



REPLY TO
PRESSELY ON BAPTISM.

~~BAP
W7273~~

FROM THE
Am. Bap. Publication
AND S. SCHOOL SOCIETY,
21 S. Fourth street, Philada.

*Journal of the Theological Seminary,
Princeton, N. J.*

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. ...

SCB

10429

REPLY

TO

LECTURES

ON

THE NATURE, SUBJECTS, AND MODE

OF

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM,

BY

JOHN T. PRESSLY, D. D.

BY

SAMUEL WILLIAMS.

Pittsburgh:

PRINTED BY ARTHUR A. ANDERSON.

1841.



P R E F A C E.

.....

*To the members of the First Baptized Church of
Jesus Christ of Pittsburgh.*

DEAR BRETHREN IN THE LORD:

Fourteen years ago, I was called in the Providence of God, to the care of your souls. At that time you were few in number, feeble in resources, and like your brethren in the days of Paul, "a sect every where spoken against." Immediately after my connection with you in the pastoral relation, I was called upon to maintain the cause of truth against fearful forms of error.

On various occasions, I have opposed from the pulpit, and now deem it my duty to expose through the press, the doctrine of *Rantismal Salvation*. A doctrine, while it mutilates the scheme of "salvation by grace," utterly sets aside the authority of Christ as Lawgiver in Zion, and wherever it prevails, entirely supercedes the ordinance of *Christian Baptism*. It also destroys the distinction God has made between the church and the world. Hence, in all countries where the Romish church is established, and in some Protestant provinces, all children are *christened* by *Rantism*,—all of the inhabitants are members of the church, though they may be *infidels* in sentiment, and more degraded than heathen in morals; and consequently, pure primitive christianity, both in spirit and form, is almost wholly unknown to them.

With what ability and fidelity I have opposed those errors, I leave you to judge. Of one thing I am certain, that is, that God has unequivocally given to us the seal of his approbation, in the fact, that he has increased our number from twenty-seven, to more than four hundred, notwithstanding several churches have been organized of members dismissed from us for that purpose.

While we continue to strive together for the *faith* and *practice* of the gospel in the strength of the Lord, let us also

cultivate those graces which adorn the christian character,— at once the fruits of the Spirit, and a sure pledge of joys to come. Especially, would I exhort you to pray with, and for your children; and instruct them in the knowledge of eternal truth, at home and in the Sabbath School. Not, from the consideration that the Jews were circumcised, nor from that of vows made at the shrine of the Man of sin, do I thus exhort you; but, from the consideration that they are *yours* by a Divine constitution, and because the Spirit has *expressly* commanded you to “Bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.”

Let us not suppose that we are exempted from the obligation to engage in the conflict with surrounding corruption, because we have been buried with Christ by baptism, after the command and example of the Redeemer, in preference to following the rudiments of this world, and the traditions of men. No: so long as error is rife in the land, so long as the sophistry of the schools is brought into requisition to blunt the edge of the word of God, and while the mists of Babylon are wafted upon the breeze of popularity, and being spread over the fair face of christianity, obscuring the glories of the Sun of righteousness, we *must* be “valiant for the truth in the earth:” contending earnestly, for the faith once delivered to the saints, and for the ordinances, unmutilated and unpolluted by the touch of man, as conveyed to us through the pure word of Divine testimony.

For the author of the “Lectures” to which I reply, I have no other feelings than those of respect and kindness.

No considerations, however, can justify the palliation of error, nor apologize for lack of zeal or courage in the maintenance of the “truth as it is in Jesus.”

To contribute something towards the victories which Christ will achieve over the kingdoms of darkness, these pages were prepared, and are now presented to you in token of my affectionate regard for your welfare, accompanied with my fervent prayer, that in the cause of our Master you may prove “faithful even unto death.”

Respectfully, your Pastor,

SAMUEL WILLIAMS.

Pittsburgh, May 1st, 1841.

REPLY

TO

LECTURES ON CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

.....

“IN vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men,” is a caution, applied by the Saviour, to those who, under religious pretensions, practiced the inventions of men, to the neglect of the ordinances of God; and thereby renounced the Divine government, and nullified the institutions of the gospel. To this declaration of Jesus Christ, and to the greater part of the connecting paragraph, I shall frequently recur in the course of the following strictures.

I here premise, that with almost the whole of the first Lecture I most cordially agree. With mingled emotions of joy and regret, I make the above statement; considering, as I do, its connexion with others, which tarnish the beauty of its sentiments; and destroy, as I think, the sacred ordinance that conveys emblematically the glorious truths therein enu-

merated. I rejoice, that the worthy author in his first Lecture, so skilfully erects the superstructure of salvation on the "sure foundation" of sovereign mercy in Christ Jesus; but, I deeply regret, that in the second, he proceeds to destroy that which he began to build. And this, he does, it would seem, for the purpose of perpetuating a custom that has no authority in the word of God, and should be numbered among the traditions of men, which "make void the Divine commands." Can the perpetuity of a human device, make amends for frittering away the doctrines of grace, which are well nigh destroyed already, by the whittling architects of mystical Babylon? Let every reader pause, and reflect upon this question.

The text prefixed to Dr. Pressly's Lecture, is the apostolic commission, as recorded by Mathew. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," chap. 28: 19. According to the remarks of the Dr., page 25, the commission specified no other subjects of baptism than believers, and yet he undertakes to shew in Lectures founded upon the above text, that infants are proper subjects of baptism. One cannot resist the impression from this fact, that either the Dr. could find no text for infant subjects, or otherwise as far as subjects were concerned in his lectures, he preached *from* the text instead of preaching on it.

Notwithstanding he admits that believers are the only subjects specified in the commission, yet, he argues that its terms do not prohibit other subjects. By his argument, or rather his sophistry, his admission is destroyed; just as the requirement of the com-

mission is nullified by his practice. The fallacy of his argument lies in the assumption of that which he does not attempt to prove. He says, that the inference drawn by the Baptists, from the terms of the commission is not valid; and that such a principle of reasoning would "lead to consequences of the most revolting character." And then illustrates the charge by assuming that faith is as indispensable to the salvation of the infant, as to the salvation of the adult; and that baptism is as essential to the salvation of the soul of the infant, as eating is to the life of the body. He refers to the words of Paul 2d Thess. 3: 10, for illustration. These are "revolting" assumptions, and are utterly at war with truth and reason. The commission, only contemplates those who are capable of believing the gospel.

But, I cannot impute to the Dr. the sentiment, that faith is as indispensable to the salvation of the infant, as to that of the adult. I therefore suppose the foregoing *assumptions*, were made for the help of a bad case. He says, "that common sense would teach us, that when our Lord speaks of believing, in connection with being baptized, he has reference to those who are capable of believing." I think so too.— And I further think, the same instructor would teach us, that as the Bible never speaks of infants in connection with baptism, they are not included in the law of baptism, and therefore can never be brought out of it by inferences, no more than a guinea can be drawn from an empty purse.

The command to make disciples, baptize believers, and to teach the baptized, by its positive terms, of necessity, excludes infants. The gospel, is glad tidings of great joy. But, to the unconscious infant,

it is no tidings at all. Faith comes by hearing. And he that believeth shall be saved. The Law of Christ requires that every believer should be baptized. But it no more requires the infant to be baptised in order to christian obedience, than it requires faith in them, in order to their salvation. They are saved by the regenerating and sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit, but not thro' faith in the word of God, or "belief of the truth." Consequently, baptism being enjoined *only* upon believers, it has no application to them whatever. Nor does the perfect work and complete atonement of Christ, made for the dying infant, need the touch of polution, to make them more prevalent before the Divine Throne. Human devices, formed, to assist infinite wisdom, and human hands put forth to finish or add to the perfection of the immaculate Redeemer's work, are not only wholly gratuitous, but awfully presumptuous, especially, when performed in the name of the sacred Trinity.

The author of the lectures under review, often speaks about the right of infants to baptism. Does he mean by this that it is a precious privilege? Or does he mean that it is a solemn duty? If, a favor, or privilege connected with salvation, then he exalts it to a point of importance equal to that of faith, received in regeneration. Precisely the doctrine of Augustine and the Church of Rome,—Baptismal regeneration. If a duty, then it presupposes a law, prescribing that duty; and it implies, the exercise of the understanding, will and consciousness of the subject. But we have seen, and Dr. P * * * admits that the only law of baptism God ever gave to man, does not include infants; and when Peter defines baptism as far as the subject is concerned, he says "it is not the

washing away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a *good conscience* toward God, by *faith* in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." Is the "*right* of infants to baptism," a favor or privilege that connects all who are compelled to be baptised, with the blood of the atonement, as faith does in the case of the adult? Then here is salvation by works, and not of grace, for none were ever put into the covenant of grace, but those who are called, and remain in that spiritual relation to God. The Dr's doctrines are at war with his practice. His doctrines suspend the salvation of the soul, upon the *purpose of sovereign grace* in Christ Jesus, to whom it is united in an everlasting bond *by the Holy Spirit*. Heb. 8, 9-12. But his practice seems to say that the soul cannot be in the covenant,—its interest not sealed there, until a human device be brought into requisition for that purpose. Baptism is no where in the Bible called a seal of the covenant; nor the minister of the gospel, the agent to confirm our interest in the redemption of Christ. Pædobaptist ministers so call it, and so speak of it. But Paul, guided by the unerring Spirit, says, that we are "*sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise*." Eph. 1 : 13. 4 : 30.

Baptism, therefore, is not a privilege to those to whom it is not a duty; and we have seen, that it is not a duty to those who cannot comprehend its obligation, or conscientiously discharge it. It follows therefore, irresistibly, that it is the duty of those, and only those, who believe,—who are already in a state of salvation, to be baptised. To such it is a privilege to be "*buried with Christ by baptism*;" and thus, testify their love to the Saviour, who died and

rose again for them, by obeying His commandment. Notwithstanding the Dr. admits, p. 25, that the commission, or law of baptism does "not afford any evidence of the right of infant baptism;" yet, he says, that it furnishes no argument against it. It is true, that it does not, in so many words, prohibit baptism. That is, it is silent on the subject. He says, they are not included in it. And yet, he thinks there is an "impassable gulf between" the premise and the conclusion. This is passing strange. To say as little as possible about the assumptions of the Dr. in order to make this "impassable gulf," I only reply, that such logic would make sad work, if applied in the interpretation of the principles of the Divine government. For example, the Saviour commands his *disciples* to partake of the emblems of his death. We infer from the terms of the command, that infants are not proper subjects of that ordinance, for the simple reason, that they are not disciples, or believers. But, according to the Dr's logic there is an impassable gulf between the premise and the conclusion. Will he apply his assumption here, that the Lord's supper is as necessary to the salvation of the soul of the infant, as eating is to the life of the body? Surely it is as appropriate here as any where. In this case, the Dr. is on one side of the "impassable gulph" and his children on the other, for he does not admit them to the communion, though all baptised persons of good morals, in primitive times, were eligible to that ordinance.

The Baptists have their children with them, trusting in Christ for their salvation, and see no frightful gulf between the premise and conclusion in neither case. The command specifies believers as the pro-

per subjects, and therefore, all others are prohibited from the ordinance of baptism. For them it was instituted. They alone can discern its doctrinal import, and apprehend the spiritual blessings, of which it is the appointed emblem. They attend to it as a privilege, because, they know it to be their duty. And when they perform it, having "answered a good conscience toward God," go on their way rejoicing.

The invariable practice of the apostles, affords a good comment upon the correctness of our conclusion, drawn from the terms of the commission. To suppose that they did not understand the nature and extent of their duty contained in the commandment, or that they wilfully disregarded its requirements were highly absurd. Their administration of the ordinance, therefore, must be in exact accordance with the terms of the law prescribing their duty. Accordingly, on the day of Pentecost, "They that gladly received the word, were baptised," Acts 2: 41. The people in Samaria "gave heed to the things which Philip spake," had great joy and "were baptised both men an women." Oh! what an excellent place here would have been, to have added children. Luke could not make the addition, however, for he was under the direction of the spirit of truth, and therefore, would not misrepresent the apostles. It was reserved for the monks of the third and fourth centuries to tack on to christianity these inventions of men, that now make "void the commandment of God." See Acts 8: 12. Philip, acting under the direction of the "Head of the church" did not dare to baptise the Eunuch, until he made a credible profession of faith in the Lord Jesus, but complied with

the rule of his duty. "If thou believest thou mayest." Thus he honors the Lawgiver of Zion, by conforming to his holy will, remembering the declaration of his Judge, "By my word shall ye be judged in the last day," Acts 8: 37.

