one, "but with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment." But, in assigning our reasons for not entertaining fears, we have wandered a little from the subject, therefore we will return.

Then the import of the word "baptize" or "baptism," as we find it in our common English Bible. To that book, and to that alone, do we look for the proper meaning of the word

"baptize." Here we anticipate an objection raised by those who are disposed to criticise. We have no objection to criticism though we have to garbling, and we hope none will be disposed to do that. Now let us try the principle in the use of other words, for example, the word "religion." Take the meaning of that word as given by some of the learned, and make an application of it, without any reference to the design of it, in its true import, and it will damn the sinner's soul. Now the reader may be disposed to exclaim, error! error!! But hold, dear sir, and wait till we have seen the conclusion in the application. See then the meaning of the word "religion" as given in Buck, which is, "to bind fast." Here we ask, what is man's condition by nature? Is he not the servant of sin? Is he not led captive by the Devil at his will? Again, it is said, "ye are of your father the Devil." Now "bind him fast" in this condition, and it will at once be seen that he is lost forever. Let us then define "religion" according to its nature and design. True or pure religion in its nature is holy, and its design is to bring the soul into union with God in Christ. So we see the simple meaning of the word "religion" as taught in the Bible is spiritual union with Christ, so in the meaning of the word "baptize," its true and simple meaning is to initiate into, or unite the subject baptized, with the church of God. Equally so in the use of other words, we will

find the same principle taught. See then the words, house, sword, farm, &c. Now we know that the mode or form of the house is not dependent on the meaning of the word which only expresses its use or design, that being a place of rest or shelter from the storm. So in the case of the sword; we read in the Scriptures of a two-edged sword, of a fleming sword, of the sword of the spirit. Now we ask again, are we to determine on the mode or form of the sword, from the definition of the word "sword," which is "an implement of war"? Most assuredly not from the meaning, but the design and the effect produced by it. In one place the sword is to slay, in another it is to guard, and in another to reprove and teach. So we think it may be clearly seen, that the proper meaning is to be taken from the design, and the effect produced. This will also apply in the case of baptism as we shall see by examining various passages of Scripture on the subject. But, lest we weary the patience of the reader, we will close this lecture and pursue the subject in another.

LECTURE XIV.

The same subject continued.

In pursuing this subject, as we have taken a view of the noun, we will also examine the definition of the word in the use of the verb, that it may fully appear that we have not mutilated the meaning of the words as used in the preceding lecture. We find this language in the Scriptures: "So fight I, not as uncertainly." Now we ask, can the mode of warfare be determined from the simple meaning of the word "to fight?" which is, "to contend in battle." Only by what was effected in the fight or combat, can it be determined, and not from the definition. Paul fought with spiritual enemies, as well as men and beasts, at Ephesus, but in the above quotation the apostle does not mean a combat with the muscular arm, in blood and carnage, amongst men, therefore the fair conclusion is, that he opposed and contended with spiritual enemies by faith; hence we are to determine the import of the word fight, from its effect, and not from the definition. We might give numerous examples of the verb if it were necessary, but the termination would be the same. A few examples more we will give, that it

may appear to the observer, or to all reasonable minds, that the position we have taken is a correct one, on this subject. The words run, eat, believe, go, &c., all of which will depend on the effect produced for their proper meaning, and not on the simple meaning for the termination. We will now examine the word "baptize" on the above plan, as we find it used by the writers of the Scriptures; and it is evident that the word "baptize" was used by them with different designs, and in view of different things; therefore we will examine the word from its origin, as given in the English translation of the New Testament. 1. John's baptism. And where did he get his authority to baptize? From God the Father, most certainly. See Mal. 3: 1. "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me." Also Matt. 3: 5, 6. "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." And Mark 1: 4. "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Again, John 1: 23, he said: "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord," &c. From the passages above cited, without multiplying Scripture, it is clear that John received his authority from the Father to baptize. And as John was sent to prepare the way of the Lord, or Christ, it is most

certain that his baptism was a preparatory rite, and not an initiating rite, nor the seal of the covenant of grace, nor could it be the Christian baptism when the name of Christ was not used in his baptism. What then was effected by it? See lecture on John's ministry, for the answer. But to the meaning of the word "baptize," as used by John. Now John's pulpit, (if we may so speak,) was the wilderness, and this will account for his baptizing in Jordan. The Anti-Pedobaptists contend that John immersed, for the reason that it is said "in Jordan." Now when we compare the sixth and the eleventh verses of the third chapter of Matthew, there will be found a difficulty hard to reconcile; for in the sixth verse it reads "in Jordan," and in the eleventh verse he (i. e. John) says, "I baptize you with water unto repentance," &c. We ask, why baptize in Jordan with water? Why not in water, if immersion was the mode in which John administered that rite? Now it is evident from the design of that rite and the effect produced by it, that the word "with" was the most appropriate word in that place. Now the grand design of that rite, as administered by John, was to bring Christ directly before their minds as amongst them. See John 1:31. "But that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water." Then the effect produced was, as they came to John

of choice, the engagement was a willing one on their part, and John administering evinced his authority, and gave the proof of Christ being amongst them. Here, then, is a contract witnessed *by*, or *with* water, and not *in* water. The propriety of this language is seen in 1 John 5: 6. "This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ," &c. And this is the contract as proposed by John: ye must believe on him that is to come after him; that is, on Christ Jesus. See Acts 19: 4. John testified that Christ was amongst them; the Jews manifested their willingness to embrace or receive him, when he would appear amongst them. Now the condition of this contract on John's part was, he required the people to repent, and on their part they pledged themselves to repent; hence this contract bound them to repent, which was their duty to do. And this contract was sealed with water, according to the Mosaic law, which was by sprinkling; for it is evident that if John had violated that law, the Jews would have rejected him, but they acknowledged him as a prophet. See Acts 19: 3. "And he said unto them, unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, unto John's baptism." Also 13: 24. "When John had first preached, before his coming, the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel." We deem it unnecessary to offer any farther argument on John's baptism, as respects the Jews, for what

will apply to his baptism as given by one of the Evangelists, will apply to all of them. But John had two baptisms, for he did not baptize Christ unto repentance; though the same word is used, the design was different. Hence in this as in the former case, we must determine the meaning of the word from the effect produced. Now was this baptism to initiate Christ into the church? Common sense would reject such a conclusion, for his circumcision introduced him into the church, therefore his baptism was for another design. This may be easily seen, by consulting a few passages of Scripture. Though we have noticed this subject in a former lecture, yet we think it will be for the advancement of truth to examine it again, in view of the import of the word "baptize," as used in respect to Christ. Now it is evident that the ministry of Christ was under the law, "for he came not to destroy the law but to fulfill." Again: whatever his baptism was, it was something required by the law, or he would not have said to John, "thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." If the act he required John to perform was one not required by some law, his language was altogether unmeaning. And had John and Christ acted contrary to law, or without law, they most certainly would have been rejected by the Jews for such action; but no charge of this kind was alleged against either in this case,

i. e. of John's baptizing Christ. Hence the propriety of the language of the Saviour, "thus it becometh us to fulfill," &c.; and when John heard that word "fulfill," then he "suffered him," or baptized him. It is well known that the Baptists believe that Christ was immersed, and that as an example for us to follow in the ordinance of baptism. Now let us examine this subject, that we may see whether such conclusion is consistent with Scripture, or even common sense, by a series of questions and answers.

Question by a Pedobaptist. Was Christ immersed when he was baptized?

Answer by Anabaptist. He was.

Pedo. What evidence have you of it?

Ana. Because he "was baptized by John in Jordan." Mark 1:9.

Pedo. Where were Christ and John at that time?

Ana. In the wilderness of Judea.

Pedo. Is it reasonable to suppose they had any other means of using water, but by going to

Ana. It is not reasonable to suppose they had.

Pedo. He was in Jordan, but how do you know he was immersed?

Ana. It is a plain, reasonable inference, from his being in Jordan.

Pedo. Are we justifiable in deciding or settling on any important principle from in-

ference, where we have neither precept nor example?

Ana. The postion is doubtful. Have you any Scripture example for persons being in the stream and not immersed?

Pedo. We have in plain language, see Josh. 3: 8. "When ye are come to the brink of the water of Jordan, ye shall stand still in Jordan." This passage is too plain to require any comment, and John being a priest and in the wilderness of Judea, when Christ came to him, he went to the brink of the water of Jordan, and baptized him.

Ana. Is it not reasonable to suppose, that as he went into Jordan, he was immersed?

Pedo. If "into" proves his immersion, the same word will prove that when he went into the mountain, he was overwhelmed in it. Such testimony as proves too much, destroys itself, and proves nothing. What was the design of Christ's baptism?

Ana. An example for us to follow.

Pedo. Was Christ's baptism under the law?

Ana. It was under the gospel; for proof see Mar. 1: 1. "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God."

Pedo. Does the passage refer to the preaching of the gospel which presents Christ and him crucified to sinners, or does it refer to the birth and life of Christ?

Ana. To the birth, life and death of Christ.

Pedo. Was not Chrisi's ministry under the law?

Ana. It was, according to his own language; "I came not to destroy the law but to fulfill."

Pedo. Did not the law require his baptism? You must admit it did, for "thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Does the word "fulfill" signify the introduction of a new plan, or work, or does it signify the close or end of an old one?

Ana. The most reasonable conclusion is, that to finish, or complete, is the prime meaning. What, then, was finished by John's baptizing the Saviour?

Pedo. It was meeting the claims of the Levitical law, which required the high priest to be washed with water before he could minister in the priest's office. See Exod. 29:4; Lev. 8: 5, 6; Num. 4: 3; and Luke 3, 21. "Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also being baptized," &c. In this quotation we have a clear illustration of the language of Christ to John "to fulfill," for Christ was the last person John baptized, or washed. Hence the language of John, "he must increase, but I must decrease." The above references will show that the baptism was done by washing with water, and not in water; and it was in accordance with the law, therefore it was the inaugural rite that brought him into the priest's office; and as a farther evidence of this truth,

he never taught publicly until after he was washed.

We close this lecture with design to pursue the subject, by investigating the effect produced, in the apostolic age, in sealing the covenant.

LECTURE XV.

On the Sealing of the Covenant, by the Apostles, on the day of Pentecost.

The authority that Christ received, by his being baptized by John, fully authorised him to officiate as a priest; and though he suffered and died, yet as he rose again, his authority was not only from his divine nature, but from his legal authority, to commission and send the apostles to teach, or disciple and baptize. Hence from the authority the apostles received, Peter, on the day of Pentecost, introduced the first gospel sermon after the resurrection, and connected with it the first Christian baptism, *or seal of the covenant by water in the new form.* And it is but reasonable that Peter should use the language that he did, when we view the circumstances with which he was surrounded; for at that time Peter, (though an apostle,) had never heard nor seen any one baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but was familiar with the baptism of repentance, and for that reason no doubt uses the language as in Acts. 2: 38. "Then Peter said unto them, repent and he baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift

of the Holy Ghost." And some arrive at the conclusion from this, that the pardon of sins is in the act of water baptism, because he says repent and be baptized; now let such as are tenacious for the simple form of Peter's language in a literal sense, confine themselves to that language, and they will at once see the subject would be saved without faith; and who would believe such error? *None but a heretic.* Now let the enquiring subject after truth examine the context. See Acts. 2: 41. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Here faith is clearly implied in the words "*gladly received*," and they "received his word" before they "were added unto them." It might be well for the reader to examine who they were that are brought to view in the text just quoted. As we have treated somewhat at length on this subject in a former lecture, we will not weary the patience of the reader farther.

We will now proceed to examine what was effected by the baptism spoken of by Peter. It is evident that it was an initiating ordinance, for it effected a union betwixt the parties spoken of in the text; and it could not have been a spiritual union, for no external ordinance can effect such work; but it is certain that it was a legal union with the church in the new form that was effected by the baptism Peter administered. See Acts

2: 42. "And they continued steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." Mark the language "*doctrine and fellowship.*" Now we ask, were the apostles in fellowship with the whole church or only with a part? With the whole church most certainly, and if so, is there then a remaining doubt about their children being brought into the church with them, seeing both the apostles and members were Jews. And we presume none will doubt for a moment, but that the apostles were indoctrinated before the day of Pentecost, and if they were, they most certainly understood the relation that children sustained to the church, but not one word is mentioned by them of children being rejected, but on the contrary, we are taught by Peter, Acts. 2: 39, that "the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off," as well to the child as the parent. We think the plain common sense meaning of the passage is, to all that in after ages believe, their children are entitled to the blessings of the covenant on the parents' faith. This construction of the passage is easy and natural, but mutilate the passage by rejecting the children, and at once you produce division and confusion in the church, at the commencement of the gospel day. But there was fellowship and union and no division; hence the conclusions drawn from the premises are natural and easy, that the children received

the seal of the covenant, in the new form with their parents. We know that it is the opinion of many, that all who were baptized were believers. Such view is not warranted by the word of God. But it was those who believed or received his word that were baptized? We think it straining the Scriptures thus to decide, but that there were three thousand added is clearly taught. That there were not that number of believers, is, we think, clear from the passage, "three thousand souls added." How many of them were children, is not said, nor is it said that all that were added, were believers. Therefore we conclude that there were many children that were added, with their parents, to the church, on that day, who were not capable of believing. But it is believed by others that the mode by which those persons on the day of Pentecost were added to the church, was by immersion, from the fact that they believed that the Spirit overwhelmed them. (But the Scriptures say, "it sat upon them.") Now if that proves immersion, it also proves that many unbelievers were baptized; for it is presumable, at least, that the Spirit operated upon many that did not believe, for none would venture to say that all that were convicted were converted; hence such evidence proves too much, and therefore proves nothing. But further: they could not have been immersed, from the circumstances that attended them on that occasion. It is

most certain that there were no previous arrangements made by the people for immersing, prior to the day of Pentecost. It was nine o'clock in the morning, according to our reckoning of time, when Peter began to preach, and at the close of his sermon the outcry was made, "men and brethren, what must we do!" Now is it reasonable to suppose they could have commenced baptizing before the hour of twelve o'clock? Then here are three thousand to be baptized, (immersed as the Baptists say,) and twelve apostles to perform the work, and, at the greatest length of time reasonable, only seven hours to perform the labor in. Now to suppose that twelve men could immerse three thousand persons in four hundred and twenty minutes, is perfectly preposterous; yea, common sense would blush at the idea. And these circumstances are not exaggerated, nor even strained. (Let the reader examine and judge for himself.) Away then, with the idea of immersion on the day of Pentecost, for we presume no such thing was thought of by apostles or people.

We notice in the next place, that the Acts of the Apostles is the only inspired church history that we have, which treats of the baptism of households; and in tracing this history, we shall notice the facts as recorded and the circumstances connected with them in the several transactions. Here we arrive at the point where we might introduce ancient

church history, and give the views and practice of many of the fathers; but as we have said in a previous lecture, we wish for no history but the Bible nor any lexicon but the Bible, we will confine ourselves to it alone. To arrive at safe and fair conclusions in the investigation of Biblical truth, we must not only take actions, but circumstances connected with them, into the account; either of which, if rejected, would lead to error, more or less. Then to pursue the history as given in the Acts of the Apostles, on this principle, we shall, in the first place, notice the case of Philip baptizing men and women in the city of Samaria, as it is the second account of the Christian baptism in the Acts. The inhabitants of Samaria were a mixed people, and would have no dealings with the Jews. See John 4: 9. "For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans." And Philip being a Jew, it is reasonable at least to suppose the Samaritans would be unwilling to fall in with Jewish customs. Again: is it reasonable to suppose that they had any preparations for immersing? It is not to be presumed they had. But farther. Philip being a Jew, and accustomed to infant church membership, is it to be supposed that he would have neglected them? Or if he had learned that it was wrong, while establishing the first Christian church in that city, would he not have given them instructions on the subject of their children? (for it is either right or is wrong to

baptize children.) But his being a Jew and remaining silent on that subject, is as strong proof as can be adduced from reason, that their infants were initiated into the church with their parents; and from another fact in the connection, which is, the mention made of baptizing women, see Acts 8: 12, "they were baptized, both men and women." Here is the first account of baptizing females under the gospel. Now it was right, in the nature of things, that women should be named as being baptized, who had formerly been represented; and moreover, as infants had, in former time, been members by circumcision, it was neither necessary nor important to name them, and the silence of the apostle at once implies their admission to membership in the church of God, in the apostolic day. Again: if immersion had been the mode by which Philip administered, would it not have been necessary for him (being a Jew) to give some reason for that mode, as well as for rejecting infants? Most certainly it would, he being acquainted with the language as taught by the prophets, which was sprinkling. What then was effected by the baptism of the Samaritans? It was the sealing of the covenant of grace, in which God's truth was pledged to them to be their God; for it could not be that Philip had forgotten the promise that Peter expressed on the day of Pentecost, "the promise is to you and your children," and would not have taught

differently from what he believed. Where then, is the least evidence of immersion, from any or all the circumstances connected with Philip's baptizing in Samaria? We answer, not one particle of evidence can be drawn, by fair reasoning, in favor of immersion, in the whole case. Let the enquirer after truth examine the evidence as given, and if it be not consistent with truth, reject it; but if it is, let it have its due weight, and let the practice agree thereto.

The next passage in order on the subject of baptism, is Philip baptizing the eunuch. This circumstance, by a superficial glance, might be thought to favor immersion; but this case, by fair and impartial examination, will be found to favor immersion no more than the preceding one, which has not the least appearance of such a mode of baptism.