Cornelius and his friends, the first Gentiles, believed the gospel, "spake with tongues, and magnified God," before they were baptised, Acts 10: 46. Lydia the merchant, and her household of clerks were believers in the Saviour, before they were baptised, for Paul and Silas visited them afterward, and "comforted the brethren" with the promises of the gospel, Acts 16: 40. The jailor and his household "rejoiced, believing in God." Acts 16: 34. Many of the Corinthians "hearing, believed, and were baptised," and Crispus "believed in the Lord with all his house" Acts 18: 4. Stephanas, and his house were the first baptised in Corinth, who "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." 1 Cor. 16: 15. Thus, invariably, did the apostles baptise those, and only those, who exercised faith in Christ, in obedience to their ascended Lord. "He that *believeth* and is baptised." They did not presume to reverse the order of the Divine law, in order to violate its holy requisitions. In all congregations and communities of Pædobaptists, believes baptism is superseded, by the violation of the law, specifying the requisite qualification in the subject, and guiding the administration of the ordinance. For if they baptise or rantise the child (as the case may be) then they do not baptise him, though he afterwards believe. We may safely take our stand upon the ground, that the requirement of the law of baptism, implies the exclusion of those, who do not possess

the necessary qualification for the ordinance, as necessarily as the prohibition of any sin, implies the requirement of a corresponding duty ; and that the apostles, guided and controlled, by the unerring spirit, *always* required evidence of faith in the candidates before baptising them ; and then defy the world to move us from our position. Mere assumptions will never separate just conclusions from sound premises. Faith, in a preached gospel, incomprehensible of course to the infant, is essential to its salvation, as to the salvation of the adult ! Baptism, as eating is to the preservation of its body ! What doctrines these are ! Doctrines of popery ; only assumed by protestants, for the purpose of upholding the strongest pillar of that execrable system ! Verily, this popgun of sophistry, must lay very near the door of Peter Edward's Magazine, or so many Pædobaptist disputants would not come out to the field with the same poor weapon. Every intelligent and affectionate disciple of our Lord, will feel himself as secure against such weapons, while standing upon the above proposition, supported as it is, by the whole history of apostolic practice, as Sampson did against the cords of the Philistines, when clothed with the power of the Omnipotent, and standing in the top of the rock Etam.

The first argument the Dr. offers, after attempting to sophisticate away the terms and exclusive claims of the commission, is from the supposed identity of the Jewish and Christian church. To every intelligent mind, the notion, that a New Testament ordinance is to be learned from the Old Testament writings, must seem, to say the least, very singular.

It is just like going to the commission for infant subjects. It is singular, because, the ordinance is not there! It had no being until a "man was sent from God, whose name was John," to commence it, in "the beginning of the gospel of the Son of God," Mark 1: 1—4. It is going to the Jewish dispensation to ascertain a duty connected with the Christian dispensation. And we greatly doubt whether an instructor of Theology would stake his reputation upon the issue of any other question, with no better arguments for its support than those drawn from a source that is silent on the subject. Dr. Mason, in an argument for a mixed church, said, that "it contributed directly to her prosperity, by extending her resources, and by increasing her numbers.— Her resources are increased by pecuniary aid, and the aid of talents." This is a weighty argument, for money is almost always more influential than the truth. And Dr. Mason may have been honest in using it. Still, it was founded on policy, and not on fact. It can never be shown that the Jewish nation and the Kingdom of Christ are the same. That the Jews were under the government of God and many of them pious, I do not deny. But I do deny, that the constitution of the Jewish theocracy and that of the Christian church are one. The very first argument adduced by the Dr., destroys itself. For if children of believers were constituted members because they were members, then circumcision did not make them members, for the Dr. contends that the children are not members until baptized; but if baptism, the initiating ordinance of the Christian church, comes in the room of circumcision, then the Jewish and Christian churches are not the same; for, as we

have seen, the children were members of that church by birth, and not by circumcision. Another discrepancy in his argument is, that he does not include servants with children, for they were equally eligible to the *precious* "privilege," (according to the covenant made with Abraham,) which made Zipporah say to Moses when she circumcised her son, "a bloody husband art thou to me, a bloody husband, because of the circumcision," Ex. 4: 27. So that instead of lamenting an abridgement of *privileges* under the gospel dispensation, servants, children, and parents, all, may well rejoice that the old burden of bloody circumcision is not imposed upon us—Gentiles. Priests were not required to administer the ordinance of circumcision; and, therefore, unless they be parents, they need not be concerned. In case a Priest cannot be obtained in the Romish church to administer the substitute, and the child should be in imminent danger of death, the parent or neighbor may perform the sealing operation.

The chief privilege they enjoyed, we, without distinction, enjoy. Unto us, as well as unto them, is committed the oracles of God; so that our children may be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and become children of Abraham *by faith* in the Lord Jesus, the promised Seed, in whom all the promises are yea and Amen.

The covenant made with Abraham, recorded Gen. 17, is the one from which our Pædobaptist brethren get their principal argument. It includes two things, a promise to be a God to Abraham and his seed, and one to give the land of Canaan. Although Canaan was to be an everlasting possession, and circumcision was to be in their flesh for an everlasting cove-

nant yet, our brethren, who claim the blessings of this covenant on account of the identity of the Jewish and Christian churches, do not lay claim to their inheritance in Canaan, nor do they attend to the everlasting mark which every child of the covenant was to have made in his flesh. We are Gentiles, I seem to hear some one say, and not the *natural* seed of Abraham. If, then, the spiritual seed, only, are interested, Paul explains it in a few words—‘If ye be Christ’s then are ye Abraham’s seed and heirs according to the promise.’ In neither case can unbelieving children of Gentiles obtain a place—neither in the land of Canaan nor in the church. Nor can they from the terms of the covenant be either circumcised or baptized.

The great mistake with many seems to be, that they suppose they bear the same relation to Abraham that the Jews, his natural descendants, do; and, therefore, they are entitled to the same promises and privileges with them. When it comes to the seal, or token, then they tell us it is changed. But, *never* do they point to the passage in the Bible to prove it. No: the proof of this is to be found in naked assertion, catechisms, treatises, and traditions received from the councils of the church of Rome.

Abraham is the father of all the faithful, not as a natural ancestor, but as an eminent model of faith in God. Much in the same sense that Tubal Cain is the father of all artificers in brass or iron. And as it regards the sign of circumcision, it is not a seal, nor ever has been, to any other than Abraham himself. To him, it was a seal of the righteousness which he had long before it was imprinted upon him, for the express purpose of designating him as the

father, or example, of all them that believe, without respect to natural generation, and also without respect to circumcision or uncircumcision. Rom. 4: 11—13, Gal. 3: 29.

The Jews, the natural seed, were not permitted to enter the kingdom of Christ without repentance and faith. The Pharisees urged the plea that Abraham was their father, but John insisted on it, that *proxy* faith would not answer in the spiritual, discriminating kingdom of the Redeemer. "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire," Math. 3: 10. Whether they thought the Jewish nation was the same with the kingdom of Christ, and that because they were the descendants of Abraham, they had an undoubted right to the blessings of the church of Christ, it does not positively say. It would seem, from this and other passages, that they had much the same views with our Pædobaptist brethren, with this addition, they thought that as the Gentile converts pretended to be the children of Abraham, they ought to be circumcised, as that was the law and token of that everlasting covenant! They urged this matter so far that the Apostles were obliged to meet in consultation upon the subject at Jerusalem. It is worthy of remark, that at that council called to deliberate on the subject of circumcision, instead of the Apostles urging in behalf of the Gentiles, that they had in baptism attended to the law of the covenant, they never speak of baptism at all, nor do they yield to the clamors of the Jews about the obligations of the covenant made with Abraham, the uncircumcision of the Gentiles, &c. And not a single word do they say about baptism coming in the room of circumcision. On the

supposition that this was the case, their silence is unaccountable, Acts 15: 1—22.

Abraham is called by Paul a good olive tree, because he received along with promises of temporal blessings for the Jewish nation *enmasse*, promises of spiritual blessings for all believers in Christ, THE SEED OF PROMISE, Rom. 11: 13—34, Gal. 3: 16. See Dr. McKnight, in *Loco*.

This is in accordance with the nature of that dispensation. It was typical. The gospel was preached through the types to Abraham. All of the temporal blessings of the Jews were typical of the spiritual blessings which believers now enjoy. And hence the complex character of some of the promises.—Their primary application was to the natural seed, and related to their temporal privileges. Their secondary application is to all the spiritual seed of Christ, the children of Abraham by faith, and relate to their spiritual blessings, of which the temple with all its ceremonies, circumcision, &c. &c. are all typical. Circumcision was a type of the new birth, not of baptism. The Paschal lamb was typical of the atonement of Christ, not of the Lord's supper. The connection of the Jews with natural Abraham in the covenant of circumcision, under the figure of the olive tree and branches, was typical of the connection between believers in Christ with faithful Abraham. The Jews were broken off by unbelief, and the believing Gentiles and Jews are grafted in by faith, or regeneration, of which circumcision was the type, Gal. 5: 1—6.

The Jewish kingdom or church was by no means the same with the kingdom or church of Christ.—Daniel prophesied of the kingdom of God which

should be set up in the days of the Cæsars, unlike all others which preceded it, spiritual in its nature, and eternal in its duration. Dan. 2. 44. Into which none were admitted without fruits worthy of repentance, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Math. 3. Acts 2. The Jews were enraged at the Saviour because he did not consent to their views of the Nation, and deliver them from the Roman yoke, and at last crucified him. His kingdom and theirs, the same! From the haughty children of Abraham, the circumcised subjects of the Jewish kingdom, He turned away in disgust, after having told them that they were of their father the Devil, and said to his little band of disciples, "Fear not, little flock, it is your father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." "As many as *received* him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that *believe* on his name; which were born, not of *blood*, nor of the *will of the flesh*, nor of the will of man, but of God." John 1: 12—13.

The reader may clearly see the difference between the covenant of circumcision and the covenant of grace. They were both included in the promise made to Abraham in the covenant recorded in Gen. 17, and are spoken of by Paul in Gal. 4, and Heb. 8th and 9th chapters. Here is the contrast.

ABRAHAMIC COVENANT.

OLD COVENANT.

The old covenant was only a *temporal* relation betwixt God and a particular nation, which is now *done away* and come to an end; Heb. 8: 13.

NEW COVENANT.

1. The new covenant is an *eternal* relation betwixt God and his people from among all nations, and is therefore called an *everlasting covenant*. Heb 13: 20.

II. The old covenant was *carnal* and *earthly*:

1. In its *worship*, which stood only in meats and drinks and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, Heb. 9: 10.

2. In its *sacrifices* of bulls and goats, which could never take away sin, or purge the conscience. Heb. 9: 9, and 10: 4.

3. In its *mediator*, viz: Moses. Gal. 3: 19.

4. In its *priests*, viz: Aaron and his sons, who were sinful men, and not suffered to continue by reason of death. Heb. 7: 23—28

5. In its *sanctuary*, which was worldly and made with hands. Heb. 9: 1—24.

6. In its *promises*; they being worldly blessings in earthly places, and respecting only a prosperous life in the earthly Canaan. Deut. 28: 1—15, Is. 1: 19, Josh. 21: 43—45, and 23: 14—16.

7. In its *subjects*, or people covenanted; they being the fleshly seed of Abraham, children of the temporal promise, related to God as his typical people, and to Christ as his kinsman according to the flesh; which typical and fleshly relation availed them much for the enjoyment of the typi-

II. The new covenant is *spiritual* and *heavenly*.

1 In its *worship*, which requires a true heart, faith, and a good conscience, and to be performed in spirit and truth, Heb 10: 19—23, John 4: 23.

2 In its *sacrifice*, which is Christ, and which perfects forever them that are sanctified, Heb 10: 14.

3 In its *mediator*, viz: Christ Jesus, Heb 12: 24.

4 In its *priest*, viz: Christ, who is holy, harmless, &c. and abideth priest continually, ever living to make intercession for us, Heb 7: 24—26.

5 In its *sanctuary*, which is heaven itself, whereinto our great High Priest hath entered, having obtained an eternal redemption for us, Heb 9: 12.

6 In its *promises*: they being spiritual blessings in heavenly places, and chiefly respecting the life to come, and the enjoyment of the heavenly inheritance, Eph 1: 3, Tit 1: 2, Heb 8; 6, and 11: 16.

7 In its *subjects*; they being the spiritual seed of Abraham, typified by the fleshly seed; being chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world; predestinated unto the adoption of children, and redeemed by the blood of Christ. These are the children of the promise, who, in God's appointed

cal and earthly privileges of this covenant; but as Hagar, the bond woman, was cast out with her son born after the flesh, so the covenant itself being antiquated, its temporal, typical, privileges vanished, its subjects cast out and disinherited; the fleshly relation upon which they received circumcision, availed nothing for their partaking of spiritual privileges, nor were they, as children of this covenant, admitted heirs with the children of the free woman, or new covenant, Rom 9: 4-9, Gal 6: 15, and 4: 22-23.

Will our Pædobaptist brethren in despite of the declarations of immutable truth, and all our entreaties persist in claiming relationship to Abraham through Hagar, and tenaciously cling to the old covenant?

time, are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God: being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, even by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever: who have the law of God written in their hearts, and all know him from the least to the greatest. Through this work of the Spirit, they believe in the name of the Son of God, and by the profession of this their faith, they appear to be the seed of Abraham, children of the free woman, and heirs according to the promise, to whom belong all spiritual privileges, and baptism among the rest Eph 1: 4-5, 1st Peter 1: 18-19, John 1: 13, 1st Peter 1: 23, Heb 8: 10: 11, Gal 3: 26-29, and 4: 28-31, Acts 2: 41-42.

From the above contrast it appears that the old covenant together with the things appertaining to it, were only earthly patterns of things in the heavens, Heb. 9: 23,—figures for that time, ver 2—shadows of good things to come, Heb. 10: 1, imposed upon typical Israel until the time of reformation, chap 10: 10, under which they were shut up to the faith that should afterwards be revealed, Gal. 3: 23. So that aside from their typical reference, there was nothing spiritual or heavenly in them. And as this covenant was typical and earthly, so were the covenant-

ed people. In order to enjoy its privileges it was not necessary for them to be regenerated or believe in Christ. If they were the fleshly seed, and were circumcised, they were members in good standing in that typical church or nation, though they should be worshippers of idols, as many of them were.

Though some of the fleshly Israel were of the spiritual Israel, they were not so by their fleshly relation to Abraham, nor by the temporal promise concerning his natural seed, to which circumcision belonged; but by faith, through grace, in the notable SEED, the Mediator of the new covenant, of which their fleshly relation and temporal covenant were but types, or were earthly patterns, Rom. 11: 5—7, Heb. 11. 13—39, 40.

Unless we keep the distinction clearly drawn, while running the parallel between Abraham's two-fold seed, we shall confound those born of the flesh with those born of the Spirit. Whether our Pædobaptist brethren mistake this matter altogether, or whether they multiply words to confound this doctrine, we cannot say. It is very certain, that type and antitype hold the same proportion with flesh and spirit, shadow and substance, earth and heaven; and therefore, the distinction between the two-fold seed, *must* be observed. Now, the whole argument of the Dr. runs upon the supposition, that the fleshly seed of New Testament believers are as really the spiritual seed of Abraham as the infants of old Israel were his fleshly seed. This is an absurd supposition! A premise without the shadow of proof! A mere assumption on which men have builded a Jewish Gentile church state; such as infidel France—superstitious Italy—bloody Spain, &c. &c.,

wherever, in short, the barrier that Christ set up between his church and the world, has been broken down, by the influence of this doctrine. Hence, the confusion manifest in the reasoning of the advocates of this system. Sometimes they argue that the children of believers should be baptised, because *they are* the children of believers, and therefore members of the church; then, perhaps, in the next paragraph, they contend that they should be baptised to initiate them into the church. So that one destroys the other. For, if members by birth, then baptism does not initiate them into the church. If they become so by baptism, then they are not such by birth. These phrases are used alternately by the Dr., with great frequency, as though he supposed his hearers and readers would accept of them as synonymous in logic, well established premises, or correctly drawn conclusions, notwithstanding they devour each other, in toto. If the fleshly seed of Abraham typified the fleshly seed of believing Gentiles, then, the spiritual seed—the true antitype, are superceded by the fleshly seed of the Gentiles—or in other words, this would destroy the distinction between the type and antitype. Upon the above supposition, the typical beasts offered in sacrifice, under the former dispensation, must have antitypes under the gospel, in kind and character with themselves. Unless this is admitted, it follows undeniably that the natural seed of Abraham, *born of the flesh* according to the *temporal* promise, typified his *spiritual* seed, *born of the Spirit* according to the promise of the New Testament. The conclusion is triumphant that baptism belongs *only* to the spiritual seed of Abraham, whether they be Jews or Gentiles.

“ If they are Christ’s, then are they Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” “ He that *believeth* and is baptised, shall be saved,” whether Abraham or Cornelius be his fleshly father, or not.

The spiritual seed are distinguished from the world, and their right to the ordinance of baptism established by the following considerations, in addition to the *express* and *definite* command of Christ :

1. The fleshly birth of the natural and spiritual seed of Abraham are common to both, and therefore it does not distinguish them.

2. Without the character of the sons of God, they are not the spiritual seed ; but “ being born of blood, of the will of the flesh, and of the will of man,” (as are the infants of believers as well as others) does not give that character—therefore, only believers are subjects of baptism. John 1 : 13.

3. The spiritual birth has no necessary connection neither natural nor federal, with the fleshly birth, therefore, the former can never be inferred from the latter. It is the result of election, and not of earthly relationship. Naturally, we are children of wrath. Nor have we as spiritual seed, any federal connection with the fleshly birth. For the new covenant is not made with the natural seed of believers, as the old temporal covenant was with the fleshly seed of Abraham.

4. The natural seed of believers can no more be counted the spiritual seed, than the natural seed of Abraham ; and the Apostle says, that they are not according to the flesh “ accounted for the seed.”

5. Observation proves, that some of the natural seed of believers become spiritual, but it also proves that the children of infidels become Christians. It

proves too, that some of the children of both are carnal, impenitent, and die in their sins. Therefore, *christening* does the latter no good; while baptism is the duty and privilege of all who believe.

6. If the above proposition be correct, then it follows that no judgment can be formed of the character and destiny of men either from the faith or infidelity of their parents. And therefore, baptism belongs only to those described in the command. From the nature of the institutions of circumcision and baptism, it is utterly impossible that one could be placed in the room of the other. They are totally dissimilar, —they agree in nothing more than *any other two things*, of which we can form a conception. That this may be obvious to every eye, prejudiced or not, I here present the contrast in the juxtaposition of the ordinances.

CIRCUMCISION.

BAPTISM.

1. Circumcision was expressly limited to males.

2. Circumcision required no previous profession of faith and repentance.

3. Circumcision did not denote the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

4. Circumcision belonged to Abraham's family, either natural or adopted.

5. This was to be done on the eighth day precisely.

6. Infants were commanded to be circumcised.

1. The Baptismal institution includes both *men* and *women*.

2. The gospel requires this profession without exception to age, parentage, or circumstance.

3. "We are buried with Christ by baptism," and rise with him in the same.

4. Baptism belongs to believers of all nations, and is not in this respect a wall of partition.

5. Baptism is to be performed at any time that men believe.

6. Infants are nowhere commanded to be baptised.

7. The Bible never calls circumcision, baptism.

8. A male servant, bought with money, whether an atheist or believer was to be subject to the rite as well as the seed.

9. It was a painful—bloody rite, not performed on the face or forehead.

10. It was administered by either of the heads of the family, and not by priests.

11. The uncircumcised were not permitted to mingle with the worshippers under that dispensation.

12. It forbade the usual civilities of social life to the uncircumcised.

13. It was a duty not binding on the child, but on the parent. It was an act of the parent. The child was neutral.

14. Circumcision required no faith in the parent to entitle the child to this ordinance. It was done to the child irrespective of the moral character of the parent.

15. It was not performed as an act of worship in the name of the Trinity, but merely as a token or a sign of a covenant between God and the family of Abraham.

16. It imported that those who received it were entitled to all the promises made to Ab-

7. The Bible never calls baptism, circumcision.

8. Baptism is applied to none but those who believe—who are made “free by the Son,” and profess faith for themselves in his name.

9. Baptism is neither the one nor the other, but simply an immersion in water.

10. Baptism, is to be administered by those only who are qualified and commissioned to preach.

11. No such distinction is made by the law of baptism. The gospel is to be preached unto all.

12. But baptism does not prohibit this,—it rather encourages it.

13. Baptism is obligatory on the subject. He must not be neutral, “repent and be baptised.”

14. If baptism be the substitute now, the privileges of infants are greatly abridged, for multitudes go without, on account of new regulations in Judaized Churches.

15. Baptism is a religious, solemn act of worship rendered to God, and administered in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

16. But baptism does not import that its subjects shall

raham concerning his natural seed. enjoy any such temporal blessings.

17. The Jews who had received this rite were not exempt from baptism when they believed, and therefore the latter could not have come in the room of the former. They were not sealed twice. 17. Those, now, who are baptised or *rantised* by inference from the law of circumcision, ought to be baptised when they believe, in obedience to the command of Christ.

Under the Jewish dispensation, Jehovah administered a moral government by a system of external law,—moral, ceremonial and judicial; which embodied the same principles of justice and mercy that are more fully presented in the gospel dispensation; and traced by the hand of the Spirit, not on tables of stone, but on fleshly tables of the heart. Hence, the latter is called the ministration of the Spirit, which is more glorious than the ministration of law that was “done away” and *abolished*. 2 Cor. 3: 7-17.

Though, our brethren admit that the ceremonial law was abolished, and therefore not obligatory upon Christians, yet, they fancy there must be something in the room, at least of one of them. One seems to spring somehow from the ashes of the other. The former abolished, nailed to the cross,—i. e. crucified. dead, and yet, still living! The law of circumcision still living and in force! What is still more wonderful, is, that they *infer* infant baptism from it, and suppose, that this meets the claims of that law! Jonah, was certainly as near going to Ninevah while on his way to Tarshish, as our brethren are to the fulfilment of the law of circumcision, when they baptise their children.

Furthermore, if the two dispensations are one, if the Jewish nation and the kingdom of Christ are the

same, if the congregation of Israel and the churches of Christ are identical, it follows, that the Pharisees, after all, were right, in requiring believers in the days of the Apostles, to be circumcised and keep the law of Moses.

But Dr. P., says p. 37, that "though one sign of this relation has been abolished, another has been appointed," and that "He who appointed circumcision to be the sign of his covenant under the former dispensation, has under the milder dispensation of the gospel appointed baptism." Now, why does the Dr. so adroitly shuffle from the point? Why did he not add "baptism to be *the sign* of the covenant under this dispensation; and then produce *one* text to prove that it came in the room of circumcision? This he well knew he could not do. Words may be multiplied to equal the stars in the sky, but one proof is worth more than all of them, where religious duty and the honor of God are involved.

On p. 44, the Dr. argues that because a change of heart, the spiritual circumcision, is the antitype of the fleshly circumcision, therefore baptism came in its room. This unwarrantable mode of arguing would destroy the whole of the typical system, if followed out. If baptism is the antitype of circumcision, then regeneration is not; and then it would follow, that circumcision was a type of a type, a shadow of a shadow! In opposition to this, Paul declares, that the "Law was a shadow of good things to come, but the *body* is *Christ*," and not baptism.

So that, the substitution of baptism for circumcision is not only totally unfounded in the Bible, but it is destructive of the divinely appointed relation between the types of the former dispensation, and the spiritual blessings of the present.

The third lecture, is commenced with a repetition of what the author had often in substance before stated concerning the "sacred community," infant membership, and instituted sign of that membership, &c. It were easy to show that the "sacred community" were a stiff-necked people—a generation of vipers, and the murderers of our Lord; and that the principal blessing peculiar to them was the possession of the "Oracles of God," which to infants is not of much interest. And as to the "privilege so dear to the heart," the *painful* privilege that the Israelites seemed glad to neglect, we would not "rob" the Dr. nor any other child of Abraham of it, not upon any account; nor yet, of the more pleasant privilege of human device, substituted; if we did not think that Christ is robbed of his glory as Lawgiver in Zion thereby. In regard to "cutting off the children from the Christian church," we remark, it is impossible, for the simple reason that they were never numbered among the primitive churches. The Dr. in this respect is cruel to the dear children, for after he initiates them, he prohibits them from enjoying the privileges of the church. 'Thousands, have received the *sign*, have been *christened*, are within the *pales*, and have not been taken *once* to the Lord's table to commemorate the death of the Saviour! Did Christ prohibit any of his disciples? Why, the Jewish children partook of the paschal supper, and are not the privileges of the gospel "greatly enlarged?"

There is abundant proof that the church of Jesus Christ is not the congregation of Israel led by Moses. The same principles of justice and mercy were exhibited under both, but the form was totally different. Circumcision was a part of the *form*. It was

appointed, and abolished, with the whole typical system of which it was a part. Nothing was appointed in its stead. It ceased to be binding upon the believing Jews. It never was obligatory upon Gentiles. But when God set up a kingdom for his Son, He appointed two ordinances, Baptism and the Communion, for the observance of all believers in every age, as evidences of their love, and fruits of their faith in the Messiah. That this has no connexion with the Jewish nation whatever, I proceed to show. John the Baptist was sent to proclaim the approach of the kingdom of heaven, and the Pharisees requested admission on the ground that they were children of Abraham, but they were refused. The Gospel kingdom, was not the Jewish, or their plea would have availed them. Faith and repentance were required as pre-requisites to admission: Every tree was required to bear good fruit for itself. Proxy faith, nor pious ancestry would not answer this discriminating spiritual dispensation. Mark 3: 7-12. 4: 17. 10: 7. 11: 13. "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God." John did baptise in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance. &c. Mark 1: 1-5. "The Law and the Prophets were until John:" since that time the kingdom of God is preached. Luke 16: 16. From those passages it is clearly proved that the former dispensation or church state ceased, and that it had no connection with the gospel churches whatever. The sceptre departed from Judah, because Shilo had come, to whom, and not to the standard of Moses, *the people* were to gather. The church of Christ, therefore, is not the same with the Jewish church, altho' the principles of piety are the same under all dispen-

sations. As "the right of infant baptism" never existed, we cannot otherwise than deny it, if we wish to obey the Bible. It did not exist in the former dispensation. It is not mentioned once in the Old Testament, nor in the New. The Dr. says, "to demand positive and express authority for infant baptism from the New Testament, is unreasonable." But if it is not in the Old, it seems *very reasonable*, we should ask for it in the New, especially, as baptism is a New Testament ordinance. I suppose, our brethren would rather we would not question its authority at all. It is like the celebration of mass. It can only be proven from the *silence* of the Bible.