We are aware that there are many who contend that we must have example or precept in direct form, or we are not authorized to come to any decision in positive form, with regard to any mode whatever; while many persons of such views will fix their premises on supposition or tradition, and then draw their conclusions in the most positive manner, without any regard to reason or circumstances. And to say the least of such a course of reasoning, it is unfair dealing with truth. Now to take the case before us, and leave out circumstances and reason, and attempt a decision from the simple language

itself, for it is said, "he baptized him," who could determine, from this language, what the mode was by which he (the eunuch) was baptized? Whether face down or back down, or whether one, both, or either went under the water, or whether the water was sprinkled or poured, or how it was done? But we are dependent on reason and circumstances, combined with Scripture, for a correct view of the mode by which Philip baptized the eunuch, and we will examine the passage accordingly. We will not tax ourselves with the labor, nor our readers with the trouble of reading the whole history of the case, for it is believed by all, that Philip was divinely instructed to journey towards the south, where he met with the Ethiopian eunuch, and found him reading Esaias the prophet. The first thing to be noticed in this history, is the passage the eunuch was reading, from which Philip preached unto him Jesus. The history of Christ, as read by the eunuch, commences at the thirteenth verse of the fifty-second chapter of Isaiah, and includes the whole of the fifty-third chapter. Nor will it be doubted by any, that Philip was a Jew and felt some degree of interest for Jewish rites, that were not forbidden by authority; and from this connection of Scripture, with which Philip was familiar, he evidently understood the mode of baptism; for it is said in Isa. 52: 15, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," &c. Now we ask, is it reasonable to suppose that

Philip would have gone contrary to what the Scriptures taught? which was to sprinkle, and run into immersion, which is not taught in the connection; nor can it, with any degree of propriety, be inferred from any part of that connection which the eunuch was reading. So much for the evidence of immersion drawn from the passage, that it is nothing short of a perversion of Scripture to draw such inference from it. But we proceed to examine other facts in the conversation betwixt Philip and the eunuch. It is evident the eunuch had learned that baptism was a duty, or he would not have applied for it. From whence did he learn this? Either from Philip or the prophet, or both. There must have been a correspondence in Philip's teaching and the prophet's language, in order to gain the confidence of the eunuch in the truth of what he was taught; hence he makes application in this language: see Acts 8: 36. "*See here is water*, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" The manner of expression as used above, clearly implies that there was but a small stream; for had there been a large one, the language used would have been at least out of the common course of things. To call attention to an object fully in view, would be to use words without making any communication, which was not the case on that occasion; hence the language used corresponds with the facts as they existed. This will lead us to notice another fact in the

case; which is, that there is no stream on the way from Jerusalem to Gaza, but the south branch of the brook Kedron, until we arrive at the waters of the Mediterranean sea, and that branch of Kedron but very small, which we shall see in 2 Chron. 32: 3, 4. "He took counsel with the princes and his mighty men to stop the waters of the fountains that were without the city, and they did help him. So there was gathered much people together, who stopped all the fountains and the brook that ran through the midst of the land, saying: Why should the kings of Assyria come and find much water?" These are facts which stand connected with the circumstance of the eunuch's baptism, though they may by some be considered as irrelevant; but let the geographer or the historian determine these facts for themselves. Another circumstance was the eunuch's want of preparation for such a mode of receiving the ordinance of baptism. But again: Acts 8: 38, 39. "They went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water," &c. From this language it is taken for granted by many, without farther examination, that immersion was the mode, when every circumstance connected with the case, goes to forbid the idea of immersion. Let us then bring all the facts concisely to view, then a fair conclusion can be drawn from the premises. First, Philip was a Jew, and well understood

the first form of sealing the covenant, which was by shedding a small quantity of blood. From whence then did he learn the mode and subject of baptism? The Baptists say, from Christ in the commission to preach and baptize. Would Christ have taught the apostles to immerse when the prophet says, "he (Christ) shall sprinkle many nations?" We presume no impartial mind would draw such conclusions from such premises. Again: the stream was small, judging from the words "see here is water." But "they went down into" and "came up out of," &c. Compare this language with the language in Josh. 3: 8. "When ye are come to the brink of the water of Jordan, ye shall stand still in Jordan." This quotation clearly shows the propriety of the language in the case of Philip and the eunuch going "down into" and coming "up out of the water." The evidence in this case is conclusive, that the covenant was sealed by sprinkling, and not by immersion.

We close this lecture, designing to examine the form in which the covenant was sealed in other instances, by the apostles.

LECTURE XVI.

On the Seal of the Covenant to Paul and Cornelius' Household.

All that were authorized to administer baptism in the apostle's day, evidently understood the commission, and the form, by which they were to administer the ordinance of the house of God. Consequently when Ananias was instructed by Divine authority to go to Saul, to instruct him in the ways of duty, and that he must needs receive the seal of the covenant under the gospel administration; (and he is the only one of the apostles that received the seal of the covenant in both forms, i. e. by circumcision and baptism, see explanation on this in a former lecture;) that he might claim the promises in the covenant as well as evidence his faith, in the Messiah; hence the propriety of his baptism. The circumstances connected with his baptism, are of importance, from which we may learn the mode, by which he (Paul) received the ordinance, at the hand of Ananias. On the most critical examination whether there were any preparations for immersion, on the part of either Ananias, Judas in whose house Saul lay, or on the part of Saul himself, or by the

inhabitants of the city of Damascus; there is not the least feature of testimony to this effect. But let us examine the facts of the case farther. It is clear that Ananias fully understood the manner in which the initiating rite was administered at that time. This, it is presumed, will be admitted by all. Now take into view Paul's situation. He was in the house, and had been blind three days. See Acts 9: 9. "And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink." Ananias finds Saul and addresses him: "The Lord, even Jesus," "hath sent me," &c. "And he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized." Acts 9: 18. Now can the enquiring mind after truth come to any other conclusion, than that Paul was baptized standing at his bedside. See Acts 22: 16. "And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins," &c. Hence the fair and just conclusion is, that in this case the covenant was sealed by sprinkling or pouring. Note: "*arise, and be baptized.*" And keeping in view all the circumstances, immersion was impossible in that place at that time, for he was not commanded or directed to leave the house, and most evidently was baptized at his bed side, therefore not immersed.

In the next place, we notice Cornelius and his household, as baptized by Peter. In this, as in former cases, circumstances are to be considered in order to arrive at a fair conclu-

sion, from the premises, as they are laid down in the history, by the apostle. Let it be borne in mind that Peter was a Jew, and well understood the commission he with others received from Christ, to preach and baptize; and it is evident that he understood the *mode* of baptizing as clearly as the *matter* of preaching. For to suppose that the apostles were not instructed as to the mode and subject of baptism, would be virtually saying, that the Saviour had not given them all the instructions necessary to the performance of their duty, as teachers in the church of God. Who but a sophister would admit of such partial instructions being given by the Saviour? Let honesty decide. The next circumstance of note is the instructions given to Cornelius, by the angel, to send for Peter. See Acts 10: 6. "He shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do." Mark! he shall tell "*thee*", not "*them*," what "*thou oughtest* to do," not "*they ought*." From the language used, it is evident that Cornelius was intended to represent his household, as was Abraham. When the soldiers had returned with Peter, Cornelius addressed him thus:—see Acts 10: 33—"Now therefore are we all here present before God, to hear all things commanded thee of God." It is most clear from the language just quoted, that Cornelius, and all that were under him, fully relied on Peter for instructions, so as to learn their duty. It is contended by Anabaptists, that because

no mention is made of children, that they (children) were rejected. Then enquire, would Peter present a promise to the Jews and their children, and reject Gentile children from the promise of God in the covenant, without violating the very principle that had just been revealed to him from heaven, "that God was no respecter of persons." Would he, could he, thus act, and not manifest partiality towards God's creatures. What a solemn charge to bring against a teacher sent of God, as was Peter. And such is the conclusion in the arguments as used by the Anabaptists, in reference to the household of Cornelius. Away with such conclusions, such sophism, as would charge God's divinely inspired minister with partiality. It is not, it cannot be sound argument, that will lead to such conclusions.

But to proceed on this subject. Doubtless there were many soldiers under Cornelius, when they heard Peter preach, that embraced the truth and with him were baptized, but that is no evidence that the children of the household were rejected. But where were those persons when Peter preached to them? In the house most evidently; here then is a great similarity in the Holy Ghost falling on the Gentiles see Act 11: 15. "And as I began to speak the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning." The great agent (the Spirit) was the same, the subjects of the same kind, the benefits the same, and the

promises to the same class of beings. Now could it be possible that Peter, on the day of Pentecost, would say to the Jews, to you and to your children is the promise, and reject the children of Cornelius' household. With this view of the circumstances, there is great propriety in the language as used by Peter, "Who can forbid water" (i. e. to be brought) "that these should not be baptized," &c. And they were baptized in the name of the Lord. In the conclusion of the whole matter, Peter being a Jew and fully understanding the subject, and the mode of baptism, would not have taught them immersion; Cornelius ignorant of the duty until taught by Peter; therefore had no preparation for such a mode, and they were in the house, and not the first particle of evidence that any of them left the house until they were baptized. Hence the fairest and most reasonable conclusion is, that they received the seal of the covenant by sprinkling, or pouring.

LECTURE XVII.

On Lydia and her Household, and the Jailer and his Household.

From the baptism of Lydia and her household, the Anabaptists seem to think without doubt, that because of their being by the river side, where prayer was want to be made, that immersion was the mode by which they were baptized. Now such reasoning is futile in the extreme, and therefore ought not to be considered as reasonable. For when the facts, as they are given us in the history, are regarded as true, (which none will doubt, unless they deny the truth of the Bible, as a revelation from God,) the baptism of Lydia's household was on her faith, and if language means any thing that is the true import of it. See Acts 16: 14, 15. "Whose heart the Lord opened that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized and her household, she besought us saying, "If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us." Lydia "attended to the things which were spoken of Paul," which fully implies faith. "And when she was baptized and her household," not one word about any of them believing, or acting

in any way; again, "If ye have judged me faithful come into my house." Note, the expressions *me* and *my* not *we* and *our*. And *she* not *they* constrained us. Now this language is so clear and plain, that no honest controversy can be held about it. So then, it is evident from the manner of the language, that her household was initiated on her faith, and in this as in the former cases, the covenant was sealed by sprinkling, for it is evident from the circumstances, as well as reason, that if immersion had been the mode, that even to carry out Baptist views, some reference would necessarily have been made to going into the water, or the rejection of the household, or both, but no such intimation is given in either case. And therefore Lydia and her household were brought into legal union with the church by their baptism. Her faith made her a spiritual member of the church, and her baptism a legal member; hence her children were legal, but not spiritual members, by their baptism.

In the next place we notice the jailer and his household. Here are circumstances so directly connected with his believing and baptism, that the case could not be clearly represented, and leave them out of view. And the propriety will at once appear to every reasonable mind, that the circumstances should be noticed, in order to arrive at a fair conclusion from the history of the case.

Then, first, we notice the hour which was

midnight. See Acts 16: 25. "And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed," &c. Again see verse 30. "And brought them out, &c." From this verse it is contended by Immersionists that the apostles were brought entirely out of the jail. Now compare verse 30. "And brought them out and said," &c. with verse 24. "Who having received such charge thurst them into the *inner* prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks." And then verse 37. "Nay, verily, but let them come themselves and fetch us out." And from the history it will fully appear that the apostles were brought out of the dungeon, but were still within the prison walls. From the language in the 37 verse, it is evident the apostles viewed themselves in the prison; and we presume they were not mistaken about their situation. And be the mode of baptism as administered by the apostles as it may, it most certainly was done within the walls of the prison. Verse 33. "And he" (the jailer) "took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized *he and all his straightway.* Verse 34. "And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." It is by many professedly believed, and taught by the Anabaptists, from the form of the passage, "believing in God with all his house," that the household were all believers, and consequently baptized on their own faith. But it can-

not be inferred, from the language, that any of the household either believed in God, or rejoiced in God, but that he (the jailer) believed in God, when with the household, and rejoiced before them. Not a word is mentioned about any of the household either believing, or rejoicing, but he did both. If the household did believe, the language is certainly not correct, for it ought to have been *they* instead of *he*. But as it is in the Bible *he*, and not *they*, therefore the conclusion is a just one, that he alone believed, and on his faith were his household baptized; for salvation was promised to his house on his believing. See 31st verse. "Thou shalt be saved and thy house;" and if salvation was promised to his house, on his faith, well might their baptism rest on it. Though immersionists do not tell us how his house could be saved on his faith; but the word of God informs us, that salvation is promised on his faith; and Peter seems to have understood the same thing, for says he, to you and to your children is the promise. Now, let Immersionists say, from the word of God, where children are rejected, and then they may expect to be believed, but not until then will they be. Once more on this subject: no previous arrangement was made for immersion, nor the least intimation of it, in all the history of the case. But how suddenly, how unexpected, did the whole scene transpire. The earth quaked at midnight, and in the course

of six or eight hours at most, the jailer believed, he and all his were baptized, the apostles' stripes washed, and meat set before them; and the apostles remained prisoners until they were liberated by authority. Where, we ask, is the least evidence for immersion from any of those circumstances, or from all of them combined? Not the first feature of testimony from any part of them; but the fair and just conclusion is, that baptism in this case, was by affusion to the jailer, and on his faith to all his in the same way. So it is easily seen that what was effected by the baptism of the jailer and his household, was their initiation into the church of God by the seal of the covenant in baptism.

We will notice, before we close this lecture, the rebaptism of the twelve whom Paul found at Ephesus, and enquired of them whether they had received the Holy Ghost since they believed. See Acts 19: 1—7. Now that these persons were baptized there can be no doubt, for they acknowledged they were baptized to John's baptism; and when they had learned from Paul the design of John's baptism, "they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus," or Trinity, which evidently shows that John's baptism was not the Christian baptism.

It is a truth known by all who are acquainted with the Anabaptists, that a large portion of them believe that John introduced immersion, and therefore claim his mode as

the origin of immersion, and that it was the Christian baptism. Now if John's baptism was the Christian baptism, how was it that these persons had never heard of the Holy Ghost, (let the honest reader pause here, and think,) when it is so clearly taught that this name is to be used in the Christian baptism? And the use of this name shows, also, that there is more effected by the Christian baptism than there was by John's; hence the propriety of those persons being baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, for in the Christian baptism the covenant of grace is sealed, and John's baptism did not effect that. As we have had occasion to show, in a previous lecture, John's baptism was a preparatory rite, and nothing more; and the rebaptism of the twelve above noticed, was their legal union with the church of God by the seal of the covenant; which, according to former showing, was by sprinkling or pouring, (which is to the same effect,) for the apostle was a Jew, and too well acquainted with Jewish rites and gospel privileges, to have introduced a mode of baptism not named in the word of God.

LECTURE XVIII.

On the further examination of the Apostolic Mode of Sealing the Covenant.

The next passage in course that presents the subject of baptism, is that in the sixth chapter of Romans, on which we had occasion to treat in a former lecture, and which we shall only notice in connection with Col. 2: 11, 12, both of which passages treat of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, or a change of heart, and have no more reference to water baptism than they have to the sun in the firmament. These passages, with a number of others of the like kind, are brought in by Pedo as well as Anti-Pedobaptists, to prove the different modes of water baptism. And it is no marvel that men get into error and confusion, when they so wrest the Scriptures as to apply the passages that treat on the baptism of the Spirit to water baptism. Such as the following: John 3: 5, *not water baptism;* Rom. 6: 3, *not water;* 1 Cor. 12: 13, *not water;* Gal. 3: 27, *not water;* Col. 2: 11, 12, *not water;* 1 Cor. 10: 2—4, *not water;* Ps. 77: 17, *not water baptism.* It is a truth that none will deny, that when Scripture is misapplied the result is error. We might comment on the

above references, and show clearly that they do not apply to water baptism, nor even point to it, but we request the reader to examine and decide for himself, according to the word of God. And we have no fear of being charged with error, when we say the above references (with others that might be made) have no allusion to the seal of the covenant by water baptism, but some of them to the conversion of the soul by the Spirit, with its effects, and others to the sovereignty of God in the laws of nature.

The next account we have of water baptism, is that given by Paul of Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanas, 1 Cor. 1: 16. Here the apostle has reference to the initiating seal of the covenant, though he says he was not sent to baptize but to preach; nor are any called of God to baptize, but to preach, for it is the church that gives men authority to baptize. But Paul, on this occasion, administered the ordinance to the above named, the latter having his household baptized with him. Now we ask, can any unbiassed mind, on mature reflection, suppose that the household was baptized on their own faith? The language fully shows that it was on the faith of Stephanas, and not on their faith. Here we have the principle carried out in practice that was taught to Abraham, that on his faith all his males were circumcumcised; so in the case of Stephanas, on his faith all his were baptized. It is evident

from Paul's knowledge of the covenant, for he had not yet forgotten the inspired promise to the jailer of salvation to his house on believing, and from his frequently recurring to the covenant and its perpetuity, that in this case it was sealed by sprinkling. And such an idea as immersion cannot be fairly drawn from the passage above noticed.

But before we leave the case of Stephanas, it will be of some benefit to the enquirer after truth to notice it as expressed in 1 Cor. 16: 15. "Ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." This text is often used as proof of immersion, because it is said "they addicted," i. e. devoted "themselves" &c. as shewing that they were all adults, and consequently baptized on their own faith, and that by immersion. Now no reasoning could be more futile, for on the contrary, the legitimate effects of the covenant are clearly shown in the government and charity of the household; and the design of the apostle, by introducing them in the close of his first letter to the Corinthians, was to show to them the effects of true piety, in view of the covenant, and that one of its designs is to bind the church together as a body; hence he says, "ye know the house," &c. and thus presents them as a sample of piety and charity. Then to draw any conclusions from this passage with regard either to mode or subject of baptism, is noth-

ing less than a perversion of truth, for the most faint conception of a church ordinance can not be drawn from it.

The next passage we shall notice is 1 Cor. 7: 14. "Else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." That the apostle did not mean that the husband was converted by the wife or *vice versa* is evident, nor does the apostle mean, because one was an unbeliever, that the children were illegitimate. Most certainly not. It is easy to learn, that the church at Corinth was composed of Gentiles, as well as Jews, and the prime object the apostle had in view, in this passage, was to show, that if but one of the parents was a believer, that the children were entitled to the blessings of the covenant; not, however, that they were personally holy, or free from moral pollution, but that they were federally holy, i. e., having a right to the blessings in the covenant, on their parent's faith, and therefore were entitled to the benefits couched in the covenant of grace. See Gen. 17: 7 and Acts 2: 39. And it is evident, from the Scriptures, that children of one or both believing parents are entitled to the seal of the covenant, though Immersionists say they are not, without giving one single reason, or one passage of Scripture as proof, only that they cannot believe, and therefore reject them. Now, we would feel unwilling to introduce evidence to prove their rejection, that, if carried out, would finally damn them. Away

with such testimony; and we have been led to wonder the Baptists do not become unwilling to use such reasoning, and lay it aside. But if they do that, their structure would fall to the ground. We might have dwelt more at length on the different items in this passage, but our conclusions on the subject of the covenant would have been the same in the end; therefore we deem it best not to use words without profit; for our conclusion is, that the apostle had no reference to the mode of sealing, but to the subject to be sealed on the parents' faith.

The next passage, as thought by some to refer to water baptism, is Heb. 10: 22. "Let us draw near with a full heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." The apostle had no allusion to the sealing of the covenant in the passage quoted above, but to the manner of personal cleansing, with which the Hebrews were familiar; and as they had been cleansed in heart by the blood of Christ, and had acknowledged that cleansing in their washing, which was a personal rite, according to the old law—See Lev. 14, 8: "And he that is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes, and shave off his hair and wash himself in water, that he may be clean:" also, John 2: 6: "And there were set there six water pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece," i. e.,

about three gallons—he encourages them to steadfastness of faith from their union with Christ. And no construction that can be given of the passage will admit of water baptism being taught, nor can it be any thing short of wresting the passage, to apply it to a church ordinance.

The passage in 1 Pet. 3: 21—"the like figure whereunto even baptism doth now save us," &c.—has no allusion to water baptism; therefore to arrive at a proper view of it, we must first understand the object the apostle had in view, in order to gain a proper interpretation of the text. The apostle most evidently intended, in this connection of Scripture, to present Christ as the great author of salvation, and that it was the same spirit that raised Christ from the tomb that moved Noah to preach to the people before the flood, see verse 20, "which some time" (or long time) "were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." The apostle surely did not mean that it was the water that saved the eight souls, but that the same flood which drowned the wicked carried the ark on its surface, and those eight, being in the ark, were preserved from death; hence the conclusion is reasonable as well as scriptural, that the ark was brought to view as the type of Christ, and not the water, for the water would not have saved them, had

they been out of the ark, nor will water save the sinner's soul out of Christ, let it be applied by whom, or in what manner it may. Then there is a great propriety in the language, as used in the 21st verse, "the like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a *good conscience* towards God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.") Then as the ark on the water was the literal saviour of Noah and his family from a watery grave, so Christ is the spiritual Saviour of the soul, by the efficacy of his blood. So the water, in baptism, represents the blood of Christ as did the ark Christ himself; hence the propriety of the expression, "the like figure," &c., that is, a clear representation of the efficacious blood, that cleanses from sin. See 1 John 5: 8. "And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one." Where, we ask, is the agreement? It cannot be in merit, nor can it be in likeness, but in this, that the water is the figure, and the blood the substance, and the Spirit is the agent that applies the blood, and they three go to witness or prove the same fact, that the Spirit applies, the blood cleanses, the water seals and testifies; hence baptism represents the salvation effected by the blood: "the like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us," &c. How then, we ask, does the Spirit use the

blood? Does he immerse the subject in it? Surely not. The Immersionist would not admit such an idea. The blood is evidently sprinkled, when applied. See Heb. 10: 22; ib. 12: 24; Lev. 16: 15; Exo. 24: 6, 7, 8; Heb. 9: 19. It is often said that baptism is intended to represent the Spirit. Now, we ask, what did circumcision (which was the shedding of blood,) represent? Not the spirit, but the blood; so the water represents the blood, but not the spirit.

But baptism is said to be the answer of a good conscience toward God. The interpretation often given to this passage of Scripture is, that their conscience is satisfied with the mode they think right, and according as their faith or tradition is, so is their conscience. And if a person believes in immersion, it is a good conscience; if they believe in sprinkling, they have a good conscience; and if it is rejected altogether, it is a good conscience. Now does not such reasoning make the person's faith or tradition, the rule by which they are governed more than the word of God? Most certainly it does. Again: can such a conscience be a good one? If it be, it is not because they have done the will of God understandingly; and we conclude that a good conscience is the result of having done the will of God from a knowledge of that will, instead of having taken Scripture in an isolated form, to quiet the conscience. Therefore an ignorant conscience, or one uninformed, cannot be

a good one, though it may be easy or quiet. It is true, however, that persons may have some quietude of mind from having done what they thought to be duty, but they cannot have that living comfort from a consciousness of having done the will of God, that those have who do his will understandingly. Then a good conscience must be an enlightened conscience, for it cannot be a good one in ignorance, or darkness of mind. In conclusion on this passage: the apostle shows, in the connection, the effects produced on the person that has entered into the ark of safety by faith, and has received the initiatory rite of baptism; but no reference whatever to immersion, except the wicked antediluvians, and they were immersed to all intents and purposes, for Noah and his household were not immersed, nor was the ark immersed, for it remained on the water, but did not go under; nor was Christ immersed, nor is the covenant sealed by immersion, from any evidence that can be adduced from the Scriptures, Old or New Testament. And Peter, on this occasion, would not teach the seal of the covenant to be affixed differently from what he had taught on former occasions, and that it was by sprinkling, (as shown in Lecture XV,) on the day of Pentecost, and in the case of Cornelius' baptism, who was the first Gentile convert to the Christian faith of which we have any account.

There is another passage of Scripture that

we will notice in this connection. See Eph. 4:5. "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." We are aware that there are different interpretations given of this passage. By some it is believed to be the baptism of the Spirit, and by others to have reference to one mode exclusively. Now for us to conclude that there is but one baptism, because there is but one kind that will save the soul, such view will come in collision with the word of God; for Paul himself teaches water baptism, and sometimes practised it. And Christ taught water baptism as well as spiritual. In view of these facts before us, it would be a wrong interpretation to say there was but one baptism, when the Scriptures teach more than two. But farther: to suppose the apostle had an allusion to any particular mode of water baptism is an improper view of the subject, for he was not treating on the ordinances of the church in the connection. But in exhorting the church to unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and to establish the truth that he taught them in the connection, he uses the words above quoted: "one Lord, one faith, one baptism." (Will the reader examine the connection, with care?) The true interpretation, as fully appears from the connection, is one Lord; i. e. one object of faith; and ye have all believed on him, and this shows their spiritual union in that Lord, and the same kind of faith by which they all received, or embraced that object. One baptism, or once

only to be baptized, which legally united them as one body to that one Lord, without any reference to the mode whatever, but to show their standing as brethren, and consequently should live in unity, as all Christians ought to do. Hence our conclusion is, from the connection, that the apostle intended to teach that baptism was to be but once administered to any individual, instead of teaching that there was but one mode of baptism.

We will close for the present, with design to pursue the subject in answering or meeting some objections, and presenting some inconsistencies entertained by Pedobaptists on the subject of membership in the church.

LECTURE XIX.

On the Right of Persons to Choose the Mode of Initiation into the Church.

We are well aware, that on this subject there is great controversy in the world; some are firmly of the opinion that the adult has the right to choose the mode for himself, and when the choice is made in honesty, and the ordinance administered by a proper officer, with the proper element, in the name of the Trinity, and a proper subject, that is all that is required to constitute a valid baptism, whether the water be sprinkled or poured on, or the subject immersed in it; either way is considered a valid baptism. This position is taken from two considerations. 1. On the ground of free agency, that the subject has the right to choose. 2. That God has not told us expressly, how that ordinance is to be administered. Now let us carefully examine the principle, that we may see whether such views are consistent with the word of God; for reason and revelation will agree, as far as reason can go. But we are not at liberty to reject revelation, because reason cannot fathom all that God has taught us in his book. First, then, on reason. Now if we are at

liberty to choose, and are justified in choosing any mode or plan, in view of the ordinances of God's house that God has not taught us, then we make agency and not the Bible the standard. Have we a right to do so? Surely not. Again: is it reasonable to suppose that he would give us a complete revelation to teach us both faith and practice? and yet, according to the faith of some, we cannot learn from it how we are to be baptized, or what we are to believe concerning the mode. If such logic be correct, the Bible is no standard. And who, in their theory, would pretend to reject the Bible and fall in with tradition? Yet there are many who embrace a theory that violates the instructions given in the word of God.

Again: it is believed by many, that the validity of the ordinance has nothing to do with the mode. Let us examine this position, whether the mode has or has not any thing to do with the design of the ordinance, in order to its validity. Then, for example, let us suppose there is a proper subject, a proper administrator, the proper element, and the three persons in the Trinity named, but the administrator transposes the Divine names. We ask, is such administration valid? What honest Bible reader would admit it? Surely not one. If, then, we have no right to transpose the Divine names, have we any right to transpose the subject and the water? Surely not. Then is not immersion a transposition,

according to the language of the Bible? It is, most certainly; for it is expressed in all cases where the word is used in the Scriptures, *with* water, and not *in* water. And to violate the plain instructions of the word of God, would invalidate the whole. And such as admit immersion to be valid, have to admit it in violation of the word of God. And with all their liberty of choice, no one has a right to choose that which is wrong. And we would sincerely wish to be preserved from choosing any thing that would be in violation of that holy book.

But further on this subject. Suppose the above named essentials are all used in the administration, but the water is applied to the subject's breast? Would it, could it be considered valid in the sight of heaven? We think no one acquainted with their Bible would make such an admission.

This position, we design to examine on reason and revelation, and if either will admit it as true, there will be some ground of justification for so believing, but if neither reason, nor revelation will admit it with consistency, we hope in God that the church will not. As we have noticed above some of the inconsistencies, in confining ourselves to the idea that four things only are necessary to the validity of water baptism, i. e. proper names, subject, element, and administrator, and as far as number is concerned the Anabaptists are more consistent than the Pedobaptists, for

the former say it must be done in the right way, but the latter say any way will do, that will satisfy the subject. And this conclusion is taken mainly from three passages of Scripture. See 1 Peter. 3: 21. and 5: 3. and 1 Cor. 6: 12. For our views on 1 Pet. 3: 21, see Lecture XVIII. on the passage. 1 Pet. 5: 3. "Neither being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the the flock." There is no one, on examining the connection, can apply the language to the subject, as having a right to choose the mode of baptism for himself, without willfully perverting it, for the apostle is most clearly setting forth the pastoral office, and to apply it in any other way, would be garbling in the extreme. Equally so, in the passage in 1 Cor. 6: 12. "All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient; all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any;" for the apostle in the connection is speaking of men dealing honestly with their fellows, and to apply the passage to baptism, pro. or con., would be a palpable perversion of sacred truth, and that, honest intelligence would be unwilling to do. So we see, that the above passage cannot be justly applied to the subject choosing any mode, or the church tolerating a wrong choice when made. Hence the conclusion, that neither reason nor revelation will admit of a departure from the word of God, without sinning either willfully or ignorantly, (and the sin of ignorance had

to be atoned for under the law, and it is not less offensive now;) and a departure from the Divine instruction in one position would invalidate the whole, as we shall see by farther examining the subject.

There is an agreement betwixt reason and revelation, as far as reason can stretch her powers. But God has revealed things to us, that reason cannot fathom; therefore we must take the Word of God for our rule of faith and practice, and not suffer reason to rule, for what reason cannot unfold, she will not condemn. Then to return to the subject, we enquire, has any human being a right to choose the plan, on which he will be qualified to enjoy the spiritual comforts of the church of God, or, in other words, be soundly converted by the Holy Spirit? Could there be one found, that would answer this question in the affirmative? We presume not one. Have we not then as much right to choose how we will be fitted for, as how we are to be initiated into, legal union with the church? How would reason answer this question? That we would have as much right in one case as in the other, for they are both of Divine appointment, therefore not left to our choice. Whether we will be converted, or baptized, or both, is left for us to choose; but if we choose to be, the *how* is not left to us. Nor can it be shown from the Scriptures, that human agency is addressed, on either of these points. The one makes a

spiritual member, and the other a legal member, and the plan being of Divine appointment, we must submit to it as taught in the Word.

But once more on reason. Had not the Israelites a right to choose where they would extract the blood from, in circumcision? We conclude the answer would be, they had not, from the fact, that the part was designated. Now, have we any more liberty to depart from the Divine plan, than they had? We answer, no, for the following reasons: God is the same, the covenant the same, the church the same, and the effect the same. The only difference is, the female has a personal right, which formerly was representative, and another part of the body that the seal is to be affixed, on which is the forehead. From these facts before us, why will men suffer vain and delusive reason to turn their minds from solid reason, to admit things that are not consistent with revealed truth?

But we are asked, does the word of God teach us where the baptismal water is to be applied? If it does not, then are we left to mere conjecture where the seal of the covenant is to be placed, and if so, confusion is inevitable. But the Bible is not so vague a book as all that. Let us then examine that blessed rule of faith, and see whether it will leave us to conjecture or not. Here we would remark that there is no point of doctrine, or practice, taught in the New Testa-

ment, that is not either typically or prophetically taught in the Old. Hence the great principle of God's moral government is clearly taught in the Pentateuch or five books of Moses, and sanctioned by the prophets. See Acts. 26: 22. "Witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." So it is typically represented that the seal of the covenant should be on the forehead. See Exo. 13: 9, 14. "And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand and for a memorial between thine eyes," &c. "And it shall be when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying what is this? that thou shalt say unto him by strength of hand, the Lord brought us out from Egypt, from the house of bondage." Isa. 61: 9. "And their seed shall be known among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the people; all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they are the seed which the Lord hath blessed." Eze. 9: 4. "And the Lord said unto him, go through the midst of the city, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark upon the foreheads of the men, that sigh and cry, for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof." Rev. 7: 3. "Saying, hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their forehead." Rev. 9: 4. "And it was commanded them that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing,

neither any tree, but only those men which have not the seal of God in their forehead." Rev. 14: 1. "And I looked, and, lo a Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads." Also, Rev. 22: 4. "And his name shall be on their foreheads." Here is a sealing in the forehead, and this cannot be applied to the work of the spirit, for the spirit seals the heart, but the seal of the covenant is on the forehead, hence the evidence is clear that in a sealed baptism, there must not only be proper names, subject, element, and officer, but the water must be applied to the forehead which is the seal. It may still be contended, that the four former are enough to give validity to the ordinance. Let us here examine this view, as entertained by many, and see whether Scriptural example will sustain us. Nadab and Abihu were priests, they had the office, the censer, the incense, and fire, but it was strange fire, which they were not commanded, and the Lord slew them, for offering strange fire. See Lev. 10: 1, 2. "And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them; and they died before the Lord." Now we ask, would there not have been as much impro-

priety in offering right fire in a strange way, as strange fire in the right way? Reason we think would answer there would. Then if we are taught any thing from the case of Nadab and Abihu, it is that Jehovah will not approbate any minister's departure from the instruction he has given in his word. So they should have taken holy fire (which was the fifth thing in the offering to have made it valid,) from the altar which would have been in accordance with the Divine direction, and thereby avoided the curse. So in the case of baptism, it requires five distinct things to be valid baptism: the fifth, which is the water, applied to the right place, the forehead, and a failure in either one will invalidate the whole. And we are confident, if we are taught any thing in the history of Nadab and Abihu, it is that no departure from the word of God in those official acts, as well as in other things, can be committed without a violation of the moral government; and if that does not destroy the validity of the action, we know not what would. Therefore we arrive at the conclusion, from the principle (and the principle is a valid one,) that immersion is a departure from the word of God, and therefore sinful; it is not only a failure in duty but an offence against God, by perverting the ordinance of his house.

But before we close this lecture, we will give some views of authors, not as proof of our argument, but to show consistency, or, as

we had better say, inconsistency; for if we understand what consistency is, many of them, if not all, are consistent in their premises but not in their conclusions. We do not object to their premises, by no means, believing they are taught in the word of God, but their conclusions we do doubt most seriously. It would be useless for us to enumerate the Pedobaptist authors that have written on the subject of baptism, and have shown, not only from history but clearly from Scripture, that immersion was not the practice of the church till within the last four hundred years, but that it was of human invention. Notwithstanding which they will admit it as valid, and recognize the subjects of immersion as in full fellowship in the church with it. This is a fact so well known, that it would be useless to cite authors for proof; one only, however, we will mention, as a specimen: see Letters on the Subject and Mode of Baptism, by J. T. Hendrick, of Ky., Letter XI, page 81. "We do not admit immersion to be the Scriptural mode of baptism; we fully and unequivocally deny that it is taught in the Bible." Now for men to admit an ordinance, or mode of an ordinance to be valid, yet not found in the Bible, is an admission without authority, and therefore unwarrantable; how conscientious men can do so, is marvellous. Then when immersion is admitted as valid, it is admitted without evidence from either reason or revelation.

But stilll it is argued, that mode has nothing

to do with the ordinance of baptism. Now we understand by the mode of any thing, the form of that thing, or the manner in which that thing exists. On this point it is argued, in reference to the supper, that the position of the body has nothing to do with the validity of the ordinance, whether the subject recline, kneel, or sit. This is true to a proverb. But does mode and attitude mean the same thing? Most certainly they do not, for mode means form, and attitude posture. So the form of a man's body and the posture in which that body is placed, are two distinct things; for it was God that gave the body the form, but man can take his own posture—sit, lie, kneel or recline, as he will. Now, according to modern reasoning, it would have done as well for Moses to have put the blood on the tip of the left ear as on the right, and on the left thumb as on the right, or on the crown instead of the ear. See Lev. 8: 23. "And he slew it; and Moses took of the blood of it, and put it on the tip of Aaron's right ear, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot." To use such arguments to prove that mode has nothing to do with the ordinance of baptism, is perfectly futile. And by farther reasoning on the subject, we shall see how inconsistent such arguments are. But to return to the point in question. As the attitude of the body in the supper has nothing to do with its design, neither has the cup any thing to do with it, nor has the kind of cup, whether it

is metallic or clay, but it is the bread and wine that gives it worth, as emblematically setting forth the body and blood of the Lord. So in the case of baptism in reference to the body; whether the subject sit, kneel, lie, or stand, these things have nothing to do with the validity of the ordinance, but the place has, which is the forehead, as we have seen above.

Let us see the analogy betwixt baptism and circumcision. It did not matter whether the blood was extracted in circumcision with a knife or a stone, but it would not have done to extract it from the finger or from the toe, from the crown or from the arm, for the place was designated. And as far as attitude is concerned in the ordinance of baptism, there is not the least intimation given in the word of God, that persons had to lie down in being baptized, or were laid down, but we have it expressed "arise." See Acts 22: 16. Now from reason as well as Scripture, we have conclusive evidence that there are five things necessary in order to baptism being a valid ordinance: proper subject, officer, names, element, and place, which is the forehead, by sprinkling or pouring, properly representing the blood of Christ, for it is his blood that is to be represented in baptism.

We leave the candid reader to examine and decide for himself, whether the evidence adduced is Scriptural or not; and if it be not founded on the word of God cast it from you, but if it is Scriptural take heed how you reject it.

LECTURE XX.

On the Benefit of the Covenant, when the Seal is Received.