On p. 48, the Dr. intimates that *satisfactory* proof can be adduced from the New Testament for infant baptism. He does not say "positive and express authority." Intelligent *Protestants*, however, profess to desire *express* authority, for whatever they do in the name of Christ, especially, in relation to positive institutes. If the duty is not *expressed* in law, there is no such duty of course; nor can any man be disobedient in neglecting it: for if "there is no *law*, there is no transgression." The Dr. says there is no difficulty in producing satisfactory proof, and Protestants profess that it must be *expression*, and not silence. *Express* proof, is not found in the New Testament, so the Dr. proceeds to draw inferences again. I will follow him, and show that they are as unfounded, and far-fetched, as when he labors to get baptism out of the law of circumcision.

His first argument is founded on Gal. 3: 29. "If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." "So then they which be of *faith* are blessed with faithful Abraham." v. 9. "For

as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse," v. 10. Now it is proven from the same chapter that believers alone are children of the exemplar of faith. And it follows, that they who cling to circumcision, a work of the law, are under the curse. And we have seen, that the rite was a bloody and painful one, not a "precious privilege," not a *seal* of righteousness to any but Abraham, not a *sign* of spiritual character.

Through the whole of this argument the author *assumes* that circumcision was the sign of an interest in the covenant of grace, and that baptism supplies its place. But, not a single proof does he present to sustain his positions. The words of our Saviour, are next quoted, "Suffer little children to come unto me," &c. We could quote scores of Pædobaptist authors against the Dr. upon this subject. See Ann of Poole's Continuator and Dodridge on this text. I believe, no one has ever before pretended, that this passage proves infant baptism. It says not a word upon the subject; no more, than on the subject of making the sign of the cross upon them. The Saviour blessed them, but he did not baptise them, for he baptised no one. John 4: 2. The interpretation of the phrase "kingdom of heaven" is not sustained. The Patriarchs were not in the visible kingdom of heaven when those words were spoken, consequently, none from the east or west, north or south, could set down *with* them. Our Saviour represents persons of certain characters, as endeavoring to enter the gate-way of heaven, who when they get within the entrance, are found to be destitute of the wedding garment, and are therefore cast out. Such were the Pharisees, who were persuaded by their

Rabbis, that they were sufficiently righteous to enter the visible and invisible kingdom, in as much as they were the *seed*, and had the *sign*. But while such were rejected, the blessed Redeemer, says, that children are of the kingdom of heaven; and that their angels do always behold the face of my Father in heaven. And Paul tells us that angels are ministering spirits to them who shall be heirs of salvation. From all which, we learn that the principal part of the inhabitants of the kingdom of glory, will be composed of those who die in infancy. This unspeakable blessing, is not obtained by birth, baptism, circumcision, nor any other work of man, but by the election of grace, through the blood of Christ. The church of Rome hath ordained, that as many children may die without baptism at the hand of the Priest, and therefore, be lost, unless they be baptised by some one, parents or any one may perform the *saving* ceremony. The labor the Dr. has performed, and the size of his book, would lead one to suppose he attached equal importance to this custom. The next argument is, from the preaching of Peter on the day of Pentecost. And the very first effort seems to be, to divert the attention of the reader from the particular promise to which the apostle refers. Is it possible that the Dr. is unacquainted with the *promise* here spoken of? If he had not referred to it before, I should be disposed to such a conclusion. I confess my astonishment that the Dr. should say that it was the promise made to Abraham. Is there no other promise in the Bible? I hope the reader of the lectures desires to know the *truth*. If so, he will carefully read the passage, Acts 2: 16—39, in which he will easily perceive that the promise is not that

made to Abraham, but that which is recorded in Joel 2: 28—32. And Peter, says, in contradiction of the Dr. “This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel.” v. 16. The promise of the pouring forth of the Holy Spirit, upon some of the posterity of the Jews, can have no application to infants whatever. The gifts were miraculous. “Your sons and daughters shall prophecy, your young men shall see visions. And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit.” Accordingly, the disciples on that occasion spake with tongues, seventeen languages, and prophesied. Were the infants thus engaged? Did they preach?

After all the Dr. has not found one word in the chapter, on the subject of *infant* baptism. Children in the passage means posterity, descendants. The Greek word, is not the same which expresses a state of infancy. And the promise, is limited to as many as the “Lord shall call,” whether they shall be Jews or Gentiles. Hence, “they that *gladly received the word*, were baptised.” v. 41. Afterwards, they partook of the Lord’s Supper. But the infants, were not considered subjects of either ordinance at that time.

The third argument, proposes to get something from the practice of the apostles to favor this scheme of making Christians of the poor babes, *nolens volens*. But, we shall now see, that there is not a trace of it in the history of the first churches.

Of the thousands who were baptised on the day of Pentecost, and in Samaria, there is no mention made of believer’s households. It is not said that they and their children were baptised. In Samaria, “both men and women” were baptised, but no children.

Now, on the supposition that children were baptised, is it not unaccountable that the historian never once mentions it? They never regarded them as proper subjects of baptism. In the case of the households, there is abundant proof that there were no infants in them. This, we cheerfully furnish, although it is the duty of our opponents to prove the contrary. To do this, in the case of Lydia, they must first prove that she ever had a husband. If any think she had, where was he, that he was not attending to his merchandising? And if this could be proved, it remains to be shown, that she had children in *infancy*. There are thousands of households without any children, and thousands more without young children. This, therefore, does not appear from the record. She was about three hundred miles from home, and evidently had no children in infancy with her at Philippi. But, if we were to admit all of the preceding, it cannot be proved that infants were baptised, from the word household or family. Thus in 1 Sam. 1: 21, it is said that "Elkanah and *all his house*, went up to offer up the yearly sacrifice, and his vow." But, it is added v. 23, Hannah went not up; and in verse 23, that "So she abode, and gave her son suck until she weaned him." Samuel and his mother were not included in the term. Our Saviour says, Math 10: 36, that, "A man's foes shall be those of his own *household*." Surely, infants are not a man's foes. We are commanded to do good to the *household* of faith, Gal. 6: 10. None will contend that *infants* are of that household.

That there were no infants in Lydia's household, is perfectly evident from the fact recorded in Acts 16: 40. "And they went out of the prison (Paul and

Silas) and entered into the house of Lydia: and when they had seen the *brethren* they *comforted them*, and departed." Now, who ever heard of *infants* being called *brethren*? Who supposes that the promises of the gospel, the only consolation the apostles had to impart, would *comfort infants*? Credulous must he be, that can believe there were infants in the family of Lydia!

Of the house of Stephanas it is positively said, 1 Cor. 16 : 15, that "the house of Stephanas * * * the first fruits of Achaia, * * * *addicted* themselves to the *ministry* of the saints." What precocious powers these *infants* must have possessed, if the guess of the Dr. were true! Moreover, the apostle beseeches the churches of Corinth, to "submit unto such," in the next verse. Will our Pædobaptist friends yield the reins of the church to the hands of such? This would be a great change in their condition. Heretofore they have only had the *name* of being in the church, merely within its pales, but upon the supposition of the Dr. and in obedience to Paul, a change of places must occur: "Submit yourselves unto such," is the command. In the face of these facts, what becomes of the "legitimate conclusion!"

The jailor of Philippi and his household are next to be examined. The Dr. says there is no intimation, "that any one in these different households believed, except the head of the family," and then waits for a reply. I cheerfully present it. Turn, now, to the "law and the testimony." I speak to the reader, as well as the preacher. Acts 16 : 29—34. When the jailor cried out, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" they said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shall be saved, and thy house," upon the same

terms, as I suppose. "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to *all* that were in his house." Were infants subjects of gospel instruction, or discipleship?" "And he took them * * * washed their stripes; and was baptised, he and all his, straitway,"—"all his," who had been instructed, and believed in Christ, as the jailer himself did. "And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and *rejoiced, believing in God, WITH ALL HIS HOUSE.*" Here the Holy Spirit emphatically declares that *all his house* BELIEVED; not by *proxy*, but in their own souls. Proxy faith, is not in the Bible. Prayers for the dead, are as Scriptural, as proxy faith. See Mathew Henry, Dr. Dodridge, and Calvin on this passage, how they demolish the pædobaptist argument.

I have replied, and proved, that all in the house *believed*; but the Dr. will *never* fulfil his promise. I have the infallible testimony of the everlasting and unerring Spirit, and the law of the Lord, that believers, only, are the proper subjects of baptism. And he, therefore, who utters the sacred name of the august Trinity, over a misapplication of this ordinance, does it without either "law" or "authority," and would do well to ponder the Divine warning, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless, that taketh his name in vain."

The Dr's. remark on the house of Boaz amounts to nothing, for, according to the text adduced, it was a house, or household, as soon as the marriage was consummated; nor does the wish, that it should be enlarged, alter the case; it was still nothing more than a house, or household. The quotation from Paul's

letter to Timothy, is equally inconclusive; for children partly grown, need more ruling than infants, unless they are believers, which is sometimes the case, even, at the age of eight or ten years.

The reference made to proselyte baptisms is of little consequence in this controversy. Dr. Owen and many other pædobaptists argue that no such custom existed among the Jews. All concede that there were "divers washings" among them; and it is equally plain, that bathing has been in practice among the Gentiles from time immemorial, in which, of course, children were included, because they stood in need of washing. But who supposes that when our Lord appointed a positive ordinance for the observance of his followers in every age, that he would adopt a rite, because it was a custom prevalent among men? Did his own mental resources fail him? Absurd supposition! Baptism, is an ordinance of Jesus Christ; and he who commenced the administration of this sacred rite, was a "man sent from God," who did not think of looking after "washings" among men, but who regarded only the authority of God. "He who sent me to baptise," &c. John 1 : 33.

As the Dr. could find no proof in the practice of the Apostles for infant baptism, the effort to gain something from Jewish purifications, appears to be a kind of *dernier* resort. For, he might as well argue, that because all parents in the land, wash themselves and their children, therefore, the children of believers ought to be baptised!

Under his fourth head, he endeavors to find infant membership in the case of the believing and unbelieving parents. 1 Cor. 7 : 14. "Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." Some of the

members of the church at Corinth had some doubt of the propriety of living with an unconverted partner. The apostle instructs them to abide with their unbelieving husbands or wives, for, the one he says is sanctified by the other, i. e. the unbelieving by the believing. And the propriety of this, he shows by the consequence that would follow the contrary supposition, "Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." Believing in Christ, does not nullify the sacred relation of marriage, but renders it more endearing, and secures to the children of such parent or parents more tender care, as their legitimate offspring, and thus sanctifies the relation to all concerned. And he further declares, that it is probable under the divine blessing, that the believing partner, by abiding with the unbelieving partner, might win such an one to Christ.

The term, "holy" in the passage is employed in the sense of "legitimate." The apostle says, that "Marriage is honorable to all, the bed *undefiled*," &c. The parents in the church at Corinth were married, and their children were legitimate, pure or holy, because their parents were married, and the bed undefiled, legitimate, pure, or holy. The law of faith, does not therefore make void either the connubial or parental relation. And this was the doubt of these Corinthians. If the marriage relation, were dissolved by the possession of faith on the one part, then, the apostle would seem to argue, that the filial and paternal relation would also be dissolved in that case. Both the unbelieving partner and children stood in the same relation to the believing partner, and therefore the same to the church. So that, if the believing partner were to cast off the unbelieving partner,

she must also cast off her children, for their relation to her, grows out of her relation to her husband. And if our brethren will baptise the children, therefore, because they are *sacredly* related to their believing mother, they must also baptise the unbelieving husband, for he is equally *sanctified* by his believing wife. We are shut up to this conclusion. And now we ask the Dr. which is the most "ridiculous," the sense of "legitimate," or the legitimate conclusion from the Dr's. premise ?

The baptists contend that "holy" matrimony secures "legitimacy" or cleanness to the descendants, independent of faith in the parent or parents. And as to the dedication of which the Dr. speaks, it is without the shadow of foundation. He is upon this, as upon circumcision, self-contradictory. The argument amounts to this, the children ought to be dedicated, because they are born holy of believing parents. They ought to be made holy by dedication, because their parents are believers. This is precisely of a piece with the argument, that because, they are children of the seed of Abraham, they have a right to baptism, being in the covenant, by birth; and ought to be baptised because it is the initiating ordinance into the covenant.