It is often said by the Anabaptists, in derision, that it does no good to baptize infants. And this assertion is based on the ground that they can see no visible effects on those who have been baptized in their infancy. Here the evil is attributed to the wrong cause by them; for the evil (and we have no doubt but there is great evil and much injury done by parents failing to instruct their children in the covenant,) is not in the covenant, nor in the promise of God in it, but in the failure of parents or guardians to give the suitable instructions. And it is a lamentable truth, that there is not one out of five of the heads of families, if one out of ten, taking the whole Pedobaptist community, that instruct their youth in a knowledge of the covenant promises. And it is sinful for any one to charge crime on the Divine appointment, (for the Baptists say it is wrong, but can give no proof of it,) when it ought to be laid to parents or guardians, as the case may be. And many parents will have a fearful account to render on this subject in a coming day, no

doubt; for it is certain that men will have to account for what they might have known, from the capacity given and the means of information afforded them. Then it is important that we know, and do all our duty, towards God and men; and the appointment of our duty in the covenant is so plain, that he that runs may read. See Gen. 17: 7, Deut. 6: 7, Prov. 22: 6, Jer. 30: 20, Rom. 2: 1, 2, 9: 4, Eph. 2: 12, 3: 6. It would be useless to multiply Scripture proof on this point, for if the passages referred to would be rejected, that SPIRIT would reject the whole Bible in view of the covenant.

The advantages, then, of the covenant, are to be considered in order to the improvement of them.

1. The subject that is initiated into the covenant by baptism, is brought into legal union with the church of God, (and no person without it is,) and has a right to the protection of the church, for their moral character, and if the church fails, she is thus far guilty; for she is as much bound to protect, and defend her subject in a moral point of view, as the nation is in a civil point of view, and if she fails in that duty the subject is injured. It might be proper in this place to answer some objections, that are entertained by some, in view of baptism being an initiating rite. It is believed by some, that baptism is not a door, (as it is called,) into the church, for the reason that the subject bap-

tized is already in the church; in the case of infants, they are born in the church, and in the case of adults the session, or other officers, as the case may be, is the door. Now if this position be correct, we have two doors into the church, one by birth, and the other by session or other officers as above stated. Then we ask, what is gained by baptism? We would answer nothing whatever. But if they are in the church at all, it is by some legal authority; for the conversion of the soul, by the Holy Ghost, does not make any one a member of the family of God in a legal sense; they are members of Christ's spiritual body, but not of his visible body. And in the case of infants, there is no one that can show from the Scriptures, that they are entitled to either promise or privilege, without baptism; but that they are born heirs to the promise when of christian parents (one or both as the case many be.) See Exo. 12:48, 49; Acts. 2:39; 1 Cor. 7: 14. And the seal of the covenant, gives the subject the right to claim the covenant, with all the benefits contained therein as his, which we will notice. 2. The party baptized, has a just claim on the church to pray for them, and if she fails of her duty in this respect, she sins against God, and the member, in that neglect, for we are commanded to pray with and for one another; to do good unto all men, and especially to the household of faith. And according to the principle laid down in the law, there were

members of the household, that were not believers in Christ, such were infants, and consequently the church is bound to pray for the infants, that have been dedicated to God in the covenant.

3. The church is morally bound to instruct her infants. This is another advantage of infant baptism. The infant needs the instruction, the church owes the duty, and if in this duty she is delinquent, the child is injured, the church is guilty, and God is offended.

4. The child being dedicated to God in the covenant, when it arrives at a sufficient age to understand those proper instructions, it has the right, according to Divine appointment, to plead the truth of God for its salvation, as well as the mercy. See Isa. 44: 2—5. "I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring. And they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water-courses. One shall say, I am the Lord's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel." Then if it is an advantage to have the promise of God, the protection of the church, the prayers of the church, and a right to claim the truth of God for salvation, then infant baptism is of great value; but if these things are of no worth, then infant baptism is of no avail. But who would, who dare say they are not,

that is acquainted with the Bible? We presume not one. For the reason that the covenant of grace centers in Christ, and the persons instructed in the covenant, who will obey the instructions and claim the promises in the covenant, are as certain of salvation as that God's truth remains firm and sure.

But the question is often asked by the Baptists and others, why is it that the baptized children are as wicked and careless as those who are not baptized? The proper answer to this question is, they are not all as wicked as many of the unbaptized, though it is true many of them are; and for this cause, those who are enemies to the covenant take the liberty to charge the fault to the covenant, when they ought to charge the parents as being the cause, and not the covenant. It is true that many parents are, in this respect, guilty before God. And it is moreover true, that the professed friends of infant baptism have done the cause more injury than all the opposers of it; for there are many that have their children baptized, and not one word of instruction is ever given to the dear children, either as to the nature or design of baptism. And it is no marvel if children thus left ignorant of the nature and design of the ordinance, are as wicked as those who never heard of the covenant.

But it is thought by some, that to baptize children takes away their liberty; that when they arrive at maturity they may not be satis-

fied with it, and cannot be baptized over again by any of the Pedobaptists, and therefore will have to remain dissatisfied or join the Baptists, which many in such case are not willing to do. Now to answer this objection, we will observe in the first place, that no such person can be found, who has been baptized in infancy and properly instructed, according to the Scriptures, in the nature and design of baptism, that is dissatisfied. Though many that have been baptized in their infancy have been dissatisfied, but the cause was, that they were left without instruction on the nature and design of the ordinance; and no marvel that the iniquity of the parents should be visited on the children, until the third and fourth generation.

Another assertion often made, as proof against the baptism of infants, by the Anabaptists, is, that it does no good. To answer this objection we wonld ask the objector, what good it does the infant that the marriage ceremony was performed when its parents were united in the marriage covenant? The child, in point of knowledge of the marriage covenant, or of baptism, is as ignorant in the one case as the other, yet both are of vital importance to the child; the one saves its character from illegitimacy and legalizes its right to a part of the father's estate, the other legalizes its heirship to the promise of God in his family, which is the church. So the advantage of the seal of the covenant is easily

seen, for it secures the promise of God to the subject sealed, for its salvation; and if this does no good, we would ask the Anabaptist to tell us what would do good. But to conclude this lecture by a few remarks. It is no marvel that the covenant is looked on with such contempt by Immersionists when its professed friends, who ought to be the standard bearers of truth, seem to look on it as though it was a thing of nought, and treat the children of the church with as much neglect as though they needed no instruction. The advantages that are to be derived from suitable instruction afforded to the youth in the church, are almost incalculable in their nature, and would have a powerful influence on the church and the world, if afforded. But alas! the very pillars of the church (as they ought to be considered) seem as though they would let the building fall, and the cause of God die in the hands of its professed friends, for the want of the proper training and instruction of the youth by pastors and parents; and unless there is a reformation on those things, the result will be fearful. May heaven prevent it, and save the youth.

LECTURE XXI.

On the Origin and Perpetuity of the Church, under the Seal of the Covenant.

As we have heretofore noticed, the origin of the church of God was in Abraham's family, and composed of at least three hundred and twenty-one members; and from testimony in after times, it is very evident there were more than that number, for the females were represented by the males, and this church was composed of the aged and the infant. See Gen. 17 chap., Exo. 12 chap., Acts 7 chap. And there is no evidence can be found in the Scriptures from which a fair inference can be drawn, that any subject or class of members, that were appointed members of that church in its origin, were ever rejected by any proper authority; we challenge the world for evidence on this point, for the true church of God is composed of the same class of members now that it was in Abraham's day; i. e. believing parents and their offspring. And though there was a change of dispensations and a change in the form of administering the ordinance, yet there was no change in the subjects of the kingdom, (or church,) though of a different nation. See Matt. 21:

43. "Therefore say I unto you the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing fort the fruits thereof." It is obvious that at the time this language was spoken, the church was in the Jewish family; but Christ says, the kingdom of God, or as is properly meant, the church of God shall be taken from you, (the Jews,) and given to another nation, (the Gentiles.) For farther proof see Mark 12: 9. "What shall therefore the Lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the husbandmen and give it to others." Here is the same idea as given above, and on the day of Pentecost the change took place. The Gentiles were admitted into the church, but it was not a new church, but new members into the old one. See lecture on the church passing from the old to the new dispensations. For farther proof see Rom. 11: 12 to 21 inclusive. The apostle presents the root as holy, and so are the branches. Now it is evident Abraham was the root, and the Jews were the branches that were broken off, and the Gentiles were graffed in. See verse 17. "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert graffed in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree." Does not the passage show most clearly, that the Gentiles were admitted to the privileges the Jews had enjoyed? No honest mind, we think, would deny or reject it. But again:

see 1 Cor. 12: 13. "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one spirit." Also Eph. 2: 16—19. "And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers, and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." Chap 3: 6, 15. "That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same body and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." "Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." It would be useless for us to multiply Scripture proof on this subject, when it is so manifest from the word of God, that it is the same church now that was instituted in the family of Abraham. Though there has been a change of seasons, both of refreshing and of darkness, of periods, of circumstances and of dispensations, there has been no change of the church nor of its subjects; for it is true, from the word of God, that there never has been but one church on earth, (though different societies,) and there will never be more than one true church of Christ, and part of them are in heaven and part of them on earth.

But let us further examine the Scriptures on this subject. All who are acquainted with the Scriptures will admit, there is a time approaching (how far distant we know not,) when the church will arrive at her militant brightness, in the full blaze of earthly glory, when peace and truth will triumph, which is often spoken of as the the millenium, or millennial glory. In which time the church will have become as pure as at her origin in the family of Abraham; and perhaps some would say, more so. On this point we are willing to admit, (in reference to purity,) as much as any would wish to claim. Then let us see what the Scriptures will authorize us to believe, in respect to mode and subjects of baptism, in that day. See Isa. 65: 19—23. There is something in this passage a little remarkable, and that is, that human life is to continue as long in the millenium, as it was at the introduction of the church in Abraham's day. See verse 20. "There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days; for the child shall die an hundred years; but the sinner, being an hundred years old, shall be accursed." And verse 23. "For they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them." We would ask our opponents to make any other application of this passage, than that the children of believing parents will be owned of God, as members of the church, in that day. We are as-

sured they cannot. See also Jer. 30: 18—22, on the same subject as in the above connection. Verse 20. "Their children also shall be as aforetime, and their congregation shall be established before me, and I will punish all that oppress them." How were the children aforetime? Members of the church most certainly. Comment on the above passages would be useless, for they are too plain to be controverted. So much then for infant church-membership, as given by the prophets, in view of the church, in the millenium; for both the prophets, as above quoted, were treating on that subject in the connection. But we have farther evidence on this question. See Eze. 36: 20—26. And the prophet, in this place, is speaking of the return of the Israel of God to their former privileges in the house of God, and uses the familiar language with which their ancestry were acquainted. See verse 25. "Then will I sprinkle clean water *upon you*, and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you." This water, as spoken of by the prophet, is viewed by many as the water of life, or the regenerating grace of God. Now, if this be the import of the language, it would go to prove that an external application would effect an internal change, (mark the language, "sprinkle clean water upon you,") which is contrary to all Bible showing on the change of heart, by the grace of God. And the following lan-

guage will show most clearly, that the sprinkling upon, was not intended to teach a change within. See verse 26. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you," &c. It is obvious from the language in the 26th verse, that in the 25th verse, the prophet had exclusive reference to the manner, and mode of sealing the covenant, in the days of the millenium. Hence he says *sprinkle upon*, not *immerse in*. And it is worthy of remark, that what the prophets call sprinkle, the New Testament writers call baptism or washing. See Isa. 52: 14, 15; Acts 8: 36, 37; Ezek. 36: 25; Heb. 10: 22. So far as the Scriptures inform us, sprinkling will be the mode of baptism, and the children of believing parents will be admitted with them, as members of the church of God, in the latter day glory.

Now, when taking a general view of the church, in her visible state, from her origin to her end, when she will join the church triumphant above, we find that in her first existence, from the days of Abraham until the close of the Apostolic age, the right of infant membership was not even questioned, nor will it be questioned in the millenium, as far as we are informed from the Scriptures. Yet many between the Apostolic age and the millenium have, in the roundest language, denied the existence of the covenant of grace; the effect of which denial is in part the rejection of infant church-membership. And this

conclusion will naturally lead us to notice some of the effects of immersion. Then one of the first effects of immersion is, the denying of moral obligation; this done, the persons denying do not feel bound to dedicate their children to God in the covenant, nor train them up in his fear; hence another effect is, family prayer is but seldom if ever attended to by Immersionists. And another effect that follows is, the youth are to a great degree without practical restraint on the Sabbath day, and consequently, they run as the vain mind leads them; and the practice is hunting, fishing, visiting from place to place on the Lord's day. And mark the practice even of those who profess to be Christians, at the public sanctuary or place of worship, and the drift of their conversation will be found to be the world, and the things of the world. We are aware that we occupy critical ground, when thus speaking of so large a body of people as the Baptists, but we are bound to expose sin in all its forms, whether in the church or out of it; in high places or in low ones. We would not wish to be understood as meaning that there are no exceptions to the general view as given above; there are some, though but few, comparatively speaking, taking the whole body of Baptists together. Neither would we wish to convey the idea, that the Baptists are the only body of professing Christians, who have many among their number who desecrate the

Sabbath. Another effect of immersion is, that it is a practical rejection of infant baptism. For who ever knew or heard of a parent being immersed, and then turned round and had his children baptized; no such case, we imagine, has ever occurred; though a number who have been immersed, after a length of time examining the subject, have changed their views, and had their children baptized, but not at the time they were immersed.

Seeing, then, that a mode or practice is admitted by the church to be valid, that violates the principle of God's moral government, and sets at naught the Divine appointment, in rejecting the subjects, and denying their right to the church that God has expressly appointed, it is not marvellous that error and confusion is the result. And how honest men can admit immersion to be valid, in the sight of God, and at the same time believe in their hearts, that such a mode is not taught in the Scriptures, is passingly strange to us. And this we are assured of, that no man can reconcile such faith and practice together, with the Word of God. Then, if we would wish for, and expect to see the church prosper, we must admit nothing contrary to the Scriptures; nor can we expect prosperity if we neglect to obey the sacred mandate. Then let us take a farther view of the effects of that desecrating mode of baptism, to wit, immersion. It is a reasonable estimate, from the statistical reports of the Baptist Associations, that there are

one million of members in their communion, in the United States; and it is also reasonable to suppose, that in that number of members there are three hundrd thousand families, and that there are five children to each family. The number of children, then, would be one million five hundred thousand; all of which are deprived of the blessings, stipulated in the covenant, by immersion. We ask, then, is immersion an innocent, inoffensive thing in the sight of God? seeing that so many of the youth are withheld from the covenant of grace by it. Who that loves the covenant, and the souls of the children, can sanction such a practice, when every individual case of immersion, no matter by whom practised, contributes its part to this great end of injuring children, and sinning against God? But in conclusion, as we have seen that infants were members of the primitive church, and that they are to be of the church in the latter times, how is it that honest men, in the nineteenth century, can reject them? We leave the honest mind to judge of the matter, according to the Scriptures, and act accordingly. But another fact, which is, that for the last three hundred years there has not a sect of heretics risen, but what has arisen out of immersion or ran directly into it, except the Shakers. So much then for immersion, and its effects to the world. Would that all persons would examine this matter carefully, before they decide on the subject, and let facts speak for themselves.

LECTURE XXII.

On the Right to Communion at the Lord's Supper.

That the Lord's supper is an ordinance of Divine appointment, is not doubted by any except the infidel, and was designed for the benefit and comfort of all the true and proper members of the mystical body of Christ. And it is an imperative duty for all such members when opportunity offers, to participate; and if such persons refuse or neglect, it is nothing short of denying the Saviour, for Christ says "eat ye all of it." But if any eat and drink unworthily, he eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, or is guilty of as great a crime as the Jews were in shedding his blood, though that was not an unpardonable sin. But in reference to the frequency of this ordinance being administered, and received by the church, it is a matter on which there is a diversity of opinions; some think it ought to be attended to once in three months, others think twice in the year, and others there are who believe it ought to be observed every Sabbath. The question then would naturally arise; and who is right in this matter? Or, are they all right? If so, then it is mere matter of opinion as to the length of time from

one communion to another, and the frequency would tend to dertroy the solemnity, and reverential attention with which the ordinance should be viewed, as has been fully shown by the Campbellites, in their practice on that subject. But the example of the Saviour, in his observing the passover, is a sufficient proof, that the supper was intended as a yearly feast, in the stead of the passover; though it is said in Acts. 20: 7, "And upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread," &c. Now we think from the passage above cited, we are not warranted in believing, that the disciples came together on the first day of every week, to break bread in the communion of the Lord's supper; but that they chose that day of the week to keep the yearly feast, in memory of what Christ commanded. Therefore, we have no warrant for administering the holy supper in any one society or congregation more than once a year.

But on the right of communion, it is believed by many, that a union with Christ by faith, gives the right to the communion of the supper. Now if this be a correct view, then what is gained by baptism? The proper answer would be, there is nothing whatever. And if there are no promises, or privileges, to be gained, or enjoyed by baptism, it is certainly a useless thing; which is by no means the case in that ordinance. But conversion gives a qualification for the enjoy-

ment of the Lord's supper, and baptism a right to the privilege of partaking. This is fully and clearly taught in view of the great principle of government, as given in the word of God. See Exo. 12. 47,—50: that every person before they ate the passover, were to be circumcised, and it is evident Christ did not change either principle or subject, in the Divine government, for had he changed either principle or subject, he would have violated the will of the Father; but he came to do his father's will, therefore the conclusion is Scriptural, that the person must needs be baptized, before partaking of the Lord's supper. For it is evident, that the right does not qualify to enjoy; nor does the qualification to enjoy give the right to partake. These are plain common sense views formed on truth. But for farther example, a member of a family who has a right to the provision in the family, may be arrested by disease, and therefore cannot partake of that provision, and if he were to partake, without the disease being arrested, it would tend to injury instead of profit. But a stranger who was in health, might present himself in the family, and need the food, but having no right, therefore ought not to partake, until he receives a right from the proper authority.

But again on this subject. It is well known that our government has established a law, called the naturalization law, by which foreigners are admitted into the rights of citi-

zenship; (and we suppose no one would contend that our nation had two plans of naturalizing; then why should heaven have two plans, if men admit but one?) But if a foreigner was to take the oath before an improper tribunal it would not constitute him a lawful citizen, though the subject might have been honest; yet his honesty would not meet the law, for he had failed to comply with the law; and failure though in honesty, will not meet lawful demands. Then why should an unscriptural practice be tolerated by men, as valid in the sight of God. Then to obtain a proper right to the communion of the supper, the preparatory rite must be performed in view of the things designed, and the things designed were first, the seal of the covenant; in the second place, the blood of Christ is typified; and in the third place, the promise of God is secured, and his truth pledged. And to attempt the initiating right without having these things in view, we would fail to receive a proper right to the privileges of the church of God. It will be necessary here, to introduce some of the references and arguments brought to view in Lecture XVIII, to show clearly and fully how baptism gives the subject a legal right. See 1 John 5: 8. "And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one." Where, then, is the agreement? It cannot be in efficacy, for the water is not efficacious, but the blood of

Christ is; therefore the agreement is in the form, design, and end. The spirit is the agent that applies the blood; and how, we ask, is this application made? By immersing, pouring, or sprinkling? By sprinkling, most certainly; for the Scriptures call it the blood of sprinkling. See Exo. 24: 6—8, Heb. 9: 19—21, 10: 22. The blood in circumcision pointed to the blood of Christ, so the water in baptism points to the same blood; hence there is an agreement, for the spirit applies and is a witness; the blood that is applied cleanses, and is a witness; the baptismal water agrees thereto, and is an outward sign of the inward grace in the adult, and of the need of the inward grace in the infant.

But to pursue the subject farther. Let us suppose the administration of the supper to represent Peter's death, for he was crucified. Would not every Bible reader exclaim, "a perversion of the ordinance!" which it would be. But why a perversion? Because it never was intended to remember Peter, or bring him into remembrance; then the design being wrong, would pervert the whole matter. So in baptism. If baptism were administered in the name of Paul, Peter, and John, would it not be a perversion of the ordinance? It would be, to all intents and purposes. Then to baptize for the purpose of representing the burial and resurrection of Christ, is a perversion of the ordinance; for baptism was designed to point to the blood of Christ, for his

blood is called the blood of the covenant. See Heb. 10: 29. "And hath called the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing." But his blood was shed before he was buried, and consequently he arose without blood; and if bastism, as the Baptists say, is to represent the burial and resurrection of the Saviour, then what is effected by it for us in this life? We can see nothing whatever, only that we shall rise from the dead. And human agency is nowhere consulted whether we shall arise from the dead or not, for all shall rise, whether good or bad. In this view of the subject, immersion is a perfect nullity, and can have no effect on us until the resurrection; for our agency is nowhere consulted, either with reference to death or the resurrection. Therefore we think the evidence is clear, that immersion is performed in view of a wrong object, and therefore a blank, or a perversion of the design of Christian baptism.

But other Immersionists say we must follow the example of Christ, in order to obtain the legal right in his baptism, and therefore must go down into Jordan. Now it would seem strange that a duty performed under the law must be practised under the gospel, when the same persons say the law is done away. Now such gross inconsistencies will refute themselves, before the reflecting mind. For further views on this subject, see lecture on the design of Christ's baptism.

But before we close this part of the subject we must take a farther view of the sixth chapter of Romans, as this is one of the passages upon which the Baptists lay much stress, in support of their practice, to gain a right to the communion. Now according to Mr. Pengilly's position, we would be led into utter confusion were we to follow him, for he has run into confusion himself. See page 80, part 3, in Appendix of Scripture Guide to Baptism. He makes the language in the passage both literal and figurative. In the literal meaning he finds the mode of baptism, as he thinks, and in his figurative sense he finds the kind of death the subject has to die, which is a death to sin. And the inevitable conclusion from his position is, that immersion converts the soul: and we want no such conversion, for it is error in the extreme, and will not save the soul. Such garbling (for it is nothing else) never can present a consistent system to a reasonable mind. Now let Mr. Pengilly, or any other Baptist, make a literal application of the passage, and the man could not be found that would practice such a mode, for then they would have to be baptized into death, and consequently deprived of the communion. But take it in a figurative sense, and the true import of the language is easy, for it teaches the work of grace in conversion to God, which is the apostle's design in the passage, most certainly,

and has no reference to the legalizing rite whatever.

Now, from all the arguments introduced by any or all of the immersionists, as far as we have had access to their writings, or views otherwise expressed, they have not failed to present baptism as representing Christ's baptism, or the burial and resurrection of Christ, and sometimes both, neither of which baptism ever was designed to point to, or to represent, therefore can give no right to the communion, from any evidence given in the Scriptures on that subject. And a practice that has a wrong object in view, cannot be valid in the sight of heaven, and is not only useless but sinful, for the reason that the design is perverted, and therefore cannot give the subject a right to the privileges of the church of God. And no person has a right to the communion of the supper, without the seal of the covenant, (and the evidence is clear, that baptism has taken the place of circumcision—see Lecture on the church passing from the Old to the New Dispensation;) and it is that alone that gives the right to all the privileges of the church of God upon earth; but it is grace alone in the heart, that can qualify the subject to enjoy those privileges. And it is consistent with sound philosophy to suppose, that when God appoints any thing to a certain end, that when the act is performed in view of the end, he will accept it; but if applied to

another end he will reject it; for to do any thing to an end, and not have the end in view, is worse than not doing it at all. Therefore we conclude that the Friend Quakers, in their system and views, are much more innocent or less guilty than the Immersionists of any class; for the latter pervert, while the former neglect a commanded duty.

It will be necessary to take another view of the subject, before we close this Lecture. That is the passage on communion in 1 Cor. 11: 28. "But let a man examine himself and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." From the manner in which this passage is often used, it would appear that it contains every thing requisite, to participating in the Lord's supper. While it is clear from the connection that the apostle fully understood the Corinthian church to be in full communion, and as to their right to the ordinance the apostle seems to have no doubt. Their preparation to enjoy the privilege, was the object the apostle had in view in the expression, "let a man examine himself and so let him eat;" but their right to eat was not questioned by the apostle, for he well knew their legal standing in the church at Corinth. And well might such language as the above quoted, be used, for if that (i. e. the image of God enstamped on the mind,) be wanting, there can be no enjoyment, for it is that and that alone, which qualifies the soul for the enjoyment of heaven. And it is the

seal of the covenant alone, that gives the right to the communion of the saints, at the table of the Lord.

A few remarks further and we close. How good men, who are acquainted with their Bibles, and who are authorized to minister in holy things, can admit of persons, in the face of such clear Scripture testimony, to the communion, whose practices are so different, in view of a legal right to partake of church privileges, is indeed strange. Some there are, who think baptism has nothing to do with communion; and it would be well for such ministers to notice the passage in Ezek. 44: 5—9. "And the Lord said unto me, son of man, mark well, and behold with thine eyes, and hear with thine ears, all that I say unto thee, concerning all the ordinances of the house of the Lord, and all the laws thereof; and mark well the entering in of the house, with every going forth of the sanctuary: v. 6. And thou shalt say to the rebellious, even to the house of Israel, thus saith the Lord God, O ye house of Israel, let it suffice you of all your abominations, (7) in that ye have brought into my sanctuary strangers uncircumcised in heart, and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary, to pollute it, even my house, when ye offer my bread, the fat and the blood, and they have broken my covenant because of all your abominations. (8) And ye have not kept the charge of mine holy things; but ye have set keepers of my charge

in my sanctuary for yourselves. (9) Thus saith the Lord God, no stranger uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcieed in flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary, of any stranger that is among the children of Israel." From the above quotation it is evident, that admission to the highest privileges of the church, without the initiatory rite, is a direct violation of God's command. And it is nothing short of a downright perversion of ministerial authority for any minister, or church session, to grant such liberty, and it will not be strange to find confusion the result of such departure from the standard of truth, which requires the subject to be baptized before he eats and drinks of the body and blood of the Lord. And they that would partake of the supper of the Lord, without the seal of the covenant, are intruders on the church of God.

LECTURE XXIII.

On government in the Church of God.

It is self-evident, that government must, and will exist in some form, where there are superiors, inferiors and equals; because the superiors have the right, and inferiors owe their obedience, and equals have their privileges and owe their duties in the same proportion. Hence not only the necessity, but the propriety of government may at once be seen, in order to secure the right of the superior and the interest of the inferior. The propriety of the apostle's language in view of government is appropriate, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor, is due. And this government is founded on the great principle of justice, which is right in itself, and will not admit of any departure from that sacred rule without crime.

Government then in itself simply considered, is the exercise of proper authority, in the proper way; and this exercise of authority amongst men had its orgin first in the private family, and then extended to communities, in order to secure the interest of all classes in the community.

It is of importance to notice the government of God, as his government is moral in

its nature, and all human government is founded directly or indirectly on the great moral principle. The government which was established amongst the Hebrews, in the first institution of the church on earth, might be considered theocratical, from God's direct communications to them. And in this government there were rights afforded, privileges granted, requisitions given, and prohibitions made, all of which combined together, were designed of God to secure the Divine honor, and to promote the best interest of human society. Now the fundamental principle in the establishment of law or government, was to secure the worship of the true God, and to prohibit men from becoming idolaters in their worship. And to secure this object fully, God gave to Moses on mount Sinai, the law for the regulation of man's life, and the unadulterated worship of the true God; see Exo. 20. For man cannot be happy without law, nor will law make him happy unless he obeys it; and if he obey from the heart, the blessing will attend him in that obedience. Then that the church might have complete knowledge of all her duty, a more full developement of those laws, was made by Moses to the Hebrews, when in the wilderness, by which they were instructed in reference to their duties, and classes in society. Hence the propriety of such distinctions in the law, as taught in the Scriptures, to wit: the ceremonial or Mosaic law, which points out per-

sonal duty; the Levitical law, which points out men in authority to officiate in the administration of law; and the moral law, as the great principle by which all actions should be regulated in society. Here it should be remembered that Jehovah himself was the great King and ruler, that decided on matters of litigation in the camp of Israel. See Exo. 21, Num. 17. In the foregoing we have the principle fully brought to view by which the church is to be governed, nor was the principle changed in the new dispensation; one difference is, that in the old dispensation, the Lord called by Moses; but in the new dispensation, he calls by his Spirit. See 1 Cor. 12: 4—12. There is another point of difference in the old, it was prophet and priest, but in the new it is minister and elder; with the same grand object in view, the prosperity of the church in her militant state, which is designed to terminate in the declarative glory of God.

It is admitted by all, as well as taught in the Scriptures, that government is essential in all communities, in order to their happiness. And it is the right and privilege of any community, to fix and establish their own form of government; provided, they do not violate the government or law of God, as taught in the Scriptures; and that, no individual or community has a right to do. Moreover, there is no community, from the smallest famly, to the largest nation, that can exist as a

body without government, for without it they would fall into utter confusion, as would all nature, if her laws were dissolved. Therefore, it is government alone, that can maintain and preserve the church as a body, (this perhaps the reader may at first view think strange of, but it will be found true on investigation,) but it is a union with Christ that can comfort and save the church.

We then as a body, known as Cumberland Presbyterians, have adopted a form of government, and as far as we understand the Divine plan, think it consistent, and calculated to promote human happiness, and secure the Divine honor. This form of government is in its nature moral, but in its administration ministerial and declarative. It is important that communities, who have established their form of government, and subscribed thereto, should be regulated by that rule; for if they do not regard their own established and acknowledged rule, they cannot expect to maintain order and enjoy prosperity. We, then, as a distinct body from other denominations, have fixed, and subscribed to, a particular form of government, which is contained in our Confession of Faith, and as we most fully believe, is founded on the Word of God. Therefore, it is important that we regard that standard strictly, in order to prosperity, and, as taught in that Discipline, the existence of the

several judicatures; and we cannot expect prosperity, as a people, if we live in disregard of them.

1. Our General Assembly is the highest judicature and bond of union in our branch of of the church. With how much indifference is that judicatory treated by many of the presbyteries and churches, under her care. How small frequently the representation is, to what it ought to be. And can any part of the body expect prosperity to attend them, and treat the highest authority in that body with such disrespect? From fair reasoning they cannot. It is often said it is a tax on the church to send members to the Assembly. It is true that it is somewhat costly to serve God and the church, (but David said, God forbid that I should offer to the Lord, that which cost me nothing—see Sam. 24: 24,) but it will be found more costly not to serve him. And as the whole church is interested in the business of the Assembly, therefore the whole body should give her attention to it, and whenever persons fail to regard such authority, it is sinful in the sight of God. In the next place, we notice the want of due attention to our Synods, and how many ministers and elders are delinquent in this respect, as though there was no obligation resting on them to attend Synod in their bounds; when it is evident it is treating the authority and government with disrespect, and therefore sinful in the sight of God, if no just cause is

given for such failure. But farther: the want of proper attention to our Presbyteries, which occupies such important ground, for the prosperity and perpetuity of the church; for it is well known that Presbyteries train up men and bring them into the office of the ministry, which is so essential to the church in her militant state, as well as to warn the wicked of their danger and invite them to Christ, that they might be saved. It is taught in our Discipline,* that the ordained ministers in a certain bounds, and an elder from each society, ought to attend Presbytery. But how many fail in their duty from small causes, as though it was not a matter of any importance for them to attend? And who but God can tell the amount of injury the church has sustained, on the account of such delinquency. On this point, one or two suggestions. Let the world and the church mark the minister, that manifests but little concern for, and is often absent from, the judicatures of the church, and that man will be found little else than a mere cipher in the church of God, and his labors in the ministry measurably paralized; these results, from such a course, will not fail in one case out of ten. Let the church look at the facts, and they will be found true. And mark the session that seldom has a representation in Presbytery, when or where was

---

* See Confession of Faith—on Presbyterial Government.

it ever known, that such a society prospered in religion: they are few and far between, if such a one could be found at all. And it is not marvellous that these things are so, when men disregard government, which they themselves acknowledge to be proper and right. And it is to the Presbytery, the session must apply for supplies of preaching, if she would act in accordance with discipline. We will now notice the lowest, yet the most important judicature in the church, to wit, the church session; for, strictly speaking, the sessions govern the whole body, as to the session of any congregation belongs the right of deciding on the qualifications of persons for membership in the church, to admit to communion, to censure or expel if need be, also to see that the members walk orderly, and to defend and protect the moral character of their members. What an important work the sessions have to do! They have to judge of the qualifications of persons for the enjoyment of church privileges; and the man that is brought into the ministry, has first to pass the session: how important, then, that they be careful on this subject, lest they admit to the communion such as have no moral qualifications for such a high privilege as to approach the table of the Lord. And a person to approach that holy table, without a preparation to enjoy the ordinance, would be like a sick man partaking natural food, instead of profiting, it would injure him. An-

other important business of the session, is to see that the children of the church are instructed in the doctrines of the Bible, and not only so, but that they are dedicated to God in the covenant: and also, that the members are not Sabbath breakers. Moreover, the session should see, that no member or members deny the Saviour, by refusing to partake of the Lord's supper when opportunity offers. But farther, that heads of families, who are members of the church, do not live prayerless in their families. Now, all these duties are so plainly taught in the Scriptures, and Discipline, that we think no one acquainted with the Word of God could doubt for a moment, at least no true Christian would. And our Confession of Faith so clearly teaches those duties, that no session, unless they are willfully ignorant, can fail to see them.

But another duty the church owes to God and to herself, that sessions are required to attend to; and that is, the support of the gospel, which is fully embraced in the government of the church. We are aware that this subject is looked on by many as one of a very peculiar kind, because it has to do with the fiscal concerns of men. And as many think it is mixing temporal and spiritual things together, sessions are not willing to impress this duty on their members, as a debt they owe to God, themselves, and to the church, to aid in supporting the gospel. On this subject there

is no doubt, but that our ministers are difficient in teaching the church her duty, in reference to the support of the gospel. For it is abundantly taught, both in the Old and New Testements, that they who minister at the altar shall live of the things of the altar, see 1. Cor. 9. 14: "Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the gospel, should live of the gospel." And they that withhold more than is meet, will tend to poverty, and he that muzzles the ox that treadeth out the corn, may expect the ox to dwindle, and the owner to suffer loss, and that too of a kind that time will not, nay cannot repair. The duties that devolve on church sessions, are of no small importance, seeing she has the oversight and care of souls, and the proper exercise of discipline in the society, for the session stands in the same relation to the society, in a religious point of view, that the parents do to a family, in a natural point of view. The same principle will apply to heads of families, as to sessions; if they do not exercise proper government, both will fall into contempt in society. It is not the food or raiment that gives character to the family, but their behavior and intelligence that gives them standing; therefore it is important, that government of the proper kind be exercised, in order to form and maintain character, and without it no proper influence can be exerted in community. And if the session, in a congregation, will suffer the members to think

and act as they think best, so that they are not grossly immoral, and there is no notice taken of them if the Sabbath is violated, family prayer neglected, the children not dedicated in the covenant, the sanctuary almost forsaken by some, and others turn their backs, so to speak, on the Lord's Supper, yet no account of such things taken by the session, it could not be expected by any, acquainted with their Bible, that such a society would prosper in religion, or exert a moral influence on community. For the want of practice is corresponding with the profession; and persons who do not attend to the duties of religion, as taught by the Word of God, are of no real benefit to the church; and if the church is not benefited by such, she is evidently burthened; for if persons do not honor their profession, the church will be dishonored by them, and consequently the moral influence of the church will be diminished in proportion, and will not be useful in the same degree as if she were to discharge duty faithfully. What an important station, then, do the sessions sustain in the church of God, when it may truly be said, that souls are cleaving to her skirts; for it is true, according to our Book of Discipline, that the sessions have almost the whole, if not the entire rule of the members; while the Presbytery has the oversight of the Session; the Synod the oversight of the Presbyteries; and the General Assembly, as the advisory body, has the government and regu-

lation ef Synods and Presbyteries, as the bond of union in the whole body. Seeing then, that the church session, in connection with the parents, has the training of the children of the church, and the receiving of members into the communion, O how solemn the work she has to do. How much depends on the session for the prosperity and spirituality of the society over which she is called to preside. It is one of the duties, and one too of no small import, that the session should see that the gospel is sustained, in the society over which they are chosen to rule, and that too, as God has prospered them, for that is the Divine plan, and a society that will not do that, may expect disasters, less or more, sooner or later, to attend them, for withholding more than is meet, and it is the duty of the session to see to it. And the church that will not do her duty in this respect, may expect finally to dwindle and die; and the result will be souls will perish through the negligence of the session.

But before we close this lecture, we will notice another evil that prevails in the churches to a considerable extent, and not a small evil either, for it has a bad influence. It is this: a disposition to have the gospel let out, (if we may so speak,) to the lowest bidder. But, lest our readers should not fully understand us in this idea, we will explain our meaning. The proposition is often made, how much is the least you will take and preach to

us once or twice a month, for six months or a year? (as the case may be), with design to see what minister can be had the cheapest; and a young man is often sought for on this account. And if the applicant can get his choice preacher, and the lowest price, he is well suited; but the lowest price seems to be one of the objects in view. We will say nothing about what has led to such a state of things, though we might give them. Now, such proposition to a minister is calculated to press his feelings, and could those who make such proposals, fully realize the sensation produced under such circumstances, they would not make them often; and such procedure is well calculated, if persisted in for a length of time, to bring the gospel into disrepute by virtually making merchandize of it, and finally to ruin souls. And we pray God, by his mercy, to preserve the church from such error, and incline the officers in the house of God, to read the Bible, and learn their duty, and try to rule right.