There is no wish manifest in the Dr's. argument that the servants, should partake of the seal, as they did in Abraham's day. No desire, that they should be taken into covenant relation with God, by baptismal dedication on the strength of the faith of the head of the household. This is a gross departure from the stipulations of the covenant. Surely, if the unbelieving husband can be sanctified, and the children of such be baptised, there might be room in some

corner of the covenant for the poor orphan servants, especially, as the privileges of the covenant are "much enlarged" in this dispensation! Cannot these poor souls be "included in the bond of God's covenant with his church?" "The child inherits the privileges of the covenant from the believing parents," and yet, there is no such mercy in this scheme for the servant of the seed, though both his master and mistress may be believers! What, is the gospel dispensation less "benign" than the covenant of circumcision? Though I ask these questions to show how inconsistent these brethren are with their professed attachment to the covenant of circumcision, I do not wonder that they do not "care for the soul" of their servants in this respect, for, they who can invade the prerogative of Immanuel to give laws to his people by superceding them, and "making them void by men's traditions," and thus rob Him of his glory as King in Zion, can without scruple refuse to give the *infant servant*, the "benefits of the covenant." This "right," is now denied them, though it would seem that our brethren think that the salvation of the soul depends upon having the sprinkling seal, upon their foreheads. If this is not the sentiment, why do they labor so hard and so long to *eke* out of some dark passage a little inferential proof for their favorite device? The Bible, however, remains as silent as the grave on the subject of infant baptism. And Christ is still demanding our confidence as the only foundation of our hope, for the salvation of our own souls, and that of the souls of our children. May we not "crucify Him afresh and put him to an open shame," by disbelieving the fulness of his grace, the completeness of his righteousness, the efficacy of his blood,

the *sealing* of his Spirit; and leaning upon a *christening* ceremony of man's invention! Infidel France, superstitious Germany, Italy with her sales of new-made relics of the cross, and traffic in indulgences, and seat of the Beast, bloody Spain, Portugal and Mexico, and degraded South America are specimens of the baleful tendency of this anti-christian practice. All of these are *christened*.

Although Christ declared to his disciples, that his "kingdom is not of this world," yet, men have taken it upon themselves in opposition to the word of God, to open this *sluice*, for the world to flow into it, until pure christianity both in its spirit and form is almost entirely obscured. For centuries, it was to be found not in the *christened* church, but in the remote vallies of Piedmont, and in the mountains of Wales, represented as heretical by the anti-christian power that was erected and rested on this main pillar of Popery. Trusting, to this sprinkling operation, millions of souls in mystical Babylon, have gone securely to ruin. With the introduction of this error, nearly all of the errors of the anti-christian church were introduced. Infant baptism and infant communion were originated at the same date, and rest on the same ground. The Jewish children partook of the paschal lamb as well as the "precious privilege" of circumcision. They both originated in Africa, the darkest part in Christendom; and with them the consecration of water,—the use of sponsors—the sign of the cross—the form of renouncing—unction—anointing with oil—the giving a mixture of milk and honey to persons just baptised—prayers and oblations for the dead, and a score of other fooleries: these, were mentioned by Tertullian for the first time, and afterwards main-

tained and industriously propagated by Augustine. As the Dr. has totally failed to find precept, example, or even a shadow for infant baptism in the word of God, he proceeds page 72, to search the *Pandora* of human tradition, for authority in favor of this custom of the Romish church.

The first reference he makes is to Justin Martyr, who says "we have received the spiritual circumcision, by baptism, by the mercy of God, because we were sinners." Does the Dr. endorse this sentiment taken literally? I have already observed that infant baptism was first practised because of its supposed saving efficacy. This very doctrine is the essence of Antichrist. And the same *expediency* which devised it, also dictated the sale of indulgences, purgatory, pilgrimages, prayers for the dead, &c. &c. I take a different view, however, of the meaning of Justin, from what he afterwards says in his address to the Emperor Antonius Pius. From which we learn he seems to have regarded it not as a *regenerating process*, but the emblem of grace previously received. He says, "I will now lay before you the manner in which, on our own conversion, we dedicate ourselves to God through Christ, lest if I omitted this, my address might be suspected of sincerity. *As many therefore, as are persuaded and believe*, that the things taught and said by us, are true, and take upon them to live accordingly, are taught to pray and ask God, with fastings, the forgiveness of their former sins: we uniting with them in these exercises. Then, *and NOT TILL THEN*, they are brought to a place of water, and there regenerated after the same manner of ourselves." This clearly proves that the "childhood" mentioned by Justin was not infancy. He

moreover professed sincerity in this address before the Emperor. But upon the supposition that they practised infant baptism, he was guilty of the most revolting duplicity. In addition to this, as the apostles baptised none but those who believed, gladly received the word, received the Holy Ghost, &c. These persons must have been old enough to understand and believe the gospel.

In regard to the testimony of Tertullian, I remark, that without perversion it cannot support the cause for which it is adduced. Venema, says, in his history of the church, vol. 3 : p. 108, that "he has nowhere mentioned infant baptism among the customs of the church. For, he dissuades from baptising infants, and proves a delay of it to a more mature age, is to be preferred."

The passage alluded to is as follows : "The delay of baptism may be more advantageous either on account of the condition, disposition or age of any person, especially in reference to little children. For what necessity is there that the sponsors should be brought into danger ? because either they themselves may fail of their promises by death, or be deceived by the growth of evil dispositions (in the children.) The Lord indeed says, 'Do not forbid them to come unto me.' Let them therefore come when they are grown up ; when they can understand ; when they are taught to what they are to come. Let them become christians when they can know Christ. Why should this innocent age hasten to (the sign of) the remission of sins ? Men act more cautiously in earthly things ; so that divine things are here intrusted with whom earthly things are not. Let them know how to seek salvation, that you may appear to give to one that asketh."

Now, does not the reader clearly perceive that infant baptism is referred to by Tertullian on purpose, to disapprove, and condemn it? He represents it as an *innovation*, which he considered his duty, strongly and decidedly to oppose. There is nothing proven, therefore, by the passage, except that persons ought *to know Christ* before they are baptised; and that about that time the error of infant baptism, the sign of the cross, &c., began to be introduced. The reader must always bear in mind, that there is a wide difference between ancient Christianity and primitive Christianity. The former which took its rise in the second century, is what gave the power, the pope, and all the mummeries to the church of Rome. The latter is found alone in the Bible.

The controversy now going on between the Oxford tract, popish party, of the Episcopal church, and the more evangelical party, is upon this very subject, whether the traditions of the Fathers, are of equal authority with the word of God, or not? If the reader will consult Isaac Taylor's new work and Bishop M'Vaine's, he will see many developements of the corruptions of the second and third centuries; and the one which we now oppose among the rest.

The next witness the Dr. introduces is Origen, who was born in the latter part of the second century. He was a learned man says the Dr. I say he was one of the most whimsical interpreters of scripture that ever lived. He was an "everlasting allegorizer" according to a Pædobaptist author, and condemned on different occasions, for his numerous errors. Let history decide between us. Dr. Wall has shown clearly that by babes in Christ was meant by Origen, such as "desire the sincere milk of the

word, spoken of by Peter. The quotation made by the Dr. is a mere interpolation made by Ruffinus, who pretended to translate the Greek of Origen into the Latin language. This is admitted by Dr. Dodridge, and proved by Dr. Gill, from the genuine Greek fragments of his works. Besides, the "Apostle's order" could as easily be seen by us as by Origen, if it were in the New Testament.

The next witness the Dr. brings forward is Cyprian, who gives the decree of a council held in Carthage about in the middle of the third century. The Dr. takes peculiar care to keep back the ground upon which this decision was formed. It would have shown the character of this famous council very much to his disadvantage. This is the very council to which the Romanist refers for authority for exorcism, prayers for the dead, &c. Will the Dr. endorse its doctrines and doings? If he does in one respect, he is bound to do it in all, or it is no authority. But, to the record—Fidus asked, "may children be baptised"? (the question proves that it was a novelty.) To which the council replied, "God denies grace to none; Jesus came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them. Besides, God would be a respecter of persons if he denied to infants what he grants to adults. Did not the prophet Elisha lay upon a child, and put his mouth upon his mouth, and his eyes upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands? Now the spiritual sense of this is, that *infants are equal to men*: but if you refuse to baptise them you destroy this equality and are partial." There, we see baptismal regeneration and more. In the estimation of those corruptors of christianity, baptism, was not only efficacious in saving the sub-

ject, but also miraculous in its power! I had begun to think, as I advanced in the perusal of the work, that the Dr. was disposed to attach saving importance to this business, but I was by no means prepared to suppose he would so verbosely laud the above decision about the miraculous power of this *saving invention*. Gullibility, itself, could not be induced to believe in the purity or wisdom of such a council!

Augustine, is the last witness whom the Dr. introduces. He espoused the cause of infant baptism, and did all in his power to oblige all churches to espouse it too. He was sent as a missionary from the church of Rome to Britain, and met with a christian Association of ministers and members, in the vale of Carleon, and argued with them at great length upon the subject, urging them to receive this custom of his church, but they refused on the ground that it was not found in the word of God, and whereupon, he called upon the soldiery, and cut to pieces several hundred of them for their obstinacy against the "traditions of men." See Iveny's history of the English Baptists. Also, Davis' history of the Welsh Baptists. It ought to be observed here, that Augustine, although a child of christian parents, was not baptised himself until he was grown to manhood. The same remark is true of many others of the Fathers. Under the influence of this monk a council was convened at Carthage, A. D. 416, to condemn the heresy of Pelagius, and from Carthage fourteen of them adjourned to Melo in Numedia. At this council Augustine presided, and succeeded in procuring the passage of the following decree. "It is the pleasure of all the bishops present in the holy Synod, to order that whosoever denieth that infants newly born of

their mothers, are to be baptised, *shall be accursed.*" This decree was sent to Rome and ratified by Pope Innocent, then by Pope Zozimue, and afterwards by Pope Boniface. Thus, this murderous monk served the cause of Popery and the Devil, in first obtaining the ratification of his anathema against the christians, and then under the sanction, and with the power of the Popes, in proceeding to murder the followers of the Lamb, because they refused to "make void the commands of God by the traditions of men." At this time, there were four hundred churches in Africa that refused submission to this imperious prelate, on account of which persecution raged against them until it was said, "it was not Austin's fault that one was left to tell the barbarous tale."

This active tool of the Pope, said that, "he never heard of any one who maintained that baptism is denied to infants." And yet this same fellow once pretended to be of the sect of Manicheans, who every one knows, denied infant baptism. He also taxed Pelagius with the same thing, and complained of other heretics who denied it. The quotation from Pelagius is proved by Dr. Gill, to mean not exactly what Dr. Pressly would have it express. His words are, "that he *never heard*, no, not any impious heretics, that would say concerning infants, what he proposed or mentioned." The phrase *what he proposed or mentioned*, Dr. G. shows does not mean that *infants are not to be baptised*. Moreover, it is evident, that Pelagius did not mean any such thing, from the fact that he was charged by Augustine with denying infant baptism. But, both of these authorities are too late, for all concede that the worship of images commenced before this time, and many other corruptions.

The Donatists, and afterwards the Waldenses and many other churches, who were esteemed heretics, still adhered to believer's baptism, and opposed the innovations of the "general church" (as the Dr. calls it.) And as it regards the prevalence of infant baptism from the time of Augustine down to the Reformation, we readily acknowledge that this was the case in the church of Rome, but it cannot be proved that the christian churches in Piedmont and Britain practiced this device. On the contrary Dr. Allix, William Jones, in his history of the Waldenses, Robison, and others show triumphantly that amid the most cruel persecutions they persisted in opposing this tradition. The records of the church of Rome prove the same thing. This was one of the things charged against them, that they would not submit to the councils and Bishops of the church. See Milner's end of controversy on this subject. Mr. Hughes, charged Mr. Brackenridge with practising infant baptism after the church of Rome, and not according to the Protestant Rule of faith. Mr. Brackenridge did not attempt to deny it.

We close these references with one quotation from Dr. Moshier, the text book of Church history, I suppose, in the Seminary over which the Dr. presides, a Pædobaptist too, *second century*, he says, "The persons to be baptised, after they had repeated the creed, *confessed* and renounced their sins, and particularly the Devil in his pompous allurements, were *immersed under water*, and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." I would refer the reader to scores of other testimonies, in Booth, Hinton, and Carson's works on this subject.

It appears entirely conclusive, that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration was broached at an early day, and then the practice of infant baptism was introduced. While, however, it is inefficient as a saviour, and anti-christian in origin and character, it serves the same purpose as did the traditions of the Pharisees, "to make void the commandments of God."

THE INSTITUTION OF BAPTISM.

In reply to the fourth Lecture, I proceed to consider the institution itself. And here I would premise, that the term *mode* is made use of by our opponents for the sole purpose of destroying the ordinance, which, I hope to make apparent to every mind. I have heretofore spoken of "infant baptism," while discussing the subjects of the ordinance, because the Dr. argues in favor of it. But I shall now show, that while he talks of "infant baptism," he practises infant *rantism*. I am aware that many baptist writers, have followed their brethren in the use of the term *mode* in controversy upon this subject, out of courtesy; while both truth, and the laws of language, have been violated as the necessary consequence. I cannot compromit the claims of righteousness and dishonor Christ, for the sake of politeness to men. The price, is too great, for the purchase of human favor. In the search for Divine obligation, I hope never to be left so much to myself, as to ask for the voice of *the people*. "To the law and the testimony" should be our motto; and implicit submission to the *will of God* should be our greatest pleasure.

PHILOSOPHICAL VIEW.

Every distinct substance, possesses a form, mode, or figure, peculiar to itself or its class. This is true

from the globe down to an atom, whether we regard animate or inanimate creation.