But we would further remark, that one of the difficulties that hinders much the usefulness of the church, is her conforming so much to the world. For almost any measure proposed for her action, which does not in some degree meet popular opinion, is touched with a light hand, if at all; and it is lamentably true, that the church seems so willing to conform to the world, while she is professedly trying to save it from the dire consequences

of sin. And such conformity is a departure from the Word of God. See Rom. 12: 2. "And be ye not conformed to the world," &c. But if the church would be successful in reforming and leading sinners to Christ, her members must come out from the world, and give practical evidence of their enjoyment which the world knows not of. For it cannot be that the church can be instrumental in saving the world, while she conforms so much to the ways of it. Here we would exclaim, *pity!* PITY! that men, and especially teachers in Israel, were not more afraid of sin, and less afraid of popular opinion, and do the will of God, regardless of what the world might say of them; for it is said, "the fear of man bringeth a snare," and will cripple the energies, and hinder the usefulness of leaders in the church of any class, preachers or elders, unless abandoned.

LECTURE XXIV.

On the Observance of the Sabbath.

That God appointed one day in seven, as a day of rest to be observed by the Jews as a weekly Sabbath, none will doubt who have read the Bible. But an important enquiry on this subject, is often raised in the minds of some; was this appointment of the Sabbath; a moral or a positive institution? It was a moral institution most certainly. Now the difference betwixt a moral and a positive institution is, that the positive may be changed at the will of the lawgiver, without violating the authority of him who gave the law, or imposing on the rights of the subjects to whom the precept was given. Such for example as the precept given to Adam in the garden, not to eat of the forbidden fruit; which is now changed to that of refraining from sin. Also the gifts and sacrifices that were offered under the law, are changed to practical duty , without imposing on the interest of the subjects. But a moral appointment is right in itself, and therefore cannot be changed without injury to the character of the law-giver, and imposing on one

class of subjects, something different from that on another.

The change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week was not only right, but was profitable in the gospel dispensation, to keep in lively recollection on its repeated return the completion of the great work of human redemption; as well as a time for rest, and religious devotion. Now the portion of time, which was one seventh part, was a moral appointment, and more was not given to the Jews as a Sabbath; nor is there less given to the Gentiles, than one seventh part of the time. But the day of the week was a positive appointment, and therefore could be changed without violating the right of either ruler or ruled.

But the appointment of the Sabbath was not only designed for God's declarative glory, but for the benefit and happiness of man; that in obeying the Divine commandment, he might show his loyalty to his Creator, and enjoy that rest God designed him to have; that on the return of every seventh day, he might retire from the cares of the world and enjoy his God. And a disregard to this Divine institution was not passed by unnoticed by the Great I Am, but was often visited by severe judgments, and sometimes death. See Exo. 31: 14, 15. "Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you; every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death, for whosoever doeth any work therein,

that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord: whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death." Exo. 35: 2, 3. "Six days shall work be done; but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day." Also, Num. 15: 32—36. "And while the children of Israel were in the wildrness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the Sabbath day. And they that found him gathering sticks, brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him in ward because it was not declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, the man shall be surely put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died, as the Lord commaned Moses." And many other passages might be cited to show, that the Divine Being would not suffer the Sabbath to be profaned, and pass it unnoticed; but judgments, directly or indirectly, would attend the Sabbath breaker. It is evident that the Sabbath was a benefit to the Jews, in affording them an opportunity of attending to the duties of the sanctuary, and of

contemplating the great work of creation, while rendering obedience to the command of God. Not only so, but looking prospectively to that eternal Sabbath of rest above, no labor was to be performed on that holy day, except the work of necessity and mercy. And the seventh day was to be observed as the Sabbath, until a greater work was to be performed than that of creation, which was the death and resurrection of Christ, as we shall presently see from the Scriptures. And the weekly Sabbath was a type of that eternal Sabbath that is to be enjoyed above, by those who will seek a preparation for it, and keep the one below; for no willful Sabbath breaker can be admitted to enjoy the one above, who will not keep it here. The Jews were taught, prophetically, that there would be a change in the day of the week, though not in the amount of time. See Ezek. 43: 27. "And when these days are expired, it shall be that upon the eighth day and so forward, the priests shall make your burnt offerings upon the altar, and your peace offerings, and I will accept you saith the Lord." And when Christ was on earth he strictly enjoined the observance of the Sabbath, as a duty men owed to God, and to themselves. Some there are, however, who are very tenacious for the example of Christ in two or three things, yet disregard the sacred injunction of the observance of that holy day. And Christ could not have required less than the

strict observance of the Sabbath, (we speak with due deference,) without differing with his Father, for he required it. See Exo. 20: 8. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." And Mark 10: 19. "Thou knowest the commandments," &c. Also, Luke 10: 26. "He said unto him, what is written in the law," &c. Verse 27. "And he answering said, thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," &c. Verse 28. "And he said unto him, thou hast answered right," &c. And when Christ had finished his work, which the Father gave him to do, he rested in his grave on the Jewish Sabbath, (for the work of obedience was under the law, but the work of deliverance was the commencement of the gospel dispensation.) And on the eighth day, i. e., after the seventh day of the feast of unleavened bread were ended, he rose from the dead; and, as expressed by the prophet: "And when these days" (the seven days of the sin offering) "are expired, it shall be that upon the eighth day, and so forward, the priest shall make your burnt offerings and your peace offerings," &c. See Ezek. 43: 27. And when the Saviour, by his death, had made an atonement for sin, on the eighth day or first day of the week he rose from the grave, thereby accomplishing his greatest work, for a triumphant victory was gained over the powers of death, hell and the grave. Therefore, the day on which this victory was achieved should be kept as sacred, by all

men, as a holy Sabbath, in memory of what Christ did for them, for all men are benefitted by it. And, as was remarked above, it was the greatest work, and true it is; and it will fully appear to be so, when contrasted with the work of creation; for in creation, there were neither pains, groans, nor tears, but in redemption, there were pains, groans, tears, and blood. And when the Father ended his work, he rested on the seventh day; then all was mild and calm; but when the Son finished his work nature was convulsed, and he rested in the grave, from whence he arose victorious and triumphant over those fearful enemies, and gained a glorious victory for man; therefore that holy resurrection day may well be considered the Christian Sabbath unto the end of the world. And from the benefits we derive from that conquest, gained by Christ for us, it is no less than treating him with contempt to violate or disregard that sacred day. For on the resurrection of the Saviour hangs the whole truth of the Bible, with all the messages of the gospel of peace to a fallen world; for if Christ be not risen, then our preaching is vain, and your faith is also vain. See 1 Cor. 15: 14, 17. And it is but a reasonable service to devote ourselves to God on the Sabbath. See Rom. 12: 1. But there are many, and some professed Christians too, who disown any such thing as a Christian Sabbath in the gospel dispensation; for they say that Christ did that away, with many other

ceremonies. This conclusion is mainly drawn from Rom. 14. 5. "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Now to draw such conclusions from the above passage, is most certainly wresting it from its true meaning; for the Sabbath is not referred to in the whole connection, but certain feast days, new-moons, eating meats, &c. We will not say that such reasoning is sophisticated, but that it is founded on ignorance, ignorance of the Bible. We shall not turn aside to argue the case with such, but simply refer the reader to Rom. 3: 31. "Do we thus make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." And the law being established, requires the observance of the Sabbath. And we would call attention to the life of such as thus disregard the Sabbath-day; mark their life, how little like true piety; mark their reasoning, how little consistency; and mark their religious influence in society, and it will be found little, if any at all.

The Sabbath is the Lord's day, and persons who profane that day are guilty of moral robbery in the sight of God. See Mal. 3: 8. "Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me," and can such as thus offend expect to escape the hand of justice, without repentance and pardon? They will not, they cannot. For the sake of a clear illustration of the crime of Sabbath-breaking, we will

suppose, reader, you have seven dollars, and you bestow upon a sufferer six of them, but after a little, that sufferer finds it convenient to take the seventh one also. Now, reader, what would you think of such a one? Would you not at once exclaim against him as unjust, and dishonest? Most certainly you would. Then let us make the application. So the Sabbath-breaker is acting; for God has given him six days to labor, and do his work, but he takes the seventh for his own pleasure and amusement. Out of thine own mouth, Sabbath-breaker, God will judge thee, and without repentance and pardon, will banish thee forever, from that holy Sabbath above.

Now, if any wish to know what a breach of the Sabbath is, we would refer such to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, for information on that subject; for they are the standard for moral rectitude of life, and clearly point out how the Sabbath is to be sanctified, and what a breach of the Sabbath is; so that any one, wishing to know his duty, may learn it from that sacred book. It is said, "in it thou shalt not do any work," therefore the day is wholly to be devoted to the Lord. But there are many who make no preparations for the observance of the Sabbath, but on the other hand, lay their plans for business and amusement; such as the merchant posting his books, the farmer attending to his stock, or the men of pleasure,

passing their time in roving from place to place, as best suits their vain fancy. O, my soul! Will not Heaven bring his stewards to an account, for such a course as this? Justice will not, cannot pass them by unnoticed. We would warn the Sabbath-breaker in the name of God, beware of what you do on that holy day; give yourselves to the service of Jehovah on the Sabbath; for the curse never comes causeless, but will overtake the offender in due time.

Sabbath-breaking is one of the crying sins of our nation, and has a demoralizing influence on both church and state, and if the church was clear of it, the world would be less injured by it. But alas; in how many instances do we find members of the church engaged in violating the Sabbath, in visiting from house to house, and not one word scarcely about Christ and salvation in all their conversation, but politics, honors, pleasures, fashions, and wealth engross the whole conversation. Now, we ask, what benefit can a Sabbath breaker be to the church of God? The answer is, little or none at all. And if the person is of no benefit to the church, the church can be of no benefit to such, only to reclaim him from his backslidden state, which is but seldom done in such cases. Therefore, we are fully of the opinion, that members of the church that will not keep from violating the Sabbath, ought to be excluded from her communion, for such are a clog to the wheels

of Zion. And they that cannot keep one day out of seven below, cannot reasonably expect to enjoy one above that will never end.

What an amount, then, of responsibility rests on the officers in the church, to see that their members live as becometh followers of Christ, that the world may see their good works, and be thereby constrained to acknowledge the truth of religion. On this subject there is much need of, and great room for, reformation in the church as well as the world. Where, then, ought this reformation to commence? It would reasonably be expected to commence in the church. We would not be understood as meaning that all the members of the church are Sabbath breakers, by no means; for there are very many who esteem the Sabbath highly, and try to improve it as for eternity; yet there are others in the church who do not. Then let every one who is conscious of guilt in this respect, reform *one*, i. e. himself, and the evil will soon cease. And to accomplish this desired object let the standard of piety be raised much higher than it is; and let the Sabbath become a delight, holy and honorable, then Zion's light will shine brighter, her borders enlarged, and many added to her numbers, such as shall be saved. May Heaven grant it.

LECTURE XXV.

On a Call to the Ministry of the Gospel.

This is a subject of vital importance to the church. There is a diversity of opinions amongst men on this subject; and the church is and will be affected, less or more, in proportion to the influence of those men who hold these different views. If men deny such a thing as a call, or being impressed, or moved by the Holy Ghost to warn sinners to flee the wrath to come, and yet engage in that work, it is evident such men can have no internal evidence whether they are doing the will of God or not; and a man who decides on a matter of which he knows nothing, renders a premature judgment, and therefore will expose himself in the view of the honest, intelligent mind. And if the Holy Spirit has not called him to the work, he cannot expect that Divine agent will help him to do the work; then he has neither aid in, nor comfort from the work, but mere self. It need not be thought strange, if such men as are going to and fro through the earth, sounding the trump,

yet deny any authority by the Holy Spirit to do so, should give an uncertain sound. See 1 Cor. 14. 8. "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle." The sound would be useless, nay worse than useless, for they will deceive the people, and lead souls to destruction; for it is the blind leading the blind, and both will fall into the ditch. And the influence of such men does not tend to moralize community, but to settle the minds of many in superstition, blindness and error, and it will be a wonder if such do not thus remain until they wake in eternity under their mistaken view, when all will be lost.

But there are many establishments now in existence, and others being raised for the purpose of manufacturing preachers of the gospel; believing as many do that the call of the church, with the consent of the person called, after receiving a good education, and then ordination by the proper authority in the church, commences and finishes a call to the ministry. Then such are prepared to enter on the important work of preaching, with a view to secure a sustenance in life. Many heads have been crowned with ministerial authority, no doubt, while their hearts have not felt the burthen of the word of the Lord as fire shut up in their bones. And they might be heard, time and again, by the enquiring mind, yet it could not learn, from

their exhibition, how to obtain religion; nor what religion was from all their instructions. Though such men might teach a great many good things, and give good instruction, as regards doctrine and duty, it would be in that formal and lifeless manner, as if the human soul were hardly worth saving, hell barely worth shunning, and heaven but little gain. Such men may be moral in their deportment before the public; but in their exhibitions cold and insipid. These men are clearly described by the prophet Jeremiah, chapter 22: 21. "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied:" v. 30: "Therefore behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my word, every one from his neighbour:" v. 32: "Yet I sent them not, nor commanded them, therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord." And those cold hearted men, though they may be clear headed, will be a curse to the church and the world. And it is no uncommon thing to hear preachers say, that persons *cannot tell when* they obtain religion; therefore religion is represented by these men as a thing that is obtained imperceptibly. May God overrule, and save the church from such a ministry; for by their fruits ye shall know them.

But God has had a living ministry in the church in all past ages, since the establish-

ment of the church upon earth, and will have until the end of the world; and were this living ministry to cease in the church, she would soon become extinct and be no more, and then gross darkness would cover the people. There are none who believe the Scriptures to be true, but also believe, that God, under the old dispensation, called men to be leaders in his Israel until Christ came. He then, as Mediator and Redeemer, called the apostles to disseminate gospel truth, i. e. to preach Christ as the Saviour of the world. This they did unhesitatingly; but in his valedictory address to them, he told them to tarry at Jerusalem, and he would send the promise of his Father upon them, and they should be indued with power from on high. Here it is worthy of remark that these men, though called by the Saviour, were to wait till the Spirit aided them. Now, it would seem most reasonable to suppose, that if any of God's ministers upon earth could have labored successfully without the aid of Divine influence, it would have been the apostles which Christ had called to the work of the ministry, but they were directed to wait for the aid of the Holy Spirit. Then if if they could not be successful without Divine influence, we ask the candid mind, how can any other man or set of men be successful without such aid? The answer is easy, that no man can preach so as to win souls to

Christ, without the aid of Divine influence. And we care not how much eloquence, how much logic, how much learning, nor how well soever the arrangement may be in the man's sermon, if he is not impressed with the spirit of God to engage in this work, his preaching will be but an empty sound. For it is "not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." And if a man is not called of God to the important work, there is no evidence from reason or revelation that God will help him to do it. Moreover, we believe most decidedly, if such men as are called of God to this important work, were left to their own decision in this matter, they would withhold from the work, in view of the responsibility and their own insufficiency to engage in it; but in submission to the will of God, and the love of souls, they go forward in duty. But to return, as we have wandered off a little from the object before us. As the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are engaged in accomplishing the great work of human salvation, it is but right and fit in the nature of things, that each one should perform his own work. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." John 5: 17. Then for the accomplishment of the great end, under the law, or old dispensation, the Father, as a sovereign, selected the men through the merits of Christ, but the spirit moved the men to the work. See 2 Pet. 1: 21. "For

the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Now if the spirit was necessary to move men to speak under the law, and his influence necessary to indue the apostle to preach, after the Saviour went home to heaven, how is it that so many men have gotten into the notion, that there is nothing more for the Spirit to do on this important subject? Do they learn such a view from the Old Testament? Surely not. Do they gain such knowledge from Christ or the apostles, that the Holy Spirit has now nothing to do, in calling men to minister in holy things? Most assuredly they do not. The question might naturally arise, from whence do such men derive their notions? (for they are mere notions.) We answer, from no better a source than a heart filled with pride and blinded by sin; and self-importance, under an evil influence, is the legitimate source from which such pernicious sentiments arise. In reflecting on this subject we are reminded of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, who spoke against Moses and Aaron, that they took too much on them; the result with these men and their company was fearful. See Num. chap. 16. And we fear much, that those who deny the influence of the Spirit, in calling men to the holy work of the gospel ministry, will be rejected of God also. And though they may not directly exclaim against Jehovah, as

did the former, yet they directly and practically disown a Divine call, thereby speaking against God, or reproaching him by claiming the right to do, what none but the Holy Ghost can do, to enable a man to become instrumental in saving souls.

We wish to be distinctly understood on the subject of literary attainments for the gospel ministry; they are excellent helps to that great work: nay more, there is no man can be extensively useful in winning souls to Christ, without at least a pretty correct knowledge of the various branches of an English education; and the more learning a man can gain, the better he is prepared, in this respect, to do good. We will here remark, that it sometimes happens that presbyteries meet with men who are so anxious to get into the work of preaching, that they have no time for, and but little disposition to gain knowledge; but *preach*, *preach*, (to use the plain expression) is the great hobby with them. We would say to presbyteries, beware of such men, for there is something about them wrong, and if such men are promoted to the ministry, it is ten chances to one, that they prove a curse to the church. But such as are called of God to this important work, have minds sufficiently capacious for improvement; for we fully believe Heaven would not call a man to preach, that had no mind for improvement. And such facilities are now

within the reach of any, and every young man, that if he persevere in the search of knowledge, he may gain a sufficient amount of it to be useful to the church and the world. But if he be too indifferent about seeking knowledge, in order to usefulness, such never will be any thing better than a burthen to the church, if not a curse to her. It is a misfortune that often, if not always, attends men of the above description, that they are self-confident, having had some extraordinary revelation in their conception, heard a sound, seen a light, or by some other enthusiastic notion, gotten into the belief, that they are called to preach, and cannot be persuaded out of it, while there is an evident want of that humble self-diffidence which characterizes the truly called of God. But according to the faith of some, (and not a few either,) in view of human salvation, every thing hangs on the horn of fate; and this class of men, in reference to a call to the ministry, seem to think it is the province of the church to select men for this holy work, and place them in some institution of learning to prepare them, and then clothe them with authority to administer the ordinances of the church, and that this is all that is necessary to constitute a true minister of Christ, thereby virtually disowning the right of Jehovah to make his own selection of men to fill that sacred office, whose right alone it is to select men for that

important station. Therefore such men as make their own choice in this solemn business, without being impressed by the Spirit of God to do so, or such as have been selected by the church for that important calling, the Holy Ghost not having moved them to the work, with all the wisdom they may acquire, will not be instrumental in the conversion of souls to God; and though such men may teach and do a great many good things, they will be unsuccessful in leading souls to Christ.

We will now notice something of what we understand to be a call from God to the holy ministry of the Word. In the first place we would say, no man is called of God to preach the gospel, until he is renewed in heart by the spirit of God, and has become an heir of God through Christ. Nor does he call every converted man to this solemn work, but, as a sovereign, makes his own selection of men, either from keeping the flock or from the receipt of custom, from the shop or the farm, from the palace or the hovel, or from fishing, as he will. And who but that infallible Being, who has made man, can select those who are capable of becoming fishers of men. And, in the second place, such as God calls to labor, in word and doctrine, feel, in common with all Christians, a desire for the salvation of souls; but more than this, a deep and solemn solicitude for the salvation of the world

of mankind. Viewing the lost condition in which they are by nature, the thought often comes up in his mind, will you not try to warn them of their danger? His soul is moved in him, in view of the fearful end to which men are exposed by sin, but the importance of the work of warning them of their danger, (notwithstanding he sees such a fullness and beauty in Christ, to meet the perishing condition of a fallen world,) makes his heart shrink within him at the thought of attemping it. Not that he is unwilling that sinners should be warned, but he feels his great want of qualification to engage in such an important work. He mourns, and is ready to exclaim, O God, must sinners lie down in eternal ruin! Sometimes the heart will involuntarily exclaim, Lord save a sinking world from hell. The mind of the man, under such exercise, will be drawn much to the Scriptures, enquiring after truth and duty, with a sacred delight in view of his own acceptance with God. And seeing many passages in the Word of God, that so appropriately apply to the sinner's case, he sometimes comes to the conclusion: if I thought I could persuade my fellow men to turn from sin, I would try to do so. And a sense of eternal things, with a view of the condition of a guilty world, is almost constantly before the mind. Truly the soul is pressed, yea, the heart is burdened indeed, but the mind consents to

yield to duty, and the effort is made. He often reproaches himself, and in view of so much imperfection in his performances, he almost resolves to make no farther effort, though his mind feels peace in the honest endeavor to discharge duty. But still his mind is pressed with the worth of souls, and feeling a deep concern for the cause of God, and the salvation of men, he often enquires, in his devotions, what his duty is. But his heart shrinks within him at the idea of becoming a preacher of the gospel, with so much imperfection and weakness, and he mentally exclaims, "Lord who is sufficient for these things!" concluding that if he could have peace of mind, and live as a private member of the church, in the enjoyment of religion, he would rejoice in his humble sphere. But the man whom God designs to preach the gospel, cannot rest contented in the discharge of private duty. His heart yearns over poor sinners, in view of their dreadful end, and he often concludes he would be willing to do any thing if sinners could be rescued from destruction. The mind, under the exercise as above described, often calls in question its motives, fearing that pride, self-esteem, popularity, or some other evil, is prompting it to those exercises. But in humble sincerity, examining the motives brought before the mind, an honest decision is made, that the glory of God, and the salvation of souls,

with a desire for the prosperity of the church, are the prime and leading objects of his desire. And such men as are moved by the Holy Ghost to this important work, whether at home or abroad, on land or at sea, by day or by night, (for sleep often departs from them,) are burdened in mind, and feel, as expressed by the prophet, O that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for poor sinners. Seeing so many insuperable difficulties in the way, the man knows not what to do; and the fearful thought of meeting poor sinners at the bar of God, who, if he had warned them, might have escaped the wrath of God, but then it will be too late: under such a view the man's soul is moved with indiscribable sorrow and grief for his fellow men, and resolving in the fear of God to try to do duty, he determines to make his case known to his brethren, in order to receive counsel, and to learn what duty is, in his case, on this momentous subject. Here we will remark, that we honestly and humbly believe, that no man, laboring under these solemn impressions to do something in the cause of God, can tell what the work is he has to do, until, as Paul said to Timothy, he makes full proof of his ministry. And we doubt not but that the man, if he will be faithful in duty, with a submissive mind to the will of God, will learn his duty, so far at

least as to enjoy peace and comfort of mind in the discharge of it. One thing is certain and clear to the minds of such as are under those solemn impressions to warn sinners, that no earthly consideration could induce them to engage in this work.

It would hardly be supposed for a moment, that any man could have blind zeal enough to undertake an embassy from his government to a foreign foe, without any authority to negotiate with them. And were he to attempt such a course, what might we expect the result to be? The offending party would laugh him to scorn for want of authority, while the offended would look upon him with contempt and disapprobation, for acting without a call and commission from the government. So it is with men who attempt to negotiate between an offended God and offending sinners. Though the ambassador may be ever so learned a man, yet he cannot recommend himself to the consciences of the guilty in the sight of Heaven; for God has not called him, so the spirit does not, yea cannot help him, therefore his labor will be vain and worse than vain.

Such men as are under solemn and abiding impressions to labor in the cause of God, are often seeking for evidence of their call to the work, and sometimes such evidence as is desired, is obtained; but again they doubt, and again ask for evidence and again obtain

it; but seeing so much imperfection and deceitfulness in their own hearts, they think that it cannot be, that God would condescend to work by such instruments; and still they doubt, and are thus tossed to and fro, and know not what to do. A sinking world in view, the fullness of Christ so complete; the willingness of God to save, and revolting sinners hasting to destruction; with such views, and under such impressions, the minds of men can find no rest until the consent is given to do duty. Then, in humble submission to the great head of the church, they resolve to do duty leaving the consequences with him, who has a right to dispose of such events. And often in their attempts to discharge duty by exhortation, or giving their views of a passage of Scripture, they will have peace of mind, feeling couscious of having tried to do duty in the best way they could; though often fearing their motives are wrong, and finding a thousand objections against themselves and their performances. Thus they are led, in the providence of God, to a satisfactory knowledge of the will of the great head of the church, in their case, on this subject; "for if any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine." (We would remark here, that we believe the constitution of our church is admirably suited for the purpose of leading young men who are under impressions, into the ministry, so as to give

satisfaction to the judicature, and maintain the interest of the church.) Suffice it to say, that the called of God to the ministry of the word, will find difficulties in his way, at almost every step; and were it not for the promise of the immutable Jesus, he would sink in despondency. "Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." It cannot be that Christ intended this commission to die with the apostles, nor for the end of the world to come at their death; but that this commission or call should be with their successors in the ministry, until time should end. Yet, amidst all the straits through which the man of God has to pass; if he gives the full and free consent of his mind, to do the will of God in all things, and perform duty when presented, relying on promises when in the duty; that man will enjoy the smiles of his God. It is often a cause of doubt with young men, as well as the more advanced sometimes, that their labor seems to effect so little good to the world, that surely if God had called them to do this important work, there would be a greater effect produced by their labor. We will here say, for the comfort and benefit of those who may read this little work, that it is one of the blessings of God, in the exercise of his providence, that men do not, nor cannot see the amount of good they do in preaching, for often were they to see all the effect, they might for a season be

puffed up with self conceit, thereby resting under a cloud for a time. When God led the Israelites out of Egypt, there was a cloud betwixt them and their pursuers. But for the benefit of the Israelites, the cloud that was dark to the Egyptians, was light to them; so it is often in the dealings of providence with ministers in their preaching, the dark side is to the man to keep him humble, and the light to the people that they may be profited.

But a word to young men on this subject, and we close this lecture.

Dear young brethren, if in the providence of the King of Zion, your minds are impressed on this important cause, the cause of God, and the interest of souls, beware how you treat those impressions. For if the spirit of God moves the minds of men to feel a deep and solemn concern for the salvation of men, and the cause of truth, and those impressions are rejected, take heed lest thy skirts be stained with the blood of souls, and sinners perish through your neglect of duty. But if on the other hand men are prompted by pride, or any other kindred evil, to seek the office of the ministry, O how fearful the thought! What! a proud preacher! one of the most accursed things on earth, or as a good old father in the ministry once said, a proud preacher was one of the meanest things out of hell. Then, dear brethren be humble,

and in duty be faithful; and were we capable of summing up and presenting the qualifications of a gospel minister, in a condensed form, we would say, let him have a well informed mind, and an humble honest heart; and may God call many more such into the vineyard, and save the church from admitting those whom he has not called.

APPENDIX.

PART I.

In presenting this little work to the public, we have no desire to be considered as having sought after something new, for the sake of singularity, speculation, or profit. Though there may be something new in point of matter, yet that matter, as presented in the work, is found in the Bible, of which the reader is to be the judge for himself. And if the premises on which the arguments are founded, be not clearly presented in the word of God, and the conclusions not fairly drawn from those premises, then let the labor fall worthless to the ground, and the arguments sink into oblivion, to be remembered no more. But on the other hand, if they be founded on revealed truth, we hope in charity they will be carefully examined; and let them not be rejected because of their singularity, (if they

be so considered,) though they should come in collision with the views and practice of many in the church in the present day. We therefore solicit a careful and honest examination of the arguments, before they are rejected.

We acknowledge we feel a degree of delicacy in presenting views to the public, that are different from those taught in our Confession of Faith. We hope it will not be thought our object is to find objections to, and reject that book. Such is, by no means, our intention or desire. But as this is a land of liberty, both of thought and speech, when investigating matters of truth, we come in contact with sentiments taught by men, not according to the Word of God, we feel at liberty to show the reasons why we thus differ from them.

In treating on the covenants in this work, we said nothing of the covenant of works, as taught in our Discipline: first, for the reason that we find no such covenant taught in the word of God. In the second place, if it were a covenant, it seems to have no connection with, nor relation to, fallen man's present or future state, but seems to have been introduced for the purpose of contrast, more than for profit to men. For if such a covenant had been made with our first father, in his primitive state, it was designed to suit his situation in that state, but could not have any

profitable influence upon man in his fallen condition. And after a careful and honest investigation of this subject, we have come to the settled conclusion that there never was a covenant of works made betwixt the Divine Being and Adam, or any of his family since, the condition of which was life gained by works. True, our first parent had life when the command was given him, and had he obeyed the command, life would have been perpetuated; but he disobeyed, and the result was spiritual death. We ask, was that death the result of a violation of a contract, or of a positive command? Of a command, most certainly. We refer the reader to our Confession of Faith, chap. 7, sec. 2, and let him examine the proof given to establish the position as there taken. We are fully persuaded that no court of justice would receive testimony so foreign from the point as that is, and would give a verdict in favor of such testimony, as being in point to prove the facts which they were introduced to establish. In the references in the section mentioned, there are duties pointed out, and requirements made of man, many years after he was a fallen sinner, brought to prove the existence of a covenant of works made with Adam in his primitive state, which is certainly foreign from the point. One passage, however, given as proof, was spoken to man in his primitive state. See Gen. 2: 16, 17. "And the Lord commanded

the man saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat. But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Now to suppose that this language presents a covenant, is altogether inconsistent with the language in a covenant; for a covenant between the Divine Being and his creatures, is an agreement betwixt two parties, in which a blessing is proposed on the part of the proposer, and if the condition is complied with by the second party in the contract, the blessing is obtained sooner or later; but if the condition be not complied with, it is not a curse that is to follow, but the blessing is withheld; for it can nowhere be found in the Scripture, that a curse is connected with the terms of a covenant. But in a command it is not so; for if the command is not obeyed, the curse is not withheld; it is inevitable. In the above quotation there are three distinct things brought to view: first, a command, with toleration to all the trees in the garden save one; second, a requisition to withhold from that one; and third, a fearful threatening if the requisition is violated. Hence we understand the above passage as a direct command, given in the principle of sovereignty, for man's best interest and the Divine honor, both of which would have been secured had the command been obeyed; but it was not.

Here we will observe an objection that has been, and will no doubt again be brought up against us:—How can one who has the ordination vows upon him, thus reject any part of the Book of Discipline, after having received it? We would simply reply, that we are authorized from the book itself so to do. See Preface to the Confession of Faith. "If it speak not according to the Bible, let it be rejected," &c. But again, we are reminded, did we not promise to study the peace and purity of the church? We answer in the affirmative; but we did not promise to study the peace and corruption of the church. See sixth question to be propounded to candidates for ordination, on the form of government. Then the purity of the church is the grand object in view, for peace and corruption cannot dwell together in unity. The PURITY of the church has been the main-spring of action that has led us to give our views to the public, why we reject the covenant of works as taught in the Confession of Faith. 1. That there is no such covenant taught in the word of God. 2. It is the admission of a doctrine that cannot be found in the Bible, therefore we reject it. And 3. It is calculated to perplex, instead of instruct.

Also in the case of immersion, instead of violating our ordination vows, they have urged us to take the position we have, feeling conscious that we are not justifiable in admitting

any practice in the church that is not taught in the Scriptures, and more especially an ordinance of the house of God. For it has become the common usage of the church for persons to choose their own plan of initiation, and it is tolerated by the officers in the church, (at least by many of them,) and it is not marvellous if there are dissentions in the house of God under such circumstances, when one is for Paul, one for Apollos, and another for Cephas. One is for sprinkling, others for pouring, another for immersion, another for going to the stream, another going into the stream, and on his knees have the water poured on him. But again. Some parents want their children baptized, others do not, and others are indifferent on the subject. We ask, in the name of reason, how can we expect prosperity to attend the church under such a course of proceedure? It cannot be, if the Divine Being has respect to order and harmony in his moral government, that he will prosper the church in such a course of diversified action. Now if the apostle chided the church at Corinth for their divisions about men, will not the Holy One much more disapprobate such dissentions about the ordinances of his house? Let reason give the answer.

There is a great want of consistency in the writings of Pedobaptist authors on this subject. They show that there is no evidence

in Scripture to prove that immersion is the proper mode of baptism, and yet they admit it as valid in the sight of the Great Head of the church. We ask the candid reader to stop here and reflect for a moment: is not such a course calculated to exert an influence on the side of immersion, from the fact that Immersionists say that nothing will do but immersion, and the Pedobaptists admit that it will do, both agreeing in the validity of that mode? We doubt not that Pedobaptists are exerting an influence on the side of immersion, that the Baptists themselves cannot do; for the less informed on this subject will see the point where those contending parties meet in their views, and there many of them will take their stand in respect to baptism; and with difficulty, if at all, can such persons be dislodged from their resting place.

The apostle James, expressing his view of faith and works, says that faith without works is dead, being alone; show me your faith without works and I will show you my faith by my works. Did the apostle intend to teach us, by this language, that any kind of works, good or bad, would prove faith to be genuine? Surely not. But in order to consistency and profit, the works must be in accordance with the faith, and the faith must rely or rest on the Word of God; so in order to the advancement of truth, both faith and works must be agreeable to the Word of God.

This, we think, none will doubt. We would now ask such ministers of the gospel as believe immersion is not taught in the Bible, and yet practice it if pressed to do so, if such works will prove their faith to be a genuine faith? Let the candid reader and the public judge. How can men who act so inconsistently, expect to lead others to consistency? It cannot be expected. See Hos. 4: 9. "*Like people like priest.*" Therefore it is not strange that the church and the world are in confusion on the subject of Christian baptism, when the leaders and rulers in the church lead the way themselves to it.

It is an axiom in philosophy, that there is no effect without a cause, and that every cause will produce its effect; so there is some cause why men thus teach and act. Now it must be from one of four causes, or reasons, that such inconsistencies arise. 1. The subject has the exclusive right to choose the mode for himself. Or 2. The minister is afraid to oppose public sentiment. Or 3. A desire to increase members in the church. Or 4. The way the covenant is sealed, or the mode of baptism, is not taught in the Word of God. And from one or more of these causes these effects are produced. It will be our business here to examine those several points; and that this may be done fairly, on the broad principle of truth, there are three things to be regarded in the examination. 1.

A sound Bible theory. 2. That theory must accord with a sound experience. And 3. When the theory and experience are carried out in practice, the effects will be profitable in community; but if theory and experience do not agree and lead to good actions, they should be scrupulously examined, for there is an error somewhere.

1. Has the subject the right, from the Word of God, to choose his own mode of baptism? Or does the Word of God teach or authorize such a choice, in either of the ordinances of the house of God? We answer, it does not. For the agency of man is not consulted in this matter, either in baptism or communion, for the subject is commanded to repent and be baptized. Here the agency is consulted, whether he will repent and be baptized, but his agency is not consulted how he will repent—the manner of this duty he must learn from the holy book—nor how he will be baptized; this also he is to learn, for the mode of the one is as clearly taught as the other. Now we hold it as a truth, founded on moral principle, that the subject has as good a right to choose how he will be fitted for the church, as he has to choose how he will get into the church. And to suppose that Wisdom would command a thing to be done and not give sufficient instructions how that matter was to be done, would be an insult in the face of Wisdom. But we are met here

by those who believe in the right of choice, that water is not the thing to be chosen, that being appointed, but the manner of using the water is for the subject to choose. Upon this position there is one of two things the fact: that God gives more liberty of conscience under the gospel, in point of religious duty, than he did under the law, or he is indifferent about the mode of the sealing ordinance of his house. Let us examine the subject, and see the result. Did Jehovah admit persons, under the law, to receive circumcision on different plans; or to have the covenant sealed in different ways? Jew and Gentile, infant and adult, had all to receive the seal on the same plan. Then if, under the gospel, each one may choose his own form of having the covenant sealed, does it not present partiality in the Divine government? In our view, it would most certainly. But farther, the blood in circumcision pointed to the atoning blood of Christ, and legalized the subject in the family or church of God, and engaged his truth on their behalf. So water baptism points to the cleansing blood of the Lamb, legalizes the subject in the church, and engages the truth of God for his salvation. So we may easily see that it is unreasonable, it is inconsistent, for the law dispensation to have no choice, and the gospel dispensation to have free choice, in that ordinance, designed to effect one and the same thing, in both dispensations,

though differing only in form of administration. The conclusion is a just one in view of reason, that the subject has no more right to choose how he would be baptized, than the Jew had to choose how he would be circumcised. And if such liberty of choice is given by the leaders in the church, it is inconsistent and sinful in the sight of God.