Mathematical science, ascertains the nicer shades of distinction between the forms of substances, and modes of action, by taking its observations from an axiom founded in common sense, viz: 'Two things, cannot be one thing, while totally distinct,—a square and a circle are not the same figure, or the self-evident reason, that they are entirely dissimilar. To confound things which are distinct in form, therefore, would be no more unphilosophical and untrue, than to confound two distinct actions in moral conduct under the same name. But, God has required a specific action, from all intelligent, spiritual subjects of his moral government under the name of baptism, and therefore, no other action is obedience to the divine law than the one specified. If therefore, sprinkling is baptism, immersion is not, for two things cannot be one, while distinct and dissimilar. But, if immersion is baptism, then sprinkling is not, for the same reason. That immersion fulfils the meaning of the Greek word, and is the primary definition, every Lexicographer declares, and all our opponents admit; therefore, sprinkling, being a different action altogether, does not fulfil the requisition of the law. Crossing, or whipping, the subject, would, by parity of reasoning, be as near baptism, as the action of sprinkling the subject.

This becomes more obvious, if we apply the above principle. In morals, as in natural, or mathematical science, in regard to form and figure, every action has modes peculiar to itself. Hence, I may immerse or baptise a person sidewise, forward, or backward. Here are three distinct modes of baptism. So, the

Dr. might rantise or sprinkle a person, with a branch, a broom, or his fingers. Here are three modes of sprinkling, peculiar to the action. These modes, are not transferable from one action to the other, for the common sense reason, that the *actions* are not the same. No man would suppose he could immerse another by any of the modes of sprinkling. Nor, on the other hand, would any man think he had sprinkled another, when he had immersed him. Sprinkling cannot be called a mode of baptism, therefore, without an abuse of language; nor can it be called baptism itself, unless we violate the obvious principles of philosophy, and plain common sense.

Nor, yet, will any man argue, that the Greek language, the most copious in the world, perhaps, is so poor, that it does not afford a name for the action of sprinkling. Our brethren, would seem to wish to give *coloring* to this idea, at least, from the fact, that they use a term whose radical idea is immersion, according to their own admission, to express that of sprinkling; as though, in all the Greek, there were not a single term whose appropriate province it is to express that idea. What then is the corresponding Greek word for the English word sprinkle? I reply, *rantizo*. Now, if the reader will change the termination by substituting *e* for *o* he will transfer it into our language, just as King James's translators transferred the Greek term *baptizo* into our language. Give it the English ending, and you have the word baptise. As the meaning of *baptizo* according to classic usage, and all the Lexicons, is dipping, it would be just as proper, philosophically, and etymologically, for our brethren to call rantism or sprinkling, immersion, as it is for them to call the

action of sprinkling, baptism. But, as sprinkling is not immersion, therefore, it is not baptism. And it follows by consequence, that those who have been sprinkled, have been rantised, and not baptised.

- STRICTURES ON THE PLEA FOR RANTISM.

On page 84 the Dr. argues that the partaking of a small portion of bread and wine cannot properly be called a supper. It is enough for us to know that the Holy Spirit has so called it; and besides no one supposes that the quantity a man eats decides the character of a meal, or that it is necessary to constitute it a supper. So that he eats the bread and drinks the wine, it is all that is required. Eating and drinking the elements, are indispensable, regardless of the *mode* of eating, or the posture of the body. The baptist churches generally, perhaps, universally, administer the communion in the evening of the day

Our author, talks of applying water to the body. This is as if we should speak of applying the ground to the corpse on a funeral occasion. The command says, "baptising *them*" that hear and believe, and the history declares of believers, "*we are buried with Christ by baptism.*" The *person* is the subject, and not the water.

On page 87, the Dr. commences his argument by quoting from Acts 2: 17. If the reader will turn to page 53 of the Lectures, he will discover how easily the Dr. can keep Joel out of sight, and put the promise to Abraham in the mouth of Peter. But, the Dr. was on the *subjects* of baptism when he penned that lecture; and Joel's young men and old men, who should *prophecy*, could not by any process of his, be turned into babes, so as to suit his purpose. Now, the subject is, whether the disciples of our

Lord were sprinkled with the Holy Ghost, or immersed in the Holy Ghost? In support of the former, the Dr. asserts that "the apostles of our Lord were baptised with the Holy Ghost, by having his divine influences *poured out* upon them." But, what saith the record? "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and *it filled all the house* where they were sitting." "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." It appears plainly from the "testimony," that they were completely overwhelmed with the Spirit, as the immersed person is with the water, and also filled with it. Does this look like a *sprinkling* of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost was on them of course, as it was all around and in them, and "filled *all* the house where they were sitting." How unenviable the task of attempting to diminish the grandeur of the Divine displays of grace, for the purpose of depriving the Saviour of the honor due to Him from all of his professing subjects!

It ought to be remembered here that the Greek particle *en* rendered "with" in our version, is rendered in several of the first English versions by the word "in." "I indeed baptise you *in* water and he that cometh after me shall baptise you in the Holy Ghost." Tyndale, has it "in" water, and "with" the Holy Ghost. Matth. 3: 11. In the corresponding passage, in the testimony of Mark 1: 5. it is said they were "baptised *en* in Jordan, for the idea of taking up *the river* and sprinkling it on them would have been too barbarous; nor, could they say

“with the water of the Jordan,” for this would have been such a manifest departure from the original, that the curse in Rev. 22: 19. would have been dreaded by them. But, as the particle *en* may sometimes be rendered “with,” and as the translators were forbidden by King James to translate the term *baptizo*, they so rendered it, in accordance with the practice of the church of Rome. See, preface to old English editions of the received version.

The Dr. seems to be reluctant to let his readers even have one peep into the Greek language. If they could but learn the alphabet, and refer to any Lexicon in the Dr’s. library, they would see that the Greek word for sprinkle is *rantizo*, and that the Greek word *baptizo* means immersion, and nothing else. Sometimes, Lexicographers take license, and put the effect of dipping some three or four removes from the primary radical definition. In doing this the word *wash* is used; which always implies the dipping of the person, hands, cups or other things spoken of.

The time is fast passing away in which the people will be satisfied to take their instructions at the lips of the minister, without reference to the word of God, especially among Protestants. Without acquaintance with the original language, the intelligent reader will naturally ask, whether the Greeks themselves, understand the word *baptizo* to mean, to pour or sprinkle? It is easy to satisfy this inquiry by the most satisfactory testimony.

SIR. P. RICAUT, says that the “Greek church holds plunging to be as necessary to baptism as water is to the matter.” Present state of the Greek Church, page 163.

DR. G. KING—The Greek church uniformly practices immersion, undoubtedly the most primitive manner. Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek church in Russia. p. 192.

DR. WALL—The Greek church, in all the branches of it, does still use immersion. Hist. Inf. Bap. v. II. p. 376. Ed. 3.

In the April number of the Baptist Miss. Magazine for 1841, there is an account of the conversion of a native Greek, who expresses his views upon the ordinance of baptism in which he affirms the same things, viz: That the Greek church had no other view of *baptizo* than dipping, and that they had from the first, immersed the subject.

The next passage the Dr. examines is the allusion Paul makes to the ordinance in 1 Cor. 10: 1, 2. "Brethren, I would not that you should be ignorant, how that all of our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." "They were *under the cloud* and passed through the sea." This exactly agrees with the history, Ex. 14: 29. See also Ex. 13:21, 22, and 14: 19-22. "And were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" The sea stood in walls on either side, and the cloud was over them, between them and the Egyptians, so that they were *buried* from the sight of their enemies. "in the cloud and in the sea." And they walked "upon the dry ground." So that, while they were "baptised in the cloud and in the sea," they were not so much as sprinkled with water. Very unfortunately for the Dr. the cloud was a pillar of fire, and had not, therefore, so much as one drop to sprinkle upon the Israelites, Ex. 13: 21. The Dr. knew that

no one contended contrary to the declaration of Paul, that they were "baptised in the Red sea," in the literal sense of New Testament baptism. And no apology can be found for the insinuation, except it be that the Dr. has no fair argument for rantism in the word of God, and is obliged to resort to the trick of misrepresentation. I might adduce many pædobaptist authorities in favor of my interpretation. One will suffice. *Witsius*. On the Cov. Lib. iv. Chap. 10 § 11, says, that the Apostle used the term "baptism" in a "*figurative sense*." "The cloud hung over their heads, and the sea surrounded them on each side; and so the water in regard to those that are baptised."

The Dr. proceeds in the next place, to find some rantisms, from the Jewish custom of washing hands, cups, and couches. The first passage the Dr. quotes he misapplies. The Pharisees did not refer in what they said of our Lord, to a rite of purification, but merely of a custom among the Jews, of washing hands before dinner. And, it is sufficient for us to say, in reply, that the Dr. washes his hands by immersion. No one thinks it necessary to immerse his body in order to wash his hands. In the second quotation, Math 15: 2. They *wash* not their hands, &c. the Dr. was careful not to let his readers know that the Greek word is *nipsontai*, and not *baptizo*. Many of the most learned pædobaptist writers, assert that there were two sorts of washing of hands referred to, one by pouring, (*nipsontai*,) the other by dipping, (*baptizontai*.) Dr. G. Campbell, says, "For illustrating this passage, let it be observed, first, that the two verbs rendered wash in the English translation, are different in the original. The first is *nip-*

sontai, properly translated *wash*: the second is *baptizontai*, which limits us to a particular mode of washing; for *baptizo* denotes *to plunge* or *dip*." Accordingly he translates the passage, "For the Pharisees eat not until they have washed their hands, by pouring a little water upon them; and if they come from market, by dipping them."

The custom of dipping pots, vessels, and couches, is thus described by the Jewish writer, Maimonides, "In a laver which holds forty *seahs* of water, they dip all unclean vessels. *A bed that is wholly defiled*, if he dips it part by part, it is pure."

The case of "divers baptisms" in the Jewish service includes the bathing of the Priests, and cleansing of vessels, &c. &c. While the sprinklings or *rantisms* of which the Apostle speaks, refers to the ceremony of setting apart persons and things from a common to a sacred use. But the words are never interchanged in reference to the customs and ceremonies designated. *Rantizo* is never rendered baptism, nor washing; nor is *baptizo* ever rendered sprinkling, or applied to the sprinkling ceremonies of the Jewish worship.

On page 93 the Dr. refers to the symbolical import of the ordinance. Peter anticipates him, and says, that "it is not the *washing* away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God, by faith in the (death and) resurrection of Jesus Christ." We are said to be washed from our scarlet colored sins, to receive the washing of regeneration, wash away our sins by baptism, as in the case of Paul, &c. &c. A fountain is opened in the house of David for sin and uncleanness; and "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth from all

sin." We, by baptism, profess that we have received the cleansing efficacy of the blood of Christ; and others see in the ordinance, the symbol of the spiritual bathing in the flood of salvation flowing from the Saviour's side. It is also emblematic of our death unto sin, and resurrection unto spiritual life. "We are buried with Christ by baptism," like as he was raised up by the glory of the Father, even so should we walk in newness of life." Rom. 6:4.

ETYMOLOGICAL VIEW OF THE WORD BAPTIZO.

It is only necessary on this point, for me to say, that universally, both in classic and sacred authors, the word *baptizo* (baptise) is rendered immerse; or construed in accordance with that definition. Pædobaptist authors, shall furnish the proof, whose inconsistency, I leave the Dr. to reconcile.

From the numerous Lexicographers, I shall only refer to Robinson's Lexicon, which is the standard work in sacred interpretation; and Donnegan's Lexicon, the standard work in classic study. I begin with Robinson. Article Baptism.

Baptizo,—to submerge, sink.

Baptisma, (what is immersed.)

Baptismos, baptism, immersion; spoken of the religious rite instituted by Christ.

Bapto, to dip in, to immerse.

Donnegan renders the word thus:

Baptizo, to immerse; submerge,—saturate.

Baptisma, an object immersed, submerged.

Baptos, immersed; dyed; drawn out.

Bapto, to dip, to plunge into water, wash, dye.

I now bring forward a few, out of hundreds of Pædobaptists, who contradict their own practices.

Thus ; they write their own condemnation, for, the Dr. says, the "command ought to be obeyed."

CALVIN. "The word *baptizo* signifies to immerse, and the rite of immersion was observed by the ancient church." Institutes, lib. v. chap. xv. § 2.

LUTHER. "Baptism is a Greek word, and may be translated *immersion*, as when they immerse something in water, that it may be wholly covered. And although it is almost wholly abolished, (for they do not *dip* the whole children, but only pour a little water on them,) they ought nevertheless to be wholly immersed, and then immediately drawn out ; for that *the etymology of the word seems to demand.*" "The Germans call baptism *tauff*, from a depth, which in their language they call *teeff*, because it is proper that those who are baptised be deeply immersed." Luth. Op. vol. I. p. 333.

VITRINGA. "The act of baptising, is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the force of the word. Thus also it was performed by Christ and his apostles." Aphor. Sanct. Theol. Aphoris. 884.

HOSPINIANUS. "Christ commanded us to be baptised; by which word it is certain immersion is signified." His. Sacram. L. II. C. i. p. 30.