2. For us to say, that a minister of Jesus would be afraid to oppose popular opinion, to maintain moral principle, might appear to the minds of some, to be a hard censure; but it is nevertheless true in many cases. We would not be understood, however, as meaning that good men might not possess much false delicacy; we have no doubt but that many good men are under such influence, to some extent, but we honestly believe they are not the better of such delicacy, but are the worse. It is a truth well known, that there is great anxiety felt by many of the clerical order, for persons to unite with their branch of the church, and pressing invitations given to that effect; and of those persons presenting themselves for membership according to the different forms of government in the Pedobaptist churches, a number wish to be immersed. But the preacher in charge, or the pastor and session, as the case may be, do not believe that immersion is the Bible mode; and the person is not informed on the subject of baptism: (sometimes efforts are

made to instruct such persons and get them out of false notions,) but what is the result in such cases? The preacher immerses the subject, and all seems to be right. Now, let us examine the ground of such actions. In the first place, the preacher is, or ought to be, a man of information on this subject. See Mal. 2: 7. "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge," and he says, the Bible does not teach this mode; in the second place, he says, the Confession of Faith does not teach this mode, yet he immerses. Reader, we wish you to look at the legitimate conclusions drawn from such premises, and what are they? The preacher departs from the Bible, violates the Discipline, crosses his own judgment, and violates his own conscience, for we know not how he can do otherwise in thus acting to meet the feelings of a prepossessed mind. Strange course indeed! But let us notice the other extreme. One of the great ones of the earth presents himself for membership in the church, but he must be immersed. Here the minister pauses for a little; if this man is rejected, his influence will be turned against us, and he is so fine a man in the neighborhood, and of such respectability in community, it will have a bad effect to reject him. Hence he is received, and as in the former case, the Bible, Discipline, and conscience are all pressed out of their proper channel in view of gain in number and popularity amongst men.

A word here to ministers and churches before we leave this subject. Are we to act, or do we act from the best light we have from the Word of God; or are we ready to submit the case, as it is believed by so many to be right, that we can tolerate it, on the ground of liberty and charity? On liberty, see Gal. 5: 13. "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not libberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another." The apostle represents the church as having liberty, but cautions them not to use that liberty, for an occasion, or to meet the views of popular opinion, and so extend the mantle of charity, as to admit of modes and forms that are not taught in the Word of God. There is nothing less than deception in a course of procedure so directly opposite to the apostles' instruction; and if it be not deception, we are utterly at a loss for a name by which to express such actions; and hear the Word of God on this subject—see Jer. 48: 10—"Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully." This reference may be thought by some extraneous, but we have no doubt the truth of this quotation will apply whereever deception is found; and whether in or out of the church, the curse of God will rest on it. And may grace preserve the church from such conduct. Then let the officers in the church keep their minds fixed on the glo-

ry of God, as the prime object; and the Bible as the rule of their actions in the government of the house of God, regardless of what men may think or say.

But in the fourth place. The way the covenant is sealed, or the mode of baptism, is not taught in the Scriptures. Now, if this position be true, it would be to us a strange idea of a complete revelation from God to man, as the rule of his faith and practice. Here we take our position, fearless of successful contradiction, by any man or set of men, from the English translation of the Scriptures. And no minister of the gospel is at liberty to teach doctrine, more or less, than is taught in the sacred volume, for it teaches what we are to believe concerning God, and the duties he requires of us. Nor are we required to perform any duty that is not taught in that book; nor are we required to withhold from any action, that is not forbidden in it. Here let the reader enquire, how comes it to pass, if the mode of baptism is not taught in that holy book, that men can find out immersion is not the scriptural mode of baptism, and therefore protest against it, and contend for sprinkling, as the bible mode of the ordinance? Such is strange logic for a minister of the sanctuary. But as heretofore expressed, we again recapitulate, that it is virtually charging the Divine Being with inattention towards his creatures, to say he has

appointed an ordinance in his church, and has not taught us how that ordinance is to be performed. If this were true, it would be to us passingly strange, in view of the Divine character, we cannot reconcile it with moral government, which is in its nature unchangeable, therefore right.

But to proceed on this part of the subject: we think the Scriptures clearly teach, both subject and mode of baptism, though not in simple expression, i. e., you must be baptized by sprinkling, or you must be immersed in baptism; nor is such language necessary to establish the mode; nor is it said of the subject, the infant must be baptized. It is a truth to well known too admit of controversy, that the ordinances of the church, established under the law, are the source from which we learn the nature and design of the ordinances under the gospel. (We might enlarge on this point of truth, but a word to the wise is enough.) Now the subject and mode, or form of circumcision is not disputed by either party, from the fact, that we are taught those things so clearly in the law, that there is no room for controversy. But let us pass the five books of Moses, and the first five chapters of Joshua, and then neither Pedo or Anti-Pedobaptist can establish the mode or place of circumcision, further than the shedding of blood. And throughout the prophetic ages, there is not one ever seems to

have doubted the mode, subject, or design of that bloody rite, though not one of the prophets have told us who were to be circumcised, nor where the blood was to be taken from, nor yet how much blood was to be taken. Not one word about these things during the prophetic ages. The inquiry might arise, why this long silence on the subject? The answer is easy; they had the law, and it pointed out the mode, the subject, and the design of the ordinance. And when a heathen came to join himself to the Israel of God, as was often the case, he might have objected to the mode of initiation, as our Immersionists do to sprinkling; or the priests might have permitted him to have the blood taken from the toe or finger, with as much propriety as many of our Pedobaptists do, in allowing the subject to have his own choice in the mode of baptism. But, no; no such thing was ever thought of under the law, as far as the Scriptures inform us on the subject; and a change of mode and subject under the law, would have been no greater violation of moral principle, than it is under the gospel to change them, for the reason, that the subjects thus to be initiated, were, and are, subjects of moral government. God is a moral being, in and of himself right, therefore cannot do any thing but what is right. He made man, and indued him with rational powers; these powers capable of being exercised in things

that are right in themselves. It is right to love God, and man is capable of doing so if he will. So we see man is a moral creature, and capable of being governed by moral principle; therefore God has appointed the subjects, and can no more change the subjects in the government, then he can the government itself.

But the rite by which these subjects were designated in the government of God, was a positive institution, therefore can be changed by the author without violating moral principle, or injury to the subjects, when that end is accomplished for which the positive institution was appointed. And a positive institution is not designed to increase moral obligation; but to aid the subject to meet that obligation. Then to love God is morally right, and circumcision being the positive institution, was designed to aid men under the law, to meet that obligation. 1. By securing the truth of God, that he would be their God, and their seed's God. In the second place, by that rite they secured a legal standing in the family or church of God. And in the third place, the blood that was shed in that rite, typified the blood that was to be shed, for their moral cleansing. So when the blood of the Antitype was shed, the rite could be, yea it was right it should be changed, from blood to water; but the subjects of that rite could not be changed,

for the reason they were subjects of moral government. For farther proof on this point, see Lecture on the church passing from the old to the new dispensation. Here the supercilious might enquire, are infants subjects of moral government? We answer, if they are not when they die (and many of them do die,) they fall back into nonentity or are no more; and who but a downright skeptic would believe such a thing, for no christian in his senses can? But to return to the mode or seal of the covenant. Where then do we get a knowledge of the covenant? From the law, i. e. the five books of Moses. Where do we get a knowledge of the subjects in the covenant? From the law. Where do we get a knowledge of how the covenant was sealed? From the law. And how was it sealed, by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion? By extracting a small quantity of blood, which was clearly typical of the blood of sprinkling. No one acquainted with the Bible would doubt this.

Again we enquire, was there any thing accomplished by circumcision, in A MORAL POINT OF VIEW, that is not effected by baptism? We answer there is no difference, only the former was prospective, the latter retrospective, and both pointing to the efficacious blood of Christ: (see lecture on the covenant of grace for farther illustration on this part of the, argument.) True it is not said ye shall

be sprinkled, or ye shall be immersed; but where actions speak to us, we do not need words to express the same thing. And as we have seen the appointment of the subject is a moral one, therefore cannot change; the object or design of the appointment is moral, and cannot change; but the mode of the ordinance has been changed from the shedding of blood to water; and when the church closes her militant state, water will be done away; for there is no water baptism in Heaven. But will God's promise fail there? No. Will the subjects who have embraced the object in the covenant not be there? Most certainly they will. Where then, we ask, is the least room for immersion, in view of the moral government of Jehovah? Yet many Pedoqaptists tell us that immersion is not taught in the Bible but that it will do; when the act of immersion is a practical rejection, of a part of the subjects Heaven has appointed in the covenant. Therefore violating the very principle on which the government is founded. Can such a form or mode be valid in the sight of the Holy One? It cannot be, for he changes not.

Then immersion is not found in the Scriptures, nor is it consistent with the moral government, but is a desecration of the ordinance of God's house, and has a demoralizing influence in the world, and tends to corrupt the church. May God save the church from immersion and its consequences!

We think, as far as government and consistency will go to establish a system of truth, we have shown that the Scriptures teach the mode of baptism, as well and clear as they do the subject. Then there must be some other cause from that of Bible evidence, that prompts our Pedobaptist brethren to admit and practice immersion. It is not presuming to say, there is something wrong in such a course of procedure, when there is such inconsistency in the faith and practice; nor can it be expected that such a course will lead to moral virtue, but to disorder and confusion. Let common observation say what the result is. Then it is not for us to say what the motives are that lead men to admit of such dissimilarity in faith and practice, but we are sure it is not the word of God, nor solid reason, though popularity and numbers have a powerful influence on many men in the church. A minister once said, in conversing on this subject, it will not do to fix the terms of communion too close yet; and, as another said, it would not do to preach his doctrine, for it would not be received. How will men account to God for such things?

We doubt not but that a church, or society, composed of ten families, all united in heart and practice, with their children in the covenant, would exert a better influence in community, than a hundred families would, some for immersion, some for sprinkling, some having

their children baptized, and others rejecting infant baptism. For the saying is true, union is strength; and it would be better for a church to have but ten BIBLE, BIBLE Christians in its society, than to have ten times ten with division of sentiment; for the godly would be grieved and their influence in a great degree lost, and the wicked hardened.

There is much said in these days about union in the church, which is truly desirable; but there may be a union in action amongst men, yet no union in heart; such are as justly reprehensible as those anciently were, who appeared to men to fast; it is said of them, "they have their reward." A union in action cannot produce a union in heart, but a union in heart will produce a union in action, which will be profitable. And to effect this desirable object let each one search his Bible honestly; not to maintain a certain doctrine, or any peculiar mode or notion, but to learn the truth with design to practice it, for it is practical truth alone that will have a salutary influence on community. In conclusion on this subject, we would say, that a union in action without union in heart, will be but a blank at last, and we pray heaven to preserve the church from such things.

PART II.

The question might here be asked, if immersion is not a valid baptism, what is the standing of immersed persons with the church? We answer, they have no legal standing with the church at all. But the enquirer advances, are all immersed persons yet in their sins, and have no religion? No, we think not; for there are many, and perhaps the most of these persons are Christians, and no doubt but many, very many, have gone to heaven that never heard of water baptism, and many others will, that have not been baptized, for baptism gives no one a qualificaion for that place of rest. (See lecture on the right to communion.) The enquirer wishes to know if there are not some ministers in the church that have been immersed. True, there are; but baptism gives no man authority to preach or administer: it is the Presbytery, in her official actions, that clothes men with such authority. But if the Presbytery should take up a man that is not in the church, and license and ordain him,

then he has full authority to administer, but the Presbytery has violated discipline in taking men not connected with the church and giving them such authority. See chap. 9, sec. 5, of the Form of Government, also chap 14, sec. 2. But two wrongs cannot make one right, therefore such men are not legally connected with the church at all, though they are clothed with ministerial authority. And such min isters, though they have no legal standing in the church, are by no means justifiable in admitting such illegality because they have the authority to minister in the house of God; for the Great Head of the church will hold ministers responsible, for he requires them to do his will, and that is revealed in his Word. But it is often said, and no doubt firmly believed by many, that there is an honest difference of opinion amongst men on the mode and subject of baptism. Here we pause with doubt; but that there is a difference, owing to tradition, we have no doubt, and the difference is more owing to the tradition than to a want of capacity to know the truth; for we read of some in Christ's day, that made void the law through their tradition, and so it is until this day. But men are not justifiable in embracing a sentiment not taught in the Word of God, though they be honest in their own opinion.

It is not believed by any, that the Bible teaches the same truth to different men in a

different form, but the same truths to all men; and if all men possessed the same moral honesty and the same degree of Bible knowledge, such a diversity of opinions would not exist to distract and divide the church of God. Hence the various views now amongst men, are more to be attributed to blind tradition than to the Scriptures or moral honesty. But the time will come, and may the Lord hasten it, when the watchmen shall see eye to eye, and all speak the same thing; then there will be a union of heart, which will produce a union of effort, and without such a union of heart all will be vain, and of no avail to the church. And if the heart is not properly regulated by moral principle the actions will be more or less defective, and policy will be the spring of action instead of principle, and sooner or later will show itself to the world as deceptive. But let the heart be regulated by moral principle, and the actions will be regulated by the heart, and truth will have its influence on the world, and God will be honored, and souls saved.

But there is another subject to which we wish to call the attention of the reader before we close; that is, the support of the gospel. It is a subject on which much depends in the progress and spread of gospel truth in the world. But it is a truth, founded on the Scriptures, that the carnal mind is enmity against God, and covetousness is one of

the corrupt streams that flow from the evil fountain which is opposed to the using of our substance in support of the gospel. But this duty is so clearly taught in the Word of God, that no man acquainted with his Bible dare oppose it without rejecting Bible truth. And it cannot but be expected that such as withhold their substance and refuse to meet the claims of the gospel, will have leanness and barrenness of soul, and be but little else than a nuisance in the church. It is a duty that men owe to God, to themselves, and to the world, to use a part of their earthly substance in support of that system which secures and maintains the liberties they enjoy; and if human nature was not so much opposed to the Divine will, it would be less difficult to influence men to aid in the dissemination of gospel truth, But it is remarkably true, that depraved nature is opposed to every requisition of the gospel; and one of the misfortunes that attend many on this subject is, that what they do give appears to them as thrown away, and forget to look at the benefits and privileges they enjoy from the gospel. This any reflecting mind can easily see, by contrasting the difference betwixt those in heathen lands and such as enjoy gospel privileges; and to us it does appear strange, that any should be opposed to support and aid a system that maintains and perpetuates the privileges they enjoy. It must be a mind that

is blind to its own interest, that can do so. We are well aware that this is a subject on which most men are very sensitive, and are unwilling to hear the subject mentioned publicly; and not unfrequently such persons say, it will not do to make the preachers rich, when the great obstacle with them is the parting from their money, instead of making rich the preacher; but this is their apology.

We are well assured it is no advantage to the usefulness of a minister to roll in the lap of affluence, nor is it calculated to make him more useful, to be pressed with poverty and want; but these extremes are calculated to circumscribe their usefulness any one may see; hence the necessity of the preacher occupying a medium betwixt poverty and wealth, in order to be useful in the church of God. Such was the situation of the priesthood under the law, that the Levites were not numbered with the rest of Israel. See Num. 1: 47—49. Nor were they to have any earthly inheritance amongst the tribes of Israel. But the other tribes were to support the tribe of Levi, and that tribe was to minister in the priest's office for the Israel of God. So clear is this taught in the Word of God, that no one acquainted with the Scriptures would dare to deny it; and so fully does the apostle inculcate this duty, that he uses the strong language—see 1 Cor. 9: 14—that the Lord hath ordained that they

that preach the gospel shall live of the gospel. It would be useless to lengthen remarks on the subject, for he that runs may read, and he that reads may see, if he will not close his eyes against the light. But, in conclusion, it is of Divine appointment that the gospel is to be supported, and that the gospel holds a claim on every member of the church so to do, in proportion as God has prospered him; and as it is out of the Kingdom of Providence that men are furnished with the means of life, and they being stewards of of God, if they withhold that small part, which is claimed by the giver of all they possess, such persons cannot reasonably expect Heaven to crown their labor.

But farther: there are many who think the preacher is as much bound to preach as they are to hear; it is true he is; but let it be remembered, that they who hear are as much bound to sustain, as the minister is to labor. And if they do not pay the laborer, the cry of him that has reaped down their fields will come up before God against them, and they will be charged with the crime of fraud in the sight of the Holy One.

Once more on this point: there are some who make no arrangements for, nor calculations on paying the Lord's tribute, and such are violating the command of Heaven; for the apostle instructed the church at Corinth to lay by them on the first day of the week,

that they might be ready to communicate, that there might be no gathering when he came. And it is but reasonable to expect, that a church, or an individual, that neglects this duty, will suffer much darkness of mind, with but little comfort in religion, if any at all; and well for such if they do not suffer great loss in the end. Let each one, then, as a steward of God, search for his duty on this subject, and then perform it faithfully. And may grace enable all to do so, that the gospel may spread to earth's remotest bound.

There is another subject to which we wish to call the attention of the sessions, and that is, preparing the bread to be used in the administration of the Lord's supper, in which many seem to have lost sight of the example the Saviour left us on that subject, and follow their own device, by preparing the bread after the material has passed through a state of fermentation, with a mixture of sugar sometimes, as though the Saviour had not taught us right, by his using unleavened bread. This may appear in the view of many as a small matter, as respects the kind of bread, or the manner of preparing it; be it so; but one or two suggestions on the subject for our reflection. What is the design of the bread as used in the supper? Is it not to represent the broken body of the Son of God? The same answer is giveu by all, it is. Which kind then most fully represents a pure uncor-

rupted Saviour, the leavened or unleavened bread? We leave each one to answer this for themselves. But the bread is an emblem of the broken body, and to use fermented bread to represent a pure body, is without precept or example. And we do hope churches, and church sessions, will desist from the use of such a fermented emblem as leavened bread, when we have the example of unleavened bread, given us by the Saviour, to represent his broken body. And we do honestly believe that it is calculated to have a deleterious influence on community for churches to use such bread in the communion of the Lord's supper.

There is an other thought, to which we wish to call the attention of parents especially. If, after you have examined the covenants, as taught in the Word of God, (and if you have not you are held responsible for such neglect,) and have seen the duty of parents who claim an interest in Christ, and the right the children of believing parents have, to the seal of the covenant, you neglect to attend to your duties, and the instruction of your children in those important duties and doctrines, as taught in the Scriptures, (on which we have treated in the preceding lectures,) we beseech you pause, and think seriously, what you are doing, and let the following thought arise in your minds. "How, O how shall I meet my children at the bar

of God, having neglected my duty towards them." Fearful account to render under the guilt of negligence.

In conclusion, we would say to all: seek to know your duty and then practice it; for God will reward the faithful, but he will punish the guilty.

71.2009.084.05480