GURTLERUS. "To *baptise*, among the Greeks, is undoubtedly to immerse, to dip ; and baptism is immersion, dipping. *Baptismos en Pneumati agio*, *baptism in the Holy Spirit*, is immersion into the pure waters of the Holy Spirit ; for he on whom the Holy Spirit is poured out, is as it were immersed into him. *Baptismos en puri*, '*baptism in fire.*' is a figurative expression, and signifies casting into a flame, which, like water, flows far and wide ; such

as the flame that consumed Jerusalem. 'The thing commanded by our Lord, is baptism ; immersion into water.' Institut. Theo. cap. xxxiii. § 108, 109, 110, 115.

BUDDEUS. "The words *baptizein* and *baptismos*, are not to be interpreted of aspersions, but always of immersion. Theolog. Dogmat. L. V. C. i. § 5.

SALMASIUS, "*Baptism* is immersion, and was administered in former times, according to the force and meaning of the word. De Cæsarie Virorum, p. 669.

VENEMA. "The word *baptizein*, to baptise, is nowhere used in the Scripture for sprinkling." Inst. Hist. Eccl. Vet. et. Vov. Test. Tom. III. sec. i. § 138.

Extracts from German writers of the age of the Reformation, and a few years subsequent, might be greatly multiplied ; but it would be superfluous.

Professor FRITCHE, a disciple of Hermann, in his Com. on Matt. iii. 6, says ; "That baptism was performed *not by sprinkling*, but by *immersion*, is evident, not only *from the nature of the word*, but from Rom. vi. 4."

AUGUSTI, vol. v. p. 5. "The word baptism, according to etymology and usage, signifies to immerse, submerge, &c.; and the choice of the expression betrays an age in which the latter custom of sprinkling had not been introduced."

BRENNER, p. 1. "The word corresponds in signification with the German word *taufen*, to sink into the deep."

The author of the Free Inquiry respecting Baptism, Leipsic, 1802. "Baptism is perfectly identical with our word immersion or submersion (*tauchen oder untertauchen*.) If immersion under water

is for the purpose of cleansing, or washing, then the word means cleansing or washing." p. 7.

BRETSCHNEIDER, in his 'Theology of 1828, vol. ii. p. 673 and 981. "An entire immersion belongs to the nature of baptism."—"This is the meaning of the word." 'This writer is confessedly the most critical lexicographer of the New Testament.

PAULLUS, in his Com, vol. i. p. 278, says, the word baptise signifies, in Greek, sometimes to immerse, sometimes to submerge."

RHEINHARD'S Ethics, vol. v. p. 79. "In sprinkling, the symbolical meaning of the ordinance is wholly lost."

"Professor ROST, the principal Greek lexicographer now living, in his standard German-Greek Lexicon, revised with the assistance of a native Greek, puts down as the primary signification of all such words as *plunge, immerse* and *submerge* (*tauchen, eintauchen, untertauchen,*) *bapto*; but under the words *wash, wet, pour,* and the like (*waschen, beneizen, giessen, begiessen,*) though he gives copious definitions in Greek, he never employs the word *bapto*, or any of its derivatives. Can any thing be more to the point?" Christian Review, vol. iii. p. 97.

SCHLEUSNER, in his Lex. on *baptisma*. "Those who were to be baptised were anciently immersed." Indeed, the three New Testament lexicographers, Schleusner, Wahl and Bretschneider, limit baptism as a sacred ordinance to immersion.

SCHOIZ, on Matt. iii. 6. "Baptism consists in the immersion of the whole body in water."

Professor LANGE, on Infant Baptism, of 1834, p. 81. "Baptism in the apostolic age was a proper baptism,—the immersion of the body in water."—

“ As Christ died, so we die (to sin) with him in baptism. The body is, as it were, buried under water, is dead with Christ; the plunging under water represents death, and rising out of it the resurrection of a new life. A more striking symbol could not be chosen.”

The author of the *Free Inquiry on Baptism*, p. 36. “ The baptism of John and that of the apostles were performed in precisely the same way,” i. e., the candidate was completely immersed under water. Speaking of Rom. vi. 4, and Gal. iii. 27, he says, “ What becomes of all these beautiful images, when, as at the present day, baptism is administered by pouring or sprinkling ?”

ROSENMULLER, KOPPE and BLOOMFIELD, all hold the same strong language on this subject. We will quote only the last, as he includes the others.

In his *Critical Digest on Rom. vi. 4*, he says, “ There is here plainly a reference to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion; and I agree with Koppe and Rosenmuller, that there is reason to regret it should have been abandoned in most Christian churches, especially as it has so evidently a reference to the mystic sense of baptism.”

WADDINGTON, in his *Ch. Hist.* p. 27, calls “ immersion, the oldest form of baptism.”

BRETCHNEIDER:—“ In the word baptizo, and baptisma is contained the idea of a complete immersion under water; at least so is baptisma in the New Testament.” *Theology*. Leipsic, 1830, vol. ii. p. 681.

“ RHEINHARD rightly says, that baptismos may also signify every common purification, but baptisma is used only at religious immersion.”

DR. CAVE:—"The party to be baptised was wholly immersed, or put under water;—whereby they did more notably and significantly express the three great ends and effects of baptism."

DR. JOHNSON, when arguing with a friend, in palliation of the Romish innovation, to which Dr. Whitby alludes (that of taking the cup from the laity,) observed: "They may think that, in what is merely ritual, deviations from the primitive mode may be admitted on the ground of convenience; and I think they are as well warranted to make this alteration as we are to substitute sprinkling in the room of the ancient baptism."

DR. CHALMERS, when commenting on the passage in the sixth chapter of Romans, in which the expression occurs, "buried with him by baptism," observes, "The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion; and though we regard it as a point of indifference whether the ordinance so named be performed in this way, or by sprinkling; yet we doubt not that the prevalent style of the administration in the apostle's days, was by an actual submerging of the whole body under water."

EDINBURGH ENCY.—"In the time of the apostles, the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptised was dipped in a river or vessel, with the words which Christ had ordered, and to express more fully his change of character, generally assumed a new name. The immersion of the wole body was omitted only in the case of the sick, who could not leave their beds. In this case, sprinkling was substituted, which was called *clinic baptism*. The Greek church, as well as the schismatics, in the East, retained the custom of immersing the whole body;

but the Western church adopted, in the thirteenth century, the mode of baptism by sprinkling, which has been continued by the Protestants, Baptists only excepted."

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE EXAMINED.

The Dr. seems determined to destroy the institution of baptism, by pleading for *a mode* of rantism. We have seen, that neither precept nor practice, can be found in the Bible, for an ordinance of rantism in the name of the Trinity; and that it is opposed to reason and common sense, to apply a mode of one action, to the performance of another. In the next place, the attendant circumstances of baptism, are brought forward; and the history of them construed in such a way, as to favor rantism, if possible. On page 94, the Dr. refers to the baptism in Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost. "Then they that gladly received the word were baptised, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand." Now the historian does not say they were baptised on that day. He only asserts that such as gladly received the word, on that occasion, were baptised. Nine tenths of the three thousand added to the church on that day, may have been of the multitude whom John and the Apostles had previously baptised, in Jordan. But supposing they were all baptised on that day. If the work were divided between the seventy disciples and twelve Apostles of our Lord, there would have been less than forty for each administrator. And the writer of this, has on several occasions, with the assistance of a Deacon, baptised two in a minute. In twenty minutes, therefore, the whole number could have been baptised. The warm heart-

ed converts who afterwards were willing to suffer the confiscation of all their goods, or lay them at the Apostle's feet to be distributed among the needy, were of course, ready to supply those who needed assistance with a change of apparel. Nor would the disciples be prohibited the privilege of immersing in the pools, for the citizens were struck dumb with the majestic displays of God's power and grace. In regard to polluting the pools, Josephus, attributes the healing virtues of the water of Bethesda, to the entrails of animals brought to the sheep market near by this pool. Besides, it is evident from history, and the five porches or dressing rooms constructed upon the verge of this pool, that the principal object of it was to afford facilities for bathing. The size of the pool of Bethesda, to say nothing of those of Siloe and Rogel, was sufficient for the immersion of the three thousand, the administrators standing four feet apart. Chateaubriand, who visited Jerusalem about thirty years ago, says, that it measures 380 feet around. Maundrell, that it was 120 paces long, and 40 broad, and 8 feet in the deepest place. See Calmet's Dictionary, or Dr. Clark, on 2 Chron. 32: 30. Is. 22: 9, and John 9: 7, and Dr. Gill on Acts 2: 41. In regard to Kedron, but fifty one days before, the Saviour crossed *the brook* with his disciples to Gethsemane. It was not a dry valley at that time. And, it was fed by those never failing fountains flowing from Mount Moriah, which secured to the land the praise of being "well watered," and "flowing with milk and honey."

We have seen, that on that day, the followers of Christ were baptised in the Holy Ghost—the whole use being filled with the Divine influence, where

they were sitting; and that none were baptised except those who "gladly received the word." Rantism, according to Dr. Wall, was not practised until thirteen hundred years after this time, and then only by those who submitted to the authority of the Pope of Rome. See Wall's History of Infant Baptism v ii. page 376. On the baptism at Jerusalem, it is only necessary further to say, that no historian thinks of describing the attendant circumstances of any given custom or rite, in their minutia, every time he refers to it. He only deems it necessary to name it, as he sees it, after he has once or twice particularly described the scene.

The case of the Jailer is next brought forward. The Dr. is very much tried for methods of shifting from the force of history. "They were in the prison," the Dr. says. Luke says they were *brought out*, verse 30. And then, that *they spake in his house*, verse 32. And, then, that the Jailer *took them*, and washed their stripes; and was baptised, he and all his straitway. And, then, verse 34, when he *had brought* them into his house, he set meat before them. Now, it must be plain, to any one that will see, that Paul and Silas were taken *out of* the prison, *into* the house; then took away from the house, to have their lacerated backs washed, and to baptise the believing household; and then, brought *into the house* after the baptism was performed. Add to this what is said in verse 13, and you have all the principal attendant circumstances of immersion, and the facilities in addition. There, was the river Strymon, and they went out of the house to baptise, and returned to the house, after they had obeyed the Saviour, and the household had imitated his example.

Can a matter be more plain, where the ordinance is not particularly described? The Dr. says, page 98, that they were still in prison. This is a flat contradiction of the sacred historian, who says, they were *taken out*, verse 30, and afterwards took from the house to baptise. That they went into the prison again is freely admitted; but that did not change, or destroy the previous facts recorded of them.

Let the reader take Pittsburgh, and apply the narration of facts in Philippi, to the Jail and the river in this city; and see how easily the whole can be understood of the immersion of the jailer's family in the city of Philippi. Here, the river is only a few hundred yards from the prison. And we may rationally suppose that the distance was not greater in Philippi.

John's baptism, "in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there," is the next case introduced. And here the Dr. makes sad work with the sacred record. His paraphrase would seem to purport, that John baptised where there was *much water*, to keep the people from dying with thirst. The *much water*, was to drink, according to his view. John, and the multitude came to Enon to drink, because there was much water there! This sage criticism, would not look so bad, if it could be made appear that the object of John's mission was to lead the people about from one drinking place to another, to keep them from being "exposed to imminent danger of perishing in consequence of thirst!" The Dr. becomes eloquent here, and seems to say, that any other view has as little foundation as "the baseless fabric of a dream." John Calvin says that, "from these words, John 3:10, it may be inferred,

that baptism was administered by John and Christ, by plunging the whole body in water." In. Loc.

While he dreams of rantising upon the base, he has laid in his remarkable exposition, I take my stand on the immutable testimony of God, that "John was *baptising* in Enon, near Salim, BECAUSE there was *much water* there."

The next paragraph, is "based" upon a quibble as puerile, as the former supposition is destitute of support. Who ever supposed, far less maintained, that when it is said that John baptised in Enon, that the administration of the ordinance, bears the same relation to the village, that it does to the element or river into which the candidates were plunged? There would be perfect propriety in saying, that I baptise in Pittsburgh, in the river Monongahela. In the first part of the phrase, in Pittsburgh, it is distinguished from all other cities and towns; and in the second, the river designated, in which the persons are baptised. What law of language is violated? Suppose, the Dr's. favorite rendering of the Greek word EN were adopted, and his practice of rantism were described, then we should have it thus. He rantised the children *with* Pittsburgh! John baptised *with* Enon! When we allow the Holy Spirit to narrate, all is intelligible. John baptised *in* the wilderness of Judea, *in* the river Jordan. And, not, in the wilderness of Egypt, nor in the river Nile. If we were to substitute *with* for *in*, it would read thus;—and the "people were baptised of him *with* the river of Jordan." This would be nonsense. We are confirmed, therefore, in the conclusion, that the baptism was performed in the river Jordan.

It is moreover affirmed by the evangelists that

Christ *came up straitway* OUT OF THE WATER after he had been baptised. A circumstance, always attendant on baptism; but *never* accompanying rantism, or sprinkling. And who ever read of cups, bowls, or basins in connection with primitive baptisms? Gladly, would the humble forerunner of our Lord, have carried a basin of water from the river or elsewhere, to have served the purpose of rantism, if such had been the will of the Redeemer. But, no! the lowly Lamb of God, more humble than his professed followers, went into the river, and set us an example that we should follow his steps, saying, "Thus, it becometh *us* to fulfill *all* righteousness!" The Eternal Father, and the Holy Comforter, approved the sacred institution, which Doctors of Divinity try to explain away, and supercede, by a human invention!

The case of the Eunuch is next referred to. I should think, that there could not possibly be any difficulty in understanding the nature of the ordinance from the circumstances here narrated. But, it does not seem to be the object of the Dr., to let plain truth on this subject have its effect upon those who are under the influence of his instructions. He evidently labors to obscure its light, and blunt its edge, by a multitude of words, which taken as rules of interpretation, are without wisdom. For, if the particles *en* and *eis*, are to be interpreted contrary to the force of the *verb* and the context, then there is no marvel why Daniel was not eaten by the lions. Upon the Dr's. principle, he was only taken *to* the door of the den!

And although our Lord says the righteous shall enter *eis* into the kingdom of heaven, yet they may

only arrive at the gate, if the Dr's. principle of interpretation prevail! But how plain the passage—“They went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptised (not rantised) him.” Now, first, we see Philip and the distinguished stranger descending from the chariot, and going down *into the water*; then, Philip baptised him, according to the law in Math. 28, and Mark 16, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and when they were come *up out of the water*, &c. he went on his way rejoicing.” The passage quoted from Is. 52, was not the passage the Eunuch was reading. The passage is quoted by Luke from the 53d chapter of that Prophet. Besides, the Hebrew word rendered “sprinkle,” in the verse referred to, is almost invariably translated elsewhere by *astonish*. And the prophecy evidently means, that Christ should *astonish* the nations, by the greatness of his condescension, the disinterestedness of his love, the power of his miracles, the purity of his doctrines, the intensity of his voluntary sufferings, the triumph of his resurrection, and especially by the achievements of his grace, as the reward of his victory over death, hell, and the grave.

In keeping the commands of God there is great reward; and the Eunuch, who entered into the marvelous—*astonishing* light of the above truths, willingly submitted to the Divinely appointed ordinance, and went on his way *rejoicing*. May all who believe in the Son of God, follow him, as he also followed Christ!

On Rom. 6: 4, the Dr. follows closely in the track of Dr. Woods of Andover, and with him fails to destroy the force of the argument derived from that

and parrallel passages. Unluckily, for the Dr. the "sound," "meaning," and every thing else, in the verse and context, are against the practice of rantism. "We are buried with Christ *by baptism.*" &c. It is not said, that we are buried with Christ by dying unto sin, or being sacrificed to the world, or by believing in Christ; but "*by baptism.*" Without a perversion of Paul's meaning, no criticism can destroy the force of this proof for immersion. Paul introduced it, as it *was*, in the days of primitive Christianity, when it was yet unmutilated by the hand of man. It was at *that time*, illustrative, of the burial and resurrection of Christ, *because* the resemblance was striking. The Dr. attempts to detect some dissimilarity between the ordinance of baptism, and the burial of Christ. But, if he were as effectually buried in a watery grave, as Christ was buried in the tomb of Joseph, when the stone closed the door, I should take him by the hand, as an obedient disciple of the Redeemer, *buried* with him *by baptism*, in affectionate commemoration of the Saviour's death and resurrection; and in evidence to others, that he determined no longer to "make void the commands of God, by the traditions of men."

The similarity between the loaf and the body of Christ is no more striking. The wafer and rantism, are on a par in this respect.

Anxious to find some shadow of proof for sprinkling, the Dr. refers on page 113 and 114 to the sprinklings connected with the Jewish worship. All, readily admit, that there were typical sprinklings, as well as immersions, under that dispensation. But, this by no means, proves that there is a figurative rantism, or sprinkling, instituted by the Head of

the church, in this dispensation. There are but two ordinances in the kingdom of the Saviour; and these are *positive* commands—not to be mutilated in the least by us, but to be implicitly obeyed.

When the blood of Christ is called the blood of sprinkling, it is in allusion to the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifices in the Jewish worship; but, instead of the word baptism being used in the Greek, it is invariably the word *rantism*. Let not any one who *rantises*, therefore, pretend to act under the commission of our Lord, which commands the minister to *Baptise*. Let those, at once acknowledge they *rantise* under the authority of the Pope of Rome, who, are determined not to be governed by the law of God and example of Christ. To those, who are willing in the day of God's power, His yoke is easy, and his burden is light. By such submission to their Lord and Master, they testify their love to him who first loved them; and shed a light upon those who look upon the order of God's house, that they may see their good works, and also glorify their Father in heaven. May every branch of Zion, exhibit the light of truth to a world of darkness; as it shone in the ordinances of Christ, when Christianity was in its pristine purity, and when the church in its primitive splendor, was emphatically a **LIGHT TO THE WORLD!**

SYLLABUS OF THE ARGUMENT.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.—1. Professors of religion, in general, consider baptism as a duty; and that it ought to be attended to by all proper subjects.

2. Baptism is a positive institution, and therefore we must have some plain precept, or example, to direct us, both with respect to the persons who are to be baptised, and the ordinance to be administered.

3. If we proceed in this ordinance, or any other, without authority from Scripture, God will reject our services with, “Who hath required this at your hands?” “In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.”

4. Baptism is an ordinance peculiar to the Gospel dispensation; and therefore the rule of our duty must be sought in the New Testament, and not in the Old.

5. The law which enjoins baptism may be found in Matt. 28: 19, 20. It enjoins a duty, durable as the unchanging dispensation to which it belongs—to charge the command with obscurity, is a daring impeachment of Divine Wisdom and Love—to suppose the Apostles did not understand it, is highly absurd; they certainly must understand it right, and their practice must be the best comment upon it.

6. If, by searching sacred history, we can learn, that the Apostles attended to baptism, we are bound to follow their example; nor can any argument, derived from education, custom, fashion, popularity, supposed indelicacy, non-essentiality, &c., &c. &c., justify those who live in the known neglect of it; for what are all these, when opposed to divine law, to primitive universal practice?

The following observations, with the remarks under each, are submitted to the pious reader's candid consideration .

FIRST—We have no proof, from the New Testament, that the Apostles ever ranted or sprinkled.

Argument 1. If the Apostles sprinkled, it is reasonable that they would have told us so, but no intimation of this can be collected from the New Testament.

Argument 2. The word baptise does not signify to sprinkle, but to immerse; this is granted by all the learned. The Apostles well knew that this was the import of the word, and fidelity to their Master's command would induce them to dip, and not sprinkle.

Argument 3. If a few drops of water, falling from the hands of a priest, were sufficient for this ordinance, how absurd and unaccountable the conduct of the Apostles: they chose places where there was much water; and because there was much water: they went down into the rivers to baptise: and shall we dare to charge the Apostles with folly, to keep up the credit of sprinkling?

Argument 4. The word baptism is sometimes used in Scripture in an allusive or figurative sense: Christ's sufferings are called a baptism—the effusions of the Holy Ghost are called a baptism—and the Apostle says, “we are buried with him by baptism.” Can we suppose that Christ was sprinkled with sufferings—that the apostles were sprinkled with the Holy Ghost—that a body is buried when a few particles of dust are sprinkled? Absurd supposition! But if dipping or covering with water, be proper baptism, then the passages referred to are clear, and the allusions proper, because the resemblance is striking.

INFERENCES.—1. As sprinkling is not baptism, those who have been only sprinkled, have not been baptised at all.

2. That it betokens great ignorance to deny that immersion is baptism, when such is the meaning of the original word, and it is constantly used in that sense.

3. That those persons who have been sprinkled, ought to submit to immersion; for the Scriptures tell us that there is “one baptism,” and no more.

4. That a person must be greatly unacquainted with the plain, literal, Scriptural account of baptism; or extremely prejudiced, not to say perverse, to affirm that the Bible says nothing about immersion, or burying in water as baptising: for it speaks of this alone.

SECOND—We have no Scriptural authority to baptise infants.

Argument 1 If the Apostles baptised infants, it is reasonable to suppose they would have told us so; but we have not the least intimation of their baptising one infant in all their travels; they speak of baptising MEN and WOMEN, but never infants.

Argument 2 The things required of candidates by the Apostles necessarily exclude infants: they require Instruction, Repentance, Confession, Reformation, and Faith; infants are incapable of these, therefore not the proper subjects of baptism. It is granted that the Apostles baptised several households, but there are many households without infants; and the Bible says nothing about infants in these; what is said of these households cannot with any truth be said of infants—they *believed, rejoiced, and ministered*: are infants capable of these?

It is a fact, that infants or children were brought to Jesus, and that he blessed them ; but not one word is said about his baptising them ; and it is certain that Christ did not baptise them ; for he never baptised any, either young or old. We sometimes hear of baptism succeeding circumcision ; and as infants were circumcised, so they ought to be admitted to baptism ; but it is sufficient to say, this strange succession is no where taught in Scripture ; and therefore we have nothing to do with it.

INFERENCE.—As infant sprinkling is a human invention, it is in vain to expect the smiles of God upon it : and, therefore, the popular opinion must be erroneous and injurious, which states, that infants, when sprinkled, are made “ members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.” A supposition absurd in the extreme, contrary to Scripture, falsified by universal observation, and dangerous in proportion to the credit it gains in the religious world : there being reason to fear, that many when they come to the years of maturity, trusting to this sprinkling work, go securely to ruin.

THIRD.—There is all the proof that we can reasonably desire, that the Apostles baptised, i. e. immersed.

Argument 1. The Apostles certainly did baptise. The preceding observations clearly prove that they did not sprinkle, we therefore infer, that dipping was the ordinance.

Argument 2. The radical, primary sense of the word baptise, required them to dip or plunge. Indeed, it is so understood by all learned men : and so the Greeks practise.

Argument 3. The places they chose, and their go-

ing down into these places, make it manifest that they immersed. "John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there." Bowls, are never mentioned.

FOURTH.—It is undoubtedly evident that many believers were baptised by the Apostles.

Among many other examples, we find Lydia, Stephanas, the Jailer, the Eunuch; and in Acts 2, we read of three thousand, therefore, as we have three thousand and four plain examples in favor of believers' baptism, and not one solitary example of infant sprinkling, in all the travels and writings of the Apostles, let conscience decide what is the line of duty. The law is—"He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved."

LAST.—We give an epitome of our reasons for practising believer's baptism.

We practise immersion, not because we wish to differ from our brethren of other denominations, nor because we expect that water will wash away our sins, or procure any part of our salvation, but we administer the ordinance, because,

1. We are commanded to do so. It would therefore be presumptuous to slight the command of our Lord, upon the ground of non-essentiality, or upon any other pretence whatever. "It is better to obey than to sacrifice."

2. We cannot in conscience *trifle* with baptism, because that, in effect, charges Christ with being a trifler.

3. Because we wish, on earth, to walk in the imitable steps of that Jesus with whom we hope to live in heaven for ever. "Leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps,"

4. Because Christ calls it a part of righteousness, and we desire to fulfil all righteousness, that we may avoid those guilty fears which arise from neglect, "It is the answer of a good conscience towards God,"

5. Because we wish to be, and prove ourselves to be the friends of the Redeemer, by universally regarding his commands, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you," And because we are anxious to avoid the censure due to hypocrites, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

6. Because we keep in view that solemn day, when we must give up our accounts to the Judge of the world. "Whoever is ashamed of me before men, of him will I be ashamed before my Father and all his holy angels."

IMPORTANCE OF BAPTISM.—The preceding observations have shown what is baptism, and who should be baptised; to see its importance, observe, that

1. *God appointed it.* John 1: 33. "He that sent me to baptise," &c.

2. *Christ submitted to it.* "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptised of him." Matt. 3: 13; Luke 3: 21.

3. *Jesus called it a part of righteousness.* Jesus said, "Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." Matt. 3: 15.

4. *The Holy Ghost sanctioned it.* "Jesus, when he was baptised, went up straightway out of the water; and lo! the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him; and, lo! a voice from heaven, saying, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am

well pleased." Matt. 3: 16, 17; Luke 3; 21, 22.

5. *The Lord Jesus commanded it.* "Go ye, therefore, teach all nations, baptising them." Matt. 28;

6. *The Apostles, under the influence of the Spirit, practised it.* Peter on the day of Pentecost, said, "Repent, and be baptised every one of you. Acts 2; 38.

7. *The first Christians were baptised.* "Then they that gladly received his word were baptised." Acts 2; 41. See also the case of the Jailer, Eunuch, &c.

8. *Baptism was then thought a privilege.* "See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptised." Acts 8; 36.

9. *The Apostle Paul was baptised.* "He arose and was baptised." Acts 9; 18. And was first called on to be baptised without delay. "And now, why tarriest thou? arise and be baptised, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts 21; 16.

10. The effusion of the Spirit was given as a reason for baptism, not against it. "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptised, which have received the Holy Ghost." Acts 10: 47.

11. They who refuse to submit to God's appointment, reject his counsel. "And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptised with the baptism of John, but the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptised of Him." Luke 7: 29, 30.

12. Christ calls for obedience. "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Luke 6. 46.—"Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." John 15: 14.



